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#### Abstract

The study compared households' consumption expenditure on fresh fish and dried fish in Port Harcourt Metropolis, Rivers State, Nigeria. Socioeconomic characteristics of the fish consumers were described, differentials in expenditure of fresh fish and dried fish consumption was determined and effects of socio-economic variables on household's consumption expenditure of fish products were estimated. 80 respondents were randomly selected from 4 locations in the study area. Descriptive statistical tools such as percent, mean and multiple regression model were used in the data analysis. The results indicated that an average amount spent on fresh and dried per monthly were $\ddagger 992,250.00$ and $\mathbf{£ 1 , 1 6 6 , 4 0 0 . 0 0}$ respectively. Fish types consumed as fresh and dried among other fish products was mainly catfish with $57.5 \%$ and $45.0 \%$ respectively. $87.5 \%$ of consumers purchased fresh fish product from open market while $53.8 \%$ purchased dried fish products from the open market. Regression results showed that monthly income, fish availability and age of the respondents were positive and statistically significant at $1 \%$ level while price of the commodity and occupation were also positive but statistically significant at $5 \%$ and $10 \%$ level respectively. The result indicated a $z$ statistics value of 2.94 and -2.651 respectively with a $p$ value of 0.000 for fresh and dried fish under a 2 tailed test respectively. Therefore, the null hypothesis that states that there is no significant difference in the quantity and expenditure of fresh fish and dried fish was rejected. The study recommends that consumers should reduce the amount on dried fish in the area.
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Introduction: Demand for fish in Africa, Asia and the Pacific is growing. In order to meet these demands, many countries will have to at least double fish production by 2030 (World Fish, 2017a). Fish is as an important component of a modern healthy diet and also a critical food source for developing countries (High Level Panel of Experts, 2014). Fish provides key macro-and micro-nutrients, and are low in saturated fat (Lynch and Macmillan, 2017). Fish consumption has been linked to a wide array of health benefits for infants and adults including the developing foetus (Millen, et al., 2015). According to Nesheim and Taktine (2007), fish can supply up to 50 percent or more of high quality protein, mineral elements (zinc, magnesium, iron, copper and
potassium), vitamins $\left(\mathrm{B}_{6}, \mathrm{~B}_{12}\right.$, niacin, thiamine, riboflavin, vitamin E) and essential fatty acids such as oleic acid and omega-3 fatty acid. The United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO, 2018), noted that world population growth has outweighed fish production due to increased fish consumption. The report further stated that fish consumption per capita across the world increased from 9.0 kg in the 1961 to 20.5 kg in 2017. In terms of utilization, fish products used for food and non-food purposes varies across countries and regions. The utilization of fish for direct human consumption increased significantly over the years from 67 percent in 1960 to 88 percent in 2018 (Vannuccini et. al., 2018). Considering the upsurge in population growth, urbanisation and
demographic dynamics in Nigeria (Barange et. al., 2018; Falaye and Jenyo-Oni, 2009), fish consumption (demand) appear to be on increase. Consumption pattern of a household is the combination of qualities, quantities, acts and tendencies characterizing a community or a human group's use of resources for survival, comfort and enjoyment. The consumption pattern is skewed towards food i.e. food is higher than the non-food items in Nigeria. (FAO, 2018) analysis of food expenditure by households in 2019 showed that various foods consumed outside the home include; starchy roots, tubers and plantains, rice, vegetables, fish and seafood, grains and flours in that order were the top food items households spent on in 2019 accounting for a combined $59.19 \%$ of food expenditure

