academicJournals

Vol. 6(7), pp. 80-86, July 2014
DOI: 10.5897/IJFA2013.0404
Article Number: 2665A9945817
ISSN 2006-9839

http://www.academicjournals.org/ijfa

International Journal of Fisheries and Aquaculture

Full Length Research Paper

Analysis of resource use efficiency among small-scale fish farms in Cross River State, Nigeria

Kingsley Okoi Itam[1], Ekanem Abasiekong Etuk[1] and Inibehe George Ukpong[2]*

[1]Department of Agricultural Economics and Extension, University of Calabar, Calabar, Nigeria.
[2]Department of Food Economics and Marketing, School of Agriculture, Policy and Development, University of Reading, RG6 6AR, Reading, United Kingdom.

Received 21 December, 2013; Accepted 23 May, 2014

The study used the stochastic production frontier model to analyze the resource use efficiency among small scale fish farms in Cross River State, Nigeria. The mean efficiency of 0.89 was obtained indicating room for farm efficiency improvement by 11%. Quantity of feed, farm size (pond size), labour and capital had significant influence on fish production in the study area, with positive coefficients of feed quantity and farm size while that of labour and capital were negative. The return to scale (RTS) was 1.055 indicating increasing returns to scale, which implied that farmers may need to increase the use of productive resources. High cost of feed, unavailable credit, lack of capital and unfavorable price of fish were among the major constraints to fish production in the area. There existed some inefficiency among the sampled farmers. The major contributing factors to efficiency were gender, family size, farming experience and education. This calls for gender mainstreaming when policies that would cause improvement in efficiency are made for implementation.

Key words: Resource use, efficiency, production frontier, fish farming, Cross Rivers, Nigeria.

INTRODUCTION

Fish farming is the art and science of controlled rearing of fish in ponds, farms and in some instances natural water bodies from hatchlings (freshly hatched fishes) to mature size (Amos and Bolorunduro, 2000). It therefore, involves the controlled feeding, fertilization, stocking combination, reproduction and harvesting of fish (Amos and Bolorunduro, 2000).

Fish farming may have started about 50 years ago with the establishment of a small experimental station at Onikan, Lagos State and an industrial farm about 20 ha at Panyan in Plateau State by the Federal Government of Nigeria (Olagunju et al., 2007). Presently, fish culture has spread to all states in the country. Fish culture has been established as the best alternative to bridging the widening gap between the demand for and supply of food fish in the country (Ugwumba and Okoh, 2010). The Food and Agricultural Organization recommends that, an individual should take 35 g/ caput/ day of animal protein for sustainable growth and development (Tanko et al., 2014).

*Corresponding author. E-mail: inibeheukpong@gmail.com, Tel: +447404793722.

However, the animal protein consumption in Nigeria is less than 8 g per person per day, which is far below the FAO minimum recommendation (Niang and Jubrin, 2001). The major animal protein sources in the country include cattle, goats, sheep, poultry and fish. Out of these sources, fish and fish products provide more than 60% of the total protein intake in adults especially in the rural areas (Adekoya and Miller, 2004). Therefore, the importance of the fishing industry to the sustainability of animal protein supply in the country cannot be over-emphasized.

There has been a decline in the supply of fish in Nigeria. This is due to the decline in the country's major source of food fish, the artisanal fisheries (Ugwumba and Chukwuji, 2010), down to 40% in 2006 resulting to about 300,000 metric tons (GAIN, 2007). Osawe (2007) reported domestic fish production at 551,700 metric tons as against the present national demand of about 1.5 million metric tons estimated for 2007. The shortfall is reported to be bridged by the importation of 680,000 metric tons annually consuming about N50 billion in foreign exchange (Odukwe, 2007). Adediran (2002) and Ugwumba (2005) asserted that the only way to boost fish production and thereby move the country towards self-sufficiency in fish production is by embarking on fish farming especially catfish farming. Ugwumba and Chukwuji (2010) noted that this prompted the Federal Government of Nigeria to package the Presidential Initiative on fisheries and aquaculture development in 2003 to provide financial and technical assistance to government programs and projects encouraging fish production.

In Cross River State, fish farming is yet to be fully developed even though the State is highly endowed with rich aquatic resources. A large percentage of production from capture fisheries is mainly contributed by artisanal fisheries whereas production through aquaculture and large trawl fishing is still minimal. Major constraints facing the full industrialization of the sector range from the high cost of feed, low capital to poor enlightenment programs on fish culture techniques. Programs such as the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD)/United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and Department for International Development (DFID)/(FAO)/Cross River State (CRS) were put in place to increase fish production to meet a target of 553 metric tons by 2011 in order to attain the FAO minimum protein requirement of 35 g/caput/day for the 2.89 million persons in the State (MANR, 2007).

