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Abstract

Depletion of natural fish stock has some fishing techniques seriously fingered. The presumed low economic performance of artisanal fisheries using environmental sustainable fishing techniques (ESFT) has lead to this study on economic of adoption of ESFT in Mangrove Swamp Zones (MSZ) of Nigeria. Data were obtained from a two-stage sampling of 206 artisanal fishermen in two states of MSZ. Fishermen socioeconomic features, adoption level of ESFT, unit prices, species and quantity of catch as well as inputs were elicited using a well-structured questionnaire and analyzed using both descriptive and budgetary tools. The result shows that fishing activities are concentrated at the sea-shore of less than 5nm. There was no sustainable fishery practice as a low (26.1%) and 24.1% adoption level of ESFT for Bayelsa and River State respectively and low (2.6%) opportunity cost of destructive fishing practices were recorded. Nematoapalaeon hastais generated the highest returns of USD 345.77/fisherman (46.6%), hence the reason for the concentration of fleets around the sea-shore. Though artisanal fisheries is economically sustainable in MSZ with a more than unity benefit-cost ratio across all adopters' categories, species like shark Etamopterus penel which are mostly found off-shore contributed more to returns of innovators than for other adopters. The study recommends a persuasive extension demonstration and the use water police to enforce strict adherence to principles ESFT.
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1.0 Introduction

An economic sustainable fishing practices must aim to save the natural stock, enhance biodiversity and ensure a steady returns without fishing beyond maximum sustainable yield. Empirical studies have shown that continuous catch that seems profitable to a large number of fish folks, has become detrimental to the future welfare and environment of the fish folks. Mmom and Arokoyu (2010) observed that continuous removal of fish from aquatic habitat is posing a threat to both the environment and the future welfare of fisher folks in Mangrove Swamp Zones (MSZ). Eboh (1995) had already noted that the efforts of farmers towards increasing the output and achieving economic goals inadvertently distabilize environmental goals, hence obstructing the sustainable economic development. In the same way, fish folks in the mangrove swamp zone who strive to increase catch per unit fishing effort are inadvertently fishing beyond maximum sustainable yield. Hardin (1968) called this situation “tragedy of the common,” because the continuous removal of fish from the aquatic environment in an area beyond social efficient level will definitely decline the natural stock, thus the future benefits derivable from such resource in the area. Fishing requires the use of Environmental Sustainable Fishing Technique (ESFT). ESFT are technicalities designed to ensure that the natural fish stock are not destroyed while the fish folks embarked on continuous fishing expedition for their livelihood (Ita, 1992; Abiodun 1994 and NDDC, 2004).

Although the growing population and economic activities of Niger Delta Region (NDR) pre-supposed intensified oil exploration and industrialization, which no doubt deplete the ecosystem, excessive fishing with sophisticated and dangerous fishing techniques further complicate biodiversity depletion in the mangrove swamp (Bisong, 2001). Aquatic organisms may have modified features that enable them withstand the adverse effects of oil pollutions and industrial effluent in the zone (Adeyemo, 2003 and Olanike et. al., 2009), but identified malaise of environmental degredation due to excessive catch has been fingered to some endangered species and fishing beyond maximum sustainable yield (NDDC, 2004; Mmom and Arokoyu, 2010). Some fishing skills and techniques in the area may appear rewarding at first instant (because they increase catch), but they can distabilize the ecosystem, make aquatic organism go extinct and increase future returns impossible (Adedeji et. al., 2011).

Mangrove Swamp Zone (MSZ) is an ecological zone that streches between 5000 - 8580 km² along Nigerian coastline with a spread of brackish water that is rich in alluvial deposits and natural fish stock (Mmom, 2007). The area is a suitable breeding ground for different species of fish (James, 2008 and James et. al., 2007) though it is saddled with rapid biodiversity depletion and annual decimation of aquatic population (David and Gianna, 2005; Mmom and Arokoyu, 2010). In view of the fact that indiscriminate use of traditional fishing input does not only distabilize the ecosystem but also reduced the future catch, Oko and Zelin (2010) and Naylor et.al. (2001) recommends that aquatic resources in the MSZ can be harness for economic growth if fishing technologies are properly and efficiently managed. A policy that will not only put the use of obnoxious fishing inputs to check but facilitates a stable ecosystem and ensures a steady increase in returns in MSZ anchors this study. This study...
investigates the degree of adoption of ESFT and its effect on rate of returns to investment in artisanal fishing in MSZ of the Niger Delta Region of Nigeria.

