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The research explored factors affecting the consumption of frozen fish in Delta State Nigeria. One hundred and 20 participants from 12 communities were randomly chosen. In order to obtain information from the respondents, a questionnaire was used. The findings indicate that $57.5 \%$ of those surveyed were females with mean of 43years old. Around $64.2 \%$ of the respondents were married and $81.7 \%$ of them were educated. The average household size was around 5 people; $92.5 \%$ were Christian and they had a mean income of $\mathrm{N} 72,499.5$. The mean consumption expenditure of frozen fish was $\mathrm{N} 11,899.95$. The average frozen fish intake per capita was $10.38 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{year}$. Beef is the principal substitute of frozen fish. Owing to health reasons, most preferred consumption of frozen fish. Religion did not impede consumption of frozen. Majority of the respondents preferred to consume frozen fish in smoked form. The result revealed that age, educational status, household size, income level, frozen fish prices and frozen fish substitute prices influence the consumption of frozen fish. It is recommended price of frozen fish should be controlled to encourage its consumption considering the nutritional benefits.

## 1. Introduction

Fish production is a major source of livelihood for the poor countries of the world, and nutritional benefits have long been known for their consumption. Fish and fish products are world renowned as a cheap source of protein and are therefore very important for improving human health. They contain high nutrient content. It's rich in amino acids, unsaturated fatty acids, vitamins and trace elements (Pal et al., 2018., Balami et al., 2019).

Fish is valued not only for their protein and essential fatty acids, but also for many other nutrients as an integral part of a balanced diet (Gammone et al., 2019). Medical research has shown that high fish oil (omega-3) consumption reduces the risk of certain diseases (Rangel-Huerta and Gil,2018Trondsen et al., 2004). Consumption of fish contributes to cardiovascular disease, blood pressure, cholesterol, Alzheimer's disease and different types of cancer prevention (Zhang et al., 2018).

These factors are main causes that led consumers to change from the consumption of red meat to white meat, especially fish, which is on the rise worldwide.

The average annual per capita consumption of aquatic products worldwide is estimated at 20.5 kg for 2017, while in 1961,2000 , and 2015 , it was estimated at $9.0 \mathrm{~kg}, 17.0 \mathrm{~kg}$, and 20.2 kg respectively. The significant rise in average fish consumption per capita was mainly due to the increase in production, revenue, population and urbanization, and the development of the modern distribution channels (FAO, 2018). However, Nigeria, the average per capita consumption of fish is about 13.3 kg per year which is still relatively low compared with the global average of 20.0 kg (Johnson et al., 2020). Although the human health benefits of fish consumption are recognized, the consumption of frozen fish in the Delta State is still not adequate. Clupeahar engusscien (shawa), scornber sconbius (titus), and johnius diessumer (croaker) are examples of frozen fish eaten.

The neoclassical economist typically regards consumption level per individual as a key indicator of the productive performance of an economy (Ezeji and Ajudua, 2015). Understanding consumption of frozen fish is
essential in revenue and expenditure planning. Similarly, Obiero et al. (2019) has stated that income is a primary driver of Eastern Africa household consumption.

In the global sense, household income, consumption and wealth are viewed as main factors in citizens' wellbeing (Lustig, 2018). Observations shows that both macroeconomics and microeconomics policies play a key role in the study of consumption behaviour. A study by Akuffo et al. (2020) also identified the correlation between income and household expenditure. Applying the absolute income hypothesis of Keynes, Kueng (2018) examines the correlation between consumer spending and income and concludes that the average consumer inclination decreases with increased income. The correlation per capita spending and income was analyzed in Bangladesh by Uddin et al. (2019) and revealed that the increase in per capita spending resulted in changed of disposal income.

Fish consumption is affected by many factors, including socioeconomic context, general patterns of food consumption, consumer personal health status, and a variety of attitudinal dimensions (Wake and Geleto, 2019). Previous fish consumption studies have revealed that age, taste, health and convenience are significant determinants of frozen fish consumption (Samoggia and Castellini, 2018).

There are numerous studies in the literature on the fish preferences of consumers and the effect of socioeconomic factors on fish consumption (Yeşilsu et al., 2019; Lee and Nam, 2019; Uzundumlu, 2017; Korir et al., 2018; Terin, 2019). All these studies were conducted outside the Delta State. Previous researches of frozen fish centered on their commercialization and profitability. No earlier study analyzed frozen fish consumption and their determinants using the Theory of Planned Behaviour. The theory of planned behaviour has been used as an explanation for many food habits where it is found that the 3 constituents attitude, subjective norm, and perceived behavioural control have a positive influence on behaviour (Shah Alam and Mohamed Sayuti, 2011). Verbeke and Vackier (2005) explored the use of the planned behavior theory as a concept-based example of fish consumption in Belgium and their findings also showed a positive effect on behavioral intentions of the three components. The paper explicitly aims to recognize factors that affect the actions of households in the consumption of frozen fish.