In spite of these efforts of Government, fish production has remained low in the country vis-à-vis Cross River State. This has been attributed to inadequate supplies from the local fish farmers, which may not be unconnected with low efficiency of fish farming in Nigeria. Onoja and Achike (2011) noted that there are indications that the development of efficiency of fish farming in Nigeria can be a bridge towards solving the problem of inadequate supplies. This can be possible if there is improvement in the use of resources by farmers as it will lead to increase in efficiency and productivity of the fish farms. Increasing productivity and efficiency within the sub-sector of agriculture particularly among small-scale fish producers requires a good knowledge of the current efficiency or inefficiency inherent in the sector as well as factors responsible for this level of efficiency or inefficiency (Agom et al., 2012).

The need to efficiently allocate productive resources for development purposes cannot be over-emphasized. Hence, every factor of production should be efficiently and effectively mobilized to reduce the gap between actual and potential national outputs (Amos, 2007). The efficient allocation of resources at the farm levels will lead to rise in Gross National Product (GNP) and per capita income. Recent studies in estimating resource-use efficiency in Cross River State are centered on crop production, with limited information on fish farming. Related studies on fish farming such as Onoja and Achike (2011) and Ugwumba and Okoh (2010) were conducted in Rivers and Anambra States, respectively. These studies explored the application of the translog model to analyze resource productivity and profitability respectively. While Onoja and Achike estimated technical efficiency of small-scale catfish (*Clarias gariepinus*) farming in Rivers State, Nigeria, Ugwumba and Okoh did a comparative profitability analysis of African crariid catfish farming in concrete and earthen ponds. Such studies are lacking in Cross River State. Therefore, the need for this study is imperative. The main objective of this study is to determine the efficiency of small-scale fish farms in Cross River State. In specific terms, the study estimates the productivity and technical efficiency of the fish farms, identifies the constraints to fish production and analyses the determinants of technical efficiency among fish farmers in the state.

The Stochastic Production Frontier Analysis (SPFA) is an economic model introduced by Aigner et al. (1977) and Meeusen and van den Broek (1977). The frontier is used for estimating technical efficiency where deviation from the frontier is decomposed into random components reflecting measurement error and statistical noise, and a component reflecting inefficiency. The estimation of full frontier could be through a non-parametric approach (Meller, 1976) or a parametric approach where a functional form is imposed on the production function and the elements of the parameter vector describing the function are estimated by programming (Aigner and Chu, 1968) or by statistical techniques (Richmond, 1974; Greene, 1980). A potential advantage of the frontier is that it incorporates the traditional random error of regression in addition to capturing the effect of unexplained variables and errors of measurement in the dependent variable. Thus, its wide acceptance and use in this study.

Small scale fish farmers are defined in this study as fishing households (as opposed to commercial companies) using relatively small amount of capital and energy, relatively small fish ponds (earthen or concrete) or vessels, mainly for local consumption (FAO, 2012). According to FAO's Advisory Committee on Fishery Research (ACFR) working group on small-scale fisheries, small- scale fisheries make an important contribution to nutrition, food security, sustainable livelihood and poverty alleviation, especially in developing countries. Since government cannot provide all the jobs for every citizen, there is need for self-employment to promote economic growth. Engagement in small scale fish farming in Nigeria will rid the country of corruption, and other social vices caused by unemployment. The null hypothesis to be tested in this study is that no inefficiency effects exists among the sampled fish farmers in the study area, while the alternative hypothesis is that there exists some inefficiency effects among the farmers.

Ho: ä = 0

Ha: ä ≠ 0

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Cross River State is one of the 36 States of the Federal Republic of Nigeria. It is made up of 18 Local Government Areas and consists of 3 Agricultural Zones namely; Calabar, Ikom and Ogoja agricultural zones. According to the national population census conducted in 2006, the state has a estimated population of about 3 million people. The State is located in the Niger Delta region of Nigeria, and bounded in the North by Benue State, in the South by the Atlantic Ocean, which is responsible for its rich aquatic resources. It is bounded in the East by the Republic of Cameroon and in the West by Akwa Ibom, Abia and Ebonyi States. Cross River lies within latitude 40° 4" South and 60° 30" North, and between longitude 8° and 9° 00" E of the equator. The annual mean rainfall ranges between 1500 and 2000 mm.