1.2 Conceptual Frame Work

Sustainable fishery is usually compromised when fishersfolk struggle for improved livelihood. Destructive fishing practices are not part of sustainable fishery, hence management practices that allows more fleets in the water without monitoring whether clean fishing practices are performed by them is a gate way for environmental degredation. Unintentional catch when targeting certain sizes of fish, crabs, the use of certain gear and vessel beyond certain areas and time as well as poison, dynamite and cyanide fishing are some of bad fishing practices that should be discouraged. Contrary to the earlier belive that ESFT will reduce catch, consequent to livelihood as fishersfolk fear being made job with these management techniques., Ehirim et. al. (2013) noted that a continuous catch with increase catch and improves livelihood is possible. Ita (992) and Abiodun (1994) differently acknowledged some techniques that can galvanize, a sustainable livelihood and a balanced aquatic ecosystem. Registration of vessels, gears and grew members and their licensing when thu meet some criteria, standard mesh size regulation, close are and season fishing and other clean fishing practices

The use of a recommended mesh size for some dominant species in mangrove as well as the use of clap with gill nets in the flood plains, will ensure that only suitable table fishes are caught while the juvenile fishes are retained in water at all time. Again, catch-sort and drop otherwise called by-catch and discard method according to Eayrs (2005), creates a second chance for already trapped fish to grow to full maturity, produce more fishes before they are finally harvested. Adopting other techniques such as, water tenure system and Fishing beyond nautical miles, complying with close area and close season fishing practices, intensifying the use of flood plains by applying organic manure in the flood plains and around the continental shelves and encouraging aquaculture along artisanal fishing will reduce the pressure mounted on the natural stock by continious fishing. Also registration and licensing of the fishermen as well as keeping catch data, complying with gear regulation and quota restriction and prohibiting the use of poison and dynamites or explosives will not only check over-exploitation, but also ensure a healthy ecosystem, sustainable fishing and livelihood of the fish communities (Ita, 1992).

2.0 Materials and Method

The mangrove swamp zone (MSZ) is within the Niger Delta region of Nigeria. It consist the brackish water front of the coastal line of atlantic ocean. It is located within latitude 5° and 7°N and longitude 5° to 8°E of Greenwich. It covers the state like Rivers, Delta, Bayelsa and Akwa-Ibom States of Nigeria. The area is a breeding site for different species of fish, accomodated the largest and highest number of fish settlements but the most distabilized ecosystem. A two-stage sampling technique was used in this study. First was a purposeful selection of two (2) stats: Bayelsa and Rivers State with predominant fishing settlements were selected out of the four states in the zone. The second stage was a purposive selection of the two largest fishing settlement in each of the states. Nmbe and Brass watersides were selected from Bayelsa State while Kai and Oyorokoto-Opobo watersides in Rivers State were selected.

A random selection of artisanal fishermen from the list of fishermen per settlement kept with the Ministry of Agriculture and Natural Resources in each state. The list showed that Nmber and Brass Water sides has 132 and 121 registered fishermen respectively while Kai and Oyorokoto-Opobo waterside has 176 and and 184 fishermen respectively. A random selection of 80% of the fishermen from each of the list gave a total selection of 202 and 289 fishermen from Bayelsa and Rivers State respectively but only 106 and 120 responses were found useful for the study. A well structured questionnaire was used to elicit information on socio-economic characteristics, adoption level of environmental sustainable fishing techniques, the quantity and prices of fishing inputs and output in the area between May and September 2010.

Analytical Method and Model Specifications

Data were analized using descriptive, inferential and econometric tools. Descriptive statistics was used to identify ESFT that were adopted. The ESFT identified in this study were those of Ita (1992) and Eayrs (2005) as shown in 3.1

\[ EST = \{V_i : i, 1...10\} \]

Where

\[ V_1 = \text{The use of recommended mesh size for some species that is dominant in an area}, \]
\[ V_2 = \text{Catch-sort and Drop technique or By-catch and Discard Method (Eayrs, 2005)}, \]
\[ V_3 = \text{Complying with Close Area and Close season fishing practice}, \]
\[ V_4 = \text{Intensifying the use of flood plains and the addition of organic manure in the flood plains and the continental shelves}, \]
\[ V_5 = \text{Use of clap nets and gill nets in the flood plains}, \]
\[ V_6 = \text{Encouraging} \]
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aquaculture along artisanal fishing, \( V_7 = \) Adopting water tenure system and Maintaining about 5 or more nautical miles in fishing, \( V_8 = \) Registration and licensing of the fishermen as well as keeping catch data, \( V_9 = \) Complying with gear regulation and quota restriction, \( V_{10} = \) Prohibition of the use of poison and dynamites or explosives. These were actually the techniques that can sustain the maximum sustainable yield (MYS) which the fish community is expected to adhere to strictly (Ita, 1992).