Fish appears to be more widely consumed in the dried, fresh and frozen forms. It is also commonly asserted in Nigeria that the dried fish product is more widely consumed than the fresh product. Also, there is an avalanche of conflicting reports as to which, between urban and rural households, consume more fish (Mafimisebi, 2010; Omotesho, and MuhammadLawal, 2010). According to USAID (2014), consumer demand for fish products in Nigeria was reported as 2.66 million metric tons which was met only in part by imports of about 740,000 metric tons that same year. FAO, 2018 reported that production from global fisheries and aquaculture sub-sectors in 2016 reached 171 million metric tons, $88 \%$ of which was used for direct human consumption. This high level of fish production resulted in a record-high global average fish consumption of $20.3 \mathrm{~kg} /$ capita $/$ year. It has been reported that fish consumption accounts for about 35\% of animal protein consumption in Nigeria (USAID, 2014). Fish consumption is estimated at 13.3 $\mathrm{kg} / \mathrm{capita} / \mathrm{year}$. Although this is higher than the regional average for Africa ( $9.9 \mathrm{~kg} /$ capita/year), it is still substantially lower than the global average of 20.3 kg/capita/year (FAO, 2018; World Fish, 2017b).

Different types of fish are consumed in Nigeria, among which include; Senegal jack (Caranxsenegallus), Marine catfish (Arius mercatoris), Alexandria's pompano (Alectis alexandrines), Mud catfish (Clariasgariepinus), Bonga fish (Ethmalosafimbriata) and Baraccudas
(Sphyraenaafria).The steady prevalence of under nourishment, amid the continually growing population over the past decade affect about 8.8 million people in 2007 and 14.3 million in 2016 (FAO, 2017b). The prevalence of food insecurity is higher in low income, urban households and in rural areas (Matemilola and Elegbede, 2017). As of 2017 stunting impacted $43.6 \%$ and wasting $10.8 \%$ of Nigerian children under 5 years of age (NBS and UNICEF, 2017). Disparities exist for fish consumption between and within countries aremainly due to location specific varieties, per capita consumption and geographic concentration of production (Tveterås, et. al., 2012). Currently, people are more enlightened with the growing awareness on the nutritional and health value of fish consumption which is contributing to the upsurge in disproportionate demand for fish. Fish products are consumed in fresh, dried and smoked forms in Nigerians (Veliu, Gessese,Ragasa and Okali, (2009). However, consumption depends on the interplay of demand and supply factors. On the demand side, factors such as income, population growth and prices influence quantity demanded whereas the supply side is relative to the fish production method and the cost of production.

People in Rivers State greatly depend on fish because that it is cheaper than livestock and non-ruminant animal protein. It is a source of food and relatively cheap source of animal protein to many people across developing nations, especially among the riverine areas.However, there is dearth information on consumption expenditure of the fresh and dried fish products in Rivers State. Empirical studies have been focused on demand and supply of fish products. However, not much has been carried out on consumption expenditure of fresh and dried fish products. It is on this background that this study compared the consumption expenditure of fresh and dried fish in Port Harcourt Metropolis. The broad objective of the study was to compare the consumption expenditure of fresh fish and dried fish among households in Port Harcourt Metropolis, River State. The specific objectives are to: describe the socioeconomic characteristics of fish consumers in the study area; examine the differentials in expenditure of fresh fish and dried fish consumption in the study area.; determine the effects of socio-economic
variables on household's consumption expenditure of fresh fish and dried fish consumption in the study area.;determine the amount of money spent on fresh fish and dried fish consumption in the study area.; identify the challenges affecting households in the consumption of fish products in the study area.
Materials and Methods: Study Area: This research was carried out in Port Harcourt Metropolis. Port Harcourt is the capital of Rivers State, located in southern Nigeria. Port Harcourt metropolis is located between Latitude $4^{\circ} 45^{\prime} \mathrm{N}$ and Latitude $4^{\circ} 55^{\prime} \mathrm{N}$, and Longitude $6^{\circ} 55^{\prime} \mathrm{E}$ and Longitude $7^{\circ} 05^{\prime} \mathrm{E}$ in Rivers State. It is a city in the Niger Delta region of Nigeria. The city lies at the mouth of River Bonny in Rivers State. It is located at about 25 km from the Atlantic Ocean and is situated between the Dockyard creek/Bonny River and the Amadi creek. It lies at an average altitude of about 12 m above mean sea level. Port Harcourt metropolis spans over two local government areas (LGAs) viz Port Harcourt and Obio/Akpor LGA.
Population of the Study: The study comprises of both dried fish and fresh fish consumers who reside in Port Harcourt Metropolis.
Sampling Technique: This study utilized a multistage sampling technique. The first stage involved the selection of four communities within the study area which includes; Rumuodara, Mgbuosimini, Diobu and Elekahia. A second stage sampling involved random selection of 20 respondents from each community totally 80 respondents which respondents were drawn from each of the aforementioned communities for the study.