The purposive sampling technique was used to select 2 agricultural zones from the 3 zones; Calabar and Ikom zones. Four Local Government Areas (LGAs) namely; Calabar Municipality, Calabar South, Yakurr and Ikom were then randomly selected. This is because of the high concentration of fish farmers in these areas. The second stage was the proportional selection of 3 towns from each of Calabar Municipality and Calabar South, and 2 towns from each of Yakurr and Ikom giving a total of ten towns. Then a simple random selection of 5 fish farmers was carried out from each of the towns making up the total sample size of 50 farmers. Data were collected with the use of a structured questionnaire designed for collecting information on outputs, inputs, farm size (pond size), prices of variables, as well as on the socioeconomic characteristics of the farmers in November - December, 2013. The questionnaires were administered through personal interviews and observation on the selected fish farmers.

Analytical technique

Aigner et al. (1977) independently proposed the stochastic frontier production function which differs from the traditional production function because its disturbance term has two components: one to account for technical inefficiency and the other to permit random events that affects production (Tran et al., 1993). It is specified as:

$$Y_i = f(X_i; \beta)\exp(V_i - U_i)\, i = 1, 2, 3 \ldots N \quad (1)$$

Where, Y= Production of the ith firm, X_i = Vector of input quantities of the ith firm, β = Vectors of unknown parameters, V_i = Random factors such as weather, risk and measurement error beyond the farmers control, U_i = Technical inefficiency effects.

The Cobb-Douglas functional form was assumed for the production technology of the farms and the empirical stochastic frontier production model was specified as:

$$LnY = Ln\beta_0 + \beta_1 LnX_{1i} + \beta_2 LnX_{2i} + \beta_3 LnX_{3i} + \beta_4 LnX_{4i} + \beta_5 LnX_{5i} + V_i - U_i \quad (2)$$

Where: Y = Output of fish (kg), X_1 = Quantity of feed (Kg), X_2 = Farm size (Pond size in square meter), X_3 = Labour (Man days), X_4 = Value of Capital (Naira), X_5 = Value of fingerlings (Naira), V_i = Random factors as earlier stated, U_i = Technical inefficiency effects as earlier stated, Ln = natural logarithm.

The intercept (β_0), and the coefficients of the independent variables which range from β_1 to β_5, are parameters to be estimated. The error factor (Vi) which is assumed to be independently and identically distributed captures random variations due to factors beyond the control of the fish farmers in the study area, while the term (Ui) captures technical inefficiency effects in the production process. The inefficiency effects (Ui) are assumed to be non-negative, half normal distribution N(0, δ^2u) and specified as follows:

$$Ui = \delta_0 + \delta_1 Z_{1i} + \delta_2 Z_{2i} + \delta_3 Z_{3i} + \delta_4 Z_{4i} + \delta_5 Z_{5i} + \delta_6 Z_{6i} + \delta_7 Z_{7i} \quad (3)$$

Where:U_i = Technical inefficiency of the ith fish farm, Z_1 = Age of fish farmer (years), Z_2 = Gender of fish farmer (Dummy, Female= 0, 1= Male), Z_3 = Marital status (Dummy, Single=0, 1= Married), Z_4 = Pond size (square meter), Z_5 = Family size (Number of persons in farmer's household), Z_6 = Farming experience (years), Z_7 = Education (Years spent in school).

The intercept (δ_0) and the coefficients ($\delta_1,\ldots\delta_7$) of the independent variables are parameters to be estimated. The coefficient of the Maximum Likelihood Estimates (MLE) of the parameters (Zs) was estimated using the Frontier 4.1 model by Coelli (1994), while the parameters were tested at 1 and 5% levels of significance.

Likert scale: The use of a 5-point Likert scale was employed to determine the degree of seriousness of the production constraints.

(i) Highly very serious = 5,
(ii) Very serious = 4,
(iii) Serious = 3,
(iv) Moderately serious = 2,
(v) Less serious = 1.

The cut-off point was determined as follows:

$$\overline{X} = \sum f / n \quad (4)$$

Where: X = Critical mean score, f = Total scale score (that is, 5, 4, 3, 2, 1), n = Scale points

Table 1. Estimated maximum likelihood parameters of the stochastic production function for fish production.

