

1 **ANALYSIS OF THE PROFITABILITY OF CATFISH PRODUCTION IN ENUGU**
2 **EAST L.G.A. OF ENUGU STATE, NGERIA**

4 **Abstract**

5 i) Objectives of the study: The study examined the profitability of catfish production in Enugu –
6 East L.G.A of Enugu state.

7 ii) Sample size and sampling procedure: A purposive sampling technique was employed in the
8 selection of 50 respondents used for the study.

9 iii) Method of data collection: Data for the study were collected using structured questionnaires
10 and interview schedules.

11 iv)Method of Data analysis: Descriptive statistics, gross-margin analysis and profitability ratios
12 were used in analyzing the data.

13 v)Results and Discussion: The result of the analysis showed that majority of the fish farmers
14 (70%) were males and within the age range of 31 - 50 years. The result equally revealed that
15 majority of the farmers (86%) had at least a National Diploma with about 5 -14 years fish
16 farming experience. The result further indicated that cost of feed and fingerlings were the
17 major cost component involved in catfish production. The gross margin analysis and
18 profitability ratios revealed that catfish production is very profitable in the study area with a
19 net income of about ₦576, 667 and a BCR of 1.6. The study however revealed that the high
20 cost of farm inputs and poor credit facilities were the major constraints to catfish production
21 in the area.

22 vi) Recommendations: It was recommended that more fish feed producers be encouraged into
23 the business to reduce the high cost of feed.

24 Key words: Profitability, Catfish, Production, Gross- margin, Costs.

25 **Introduction**

26 The elimination of food insecurity and rural poverty is a major objective of the Food and
27 Agriculture Organization (FAO) and this topic features conspicuously as the first element of
28 the organization's corporate strategy for the period 2000-2015. FAO has equally initiated
29 several programmes like the Special Programme for Food Security (SPFS), the Telefood
30 Programme and special assistance to countries in the context of the technical cooperation
31 programme, all aimed at boosting food production and increasing the income of the farmer.

With the specific focus on poverty alleviation, the challenge is to convert these development principles into practical and reliable strategies for action. Fish farming is cited as one of the means of efficiently increasing food production in food deficient countries [15]. Although the outlook of fish production is worrisome given the growing demand for fish and the declining yield of natural fish stocks due to over-exploitation, fish farming still holds the greatest potential to rapidly boost domestic animal production.

Therefore the study aims to determine the effect of the farmers' socio- economic characteristics on their profit level

Review of Literature

Fish farming is the principal form of aquaculture. Fish farming involves raising fish commercially in tanks or enclosures usually for food. Economic studies have demonstrated that fish farming in Nigeria can be a good source of income. Several works [1] show that fish farming provides cash to a family in addition to supplementing the diet of the farmer. Fish can be an important cash crop even for farmers with limited resources. According to Jamu and Ayinla (2003), [2] the high domestic demand for fish, the stagnation of inland capture fisheries and changing macro-economic environment in most Sub-Saharan Africa implies that investment in aquaculture can be profitable in Nigeria.

Fish is highly nutritious, rich in micronutrients, minerals, essential fatty acids and proteins, and represents a valuable supplement to diets otherwise lacking essential vitamins and minerals [13]. In Nigeria, the average per capita fish consumption may be low, but even in small quantities; fish can have a significant positive impact on improving the quality of dietary protein by complementing the essential amino acids that are often present only in low quantities in vegetable based diets [14].

Employment in fisheries has grown substantially in the last three decades, with an average rate of increase of 3.6 percent per year since 1980 (FAO 2010). [3] Many persons are employed in the fish industry as producers, processors or marketers. It is estimated that in 2009, 44.9 million people were directly engaged, full time or more frequently, part-time in capture fisheries or in fish farming, at least 12 percent of these were women (ibid)

Studies by Augustesson et al (2003), [4] report possible anti-cancer effect of n -3 fatty acids found in fish oil (particularly breast, colon and prostate cancer). According to Nair and Connolly (2008), [5] taking fish oil in any form can help regulate cholesterol in the body. The

American Heart Association recommends the consumption of 1g of fish oil daily, preferably by eating fish, for patients with coronary heart disease.

Materials and Methods

The study was conducted in Enugu-East L.G.A of Enugu State which has its headquarters in Nkwo Nike. The study area has an area of about 383 km² and a population of 279, 089 (NPC 2006).[6] It has a population density of 728.69 inhabitants per km². The area is made up of several communities.

