

1                   **VALUE CHAIN ANALYSIS OF ARTISANAL FISHING IN ILAJE**  
2                   **LOCAL GOVERNMENT AREA OF ONDO STATE, NIGERIA**

3   **Abstract**

4   *To bridge the demand supply gap in the Nigerian fishing industry, the value chain analyses in artisanal*  
5   *fishing in the coastal area of Ondo States were investigated.*

6   *Primary data was used in the study. Purposive sampling technique was used to select four*  
7   *fishing communities in Ilaje local government, where 35 (fishermen, processors and marketers)*  
8   *were each selected randomly from the communities. Data were analyzed using Descriptive*  
9   *Statistics and Gross Margin Analysis.*

10   *The socioeconomic characteristic indicated that 68.6% of the fishermen, 77.2% processors and*  
11   *65.7% marketers were less than 50 years of age. Result revealed that all the fishermen were*  
12   *male, 91.2 % processors and 97.10% marketers were female. 62.9% of the fishermen have*  
13   *household greater than 4, the processors has 54.3% household size above 4 and 60% of the*  
14   *marketers have household size above 4. 94.3% of the fishermen have one form of education or*  
15   *the other, 77.1% of the processors have one form of education or the other and 65.7% of the*  
16   *marketers were also educated. All the marketers are into one association or the other. Budgeting*  
17   *analysis indicated positive margin by the two categories of marketers was ₦300.54 and*  
18   *₦1,866.00 per basket respectively, a net return of 1.04 and 1.30 respectively. Processors had a*  
19   *positive gross margin of ₦43,871.54 and a net return of 1.12. Most influential actor is the*  
20   *marketer*

21   **Keywords: Value Chain, Artisanal, Gross Margin, Analysis, Fishing.**

22   **Introduction**

23   Fishery production is significant to Nigerian economy in view of its importance in providing  
24   cheap source of food security, income, employment and serves as source of foreign exchange,  
25   particularly to those of the riverine communities [1]. The Fisheries sub-sector maintains a steady  
26   contribution of about 3.5 to 4% of total GDP between 2008 and 2012, translating to about 10%  
27   of total agricultural GDP, which itself contributed between 35 and 40 percent within the same  
28   period [2]. Nigeria fish supply is from four major sources; the artisanal fisheries, industrial  
29   trawlers, aquaculture and imported frozen fish [3]. Also the sector is made up of capture  
30   fisheries and aquaculture. Capture fisheries encompasses both marine and inland fisheries.

31 The artisanal fisheries in Nigeria provided more than 82% of the domestic fish supply giving  
32 livelihoods to one million fishermen and up to 5.8 million fisher folks in the secondary sector  
33 [4].

34 The Niger Delta region contributes more than 50% of the entire domestic Nigerian fish supply.  
35 Due to abundance of both fresh, brackish and marine water bodies that are inhabited by a wide  
36 array of both fin fish and non-fish fauna that supports artisanal fisheries. It equally provide  
37 essential source of sustenance, employment and financial well-being for coastal populations of  
38 developing countries [5].

39 Fish is highly susceptible to deterioration without any preservative or processing measure. [6].  
40 immediately fish dies, numbers of physiological and microbial deterioration sets in, this  
41 invariably degrades the quality of fish [7].

42 Value chain refers to all activities necessary to bring a product or service from conception,  
43 through the different stages of production, distribution to final consumption and final disposal  
44 after use [8] and [9]. Therefore, analysis of value chain involve identifying chain actors and  
45 discerning their functions; identifying value added in the chain and assigning costs to those  
46 activities [10].

47 [11]) posited that value chain analysis is essential for understanding markets, their relationship,  
48 the participation of different actors, and the critical constraints that limit the growth of livestock  
49 (fish) production and consequently the competitiveness of small holders' farmers. These farmers  
50 currently receive only a small fraction of the ultimate value of their output, even if, in theory,  
51 risk and reward should be shared down the chain. In agriculture they can be thought of as a farm  
52 to folk' set of processes and flows. Artisanal fish value chain analysis looks at every step, a  
53 fisheries business goes through, from captured fishes to the eventual end user. The goal is to  
54 deliver maximum value for the least possible total cost.