Variable	Parameter	Coefficients	Standard error	t-ratio
Constant	β_0	-3.846	0.2903	-1.325
Quantity of feed	β_1	0.823	0.117	6.999***
Farm size (stock size)	β_2	0.340	0.050	6.815***
Labour	β_3	-0.056	0.025	-2.230**
Capital	β_4	-0.125	0.046	-2.724**
Fingerlings	β_5	0.073	0.050	1.474
Diagnostic statistics				
Gamma(Y)	γ	0.120	0.349	0.345
Sigma square	σ^2	0.60	0.031	1.921***
Log likelihood function	L	14.33		
Likelihood ratio (LR) of the One-sided error	ʎ	13.373		

Source: Computed from field survey Data 2013 using Frontier 4.1 Software, ***Significant at 1%, **Significant at 5%.

Hence, 5+4+3+2+1/5 = 3

The mean score was compared with the critical mean, 3. If the calculated mean of a constraint is greater than the standard critical value, that constraint is regarded as very serious. The variable mean score is given as follows:

$$\overline{X_i} = \sum I / n \quad (5)$$

Where: $\overline{X_i}$ = Variable mean score, I = Variable (e.g., Constraints 1,2,3,4,…13 of fish production), $\sum I$ = Total scores of all the respondents on a variable, n = Number of respondents.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The Maximum likelihood estimate (MLE) of the parameters of the stochastic production frontier model of the fish farmers is presented in Table 1. The table contained the estimates of the parameters of the stochastic production frontier model, the efficiency model and the variance parameters of the model. The variance parameters of the stochastic production function are represented by sigma squared (σ^2) and gamma (γ). From the table, the estimated sigma parameter (σ^2) show that about 60% of the variation in fish production among the farmers was attributed to differences in technical efficiencies of the fish farmers. There was a positive relationship between the level of output of fish and quantity of feed and pond size. This is expected as the level of production depends largely on these inputs, especially the quantity of feed used in the farm. Feeds are necessary resources for fish health and growth. This result agrees with that of Onoja and Achike (2011). On the other hand, there was a negative relationship between the level of output, and labour and capital. This is in contrast with a priori expectation. It implies that these resources were over utilized. Thus, indicating that the contributions of labour and capital resources towards technical efficiency of farms were decreasing.

The existence of technical inefficiency provides a good ground in determining the sources of inefficiencies for fish farmers. Variations in technical efficiency of the farmers may arise from their characteristics and the existing technology (Giroh et al., 2008). Socioeconomic variables were included in the model to determine their influence on technical efficiency. The result of the inefficiency model shows that the signs of the estimated coefficients in the model have important implications on the technical efficiency of fish farmers in the study area. The signs of the coefficients are interpreted in the opposite direction such that a negative sign implies that the variable enhances efficiency and vice versa. From the analysis, gender, family size, experience and education were the significant variables influencing the level of technical efficiency of the model. The coefficients of experience and education had positive signs (Table 2), implying that these variables reduces the efficiency level of the farmers. This is unexpected as farmers usually count on experience and with education, they would be able to read and understand instructions on agricultural innovation and easily adopt them for increased productivity. The negative coefficients of gender and family size imply that these variables enhance efficiency. Farmers usually keep large family members so as to provide labour during production period. Thus, the larger the family size, the more labour is available for farming operations, thus increasing the efficiency of farmers (Amos, 2007).

Furthermore, Table 3 shows that there was presence of technical inefficiency effects among the fish farmers in the study area as confirmed by a test of hypothesis for the presence of inefficiency effects using the generalized likelihood ratio test. Therefore, the null hypothesis of no inefficiency effect in fish production, ä = 0, was rejected

Table 2. Determinants of technical inefficiency in fish production.

Variable	Parameter	Coefficients	Standard errors	t-ratios
Age	d_1	0.378	0.293	1.292
Gender	d_2	-0.028	0.995	-2.814***
Marital Status	d_3	-0.067	0.064	-1.051
Stock size	d_4	0.022	0.035	0.641
Family size	d_5	-0.132	0.029	-6.046***
Farming experience	d_6	1.118	0.507	2.206***
Education	d_7	0.473	0.236	2.0***

Source: Computed from field survey data, 2013 using frontier 4.1 Software, ***Significant at 1%, **Significant at 5%.

Table 3. Hypothesis test of the existence of technical inefficiency among the fish farms.

Efficiency	Likelihood function (L)	Number of restrictions	Likelihood ratio (λ)	Critical at 5%	Conclusion
Technical	14.33	6	13.373	11.9	Reject

Source: Critical value derived from Kodde and Palm (1986).

Table 4. Estimates of frequency distribution of technical efficiency index among fish farms.