## Model specification

The Z -statistic is mathematically specified as:


The Z -statistic is mathematically specified as:


Method of Data Collection: Primary data were collected using a validated structured questionnaire that was administered to the respondents on a scheduled visit to the study area. In addition, interviews conducted by the researcher.
Instrument for Data Collection: The instrument for data collection was done using a designed questionnaire for the households. The questionnaire were made up of five sections based on my objectives. First sections were the Socio-economic characteristics of the respondents, determination of households' choice of either fresh fish or dried fish consumed in the study area. Secondly, the questionnaire examined the differences fresh and dried fish consumption, and as well as identified the challenges affecting households in the consumption of fresh fish and dried fish in the study area.
Validity of the Research Instrument: The questionnaire was validated for structure and content by expert evaluators in the Department of Agricultural Economics and Extension of the Faculty of Agriculture. The structural validity ensured superficial appearance of the instrument, while the content validity ensured that the items in each section are actually appropriate for the variable of interest.
Method of Data Analysis: Analysis of data was achieved using descriptive and inferential statistical tool. The objective analysis was achieved using descriptive statistics such as mean, and percentages, multiple regression analysis to examine the socioeconomic variables and determinants of household consumption expenditure of fresh fish to dried fish.
$\mathrm{Z}=$ The value by which the statistical significance of the mean difference would be judged
$\overline{\mathrm{X}}=$ Mean consumption expenditure of fresh fish consumed by the households in the study area
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$\overline{\mathrm{Y}}=$ Mean consumption expenditure of dried fish consumed by the households in the study area
$\mathrm{Z}=$ The value by which the statistical significance of the mean difference would be judged
$\bar{Y}=$ Mean consumption expenditure of dried fish consumed by the households in the study area
$\overline{\mathrm{X}}=$ Mean consumption expenditure of dried fish consumed by the households in the study area
$\overline{\mathrm{Y}}=$ Mean consumption expenditure of dried fish consumed by the households in the study area
$\mathrm{Z}=$ The value by which the statistical significance of the mean difference would be judged
$\overline{\mathrm{Y}}=$ Mean consumption expenditure of fresh fish consumed by the households in the study area
$\overline{\mathrm{X}}=$ Mean consumption expenditure of fresh fish consumed by the households in the study area
$S^{2}{ }_{X}=$ Variance of Mean consumption expenditure of fresh fish consumed by the household from formal sources.
$S^{2} y=$ Variance of Mean consumption expenditure of dried fish consumed by the household from formal sources.
$\mathrm{n}_{\mathrm{x}}=$ Sample size of households that consumed fresh fish
$\mathrm{n}_{\mathrm{y}}=$ Sample size of households that consumed dried fish
Decision Rule: If Z-calculated i.e. Z estimated is greater than ( $>$ ) the critical value which is 1.9600 for a two tailed test, then the null hypothesis will be rejected, but if otherwise accept the null hypothesis. The rule is applicable for a two tailed test.