## 2. Materials and Methods

The research was conducted in the state of Delta, Nigeria. Delta State is situated between $5^{\circ}$ and 6030 'latitude north and 50 and $6045^{\prime}$ longitude east. In the coastal areas and in the north the state has annual precipitation of around 2667 mm and 1905 mm . The precipitation in July is most severe and in August it has a short break. The temperature is about 390 c to 440 c. This can be delimited into rainforests, coastal forests and mangrove swamp forests by natural vegetation. Delta state is thus a territory with a farming advantage. There are around 4,098,391 inhabitants in the state (NPC, 2006). It consists of 25 Local Government Areas divided into three agro-ecological areas: Delta North, Delta Central and Delta South. The people's primary economic activity is agriculture. Cultivated crops include rubber, palm oil, cassava, yams and cocoyam, maize, rice and vegetables. Pig, goats, sheep, poultry, fish, micro-animals such as snails, rabbits and grass cutters are often reared. Multistage random sampling technique was applied for this study. This was deemed fitting because every frozen fish user had the same chance to be chosen for the study with this technique. Firstly, two LGAs in each of the three agro ecological areas have been chosen randomly from their list of LGAs. A total of six LGAs were therefore given. Secondly, two communities were chosen, summing 12 communities for each of the six LGAs chosen. Thirdly, ten consumers were carefully chosen from each of the twelve communities. One respondent form a household this gave a total of one hundred and twenty consumers that were selected and used for the study. Data were collected through structured questionnaire. The data collected were analyzed using descriptive statistics such as frequency count, percentages and regression analysis.

The relationship between the endogenous and each of the exogenous variables was examined using four functional forms: linear, semi-log, exponential and double-log functions.

Linear form
$Y=b 0+b 1 x 1+b 2 x 2+b 3 x 3+b 4 x 4+b 5 \times 5+b 6 x 6+b 7 x 7+b 8 \times 8+e$
Semi- log form
$\mathrm{Y}=\mathrm{b} 0+\mathrm{b} 1 \log \mathrm{x} 1+\mathrm{b} 2 \log \mathrm{x} 2+\mathrm{b} 3 \log \mathrm{x} 3+\mathrm{b} 4 \log \mathrm{x} 4+\mathrm{b} 5 \log \mathrm{x} 5+\mathrm{b} 6 \log x 6+\mathrm{b} 7 \log \mathrm{x} 7+\mathrm{b} 8 \log \mathrm{x} 8+\mathrm{e}$
Exponential form: $\log \mathrm{Y}=\mathrm{b} 0+\mathrm{b} 1 \mathrm{x} 1+\mathrm{b} 2 \mathrm{x} 2+\mathrm{b} 3 \mathrm{x} 3+\mathrm{b} 4+\mathrm{b} 5 \mathrm{x} 5+\mathrm{b} 6 \mathrm{x} 6+\mathrm{b} 7 \mathrm{x} 7+\mathrm{b} 8 \mathrm{x} 8++\mathrm{e}$
Double-log
$\log Y=b 0+b 1 \log x 1+b 2 \log x 2+b 3 \log x 3+b 4 \log x 4+b 5 \log x 5+b 6 \log x 6+b 7 \log x 7+b 8 \log x 8+e$
The lead equation was chosen based on statistical significance, the economic theory that supports consumption function concept and the expectation of the variables.

## 3. Results and Discussion

Socioeconomic Characteristics of Respondents
The gender distribution of consumers is presented in Table 1, the result showed that the female population was $57.5 \%$ while the male population was $42.5 \%$. This shows that the proportion of females who eat frozen fish was predominant. The reason could be the role played by the females in planning and management of the home in purchase of frozen fish according to the amount of money at their disposal in cooking of domestic dishes. It can also be argued that most females like frozen fish because of health reasons. Majority of consumers fell within the age group of 50 years and above and represented by about $29.2 \%$. This was followed by respondents with age group $30-39$ years, less than 30 years and 40-49 years representing $25.8 \%, 24.2 \%$ and $20.8 \%$ respectively. The mean age is 39 years. This indicates that frozen fish consumers are able bodied, energetic men and women who are in their active stage of working life. This disclosed that the young people in this age bracket consume more fish than those in other age groups. This preference of frozen fish may be attributed to the availability of the form it is prepared in the open market. Age was found to significantly associate with interest in healthy eating. Furthermore, a positive relationship existed between age and consumption (Samoggia and Castellini, 2018).