Ten communities where fish farming activities are prevalent were purposively selected for the study. These communities include Alulu, Edem, Emene, Ibeagwa, Amoji, Obinagu, Iji, Akpoga, Nokpa and Ngwuomu. Five catfish farmers were randomly selected from each community. Thus a total of fifty catfish farmers were selected for the study. Data for the study were collected from both primary and secondary sources. Data collected were analyzed using both descriptive and inferential statistics.

Budgetary technique of analysis was used to determine gross margin which was then used to analyze the profitability level. Profitability ratios of catfish farmers were then calculated in order to determine economic performance of catfish production.

The gross margin analysis is stated as:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{GM} &= \text{TR} - \text{TVC} \dots\dots\dots 1 \\ \text{TR} &= \text{P} \times \text{Q} \dots\dots\dots 2 \\ \text{TC} &= \text{TVC} + \text{TFC} \dots\dots\dots 3 \\ \text{NI (profit)} &= \text{GM} - \text{TFC} \dots\dots\dots 4 \end{aligned}$$

Where

GM	=	Gross margin
TR	=	Total Revenue
TVC	=	Total Variable Cost
TFC	=	Total Fixed Cost
TC	=	Total Cost
NI	=	Net Income
P	=	Price per kg of catfish
Q	=	Quantity of catfish sold

Profitability ratios:

94	Rate of Return on Investment (RRI) = $\frac{NI}{TC} \times 100$5
95	
96	Profitability Index (PI) = $\frac{NI}{TR}$6
97	
98	Operating Ratio (OR) = $\frac{TVC}{TR}$7
99	

100

101 **Results and Discussion**

102 Socio –economic characteristics

103

104 Table 1 shows that most of the fish farmers (54%) in Enugu-East L.G.A. fall within the age
 105 range of 41 -50 years. This means that most catfish farmers in the area are still in their active
 106 age group. Majority of the farmers (70%) were males, thus justifying Bamigboye et. al [7]
 107 and Ogunleye et. al [8] who stated that more men than women are involved in fish farming.
 108 Also, majority of the respondents (74%) were married. The table also shows that 96% of the
 109 respondents can read and write. About 54% had HND or B.Sc. while only 4% had no formal
 110 education. This finding confirms the works of Olagunju et. al (2007)[9] and Nwibo
 111 (2012)[10] who ascertained that majority of fish farmers were educated. This high level of
 112 literacy will have positive effect on the utilization of inputs and incentives for fish farming
 113 and processing. Also, education is a facilitating factor for the utilization of technologies.
 114 Most of the respondents (44%) had 5 - 9 years of fish farming experience while 16% had
 115 about 1 – 4 years experience. This indicates that most of the fish farmers were experienced.
 116 Majority of the respondents had a household size of 6-10 while 4% had over 15 persons in
 117 their household. Most of the farmers (40%) had a total pond size of between 26m² – 50m².
 118 Only 10% of the respondents have a total pond size of over 100m². Majority of the fish
 119 farmers (42%) are teachers or lecturers. This is followed by civil servants who represent 36%
 120 of the respondents. Only 10% of the respondents are full-time fish farmers.

121

122 **Costs and returns to fish farmers.**

123 The result of the analysis of the costs and returns accrued to an average fish farmer in the
 124 study area in 2017 are displayed on table 2. According to the result, an average fish farmer
 125 invested about ₦923, 333 in catfish production. These include the operating cost, labour cost
 126 and fixed cost. The cost of land constituted the greatest share of the fixed cost representing
 127 about 95.81% of the fixed cost and 54.15% of the total cost. This means that cost of land

acquisition is the major important single cost item associated with catfish production. The cost of feed (₦200, 000) was next in amount accounting for 21.70% of the total cost. This is followed by cost of labour (₦90, 000) accounting for 9.75% of the total cost. The cost of fingerling (₦60, 000) is next and accounted for 6.5% of the total cost. The variable cost items constituted 42.49% of the total cost while the fixed cost accounted for 56.51% of the total cost. From the table, total revenue of ₦1, 5000.000 was realized by the catfish famer at the end of sales during a production cycle. A production cycle is normally 6 months. The gross margin (GM) was ₦1, 098,500 while a net income (NI) of ₦576, 667 was realized. The benefit cost ratio was 1.62. This indicates that for every ₦1.00 invested in catfish production, a profit of ₦0.62 was realized. This means that catfish production is profitable in the study area. The result obtained compared favourably with the findings of Awoyemi (2011)[11] and Olawunmi et.al (2010)[12] that catfish farming is a very profitable business.