55 Value chains in artisanal and aquaculture fisheries differs and composed of several nodes the  
56 products pass through before meeting the consumers. However, Fish value chains in Nigeria are  
57 not yet developed to meet international market requirements as limited value addition is done in  
58 the industry, with the result that market for fish and fish products are limited to domestic markets  
59 [12], and the eagerness to raise immediate income from fish harvest. Actors in the chain  
60 comprises of the fishermen, (fish collector) marketer and processors.

61 The ability to make fish relevant in the market is to ensure the flow of fish and fish product from  
62 the artisanal fisherman to the consumers in the form, time and place that will be convenient. This  
63 involves the participation of some actors along the fish distribution channel especially the  
64 middlemen [13]

65 This study is imperative because, most research work in the study area focus mainly on artisanal  
66 fishing and marketing, while the areas of value chain / value addition were uncovered. It is in the  
67 light of this that the research has been conceptualized to analyze value chain in artisanal fishing  
68 in the coastal area of Ondo State.

### 69 **Objective of the Study**

70 The main objective of the study is to analyze value chain in artisanal fishing production in the  
71 coastal area of Ondo States of Nigeria,

72 The specific objectives are to:

- 73 i. ascertain or determine the socio-economic characteristics of the actors in the fish value  
74 chain;
- 75 ii. identify the major players (actors) in artisanal fish value and;
- 76 iii. estimate the profit margin along the identified fish value chain;
- 77 iv. Identify the major constraints to fish value chain actors in the study area.

### 78 **Methodology**

#### 79 **The Study Area.**

80 The study was carried out in Ilaje Local Government Area of Ondo State, Nigeria. The state lies  
81 between latitudes  $5^{\circ} 4S$  and  $7^{\circ}52N$  and longitude  $4^{\circ} 20^{\circ}N$  and  $6^{\circ} 05E$ . Its land area is about  
82 15,500 square kilometers. Ondo State is bounded in the East by Edo and Delta State in the south  
83 by Bight of Benin and Atlantic Ocean. Ilaje was purposively selected due to its predominant  
84 coastal wetland suitable for fish farming. It is situated within the mangrove rain forest and has an  
85 annual rainfall ranging between 2000-3000mm per annum.

#### 86 **Data Collection and Sampling Technique**

87 Data were collected through primary source with the aid of well-structured questionnaire.

88 Purposive sampling techniques were used in the selection of four fishing communities namely;  
89 Awoye, Odofado, Zion Pepe and Araromi sea side. The selection was based on their fishing  
90 intensity. From the selected communities, 35 fishermen, 35 processors and 35 marketers were  
91 randomly selected at the central market arena to give a total of 105 respondents.

## 92 **Data Analysis and Analytical Procedure**

93 Data were analyzed using descriptive statistics and gross margin model

### 94 **Descriptive Statistical Tools**

95 Frequency tables, and percentage were used to describe the socio-economic characteristics of the  
96 respondents. The characteristics include the age, marital status, educational attainment, primary  
97 or major occupation, experience of the fishermen, marketers and the processors.

### 98 **Gross Margin Analysis**

99 The budgeting techniques was used to determine the gross margin and income at each stage of  
100 the chain.

101 The model for the estimation of the gross margin is as;  $GMI = \sum TR - \sum TVC$

102 Where;  $TR = P_y \cdot Y_i$ ,  $TVC = P \times X$ ,  $TC = TVC + TFC$ ,  $NROL = NFI / TR$ ,  $NFI = GM - TFC$

103  $NPM = NFI / TC$ ,  $BCR = TR / TC$

104  $GM =$  Gross Margin (₦)

110  $Y =$  Price of Output (₦)

105  $TR =$  Total Revenue (₦)

111  $PX_i =$  Unit Price of Variable Input Used

106  $TVC =$  Total Variable Cost (₦)

112 (₦)

107  $TC =$  Total Cost (₦)

113  $X_i =$  Variable Input (₦)

108  $NROL =$  Net Return on Investment (₦)

114  $NFI =$  Net Farm Income (₦)

109  $P_y =$  Unit Price of Output (₦)

115  $NPM =$  Net Profit Margin (₦)

116  $BCR =$  Benefit Cost Ratio (%)

## 117 **Depreciation**

118 Depreciation on fixed assets used were calculated, using a straight line method (SLM) which  
119 assumed salvage value of zero naira. The formula is specified as;  $DS =$

120 Where:  $DS =$  Annual depreciation,  $AC =$  Asset Cost,  $SV =$  Salvage Value,  $L =$  Useful Life Year.

## 121 **Results and Discussion**

122 The actors in the artisanal fish value chain in the study were identified as; the fishermen, fish  
123 processors and fish marketers.