Table 1. Socioeconomic characteristics of frozen fish consumers ( $\mathrm{N}=120$ )

| Variables | Frequency | Percentage | Mean |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Gender |  |  |  |
| Male | 51 | 42.5 | Female |
| Female | 69 | 57.5 |  |
| Age |  |  |  |
| Less than 30 | 29 | 24.2 |  |
| 30-39 | 31 | 25.8 | 39 years |
| 40-49 | 25 | 20.8 |  |
| 50 and above | 35 | 29.2 |  |
| Marital Status |  |  | Married |
| Single | 34 | 28.3 |  |
| Married | 77 | 64.2 |  |
| Widowed | 6 | 5.0 | Tertiary |
| Divorced | 3 | 2.5 |  |
| Education Level | 6 | 5.0 |  |
| No formal education | 16 | 13.3 |  |
| Primary education | 45 | 37.5 |  |
| Secondary education | 53 | 44.2 |  |
| Tertiary |  | 51.7 |  |
| Household size | 62 | 33.3 |  |
| 1-4 | 40 | 15.0 |  |
| 5-8 | 18 | 92.5 | persons |
| 9-12 |  | 1.7 |  |
| Religion | 111 | 5.8 |  |
| Christianity | 2 | 7 |  |
| Islam |  |  |  |
| Traditional |  |  |  |

Table 1 shows that $64.2 \%$ of respondents are married, $28.3 \%$ single, and $7.5 \%$ widows or divorced. This means that most the respondents are married. This showed that there is a trend towards more frozen fish purchases and increased consumption by married persons than single persons due to an expansion in family size and greater obligations in terms of food products expenditure. This is because every member of the home depends on frozen fish as a source of protein intake in their meals. Table 1 showed that respondents with tertiary education had the highest percentage of $44.2 \%$. This was followed by respondents with secondary education having about $37.5 \%$ and household heads with primary education having $13.3 \%$ while the lowest percentage of $5.0 \%$ was recorded for respondents with no formal education. It could be seen from the above that majority of the respondents who had tertiary education showed preference for frozen fish. This showed that level of educational attainment determines and plays a significant role in the choice of fish and consumption pattern in the study area. Knowledge on high cholesterol content in animal protein would have made them to shift from animal protein intake to frozen fish for fish protein. Supartini et al., (2018) in their study on beef and food consumption pattern, noted education and
income level of respondents to positively influence consumption pattern including fish. Consumption of fishery products was also positively directly associated with education (Khan et al., 2018). Higher education levels were found leading to higher purchase but did not translate into higher fish consumption (Samoggia and Castellini, 2018).

It could be observed that high percentage of the respondents had between 1-4 members accounting for $51.7 \%$ of respondents sampled. This is followed by respondents with 5-8 members representing $33.3 \%$ of sample respondents and $9-12$ members representing $15 \%$ of the sampled respondents. The mean household size was 5 people. This tendency towards small household size in the study area may be attributed to the level of education of the respondents and their corresponding awareness of family planning measures. This may be due to the fact that as family size increases, more food items need to be purchased at an affordable price and so the need for cheap form of fish like frozen fish. According to Genschick et al., (2018) fish consumption was found to be positively correlated with household size. The result on religion revealed that $92.5 \%$ of the respondents were Christians, $5.8 \%$ were traditional worshippers while $1.7 \%$ were Muslims. This suggests that most of those interviewed were Christians.

Monthly Income of consumers
Furthermore, Table 2 established that a higher percentage ( $40 \%$ ) of the respondents earn less than N50,000 as their monthly income, $35 \%$ earn N50,000 to N 99,000 while $15 \%$ earn between N100,000 to N149,000. The least was $10 \%$ who earn N150,000 and above. This indicates that $75 \%$ of the consumers earn between N10,000 to N99,999. This indicates the respondents' monthly income was high. The mean income of the respondents was N72,499.5. Their income was enough to buy any kind of protein product for their meals. Akuffo et al. (2020) and Gbigbi (2019) in their study on food consumption, concluded that consumption is a function of income.