Efficiency range	Frequency	Percentage
≤ 0.80	11	22
0.81 – 0.90	5	10
> 0. 90	34	68
Total	50	100
Mean	0.89	
Minimum	0.41	
Maximum	0.98	

Source: Computed from output of Frontier 4.1.

Analysis of technical efficiency of the fish farmers

Table 4 shows that the predicted farm specific technical efficiencies (TE) range of the farmers is between 0.41 and 0.98 with a mean of 0.89. Many of the farmers had efficiency of between 90% and above while a few of them were less than 90% efficient. However, they can increase production by reducing the use of capital and labour inputs. This is because the value of capital and labour were negative decreasing functions to the factors.

Elasticity of production and return to scale

The estimated coefficient for the specified function represents the elasticities of the explanatory variables. The result shows that the value of the returns to scale (RTS) was 1.055 (Table 5). This implies that farmers were experiencing increasing returns to scale in fish production in the study area. Further analysis shows that feed quantity, farm size and fingerlings were positive functions to the factors, indicating that a 10% increase in the inputs will lead to 8.2, 3.4 and 0.73% increase respectively in output. Thus, indicating that variable allocation and use were in the stage of economic relevance of the production function (Stage II). The elasticities of labour and capital were negative functions to the factor implying over utilization of these factors. Hence, caution must be exercised with the use of labour and capital inputs.

Constraints to fish production

Several factors were identified as constraints to fish productivity in the study area and these were ranked

Table 5. Elasticity of production and returns to scale.

Variable	Elasticity
Quantity of feed	0.823
Farm size	0.340
Labour	-0.056
Value of capital	-0.125
Value of fingerlings	0.073
RTS	1.055

Source: Survey Data (2013).

Table 6. Constraints to fish production.

Constraints	Calculated mean	Rank
High cost of feed	3.64	1st
Unavailable credit	3.47	2nd
Unavailable capital	3.12	3rd
Unfavourable price of fish	3.10	4th
Poaching	2.92	5th
Lack of extension agents	2.60	6th
Cost of fingerlings	2.54	7th
Fish mortality	2.44	8th
Lack of skilled workers	2.36	9th
Incidence of disease	2.34	10th
Poor maintenance	2.26	11th
Lack of water supply	2.26	11th
Poor water quality	2.04	12th

Source: Computed from survey Data (2013).

according to their degree of seriousness. Table 6 shows that high cost of feed was top in the rank (3.64). This was closely followed by unavailable credit (3.47), unavailable capital (3.12) and unfavourable price of fish (3.10). These variables were considered as serious constraints of the farmers to fish productivity because their values were above the critical mean of 3. Other constraints were below the critical mean hence, they were less serious.

Conclusion

The study used the stochastic production frontier model to investigate the efficiency of resource use in small scale fish farms in the study area. The results show that fish farmers were not fully technically efficient. The efficiency range of between 0.41 and 0.98 with a mean of 0.89 among the fish farmers was obtained. The mean range of efficiency indicates that there is room for farm efficiency improvement by 11%. Production variables that had significant influence on fish production in the study area are quantity of feed, farm size (stock size), labour and capital, with a positive coefficient of feed quantity and farm size had positive signs, while that of labour and capital were negative. These imply that increasing resource use other than labor and capital would result to increase productivity in fish production among the sampled farms.

Again, gender, family size, level of education and farming experience significantly influenced technical efficiency of fish farmers. Since education and experience had a positive influence, therefore, technical efficiency can be significantly increased as the farmers get more education and experience. The negative coefficients of gender and family size imply that these variables increased the efficiency of the fish farmers.

Also, the fact that the farmers engaged members of their families in farm activities accounted for their increased efficiency. Therefore, farmers are encouraged to continue to engage more of their family members in farm operations so as to reduce labour cost and increase efficiency. The return to scale (RTS) was 1.055 indicating increasing returns to scale. This implied that resource use and allocation were in the stage of economic relevance of the production function (Stage II).

High cost of feed, unavailable credit, lack of capital and unfavourable price of fish were the major constraints of fish production in the study area. Finally, given that gender, family size, education and experience significantly influenced farmers' efficiency, government policy should be directed towards improving these variables.

Conflict of interests

The author(s) have not declared any conflict of interests.

REFERENCES

Adediran IA (2002). Super-Intensive Fish culture using water recirculating system. Proceedings of seminar on fish farming, Success Attitude Development Center (SADC), pp. 1-4. Lagos, Nigeria.