### 124 **Socio-Economic Characteristics of the Fishermen in the Study Area**

#### 125 **Gender of the Respondents**

126 The result as shown in table 1 indicated that all fishermen in the study area were male (100%).  
127 This could be attributed to strenuous and tasking nature of their operations which the male  
128 gender could possibly handle better than the weaker female counterpart. These findings is in line  
129 with the finding of [14][15][16][17] Majority of the processors (91.2%) and marketers (97.10%)  
130 were female, indicating the dominance of women in processing and marketing of fish in the  
131 study area. This result is in line with the findings of [18] who opined that the role of women in  
132 fishing cannot be over emphasized.

#### 133 **Age of Respondents**

134 The study revealed that majority of the actors in the value chain was below 50 years of age. This  
135 implied that majority of people involved in fishing operations are in their active age. This finding  
136 agreed with [19] and [20] that age had a positive correlation with agricultural productivity.

#### 137 **Household Size**

138 The relatively large and medium household sizes of majority of the actors in the study area may  
139 reduce expenses incurred on hired labour for the operations.

#### 140 **Educational status/ Membership of Association**

141 The study also revealed that majority of the actors (94.3% of fishermen, 54.3% of processors and  
142 51.4% of marketers) had one form of education or the other. Therefore the number of years spent  
143 in formal education enhances the knowledge ability to adopt modern technology in improving  
144 their fishing activities.

145 The study further indicated that all (100%) of the marketers were in one form of union/  
 146 association or the other, while the fishermen and the processors were not into any form of  
 147 association.

148 **Table 1; Socio-Economic Characteristics of the Respondents**

| Variables             | Fishermen |              | Processors |              | Marketers |              |
|-----------------------|-----------|--------------|------------|--------------|-----------|--------------|
|                       | Freq.     | percent      | Freq.      | percent      | Freq.     | percent      |
| <b>Gender</b>         |           |              |            |              |           |              |
| Male                  | 35        | 100.0        | 2          | 8.8          | 1         | 2.90         |
| Female                | 0         | 000          | 33         | 91.2         | 34        | 97.10        |
| <b>Total</b>          | <b>35</b> | <b>100.0</b> | <b>35</b>  | <b>100.0</b> | <b>35</b> | <b>100.0</b> |
| <b>Age</b>            |           |              |            |              |           |              |
| Less than 30          | 5         | 14.3         | 5          | 14.3         | 4         | 11.4         |
| 31- 50                | 19        | 54.3         | 22         | 62.9         | 19        | 54.3         |
| 51- 60                | 7         | 20.0         | 3          | 8.5          | 12        | 34.3         |
| 61-65                 | 4         | 11.4         | 5          | 14.3         | 0.00      | 0.00         |
| <b>Total</b>          | <b>35</b> | <b>100.0</b> | <b>35</b>  | <b>100.0</b> | <b>35</b> | <b>100</b>   |
| <b>Marital status</b> |           |              |            |              |           |              |
| Single                | 4         | 11.4         | 1          | 2.83         | 2         | 5.7          |
| Married               | 21        | 60.0         | 28         | 80.0         | 27        | 77.1         |
| Divorced              | 5         | 14.3         | 6          | 17.14        | 4         | 11.4         |
| Widow/widower         | 5         | 14.3         | 0          | 0.00         | 2         | 5.7          |
| <b>Total</b>          | <b>35</b> | <b>100.0</b> | <b>35</b>  | <b>100.0</b> | <b>35</b> | <b>100.0</b> |
| <b>Household size</b> |           |              |            |              |           |              |
| 1-3                   | 13        | 37.1         | 16         | 45.7         | 14        | 40.0         |