## Multiple Regression Analysis

$Y=f\left(X_{1}, X_{2}, X_{3}, X_{4}, X_{5}, X_{6}, X_{7}, X_{8}, X_{9} \ldots e\right)$

Multiple regression models was used for the analysis of the data that was collected from the field to determine the effect of the socioeconomic variables on the consumption expenditure of fresh fish and dried fish in the study area.
The implicit form of regression model is expressed as;

Where;
$\mathrm{Y}=$ Consumption expenditure (in naira)
$\mathrm{X}_{1}=\quad$ Average cost of fish (in naira)
$\mathrm{X}_{2} \quad=\quad$ Household Monthly income (in Naira)
$\mathrm{X}_{3}=$ Taste
$\mathrm{X}_{4}=\quad$ Household size (in person)
$\mathrm{X}_{5} \quad=\quad$ Availability
$\mathrm{X}_{6} \quad=\quad$ Occupation of head of house
$\mathrm{X}_{7} \quad=\quad$ Price of Products (in naira)
$\mathrm{X}_{8} \quad=\quad$ Age of respondent (in years)
$\mathrm{X}_{9} \quad=\quad$ Religion
$\mathrm{X}_{10} \quad=\quad$ Choice
e $\quad=\quad$ error term
Regression Model Functional Form
Linear Function
$\mathrm{Y}=\mathrm{b}_{0}+\mathrm{b}_{1} \mathrm{X}_{1}+\mathrm{b}_{2} \mathrm{X}_{3}+\mathrm{b}_{4} \mathrm{X}_{4}+\mathrm{b}_{\mathrm{n}} \mathrm{X}_{\mathrm{n}} \ldots+\mathrm{e}-\quad-\quad-\quad-\quad-\quad-\quad 3$
Semi $\log$ function
$\mathrm{Y}=\mathrm{b}_{0}+\mathrm{b}_{11} \operatorname{og} \mathrm{x}_{1}+\mathrm{b}_{2} \log \mathrm{X}_{2}+\mathrm{b}_{3} \log \mathrm{X}_{3+} \mathrm{b}_{4} \log \mathrm{X}_{4}+\mathrm{b}_{\mathrm{n}} \mathrm{X}_{\mathrm{n}} \ldots \ldots+\mathrm{e} \quad-\quad-\quad-\quad-\quad 4$
Double $\log$ function
$\log Y=b_{0}+b_{1} \log X_{1}+b_{2} \log X_{2}+b_{2} \log X_{3}+b_{4} \log X_{4}+b_{n} X_{n} \ldots \ldots+e \quad-\quad-\quad 5$
Exponential function
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A 5-point Likert scale was adopted in identifying constraints which affect household consumption expenditure. Their response was ranked very low=1 low $=2$ moderate $=3$ high= $=4$ very high= $=5$. These values were added to obtain a value which was divided by 5 to obtain a mean score. If the mean is greater than 2.5 , it was seen as a major constraint, mean less than 2.5
indicates the constraint is not as challenging as the others.
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION: Socio-economic characteristics of respondents.: This section presents the descriptive statistics of categories of households in Port Harcourt metropolis in terms of gender, age in years, household size in number, education, marital status,

Table 1: Socio-Economic Variables of the respondents.

| Variable | Frequency | Percentage(\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Gender |  |  |
| Male | 31 | 38.8 |
| Female | 49 | 61.3 |
| Marital status |  |  |
| Single | 24 | 30 |
| Married | 45 | 56.3 |
| Widowed | 8 | 10.8 |
| Separated | 3 | 3.8 |
| Age (in years) |  |  |
| <21 | 2 | 2.8 |
| 21-30 | 15 | 17.9 |
| 31-40 | 17 | 21.2 |
| 41-50 | 30 | 37.8 |
| 51-60 | 14 | 17.7 |
| 61-70 | 2 | 2.6 |
| 71 and above | 0 | 0 |
| Education level |  |  |
| Non formal | 11 | 13.8 |
| Primary | 1 | 1.3 |
| Secondary | 24 | 30.0 |
| Tertiary | 44 | 55.0 |
| Household size (in person) |  |  |
| 1-5 | 55 | 68.8 |
| 6-10 | 7 | 8.8 |
| 11-15 | 4 | 5.0 |
| 16 and above | 14 | 17.5 |
| Household head |  |  |
| Male | 63 | 78.8 |
| Female | 17 | 21.3 |
| Occupation |  |  |
| Salary earner | 35 | 43.8 |
| Self employed | 40 | 50.0 |
| Others | 5 | 6.3 |

