

Consumption of Fish in Ona-Ara Local Government Area

O. A. Ajetunmobi

Department of Agricultural Economics,
Ladoke Akintola University of Technology, P. M. B. 4000,
Ogbomoso, Nigeria.

ABSTRACT

Consumption of fish in Ona-Ara Local Government Area of Oyo State, was estimated using the Ordinary Least Square model and descriptive statistics. Multistage sampling procedure was used to sample the respondents (household heads). Data were obtained through structured questionnaires administered on 150 respondents. Most of the household members prefer fish for its nutritional value. The mean of the amount spent on fish was ₦2300:33. The share of budget allocated to fish had negative effect on price of its substitute and educational status of the household heads, but the total household income had positive effect on it. The consumption of fish was very high with the rich households.

Keywords- *Consumption; fish; nutritional value*

1. INTRODUCTION

Fish are a vital source of nutrition for the world's poor (Adeniyi, Kayode, Alabi and Orimafo, 2014). 400 million poor people in Africa and Asia rely on fish for more than half of their daily protein intake (Warren, 2005). Moreover, the fish sub sector in Nigeria accounts for about 40% of animal protein in the diet, and it contributed 4.74% of the agricultural share of the nations GDP in 2003 (Ojo and Fagbenro, 2003). Globally the consumption for fish continues to climb, especially in developed nations: which in 2004 imported 33 million tonnes of fish: worth over US \$61 billion: which was 81% of all fish imports, in that year, in value terms (FAO, 2006). Nigeria is characterized by deprivation and abject poverty: in the midst of enormous natural and human resources (Alamu, Abiodun and Miller, 2004). Therefore, enhancing production of fish could improve the living condition of the populace.

The objectives of this study are to:

- i. examine factors influencing household preference for fish in the study area
- ii. ascertain household expenditure on fish in the study area.
- iii. estimate determinants of household consumption of fish in the study area.

2. METHODOLOGY

Ona-ara Local Government Area has land area of 292.61km² and a population of 265, 571: which comprises of 130,615 males and 134,956 female (National Population Census, 2006). It is in the Ibadan, Oyo –State, southwestern Nigeria. Oyo State covers a total area of 28, 454 km² and has a population of 5, 591, 589 by the 2006 population census (NPC, 2006). It is bounded in the North by Kwara State, in the East by Osun State, in the South by Ogun State, and in West partly by the Republic of Benin and partly by Ogun State. It is located between 7⁰3’ and 9⁰12’ North of the equator and longitudes 2⁰47’ and 4⁰23’ East of the meridian. This location confers on the State the equatorial climatic conditions. There are two distinct seasons: the wet and dry season. The climate in the state favours the cultivation of crops like maize, yam, cassava, millet, rice, plantain, cocoa tree, palm tree and cashew.

The data used were mainly primary: these were obtained through the use of a well-structured questionnaire and interview schedule.

This was employed to make enquiries on socio-economic characteristics of the household. Multistage sampling technique was used, and it involved four stages. The first stage involved the purposive sampling of Ibadan/Ibarapa Agricultural Development Programme (ADP) zone. The second stage was the purposive sampling of Ona-Ara Local Government Area. Moreover, the third stage involved random sampling of wards from each of the Local Government Area. The fourth stage was the systematic sampling of 150 household heads (respondents).

The tools and procedure that were employed elucidated the objective of the study: this includes the following.

Descriptive statistics were employed. They are the mean, percentages and frequency distribution. These were used as tools to describe preferential characteristics.

Ordinary Least Square model:

$$Y = f(x_1, x_2, x_3, U)$$

(1)

Where;

Y = budget share of fish,

X₁ = price of fish,

X₂ = price of substitute,

X₃ = Household income,

U = error term

3. DISCUSSIONS

In table 1, more than 50% consumed fish due to its nutritional value, 32.6% consume fish for its inexpensiveness. This indicates that

society is paying more attention to the consumption of quality food. Thus, most of the respondents based their consumption for fish on the account that it had nutritional value.