Ozor and Madukwe (2001) noted that adoption process follows a seven-point likert type of scale (called NAEITA + D), with assigned ordinal values of between 0 and 6 (Lionberger, 1960 and Cameron, 1999). Therefore, adoption score of a fisherman for each ESFT his maximum stage in adoption process. The mean and standard mid value as shown in 3.2 and 3.3 respectively were compared to select the adopted ESFT. An ESFT is adopted when \( M \geq \) a standard mid value of 3.0

\[
\bar{M} = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{F} X}{\sum F} \quad \text{where} \ 0 \leq \bar{M} \leq 6 \quad \text{---------------------------3.1}
\]

\[
GMA = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{10} \bar{M}}{10} \quad \text{---------------------------3.2}
\]

Where \( i = 1,2...7 \) and \( j = 1,2,3...10 \)

\[
SMV = \frac{0 + 1 + 2 + 3 + 4 + 5 + 6}{7} = 3.0 \quad \text{---------------------------3.3}
\]

Where;
\( \bar{M} = \) Mean Adoption of an ESFT
\( GMA = \) Grandmean adoption
\( X_j = \) Adoption stage in the adoption process of an ith farmer in jth technique obtained from ordinal values attached to the adoption process.
\( F = \) Frequency of Fishermen within the same adoption stage in a particular technology.
\( SMV = \) Standard mid value

Fishermen were further differentiated to various adopters category based on their adoption potential. Adoption potential is the possible degree of adoption level an ith fisherman in all the available ESFT as at the period of this study. This is expressed as the mean adoption level in all ESFT. A fisherman is at the highest adoption potential if he shows aggressive tendencies in adopting all the ESFT with the shortest period of time but becomes the least if otherwise. The categorization is done thus

\[
AP = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{N} ADL_i}{N} \pm \text{Std.Dev(n)} \quad \text{---------------------------3.5}
\]

Where;
\( AP = \) Adoption Potential of an ith fisherman
\( ADL = \) Adoption Level of an ith fisherman in all the ESFT
\( N = \) Total number of ESFT introduced and used by at least a fisherman the area.

The economic sustainability of artisanal fishing in the area based on states in mangrove swamp zone and adopters categories were obtained using a budgetary analysis such as gross margin analysis and rate of returns to investment. The gross margin and rate of truturns model are expressed as;

\[
\text{Gross Margin} = \sum_{i=1}^{n} YP_y - \sum_{i=1}^{n} P_x X_1 + ... + P_x X_j \quad \text{---------------------------3.6}
\]
\[ \text{RTI}_j = 100 \left\{ \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n} YP_y - \sum_{i=1}^{n} P_{X_i} X_i + \ldots + P_{X_j} X_j + K}{\sum_{i=1}^{n} P_{X_i} X_{ij} + \ldots + P_{X_{ij}} X_{ij}} \right\} \]

0(\text{RTI}_j \geq 1) \text{ when the enterprise is economically sustainable}

Where;
\( \text{RTI} \) is already defined,
\( Y_i \) is the quantity of catch of an ith fisherman,
\( P_{Y_i} \) is the unit price of catch,
\( P_{X_i} \) is the unit input price of an ith input used
\( X_{ij} \) is the quantity of jth input used by an ith fisherman.
\( K \) is the fixed inputs such as depreciation

\[
\text{Benefit/Cost ratio} = \frac{D_{\text{Benefit} @19\%}}{D_{\text{Cost} @19\%}}
\]

Where;
\( D_{\text{Benefit} @19\%} \) = Discounted Benefit at 19% discount factor
\( D_{\text{Cost} @19\%} \) = Discounted cost at 19% discount factor

When the ratios is equal to 1, then the returns can comfortably take care of the investment even in the long run, but if it is less than 1, then the enterprise is expected to continue to operate in the very short run as it can meet its immediate financial obligations while economic sustainability is expected to take place in the long run. When the ratio is less than zero (0), the enterprise fails to be economically sustainable both in the short and the long run. The fisherman closes down at this stage.

3.0 Results and Discussions

3.1 Descriptive Statistics of Artisanal Fish folks in Mangrove Swamp Zone of Niger Delta, Nigeria

Table 1 presents the socio-economic distribution of the fishermen in the mangrove zone of Niger Delta Region of Nigeria. The result shows that there are more male fishermen in the area with 86.8% and 83.3% for them from Bayelsa and River State respectively. Their mean age is 39.9 and 33.3 years for Bayelsa and Rivers State respectively with majority (33.9%) of them in Bayelsa between 31 to 40 years 33.3% of them between 21 to 30 years of age in River State. Few of them (17.0%) are older than 60 years of age in Bayelsa and River State. Again, few (15% and 8.3%) of them have relatively higher fishing experience of above 20 years, implying that artisanal fisheries is centered more around the young age category than the old people. The level of formal education among the fishfolk is high with 44.3% and 38.3% of them in Bayelsa and River State having up to secondary education. Extension contact is as low as 6 times per fishing season just as they try to keep a relatively small household size of less than 5 persons per household.
### Table 1. Socio-Economic Characteristic of the Fishermen