Source; Field data, 2021
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The socio-economic characteristics show that the majority of the respondents were females with $61.3 \%$. This implies that women constituted a larger percentage of respondents in the study area. The analysis of the age of the respondent shows that they were in their most active and productive age bracket of 41-50 years with a percentage of $37.8 \%$, followed by 31-40 years of $21.2 \%$. Majority of the respondents of $56.3 \%$ are married, $30 \%$ single and $3.8 \%$ separated. This agrees with Fakoya, 2002 that marriage confers some level of responsibility and commitment on individuals who are on it. Most of the respondents had
formal education up to their tertiary level of $55 \%$ and secondary level of educational attainment was $30 \%$ in the study area. The average household size in the study area was 5 persons. $78.8 \%$ were male household heads, with females comprising $21.3 \%$. $50.0 \%$ were self-employed, who were engaged in multiple activities to support themselves and their households financially.
Differentials in expenditure of fresh fish and dried fish consumption in the study area
This section examines the consumption expenditure of the various fish products in the study area.

Table 2: Fresh Fish and dried Fish Consumption Preference

| Variable | Frequency | Percentage | Monthly Expenditure ( $\mathbf{( \ddagger )}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Fresh fish | 40 | 50.0 | $992,250.00$ |
| Dried fish | 40 | 50.0 | $1,166,400.00$ |
| Total | 80 | 100.0 | $2,158,650.00$ |

## Source: Field Data 2021

The result in Table 4.2 shows that fish preference was evenly distributed among the respondents of the study area. The result also shows that more money was spent on the consumption of dried fish than fresh fish due to the cost of dried fish.

Households' Consumption Expenditure on Fresh Fish and Dried Fish Consumption: This section presents the various effect of the socio-economic variable on household's consumption expenditure of fresh fish and dried fish in the study area.

Table 3. Average annual consumption expenditure of fish products in study area

| Variable | Frequency | Percentage (\%) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Annual income |  |  |
| 200,000-299,999 | 5 | 6.3 |
| $300,000-399,999$ | 11 | 13.8 |
| $400,000-499,999$ | 14 | 17.6 |
| $500,000-599,999$ | 5 | 6.3 |
| $600,000-699,999$ | 6 | 7.6 |
| $>700,000$ | 39 | 48.5 |
| Fresh fish type |  |  |
| Catfish | 46 | 57.5 |
| Bonga fish | 8 | 10.0 |
| Tilapia | 14 | 15.0 |
| Mackerel | 36 | 17.5 |
| Dried fish type | 10 | 45.0 |
| Catfish | 13 | 12.5 |
| Bonga fish | 21 | 16.3 |
| Tilapia |  | 26.3 |
| Mackerel | 70 |  |
| Source of purchasing fresh fish | 9 | 87.5 |
| Open market | 1 | 11.3 |
| Fish supplier |  | 1.3 |

Source of purchasing dried fish
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| Open market | 43 | 53.8 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Fish supplier | 35 | 43.8 |
| Super market | 2 | $2 . .5$ |
| Consumption frequency | 43 |  |
| Daily | 35 | 53.8 |
| Weekly | 2 | 43.1 |
| Monthly | 2.5 |  |

## Source; Field survey, 2021

The result in Table 3 shows that $48.5 \%$ of the household heads earned over $£ 700,000$ as an average annual income while $6.3 \%$ earned average income of \$250,000. The mean annual income of the household head is $\$ 960,000$. From the result, the major specie of fresh fish consumed is catfish (57.5\%), Bonga fish (10\%), tilapia (15\%) mackerel (17.5\%) while the
major dried fish type consumed is catfish (45\%), Bonga fish (12.5\%), tilapia (16.3\%) and mackerel (26.3\%). From the result, consumers' major source of purchasing fish is the open market and also that of the dried fish type. $53.8 \%$ consume fish daily, $43.1 \%$ consume fish weekly while $2.5 \%$ consume fish monthly.