Table 1: Factors indicating preference for fish

Factors/Variables	Frequency	Percentage
Fish		
No factor	1	0.7
Aesthetic	19	12.7
Cheap /Inexpensiveness	49	32.6
Nutritional value	79	52.7
Others	2	1.3

Source: Field survey, 2012.

Almost the entire households consumed fish. Expenditure on fish was up to above ₦ 6000 per month, while the mean of the amount spent on it was ₦ 2300 : 33 monthly. Fish took very large

part of the household expenditure. This was relatively due to the fact it was accessible by most of the respondents.

Table 2: Amount spent on fish monthly

Price (₦)	Frequency	Percentage
Fish		
No price/No consumption	1	0.7
≤ 2000	112	74.6
2001 – 4000	18	12
4001 – 6000	11	7.4
> 6000	8	5.3
Mean = ₦ 2300 : 33		

Source: Field survey, 2012.

In table 3, the negative coefficient on price of substitute was an indication that it had

negative effect on the budget share fish. Thus, the substitute of fish compete with fish. Total

household income and price of fish were positive and significant 1 per cent level. This indicated that, as household income rose, the

budget share allocated to fish increases, and vice versa. Price of fish had a direct relationship with the budget share allocated to fish.

Table 3: Determinants of household consumption of fish

Variable	Coefficient	t – value
Intercept	14.866	3.514***
Price of fish	0.004	5.086***
Price of substitute	-0.001	-1.541
Total household income	2.23E-05	2.578***
F – value	13.94***	
Adjusted R ²	0.49	

*** 1% level of significance, ** 5% level of significance, * 10% level of significance.

Source: Field survey, 2012.

4. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The household heads prefer fish for its nutritional value. Therefore, farmers who are raising fish should be given incentives that could enhance fish production. This will increase affordability of fish. The privilege/rich household heads consume fish than the poor ones. Government should therefore, inaugurate poverty eradication programs to liberate the poor from poverty.

5. REFERENCES

[1]. Adeniyi, O. A.; Kayode, O. A.; Alabi, A. A. and Orimafo, P. K. (2014). Demand Response for Selected Animal Products in Ibadan. *IOSR Journal of Economics and Finance*, 5 (2): 62-68.

[2]. Alamu, S. O.; Abiodun, J. A. and Miller, J. W. (2004). Food Security and

Poverty Alleviation Under the National Special Programmed for Food Security: A Preliminary Socio Economic Assessment of Yamma Lake, Kebbi State. In: P.A Araoye (Ed). Proceedings of 19th Fisheries Society of Nigeria Conference 2004: 149-162

[3]. FAO (2006): The State of World Aquaculture 2006. A Paper Presented to Delegates from More than 50 Countries at the Biennial Meeting of the FAO Sub-Committee on Aquaculture. New Delhi 4-8 September. FAO News Room, 2006.

[4]. National Population Census (2006): Details of the Break down of National and State Provisional

[5]. Total 2006 Census. Federal Republic of Nigeria Official Gazette. Printed and Published by the Federal Government,

Lagos, Nigeria Vol. 94 FGP
71/52007/2500(OL24).

- [6]. Ojo, S. O. and Fagbenro, O. A. (2004). Empirical analysis of factors influencing demand for fish in Nigeria. International Institute of Fisheries Economics and Trade, Corvallis, Oregon, (USA), 2004.
- [7]. United Nations (UN), Population Division (2002). World Urbanization Prospects, the 2001 Revision. New York. (10).
<http://.un.org/esa/populatin/publications/wup2001/WUP2001report.htm>
- [9]. Warren, E. (2005). How do we ensure fish for all? Address Delivered by the Director of Environment, the World Bank at the NEPAD fish for all summit in Abuja Nigeria, on August 25, 2005.