| Variable                      | Bayelsa State |              | Rivers State |              |
|-------------------------------|---------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
|                               | Frequency     | Relative (%) | Frequency     | Relative (%) |
| **Age (Years)**               |               |              |              |              |
| 20 or less                    | 2             | 1.9          | 19           | 15.8         |
| 21-30                         | 21            | 19.8         | 40           | 33.3         |
| 31-40                         | 36            | 33.9         | 21           | 17.5         |
| 41-50                         | 29            | 27.4         | 20           | 16.7         |
| 51-60                         | 10            | 9.4          | 15           | 12.5         |
| 61-70                         | 6             | 5.7          | 4            | 3.3          |
| More than 70 Years            | 2             | 1.9          | 1            | 0.8          |
| **Total**                     | 106           | 100.0        | 120          | 100.0        |
| **Mean**                      | 39.9          | -            | 35.2         | -            |
| **Level of Formal Education** |               |              |              |              |
| No Formal Education           | 20            | 18.9         | 36           | 30.0         |
| Adult Education               | 11            | 10.3         | 10           | 8.3          |
| Primary Education             | 21            | 19.8         | 23           | 19.2         |
| Secondary Education           | 47            | 44.3         | 46           | 38.3         |
| Tertiary Education            | 7             | 6.6          | 5            | 4.2          |
| **Total**                     | 106           | 100.0        | 120          | 100.0        |
| **Mean**                      | 7.9           | -            | 6.6          | -            |
| **Years of Fishing Experience**|               |              |              |              |
| 1-10                          | 65            | 61.3         | 65           | 54.2         |
| 11-20                         | 25            | 23.6         | 45           | 37.5         |
| 21-30                         | 7             | 6.6          | 5            | 4.2          |
| 31-40                         | 8             | 7.5          | 2            | 1.6          |
| Above 40 Years                | 1             | 0.9          | 3            | 2.5          |
| **Total**                     | 106           | 100.0        | 120          | 100.0        |
| **Mean**                      | 13.1          | -            | 11.3         | -            |
| **Extension Contacts Made**   |               |              |              |              |
| No Extension Contact          | 49            | 46.2         | 38           | 31.6         |
| 1-5                           | 21            | 19.8         | 32           | 26.7         |
| 6-10                          | 17            | 16.0         | 31           | 25.8         |
| 11-15                         | 14            | 13.2         | 15           | 12.5         |
| More than 15                  | 5             | 4.7          | 4            | 3.3          |
| **Total**                     | 106           | 100.0        | 120          | 100.0        |
| **Mean**                      | 4.9           | -            | 5.4          | -            |
| **Household Size**            |               |              |              |              |
| 1-5                           | 78            | 73.6         | 81           | 67.5         |
| 6-10                          | 21            | 19.8         | 26           | 21.7         |
| 11 or More                    | 7             | 6.6          | 13           | 10.0         |
| **Total**                     | 106           | 100.0        | 120          | 100.0        |
| **Mean**                      | 5             | -            | 5            | -            |
| **Gender**                    |               |              |              |              |
| Male                          | 92            | 86.8         | 100          | 83.3         |
| Female                        | 14            | 13.2         | 20           | 16.7         |
| **Total**                     | 106           | 100.0        | 120          | 100.0        |
| **Marital Status**            |               |              |              |              |
| Single                        | 27            | 25.5         | 53           | 44.2         |
| Married                       | 78            | 73.6         | 66           | 55.0         |
| Divorce/Separated             | 1             | 0.4          | 1            | 0.8          |
| **Total**                     | 106           | 100.0        | 120          | 100.0        |

Source: Field Survey 2011  
Source Field Survey 2013
### 3.2 Fishing Assets and Fishing Activities in Mangrove Swamp Zone of Niger Delta Nigeria

Table 2 below shows the distribution of fishermen based on their level of fishing assets and fishing activities in the mangrove areas. The result showed that there is an open access to fishing in the area with majority of the respondents engaging in only artisanal fishing as source of livelihood. Mean fishing distance off-shore is lower than 5 nautical miles (nm). About 83.0% of them in Bayelsa and over 91.6% of them in Rivers state are fishing in less than 5 nautical miles (nm) off-shore. Such fishing distance has a devastating effect on the growth of juvenile fishes and fish breeding in the mangrove. Few fishermen of less than 17.3% in Bayelsa and 8.4% in Rivers State were actually complying with the regulations of fishing beyond 5nm off-shore. Since fishing is a common means of livelihood, it means that the natural stock is at risk as the breeding areas within the mangrove will be quickly and easily destroyed with excessive fishing activities by fishfolks. The use of cast nets is common (45.2%) in Bayelsa and long lines and hook is the commonest (45.8%) in Rivers State. The use of dugout is common in both states with 68.9% in Bayelsa and 64.2% in Rivers state using such vessel for fishing. There are few fishermen that used mortorized vessel. Only 16.0% and 16.7% of fishermen in Bayelsa and Rivers state are using such vessels for fishing. It could be revealed from this result that fishermen do not have enough capital to acquire the required fishing vessel that can take them far off-shore for fishing expedition. Hence making the catch of table fishes difficult.