Adekoya BB, Miller JW (2004). Fish cage culture potential in Nigeria. An overview, Natl. Cult. Agric. Focus pp. 15-10.

Agom DI, Ohen SD, Itam KO, Inyang NN (2012). Analysis of Technical Efficiency of Smallholder Cocoa Farmers in Cross River State, Nigeria. Int. J. Agric. Manage. Dev. (IJAMAD) 2(3):177-185.

Aigner DJ, Chu SF (1968). "On estimating the industry production function". American Economic Review, 58:826-839.

Aigner D, Lovell CAK, Schmidt P (1977). Formulation and estimation of stochastic frontier production model. J. Econom. 6:21-27. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0304-4076(77)90052-5

Amos TT (2007). An analysis of productivity and technical efficiency of smallholder cocoa farmers in Nigeria. J. Soc. Sci. 15(2):127-133.

Amos TT, Bolorunduro PI (2000). Economics of aquaculture production. Extension Bulletin. No. 17, Fisheries Series No. 5. National Agricultural Extension and Research Liaison Services. Ahmadu Bello University Zaria, Nigeria.

Coelli TJ (1994). A guide to frontier 4.1: A computer frontier production. Department of Economics. University of New England, Amordale.

Giroh DV, Valla W, Mohammed A, Peter O (2008). Analysis of the Technical inefficiency of gum Arabic based cropping patterns among farmers in the gum Arabic belt of Nigeria. J. Agric. Soc. Sci. 4:125-128.

GAIN: Global Agriculture Information Network (2007). Nigeria fishery products. Nigeria's Fish Market, 2007, pp. 5-11. GAIN Report Number NI7026. Lagos, Nigeria.

Greene WH (1980). "Maximum likelihood estimation of econometric frontier functions". J. Econ. 13(1):27-56. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0304-4076(80)90041-X

Kodde FC, Palm DC (1986). Wald criteria for jointly testing equality and inequality restrictions. Econometrica 54:1243-1248. http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/1912331

MANR (2007). Report of the sub-committee on transition. Ministry of Agriculture and Natural Resources, Cross River State, Nigeria.

Meeusen W, van den Broeck J (1977). Efficiency Estimation from Cobb-Douglas Production Functions with Composed Error. Int. Econ. Rev. 18(2):435-444. http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/2525757

Meller JP (1976). Efficiency Frontier for Industrial Establishment of Different Sizes. Explorations in Economic Research. Occasional paper of the National Bureau of Economic Research.

Niang T, Jubrin S (2001). Quarterly newsletter of the Nigeria agriculture question and answer service. 1:1-7.

Odukwe A (2007). Fish farming in the tropics. A functional approach maxiprints, Awka, Nigeria, Book review.

Olagunju FI, Adesiyan IO, Ezekiel AA (2007). Economic viability of catfish production in Oyo State, Nigeria. J. Hum. Ecol. 2:21-124.

Onoja AO, Achike AI (2011). Resource productivity in small-scale Catfish (*Clarias gariepinus*) farming in Rivers State, Nigeria. A translog model approach. J. Agric. Soc. Res. (JASR) 11(2):139-149.

Osawe M (2007). Technical Know-how of catfish grow out for table size in 4-6 months. Proc. Seminar on Modern Fish Farming by Dynamo Catfish Production, Lagos, Nigeria. pp. 1-14.

Richmond J (1974). " Estimating the efficiency of production". Int. Econ. Rev. 15:515-521. http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/2525875

Tanko L, Nabil IA, Maikasuwa MA (2014). Profit Efficiency of Small Scale Layer Producers in Some Selected Local Government Areas in Sokoto State, Nigeria. Int. J. Modern Res. Rev. 2(1):52-61.

Tran VHS, Coelli T, Evan F (1993). Analysis of the technical efficiency of state rubber farms in Vietnam. J. Agric. Ecol. 9:183-201. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0169-5150(93)90047-G

Ugwumba COA (2005). The economics of homestead concrete fish pond in Anambra State, Nigeria. Afr. J. Fish Aquac. 4:28-32.

Ugwumba COA, Chukwuji CO (2010). The economics of catfish production in Anambra State, Nigeria: A profit function approach. J. Agric. Soc. Sci. 6:105-109.

Ugwumba COA, Okoh RN (2010). African Crariid catfish farming in concrete and earthen ponds: A comparative profitable analysis. J. Fish. Int. 5(1):14-18. http://dx.doi.org/10.3923/jfish.2010.14.18