Profitability ratios

The profitability ratios of catfish production are presented in Table 3. According to the table, the profitability index (PI) was 0.38 thus indicating that for every naira earned, about ₦0.38 returned to the farmer as net income. The rate of return on investment (RRI) was 62.45% which indicates that the farmer earned ₦0.62 on every naira spent on catfish production. The operating ratio (OR) is 0.27. Operating ratio that is less than one indicates a good and profitable business.

Table 1: Socio-economic characteristics of respondents

Characteristics	Frequency(n = 50)	Percentage.
Age (years)		
18 - 30	3	6
31 - 40	10	20
41 – 50	27	54
> 50	10	20
Gender:		
Male	35	70
Female	15	30
Marital Status:		
Married	37	74

164	Single	8	16
165	Widowed	5	10
166	Education level:		
167	No formal education	2	4
168	F.S.L.C	2	4
169	SSCE	3	6
170	OND/NCE	16	32
171	HND/B.Sc	27	54
172	Fish farming experience (years):		
173	1 – 4	8	16
174	5 – 9	22	44
175	10 – 14	12	24
176	>15	8	16
177	Household size:		
178	1 - 5	10	20
179	6 -10	33	66
180	11 -15	5	10
181	>15	2	4
182			
183	Pond size (M²):		
184	< 25	9	18
185	26 -50	20	40
186	51 -100	16	32
187	>100	5	10
188			
189	Main occupation:		
190	Full-time fish farmer	5	10
191	Civil servant	18	36
192	Teacher/lecturer	21	42
193	Trader	3	6
194	Artisan	3	6

196 Source: Field Survey, 2017

197

198 **Table 2: Average costs and returns of raising 2000 catfish per 50m²**

199				
200				
201			Cost (₦)	Percentage of total cost
202	Operating cost:			
203	Fingerling	2000@N30/fingerling	60,000	6.50
204	Feed	50 bags @N4000/bag	200,000	21.70
205	Utilities		10,000	1.08
206	Medication		6,500	0.70
207	Transportation		10,000	1.08
208	Miscellaneous		20,000	2.17
209	Fertilizer, lime, manure		5,000	0.50
210	Total		311,500	33.74
211	Labour cost:			
212	Pond construction		30,000	3.25
213	Salaries/wages		60,000	6.50
214	Total		90,000	9.75
215				
216	Fixed cost:			
217	Land		500,000	Depreciation 54.15
218	Pond		250,000	12,500
219	Nets, buckets, baskets, knives		10,000	3,333
220	Water pump	1	50,000	5,000
221	Weighing machine	2	10,000	1,000
222	Total		521,833	56.51
223	Source: Field Survey, 2017			
224	Cost	Amount	Percentage	
225	Variable cost:			
226	Operating cost	311,500		33.74
227	Labour cost	90,000		9.75
228	TVC	401,500		43.49
229	Fixed cost:			
230	Land	500,000		54.15
231	Depreciation	21,833		2.36
232	TFC	521,833		56.51
233	TC =	TVC + TFC		

$$\begin{aligned}
 &= 401,500 + 521,833 \\
 &= 923,333 \\
 & \\
 &\text{Total number of fish harvested and sold} = 2,000 \\
 &\text{I kg of catfish sold for } \text{₦}750.00 \\
 &\therefore \text{TR} = \text{P.Q} \\
 &= 750 \times 2000 = \text{₦}1,500,000.00 \\
 &\text{GM} = \text{TR} - \text{TVC} = 1,500,000 - 401,500 = 1,098,500 \\
 &\text{NI (profit)} = \text{GM} - \text{TFC} \\
 &= 1,098,500 - 521,833 = 576,667.00 \\
 &\text{BC R} = \frac{\text{Total Revenue (TR)}}{\text{Total Cost (TC)}} \\
 &= \frac{1,500,000}{923,333} = 1.62
 \end{aligned}$$

Table 3: Profitability Ratio Analysis of Catfish production

Ratio	Value
$\text{RRI} = \frac{576,667}{923,333} \times 100$	$= 62.45\%$
$\text{PI} = \frac{576,667}{1,500,000}$	$= 0.38$
$\text{OR} = \frac{401,500}{1,500,000}$	$= 0.27$