#### Table 2 Distribution of Fishermen by their Assets and Fishing Activities

| Variable                  | Bayelsa State | Rivers State |
|---------------------------|---------------|--------------|
|                           | Freq | %      | Freq | %      |
| **Fishing Distance**      |      |        |      |        |
| Less than 1 Nautical mile | 52   | 49.0   | 62   | 51.6   |
| 1 - 5                     | 36   | 34.0   | 48   | 40.0   |
| 6 - 10                    | 12   | 11.3   | 8    | 6.7    |
| Greater than 10 Nautical miles | 6 | 5.7    | 2    | 1.7    |
| Total                     | 106  | 100.0  | 120  | 100.0  |
| **Mean Distance covered** | 2.9  | 2.2    |      |        |
| **Fishing Gears**         |      |        |      |        |
| Long lines/Hooks          | 47   | 44.3   | 55   | 45.8   |
| Cast Netting              | 48   | 45.2   | 32   | 26.7   |
| Drift Netting             | 17   | 16.0   | 28   | 23.3   |
| Trapping                  | 12   | 11.3   | 13   | 10.8   |
| Others                    | 4    | 3.8    | 3    | 2.5    |
| Total                     | 128+ | -      | 131+ | -      |
| **Fishing Vessel**        |      |        |      |        |
| Dugout Canoes             | 73   | 68.9   | 77   | 64.2   |
| Plank Canoes              | 41   | 36.6   | 32   | 26.7   |
| Motorized Canoes          | 17   | 16.0   | 20   | 16.7   |
| Total                     | 131+ | -      | 129+ | -      |
| **Access to Water**       |      |        |      |        |
| Open Access               | 89   | 84.0   | 117  | 97.5   |
| Closed Access             | 17   | 16.0   | 3    | 2.5    |
| Total                     | 106  | 100.0  | 120  | 100.0  |
| **Occupation**            |      |        |      |        |
| Fishing Only              | 86   | 81.1   | 75   | 62.5   |
| Fishing and Farming Only  | 1    | 0.9    | 13   | 10.8   |
| Fishing and Trading Only  | 2    | 1.9    | 7    | 5.8    |
| Fishing and Schooling Only| 9    | 8.5    | 15   | 12.5   |
| Fishing and Civil Service | 8    | 7.5    | 2    | 1.7    |
| Fishing and Craft         | 0    | 0      | 8    | 6.7    |
| Total                     | 106  | 100.0  | 120  | 100.0  |
| **Technology Compatibility and Practicability** | 46   | 43.4   | 61   | 50.8   |
| Yes                       | 32   | 30.2   | 16   | 13.4   |
| No                        | 28   | 26.4   | 43   | 35.8   |
| Indifference              | 106  | 100.0  | 120  | 100.0  |

**Source:** Field Survey 2013
3.3 The level of Adoption of Environmental Sustainable Fishing Technologies in Mangrove Zone

Table 3b. presents the mean adoption levels of Environmental sustainable fishing techniques (ESFT) in Mangrove Swamp zone of Niger Delta, Nigeria. ESFT were not massively adopted in the mangrove swamp zone of Nigeria with a grand mean adoption score of 1.82 and 1.69 in Bayelsa and Rivers State respectively. There is a total adoption level of 26.1% in Bayelsa and 24.1% in River State, implying that about 73.9% and 75.9% of ESFTs have not been adopted in Bayelsa and Rivers States respectively. Among the 10 included technologies, the mean scores are less than the standard mid value of 3.0 except the close area and season technology and avoidance of dynamites and explosions with mean adoption score of 3.21 and 3.27 respectively. It therefore implies that the two ESFT were the only technologies adopted by fishermen in Bayelsa. In the same way, avoidance of dynamites with a mean adoption score of 3.56 which is greater than 3.0 was the only ESFT adopted in River State. Though other ESFT in the two states were at various level of adoption score, there is no strong evidence that they are capable of keeping breeding areas sustainable. The adoption of these practices in artisanal fisheries of the area could be due to the serious litigation measures applied in recent time by the immediate members of the parliament. This measure should also be applicable to the rest of the ESFT to facilitate a sustainable livelihood through fishing activities in the area. The study also suggests a extension teaching approach that can persuade the use of ESFT to save the areas from total distruption.