## Multiple linear regression result

The results of the effects of socio-economic variables on household consumption expenditure in the study area.
Table 4: Multiple regression results

| Variables | Linear | Semi-log | Double-log | Exponential |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Constant | -41962.9 | 7.50685 | -2.74014 | -296324 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Cost of Fish $\left(\mathrm{X}_{1}\right)$ | -1.298 | 0.000 | 0.300 | -381.379 |
|  | $(-0.2795)$ | $(1.032)$ | $(0.8665)$ | $(-0.03239)$ |
| Income $\left(\mathrm{X}_{2}\right)$ | 0.030 | 6.274 | 0.231201 | 7624.24 |
|  | $(3.570)^{* * *}$ | $(2.316)^{*}$ | $(3.258)^{* * *}$ | $(3.162)^{* * *}$ |
| Taste $\left(\mathrm{X}_{3}\right)$ | -0.641 | 0.012 | -0.033 | -3658.63 |
|  | $(-1615.21)$ | $(0.1466)$ | $(-0.2919)$ | $(-0.9479)$ |
| Household size $\left(\mathrm{X}_{4}\right)$ | 1588.28 | 0.040 | 0.086 | 3487.98 |
|  | $(1.429)$ | $(1.131)$ | $(1.206)$ | $(1.437)$ |
| Fish availability $\left(\mathrm{X}_{5}\right)$ | 9587.51 | 14385.4 | 0.492 | 0.305120 |
|  | $(2.975)^{* * *}$ | $(2.856)^{* *}$ | $(3.354)^{* * *}$ | $(2.880) * * *$ |
| Occupation $\left(\mathrm{X}_{6}\right)$ | 8601.00 | 0.213 | 0.419 | 13264.5 |
|  | $(1.809)$ | $(1.398)$ | $(1.990)^{*}$ | $(1.855)^{*}$ |
| Price $\left(\mathrm{X}_{7}\right)$ | 34.9427 | 0.000 | 0.836 | 27359.1 |
|  | $(3.646)^{* * *}$ | $(3.234)^{* * *}$ | $(2.650) * *$ | $(2.552)^{* *}$ |
| Age $\left(\mathrm{X}_{8}\right)$ | 291.441 | 0.012 | 0.459 | 10588.6 |
|  | $(2.714) * * *$ | $(3.492)^{* * *}$ | $(3.642)^{* * *}$ | $(2.473)^{* *}$ |
| Preference $\left(\mathrm{X}_{9}\right)$ | -1470.22 | -0.023 | -0.0249716 |  |
| $\mathrm{R}^{2}$ | $(-0.5685)$ | $(-0.4036)$ | $(-0.1985)$ | $(-0.2937)$ |
| F-ratio | 0.579 | 0.632 | 0.522 |  |
| Soure | $14.12160^{* * *}$ | 16.436 | 17.704 | 11.249 |

## Source; Field survey, 2021

Note; *** implies significance at $1 \%{ }^{* *}$ implies significance at $5 \% \&^{*}$ at $1 \%$. Values outside parentheses are coefficient of the variables, values inside parentheses are the $t$-statistics.