Table 2. Monthly income of consumers

| Income range (N) | Frequency | Percentage | Mean |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Less than N50,000 | 48 | 40.0 |  |
| N50,000 - N99,999 | 42 | 35.0 | N72,499.5 |
| N100,000 - N149,999 | 18 | 15.0 |  |
| N150,000 and above | 12 | 10.0 |  |
| Total | 120 | 100 |  |

Monthly Expenditure on Frozen Fish
Table 3 established that a higher percentage (39.2\%) of the respondents spent between N5000 to N10,000 from their monthly income, $30.8 \%$ spent above $\mathrm{N} 16000,20 \%$ spent $\mathrm{N} 11,000$ to $\mathrm{N} 16,000$ while $10 \%$ spent less than N5,000. This indicates that $49.2 \%$ of the respondents spent between N1000 to N10000. The mean income spent on frozen fish was N11,899.95. This implies that respondents' monthly expenditure was low. This will enable them to improve their standard of living. This finding is consonance with Zani et al., (2019) study on determinants of household expenditure in Sulawesi that the lower the expenditure the higher the consumption rate.

Table 3. Monthly expenditure on frozen fish

| Expenditure range(N) | Frequency | Percentage | Mean |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Less than N5,000 | 12 | 10.0 |  |
| N5,000 - N10,000 | 47 | 39.2 | N11,899.95 |
| N11,000 - N16,000 | 24 | 20.0 |  |
| Above N16,000 | 37 | 30.8 |  |
| Total | 120 | 100 |  |

Quantity Consumed in (Kg)/year
The result in Table 4 showed that majority ( $30.8 \%$ ) of the respondents consumes $6-10 \mathrm{~kg}$ of frozen fish per year. This was closely followed by $28.3 \%$ who consumed above 15 kg of frozen fish per year, $20.8 \%$ of them consumed between $1-5 \mathrm{~kg}$ per year while $16.7 \%$ consumed $11-15 \mathrm{~kg}$ per year. The least was $3.3 \%$ of the respondents that consumed less than 1 kg per year. The average fish consumption per capita is $10.38 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{year}$.

Frozen Fish Substitute
The result revealed that $25.0 \%$ of the respondents consumed beef, $21.7 \%$ consumed chicken, $18.3 \%$ consumed smoked fish, $15.0 \%$ consumed turkey, $9.2 \%$ consumed pork, $4: 2 \%$ consumed snail, $4.2 \%$ also consumed dry fish and $2.5 \%$ consumed egg. The result suggests that inability to afford frozen fish will lead to an increase in the consumption of beef to complement protein deficiency.

Table 4. Distribution of respondents by quantity of frozen fish consumed in a year

| Quantity consumed | Frequency | Percentage | Mean |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Less than 1 kg | 4 | 3.3 |  |
| $1-5 \mathrm{~kg}$ | 25 | 20.8 |  |
| $6-10 \mathrm{~kg}$ | 37 | 30.8 | 10.38 kg |
| $11-15 \mathrm{~kg}$ | 20 | 16.7 |  |
| Above 15 kg | 34 | 28.3 |  |
| Total | 120 | 100 |  |

Table 5. Frozen fish substitutes

| Substitute | Frequency | Percentage |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Beef | 30 | 25.0 |
| Turkey | 18 | 15.0 |
| Chicken | 26 | 21.7 |
| Smoked fish | 22 | 18.3 |
| Snail | 5 | 4.2 |
| Dry fish | 5 | 4.2 |
| Pork | 11 | 9.2 |
| Egg | 3 | 2.5 |
| Total | 120 | 100 |

Reasons for Preferring Frozen Fish
The result in Table 6 indicates that $36.7 \%$ of the respondents preferred frozen fish due to health reason. This was followed next by $28.3 \%$ who gave preference to frozen fish due to availability. About $25 \%$ of them said their preference was necessitated by taste and only $10 \%$ affirm due to unavailability of close substitute. This is in agreement with Temel and Uzundumlu (2015) who determined health and nutrition motivation and effect of advertising on consumption among the factors that increase fish consumption. Similarly, Azabagaoglu et al. (2016) found a positive relationship between fish consumption and health. Trondsen et al. (2004), indicated that with the increase in knowledge about health, seafood consumption would increase.

Table 6. Reasons for preferring frozen fish

| Reason | Frequency | Percentage |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Health | 44 | 36.7 |
| Taste | 30 | 25.0 |
| Available | 34 | 28.3 |
| Unavailability of substitute | 12 | 10.0 |
| Total | 120 | 100 |

## Religion Effect on Frozen Fish Consumption

The result in Table 7 revealed that $76.7 \%$ of the respondents affirmed that religion does not forbid the eating of frozen fish while only $23.3 \%$ of them agreed that religion forbid the consumption of frozen fish. This shows how religious values inform attitudes toward and behaviors influencing frozen fish consumption (Minton et al.,2018).