3.4 Adopters Category of ESFT by Fishermen in MSZ of Nigeria

The result in Table 3a. reveals the level of different adopters of environmental sustainable fishing techniques in MSZ. It could be seen from the result that majority (41.5% and 36.7%) of fishermen in Bayelsa and Rivers State are within late adopters category respectively while 28.3% and 25.0% are laggards in Bayelsa and Rivers State respectively. Few (15.1% and 10.0%) of the fishermen is aggregate of innovator and early majority in Bayelsa and Rivers State respectively. This finding reveals that majority of these fishermen are laggards and late adopters hence, adoption of environmental sustainable fishing practices must be more pragmatic to enable the never adopters move into the early majority category with time.

Table 3a. Adoption Score/Intensity and Adopters Categories of Sustainable Fishing Practices in the Niger Delta of Nigeria

| States          | Bayelsa | Rivers State |
|-----------------|---------|--------------|
| Adopters Category | Adoption Intensity Class Limits | Frequency | % | Frequency | % |
| Laggards/Neve | 0 - 8.0 | 30 | 28.3 | 30 | 25.0 |
| Late Majority  | 8.5 - 19.0 | 44 | 41.5 | 44 | 36.7 |
| Late Majorities| 19.5 - 30.0 | 16 | 15.1 | 34 | 28.3 |
| Early Adopters | 30.5 - 41.0 | 14 | 13.2 | 10 | 8.3 |
| Innovators     | 41.5 - 60.0 | 2 | 1.9 | 2 | 1.7 |
| Total          | -       | 106 | 100.0 | 120 | 100.0 |
| Mean           | -       | 16.5 | 18.8 | |
| Adoption Potential | 19.0±11n | | | |

Source Field survey 2013 (n = 0, 1, 2 … N represents the level of Adoption intensities)

Table 3b. Mean Adoption and Adopted Technology in Mangrove Swamp Region of Nigeria.

| States in Mangrove Zone | Bayelsa State (n = 106) | Rivers State (n = 120) |
|------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|
| Environmental Sustainable Fishing Techniques | X | Remark | X | Remark |
| 1 Recommended Mesh Size | 1.51 | Na | 2.75 | Na |
| 2 Catch sort and Drop Method | 0.72 | Na | 0.69 | Na |
| 3 Close Area and Season Fishing | 3.21 | Ad | 1.02 | Na |
| 4 Use of Flood Plains | 1.26 | Na | 0.78 | Na |
| 5 Use of Gill and Clap net in the Flood Plains | 1.66 | Na | 0.70 | Na |
| 6 Practicing Agriculture | 1.41 | Na | 1.57 | Na |
| 7 Practicing Water Tenure | 1.31 | Na | 1.28 | Na |
| 8 Registration/ License | 1.85 | Na | 2.38 | Na |
| 9 Quota Restriction | 2.08 | Na | 2.15 | Na |
| 10 Avoiding Dynamited Poison | 3.27 | Ad | 3.56 | Ad |
| Grand Mean Adoption | 1.82 | | 1.69 | |
| Percentage Adoption | 26.1% | | 24.1% | |

Source: Field Survey 2013
3.5 Economic Sustainability of Artisanal Fisheries Across some States in the Mangrove Swamp Zone of Niger Delta Nigeria

Table 4 presents the cost and returns of artisanal fishing activities across the states in the mangrove swamp zone in the Niger Delta region of Nigeria. The result reveals that shrimps *Nematopalaemon hastatis* caught in artisanal fisheries in MSZ generated about USD 345.77/fisherman or 46.6% of a fisherman’s total returns. This is followed by the catch of shark *Etamopterus penyi* with USD 250.04/fisherman or 33.7% of his total returns. A critical look across the states studied shows that about USD 320.07/fisherman and USD 232.48/fisherman or 48.8% and 34.93% of the returns from the catch in Bayelsa are made from shrimps and sardines respectively. In the same way, about USD 345.77/fisherman and USD 250.04 or 46.6% and 33.7% of the total returns are made from shrimps and shark respectively in Rivers state. The high contributions of shrimps and sardine to the total revenue of the fishermen in MSZ could be the reason for the large concentration of fishing activities within swamp zones than farther off shore. Catch of suitable table sized sharks and other highly valued species are done farther off-shore but little fishing effort is done by the fishermen in this regard. The implication of this finding to the ecosystem of MSZ is that there will be a fast and continuous loss of some endangered species of fish. Apart from being suitable breeding, World Bank (1995) and NDDC (2004) have observed that fishing close to the sea shore or the swamp areas will lead to the collapse of targeted fish species like Sardines *Sardinella maderenis* and other species.