|                           |           |              |           |              |           |              |
|---------------------------|-----------|--------------|-----------|--------------|-----------|--------------|
| 4-7                       | 17        | 48.6         | 19        | 54.3         | 18        | 51.4         |
| Greater than 7            | 5         | 14.3         | 0         | 0.0          | 3         | 8.6          |
| <b>Total</b>              | <b>35</b> | <b>100.0</b> | <b>35</b> | <b>94.6</b>  | <b>35</b> | <b>100.0</b> |
| <b>Educational status</b> |           |              |           |              |           |              |
| No formal                 | 2         | 5.7          | 8         | 22.9         | 12        | 34.3         |
| Pry                       | 10        | 28.6         | 15        | 42.8         | 9         | 25.7         |
| Sec                       | 7         | 20.0         | 5         | 14.3         | 9         | 25.7         |
| Tertiary                  | 16        | 45.7         | 7         | 20.0         | 5         | 14.3         |
| <b>Total</b>              | <b>35</b> | <b>100.0</b> | <b>35</b> | <b>100.0</b> | <b>35</b> | <b>100.0</b> |
| <b>Association</b>        |           |              |           |              |           |              |
| <b>Yes</b>                | -         | -            | -         | -            | <b>35</b> | <b>100</b>   |
| <b>No</b>                 | -         | -            | -         | -            | -         | -            |

149 **Source; field survey, 2019**

**Table 2: Descriptive Statistics on Cost and Returns of Marketers**

|                               | N  | Minimum  | Maximum   | Sum        | Mean       | Std. Deviation |
|-------------------------------|----|----------|-----------|------------|------------|----------------|
| Price/ basket fish            | 35 | 3,000.00 | 15,000.00 | 216,781.75 | 6,193.7500 | 2,544.68928    |
| Price after purchase          | 35 | 3,500    | 17,000    | 244,800    | 6,994.29   | 2,981.901      |
| Price outside the environment | 35 | 4,000    | 20,000    | 282,100    | 8,060.00   | 3,245.830      |

150 **Source; field survey, 2019**

151 From table 2 above, the average cost of purchase of a standardized basket of fresh fish from the  
 152 fishermen in the study area was ₦6, 193.75.00, immediately after purchase, and without any

153 value addition, the same quantity of fish were sold at an average of ₦6, 994, 29 and ₦8, 060.00  
154 outside the environment. The implication of this is that non- member of fish marketers  
155 association have no direct contact with the fishermen, hence must pass through them for the  
156 purchase of fish, while a profit margin of about ₦801.29 is realized from immediate purchase  
157 within the same environment and an average of ₦1866.25 from the sale of same basket outside  
158 the environment.

### 159 **Profit Margin of Marketers**

160 Average purchasing price of fish from fishermen = ₦6193.75

161 Average selling price immediately in the same location = ₦6494, 29

162 Average selling price outside the location = ₦8060.00

#### 163 **i. Profit margin of marketers on same location**

164 Average revenue from sales in same location = ₦6494, 29 - ₦6193.75 = ₦300.54

165 Net return on investment (benefit/ cost) = 6494, 29/ 6193.75 = 1.04

166 That is on every ₦1 invested in fish marketing in the same location and sell within the location  
167 4kobo is realized.

#### 168 **ii. Profit margin of marketers outside the location**

169 Average revenue from sales outside the location = ₦ 8060.00 - ₦ 6193.75 = ₦1866.25

170 Net return on investment = benefit/ cost = 8060.00 / 6193.75 = 1.30

171 The implication of this finding is that on every ₦1 invested, 30kobo is realized

### **Gross Margin Analysis For Fish Processor**

#### 172 **Average variable cost**

173 Average cost of fish purchased = ₦260, 508. 10,      Average Cost of firewood = ₦27,437.14

174 Average transportation cost = ₦1,018.57,      other variable cost = ₦2,146.57

175 Average labour cost = ₦10,925.71,      Average variable cost = ₦302,036.09

#### 176 **Fixed cost**





197

198 The table 3, shows the categories of the gross margin of the actors in the value chain

199 All the actors have a positive gross margin therefore each of the enterprise is profitable. Also all  
200 the net return on investment are greater than one therefore the sales of fish immediately at the  
201 environment was 1.04 indicating at every ₦1 invested, 4 kobo is realized, marketers outside the  
202 environment has a net return of ₦1.30kobo. Meaning that at every ₦1 invested 30kobo is  
203 realized while for processing net return of ₦1.12kobo is achieved meaning at every ₦1 invested  
204 12kobo is gained. The implication is that the marketers particularly sales after the environment  
205 has higher gross margin of ₦1866.25 kobo and a net return of ₦1.30 kobo.

206

207

## 208 **Conclusion**

209 Artisanal fish farming is a profitable venture with all the actors in the value chain enjoying  
210 different degree of profit. The two categories of marketers made a profit of ₦300.54 and  
211 ₦1,866/basket and a net return of 1.04 and 1.30 respectively. The processors equally had a  
212 positive gross margin of ₦43.871.54 and a net return of 1.12.