Table 7. Religion Effect on frozen fish consumption

| Response | Frequency | Percentage |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Yes | 28 | 23.3 |
| No | 92 | 76.7 |
| Total | 120 | 100 |

## Pattern of frozen fish consumption

Table 8 shows the consumption pattern of frozen fish of respondent in the study area. It shows that $49.2 \%$ of the respondents consume frozen fish in the smoked/dried form, $33.3 \%$ consume frozen fish when it is cooked fresh while $17.5 \%$ consume frozen fish when it is fried. This indicates that the respondents in the study area prefer consuming frozen fish when it is dried and cooked fresh. The respondents preferred it in the smoked/dried form because of taste and avoid spoilage.

Table 8. Frozen fish consumption pattern

| Pattern of consumption | Frequency | Percentage |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Cooked fresh | 40 | 33.3 |
| Smoked/Dried | 59 | 49.2 |
| Fried | 21 | 17.5 |

## Factors Affecting Frozen Fish Consumption

The result of Table 9 shows that the linear functional form of the regression results produced the lead equation having satisfied the econometric, statistical and economic criteria.

The coefficient for age is positive and statistically significant at 5\% level of probability. This shows that the age of the respondent can also be directly linked to frozen fish consumption. It also shows that the higher the age of the respondent, the higher the consumption frozen fish. The coefficient of education is positive and statistically significant at $1 \%$ level of probability, thus suggesting that education is also directly related to consumption of frozen fish. It also implies that an increase in the educational level will lead to an increase in frozen fish consumption. The finding agrees with Jimoh, (2020) study on consumers' preference and behaviour pattern towards fresh and smoked catfish in Kwara state.

The coefficient of household size is positive and statistically significant at $5 \%$ level of probability, thus suggesting that household size is also directly related to consumption of frozen fish. It also implies that an increase in the size of the household will lead to an increase in frozen fish consumption. This finding supports the work of Adeola et al. (2016) that household size had positive influence on catfish consumption. The coefficient of income is positive and statistically significant at $5 \%$ level, showing that income is directly related to frozen fish consumption. This suggests that a change in income will cause consumption on frozen fish to change in the same direction. That is, the higher the income, the higher the frozen fish consumption. This is in agreement with Abdullahi et al. (2011) who found direct relationship between income and consumer behaviour for fresh fish in Malaysia.

The coefficient for price of frozen fish is negative, thus indicating that the price of frozen fish is inversely related to consumption. This therefore suggests that the higher the price, the lower the consumption of frozen fish. The finding agrees with Terin, (2019) in a study on the influence of household characteristics on fish consumption in turkey. The coefficient for price of frozen fish substitutes is negative, thus indicating that the price of frozen fish substitutes has inverse relationship with frozen fish consumption. This therefore suggests that the higher the price of substitutes, the higher the consumption of frozen fish.

Table 9. Factors influencing frozen fish consumption

| Variable | Coefficient | Std Error | t -value | p-value |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Gender | -0.509 | 0.366 | 1.39 | 0.167 |
| Age | 0.072 | 0.028 | 2.54 | $0.012^{* *}$ |
| Marital status | 0.173 | 0.331 | 0.52 | 0.604 |
| Educational level | 4.016 | 0.458 | 8.77 | $0.000^{* * *}$ |
| Household size | 0.341 | 0.110 | 3.11 | $0.002^{* *}$ |
| Monthly income | 0.641 | 0.209 | 3.07 | $0.003^{* *}$ |
| Price of frozen fish | -0.454 | 0.019 | 24.34 | $0.000^{* * *}$ |
| Price of frozen fish substitutes | -0.083 | 0.031 | 2.70 | $0.008^{* *}$ |
| R-squared | 0.570 |  |  |  |
| F-ratio | 21.180 |  |  |  |

## 4. Conclusion and Recommendations

In the study, the factors influencing frozen fish consumption has been analyzed with the help of regression model. The result showed that age, education, household size, monthly income, price of frozen fish and price of frozen fish substitutes influence consumption. It has been determined that when these variables increase; fish consumption amount increases. According to the obtained findings, the average frozen fish consumption per capita is $10.38 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{year}$. Most of the respondents preferred the consumption of frozen fish due to health reason. Majority of the respondents preferred frozen fish in the smoked form. Religion did not hamper the eating of frozen fish as opined by wider proportion. The foremost substitute for frozen fish consumption is beef. It is recommended that the price of frozen fish should be control to encourage its consumption considering the nutritional benefits, these substitutes snail, dry fish and eggs should be made available through massive production and encouragement from the government because of their dietary benefits. The government should provide consumption credit to enable the
consumers easily afford frozen fish as well as substitutes. Since religion is not a barrier to frozen fish consumption, good market should be provided for income generation. Finally, storage facilities should be made available through subsidies for affordability by the consumers.
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