The result further shows that depreciation of fixed inputs, labour cost, lubricants and fuel constitute the highest cost of artisanal fisheries in area while charges on gross vessel length and penalty on abuse of water resources are the least. A higher charge and strict penalty could caution the bad use of water resources in the area but apparently, the open access to water and lack of litigation measures in the area may have resulted to less attention will be paid to ESFT in the area.

The gross margin for artisanal fisheries in MSZ of Niger Delta region is USD513.50 per fisherman, which is about 69.2% of the total cost of catch. The value ranges from USD557.54 or 68.2% of the total cost of catch in River state to USD488.88 per fisherman or 73.3% of the total cost of catch in Bayelsa. It could be deduced from the result that the rate of return to investment in artisanal fisheries in MSZ is 36.7% with Bayelsa and Rivers state having 41.1% and 33.1% respectively. Artisanal fisheries in Mangrove area of Niger Delta region is economically sustainable despite the adoption of environmental sustainable fishing techniques in the area. An increase in total cost of catch by 100% will give a more than 41.1% increase in return in the Bayelsa State, 33.1% increase in returns in Rivers State and about 36.7% increase in returns for all the fish folk in the Mangrove swamp zone of Niger Delta region of Nigeria. A benefit-cost ratio of 1.37 from the pooled result is an indication that the enterprise is viable now but the viability in future is questionable giving the rate of removal of juvenile fishes from the swamp.

3.6 Economic Sustainability of Artisanal Fisheries among Adopters of ESFT in the Mangrove Swamp Zone, Niger Delta, Nigeria.

Table 5. presents the cost and returns of artisanal fishery activities of different adopters of environmental sustainable fishing techniques in MSZ of Niger Delta, Nigeria. The benefit-cost ration that is greater than unity for different adopters showed that enterprise is economically sustainable the different adopters. However, there is an interesting finding from this study. Some species like shark *Etamopterus penyi* that are mostly found off-shore contributed more to revenue of adopters of ESFT than others. The Principle of ESFT belived that fishing farther off shore will help sustain the breeding areas provided by the MSZ and adopters of ESFT are abided by this particular principle (Naylor et al., 2001 and Oko and Zelin, 2010). It could be revealed from this result that about USD 332.08/innovator or 39.1% of his total returns, USD 332.58/early majority adopter or 40.9% of his total returns and USD 312.58/late majority adopter or 39.7% of his total returns is relatively higher than only USD 124.78 per late adopter or 20.7% of his returns and USD 158.18 per laggard or 23.2% of his total return. This provides a strong evidence that despite the difficulties associated with adoption of ESFT, the techniques may accomodate more returns afterall. The innovators, early majority and late majority fishermen are taking advantage of species farther off-shore to generate more revenue than the late adopters and the laggards in MSZ. This is due to their adherence to the principles of ESFT than the restofthe adopters in the area.

The study therefore suggests that although shrimps and sardine that are close to sea shores contributed more to their revenue of individual adopters, it is important to remove the mind of these group of fishermen from existing trend of fishing close to the sea-shore so as to achieve a stable ecosystem in the MSZ. This can be achieved through a persuasive extension education and good artisanal fishing demonstration that must abide strictly with the principles of ESFT by model agents or extension agents.
### Table 4. Budgetary Analysis According to the States under Study in Niger Delta Nigeria

| States Items | Bayelsa State (n = 106) | Rivers State (n = 120) | Pooling (n = 206) |
|--------------|------------------------|-----------------------|------------------|
|              | USD/Fisherman (%)      | USD/Fisherman (%)     | USD/Fisherman (%)|
| Revenue      |                        |                       |                  |
| Sardines: Sardinella maderensis | 232.48 | 34.9 | 216.69 | 26.5 | 224.59 | 30.3 |
| Brackish Catfish: Chrysicthys nigrodigitatus | 208.38 | 31.3 | 179.78 | 22.0 | 194.08 | 26.2 |
| Charge on Gross Vessel Length |                      |                       |                  |
| Water Penalty | 5.76 | 8.0 | 13.75 | 1.7 | 7.95 | 1.3 |
| Total Variable Cost | 452.05 | 67.8 | 549.87 | 67.3 | 500.96 | 67.5 |
| Depreciation | 155.64 | 23.3 | 167.16 | 20.4 | 161.40 | 21.7 |
| Registration and Training | 45.55 | 6.8 | 79.79 | 9.8 | 62.67 | 8.4 |
| Total Fixed Cost | 214.60 | 32.2 | 267.71 | 32.7 | 241.15 | 32.5 |
| Gross Margin (A – B) | 488.88 | 73.3 | 557.54 | 68.2 | 513.50 | 60.2 |
| Net Income (NI) (A – B + C) | 274.28 | 41.1 | 270.43 | 33.1 | 272.35 | 36.7 |
| RTI [100(F/C)] Percentage | 41.1 | 33.1 | 36.7 |
| Benefit/Cost Ratio (@ 100) | 1.41 | 1.33 | 1.37 |