The results on Table 4 shows the results of all models used in testing for the best fit independent variable and the estimates were evaluated for their performance using the standard economic criteria such as $\mathrm{R}^{2}$, F ratio, t -ratio, a priori expectation and a number of significant variables. Among the four models, the double log multiple regression model was chosen as a lead equation and was used for discussion because it was the best fitted for this analysis with a higher number of significant variables and a coefficient of multiple regression ( $\mathrm{R}^{2}$ ) of $63 \%$ and in addition has a higher F-ratio. The $\mathrm{R}^{2}$ of 0.63 implies that $63 \%$ of the variation in model was explained by the independent variables introduced in the model. The F-ratio revealed that the model was a good fit to the data. Monthly income, fish availability and age of the respondents were positive and statistically significant at $1 \%$ level while price of the commodity and occupation were also positive and statistically
significant at $5 \%$ and $10 \%$ level respectively. The statistical significant and positive signs of income, household size, price, and age imply that as these variables increases, consumption expenditure of fish products increases in the study area. This confirms to what Falaye and Jenyo-Oni, 2009), that fish consumption (demand) appear to be on increase. Also, it can be confirmed that a unit increase in monthly income, household size, price and age would result to $0.23 \%, 0.086 \%, 0.83 \%$, and $0.45 \%$ increase in the consumption expenditure respectively. The F-ratio of 17.7 with the probability values of 0.000 for consumption expenditure reveals that the identical consumption expenditure socio-economic characteristics such as monthly income, household size, price, and age jointly significantly influence the household consumption expenditure of fresh fish and dried fish.

Table 5: Z-test analysis on the quantity and consumption expenditure of fresh fish and dried fish in the study area.

| Variable | N | Mean | Mean difference | $\mathbf{Z}$ | Critical <br> value | Sig |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Quantity <br> Fresh fish | 40 | -0.2376875 | -0.65568967 | 2.94 | 0.0001 | 0.28 |
| Dried fish | 40 | 0.4180022 | -0.65568967 |  |  | 4 |
| Consumption <br> Expenditure <br> Fresh fish | 40 | 0.0376806 | 0.10394661 | -2.651 | 0.0000 | 0.94 |
| Dried fish | 40 | -0.0662660 | 0.10394661 |  |  | 7 |

Source: Field Data, 2020.

The result in Table 5 shows the Z-test value of the differences in the mean quantity and consumption expenditure of fresh and dried fish indicated a z statistics value of 2.94 and -2.651 respectively with a p value of 0.000 for fresh and dried fish implying that under a 2 tailed test. The differences in the quantity and consumption expenditure of fresh and dried fish
products showed a $1 \%$ level of statistical significance. Therefore, the null hypothesis which states that there is no significant difference in the quantity and expenditure on fresh and dried fish products consumed by household in the study area were rejected.

Table 6. Constraints of fresh fish and dried fish consumption among households.

| Variable | Mean | Variable | Mean |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Fresh fish |  | Dried fish |  |
| Unavailability of fresh fish | 2.825 | Unavailability of dried fish | 2.850 |


| Price of fresh fish | 3.538 | Not readily availability in the <br> market | 1.963 |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :---: |
| Insufficient money | 2.975 | Insufficient money | 2.850 |
| Poor preservative measures | 2.900 | Poor preservative measures | 2.913 |
| Poor quality of fish products | 3.050 | Health implication | 2.938 |
| Not readily availability in market | 3.563 | Price of dried fish products | 2.838 |
| Health implication | 2.950 | Poor quality of fish products | 2.313 |

## Source: Field Survey, 2021.

Decision rule; mean >2.5 = Major challenge factor. Major challenges faced by household in consumption and purchase of different fish types and products. The result showed that not readily availability in market, poor quality of fish products, price of fresh fish, etc were major challenges faced by fresh fish consumption while unavailability of dried fish, insufficient money, poor preservative measures, price of dried fish products etc were challenges dried fish consumers faced while consuming the products.
CONCLUSION: The study concludes that there was a significant different in the amount and quantity of fresh and dried fish purchased among households in the area. Catfish was a major fish product consumed in both fresh and dried forms and was mainly purchased from open market. Major challenges faced by both dried and fresh fish consumers among others include; not readily availability in market, poor quality of fish products, price of fresh fish, etc. Therefore, the following recommendations are made. Since cat fish was the highest sought for and consumed fish products in the area, it is advised fish farmers should increase its supply in the market to earn more income at the same time making the fish products more affordable for consumers.
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