Conclusions and Recommendation

Fish farming has the potential to contribute to sustainable development and poverty reduction by generating income and employment. Though there are several identified problems faced by fish farmers such as poor credit facilities, high cost of farm inputs lack of extension services and high cost of land. In view of the above constraints, it was recommended that easy access to credit facilities, subsidization of farm inputs and regular visit by extension agents should be given strong consideration. Finally, government should address the high cost of land and fish feed to encourage more fish farmers and fish feed producers into the business. Therefore, Fish farmers should be encouraged to access their credits from

272 microfinance and commercial banks at reduced interest rate by the appropriate government
273 agency.

274

275

276 **Competing Interest**

277 Authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

UNDER PEER REVIEW

References

1. Omotoso, F.O and Fagbenro, O.A. 2005a “The Role of Aquaculture in Poverty Alleviation in Nigeria” *World Aquaculture* 36 (3) 19 -23.
2. Jamu, D.M and Ayinla, O.A 2003 “Potential for the Development of Aquaculture in Africa.” *NAGA world fish centre*. Vol. 26 No 3 PP9 – 13
3. FAO 2010. Fishery Statistics
[http://www: FAO. Org/figis/ser.](http://www.FAO.Org/figis/ser) 01 -09 -2017
4. Augustsson, K; Michaud D.S and Rimm E.B. 2003 “A prospective study of intake of fish and Marine fatty acids and prostate cancer” *cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev.* 12 (1): 64 - 7
5. Nair, G.M. and Connolly, S.J. 2008 “should patients with cardio –vascular disease take fish oil” <http://www.cmaj.ca/cgi/content/full/178/2/181> 15/03/2017
6. National Population Commission of Nigeria (NPC) 2006. National Population figures, Abuja.
7. Bamigboye, E.O; Kuponiyi, F.A. and Yusuf, O.J. 2010 “Analysis of Farmers’ utilization of fish farming Technologies in Ekiti State, Nigeria. *Proceedings of the 44th Annual conference of Agricultural Society of Nigeria. LAUTECH 2010. 18th -22nd Oct. 2010*
8. Ogunleye, K.Y, Ojo, T.Y and Oyewo, T. 2010 “Training Needs of Fish Farmers in Ibadan North L.G.A of Oyo state. *Proceedings of the 44th Annual Conference of Agricultural Society of Nigeria, LAUTECH 2010. 18TH -22ND Oct. 2010*
9. Olagunju, F. I., Adesiyi, I. O, and Ezekiel, AA 2007. “Economic viability of catfish production in Oyo state, Nigeria. *Journal of Human Ecology*, 21 (2): 121 -124
10. Nwibo, S.U. 2012 “Economics of Catfish production in Ebonyi North Agricultural zone of Ebonyi state, Nigeria. *Proceedings of International Agricultural Conference ANSUIAC 2012. 6 -9th May, 2012.*
11. Awoyemi, T. T. 2011 “Analysis of Profitability of fish farming among Women in Osun state” *Journal of Economics and Sustainable Development* Vol. 2, No 4.
12. Olawunmi, A.T., Dipeolu, A.O. and Bamiro, O.M. 2010 “Economic Analysis of Homestead Fish production in Ogun state. *Journal of Human Ecology*, 31 (1): 13 – 17.
13. Shao, A., Drewnowski, A., Willcox, D. C., Krämer, L., Lausted, C., Eggersdorfer, M., Mathers, J., Bell, J. D., Randolph, R. K., Witkamp, R., ... Griffiths, J. C. (2017). Optimal nutrition and the ever-changing dietary landscape: a conference report. *European journal of nutrition*, 56(Suppl 1), 1-21.

14. Henchion, M., Hayes, M., Mullen, A. M., Fenelon, M., & Tiwari, B. (2017). Future Protein Supply and Demand: Strategies and Factors Influencing a Sustainable Equilibrium. *Foods (Basel, Switzerland)*, 6(7), 53.
15. Tidwell, J. H., & Allan, G. L. (2001). Fish as food: aquaculture's contribution. Ecological and economic impacts and contributions of fish farming and capture fisheries. *EMBO reports*, 2(11), 958-63.

UNDER PEER REVIEW