**Source:** Field Survey 2013

### Table 5. Budgetary Analysis Based on Adoption Categories of ESFT in Mangrove Swamp Zone of Niger Delta Region of Nigeria

| Adopters Categories | Innovators | Early Majority | Late Majority | Late Adopters | Lagards | Pooled |
|---------------------|------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------|--------|
|                     | Amount Per Fisherman | USD | % | USD | % | USD | % | USD | % | USD | % | USD | % |
| Sardines: Sardinella maderensis | 378.37 | 44.5 | 338.41 | 42.8 | 202.01 | 25.7 | 105.70 | 17.5 | 98.46 | 14.4 | 224.59 | 30.3 |
| Brackish Catfish: Chrysicthys nigrodigitatus | 106.81 | 12.6 | 113.77 | 14.4 | 218.53 | 27.8 | 205.10 | 34.0 | 326.19 | 47.7 | 194.08 | 26.2 |
| Sharks: Eumomota penyi | 332.08 | 39.1 | 322.58 | 40.9 | 312.58 | 39.7 | 124.78 | 20.7 | 158.18 | 23.2 | 250.04 | 33.7 |
| Shrimps: Nematosleemon hastati | 417.64 | 49.2 | 371.79 | 47.1 | 380.70 | 48.4 | 269.02 | 44.6 | 289.71 | 42.4 | 345.77 | 46.6 |
| **Total Revenue** | 1234.90 | 1146.55 | 1113.82 | 704.60 | 872.54 | 1014.17 |
| Labour (manday) | 222.20 | 26.2 | 221.73 | 28.1 | 203.21 | 25.9 | 191.97 | 31.7 | 146.54 | 21.4 | 197.13 | 26.5 |
| Bait (Kilogramme) | 26.30 | 3.1 | 33.77 | 4.3 | 22.79 | 2.9 | 26.77 | 4.4 | 19.97 | 2.9 | 25.92 | 3.5 |
| Fuel (liters) | 150.16 | 17.7 | 138.18 | 17.5 | 151.48 | 19.3 | 53.61 | 8.9 | 120.12 | 17.6 | 122.71 | 16.5 |
| Lubricants (litres) | 155.00 | 18.2 | 128.32 | 16.3 | 150.09 | 19.1 | 85.19 | 14.1 | 132.45 | 19.4 | 130.21 | 17.5 |
| Charge on Gross Vessel Length | 17.03 | 2.0 | 20.01 | 2.5 | 15.00 | 1.9 | 12.08 | 2.0 | 12.08 | 1.8 | 15.24 | 2.1 |
| Water Penalty (Naira) | 16.70 | 1.9 | 13.00 | 1.6 | 7.10 | 0.9 | 7.00 | 1.2 | 5.00 | 0.7 | 9.75 | 1.3 |
| **Total Variable Cost** | 587.39 | 69.2 | 555.01 | 70.3 | 549.67 | 69.9 | 376.62 | 62.5 | 436.16 | 63.8 | 500.96 | 67.5 |
| Depreciation (Naira) | 140.00 | 16.5 | 148.00 | 18.7 | 160.03 | 20.4 | 171.00 | 28.3 | 187.97 | 27.5 | 161.40 | 21.7 |
| Registration and Training (Naira) | 102.00 | 12.0 | 70.00 | 8.9 | 60.00 | 7.6 | 38.55 | 6.4 | 42.80 | 6.3 | 62.67 | 8.4 |
| **Total Fixed Cost** | 262.00 | 30.8 | 234.35 | 29.7 | 236.38 | 30.1 | 225.90 | 37.4 | 247.12 | 36.2 | 241.15 | 32.5 |
| Gross Margin (A – B) | 849.39 | 100.0 | 789.36 | 100.0 | 786.05 | 100.0 | 602.52 | 100.0 | 683.28 | 100.0 | 742.11 | 100.0 |
| **Net Income in Naira (A – B + C)** | 647.51 | 76.2 | 591.54 | 74.9 | 564.15 | 71.8 | 327.98 | 54.4 | 436.38 | 63.8 | 513.50 | 69.2 |
| **RTI [100(F/D)] (Percentage)** | 385.51 | 45.4 | 357.19 | 45.3 | 327.77 | 41.7 | 102.08 | 16.9 | 189.26 | 27.7 | 272.35 | 36.7 |
| **Benefit/Cost Ratio** | 1.454 | 1.453 | 1.417 | 1.169 | 1.277 | 1.367 |

**Source:** Field Survey 2013
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