213 However, among the three actors in artisanal fish value chain in the area, the marketers are the  
214 main and most influential group. This is due to the strong associations of the group which  
215 prevent others (even processors) from buying directly from the fishermen. The over bearing  
216 influence of this marketers group reduces the gross margin and net returns of other actors in the  
217 chain.

## 218 **Recommendation**

219 Based on the findings of this study, it is recommended that;

- 220 • Fishermen and processor in artisanal fish value chain should form a strong association in  
221 other to reduce the effect and influence of the marketers on their profit.
- 222 • Fishermen should join cooperative societies in other to get needed inputs rather than  
223 getting financial assistance from middlemen/marketers who always use that to determine  
224 their faith in the business.

- 225 • Government and other relevant organizations should be involved in training and  
226 retraining of the different categories of the artisanal fish value chain players.

227

228

## 229 **References**

230 [1]

231 [2] Oladimeji, Y.U., Abdulsalam, Z, and Damisa, M.A. (2013b). Socio- economic  
232 Characteristics and Returns to Rural Artisanal Fishery Households in Asa and Patigi  
233 LGAs of Kwara State, Nigeria. *International Journal of Science and Nature*. 4(3): 445-  
234 455.

235 [3] Akinrotimi, O.A., Abu, O. M. G. and Aranyo, A.A. (2011). Environmental friendly  
236 Aquaculture key to sustainable fish farming Development in Nigeria. *Continental*  
237 *Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Science* 5(2).17 31

238 [4] Faturoti, O. (2011). Nigeria Fisheries Contribute \$US1 billion to Economy. 25<sup>th</sup> Annual  
239 Conference of Fisheries Society of Nigeria, Badagry, Lagos, Nigeria.

240 [5] Andrew

241 [6] Okonla, A.A and Ekelemu, J. K (2015), November. A Preliminary Study of Micro  
242 organisms Associated with Fish spoilage in Asaba, southern Nigeria pp 557-560

243 [7] Eyo, A.A, (2001). Inventory of Storage Life of Fresh Africa Fish on Ice, 11pp

244 [8] Kaplinsky R, Morris M (2000).A handbook for value chain Research, international

245 Development Research center (IDRC) Canada. Lam *et.al*, (2011). Status of Food  
246 Security, Trade and the Economic Health of Fisheries.

247 [9] Adeoye 2013

248 [10]United Nation Industrial Development Organization 2009).

249 [11]Lawal, W.L and Ldega, E.O. (2004). Analysis of Fish Marketing in Benue State. A  
250 paper Presented at 2001 annual Conference of Association of Agricultural Economists  
251 (NAAE) Held at Ahmadu Bello University Zaria November 3-7

252 [12] Onemolease, E.A and H.O. Oriakhi (2011) Prospects and constraints of artisanal fishing  
253 in selected communities in Delta State, Nigeria, *Advances in Applied Science*  
254 *Research*, 2011, 2 (6):55 -61. Available online at [www.pelagiaresearchlibrary.com](http://www.pelagiaresearchlibrary.com).

- 255 [13]Lawal, W.L and Ldega, E.O. (2004). Analysis of Fish Marketing in Benue State. A paper  
256 Presented at 2001 annual Conference of Association of Agricultural Economists  
257 (NAAE) Held at Ahmadu Bello University Zaria November 3-7
- 258 [14]Olaoye,O.J.and Odebiyi,O.C. (2011). *Economic Viability for the Use of Microfinance*  
259 *Bank Loan on Aquaculture Development in Ogun State, Nigeria. International Journal of*  
260 *Fisheries and Aquaculture, 3(4), 70-77.*
- 261 [15] Olawunmi et al (2010)
- 262 [16] Inoni, O. E. and W. J. Oyaide, 2007. Socio-economic analysis of artisanal fishing in the  
263 South Agro Ecological Zone of Delta State, Nigeria. *Journal of Agriculture Subtropical,*  
264 *40 (4) 135–149*
- 265 [17] Bello, (2000)
- 266 [18] George, F.O.A, Olaoye, O.J, Akande, O.P and Oghobase, R.R. (2010). *Determinants of*  
267 *Aquaculture Fish seed production and Development in Ogun State, Nigeria. Journal of*  
268 *Sustainable Development in Africa, (4) 12 - 15*
- 269