

Original Research Article

Exploring Fish Consumption Pattern: A Comparative Study of Urban and Rural Households in Kawardha Block, Chhattisgarh, India

Comment [JWH1]: Include the district name instead of block

Comment [JWH2]: Name of the country should be included since it is an international journal

ABSTRACT

The present study examined the regional differences in fish consumption patterns and their correlation with household characteristics in the Kawardha block of Chhattisgarh, India. A survey was conducted with randomly selected 100 respondents (50 households from each region). The study explored various aspects of fish consumption, including occupation, monthly income and expenditure, consumption frequency, species preference, factors influencing fish consumption, and constraints faced by the fish consumers. The findings revealed that rural households consumed more fish compared to urban households, with Rohu (*Labeo rohita*) emerging as the most preferred fish species in both the regions. The majority of consumers in both rural and urban areas preferred fish consumption once a week. High-income group (HIG) urban households and low-income group (LIG) rural households were the primary consumers. The study also observed that households with a moderate occupational lifestyle consumed more fish in rural areas, whereas households with a heavy occupational lifestyle consumed more fish in urban areas. Factors influencing fish consumption were found to be the price and quality of the fishes available. Constraints faced by fish consumers included concerns about hygiene and the availability of desired fish sizes. Various reasons were identified for the reluctance to consume fish, such as the presence of bones, religious beliefs, and sensory preferences. Understanding the regional disparities in fish consumption patterns and the associated household characteristics can guide targeted interventions for promoting sustainable and healthy fish consumption practices in both rural and urban areas. This knowledge can contribute to the development of strategies to address constraints and improve fish consumption habits, leading to better nutrition and overall well-being in the study areas.

Comment [JWH3]: Corrected

Comment [JWH4]: District??

Comment [JWH5]: Position changed

Comment [JWH6]: Which each region?

Comment [JWH7]: included

Comment [JWH8]: included

Comment [JWH9]: changed

Keywords: Fish Consumption Patterns, Income Level, Occupation, Influencing Factors, Constraints.

INTRODUCTION

Fisheries and aquaculture play a crucial role in supporting various aspects of human life and society. They serve as essential sources of food, providing vital nutrition to billions of people worldwide. Fish is known for being a highly nutritious food, offering a rich source of protein, essential vitamins, and minerals. Additionally, it is a valuable source of omega-3 fatty acids, which are beneficial for heart health and brain development. The affordability of fish makes it accessible to a wide range of populations, especially in regions where other animal

Comment [JWH10]: Include citation

Comment [JWH11]: Include citation

proteins may be less available or expensive. This accessibility is particularly important for communities with limited resources, as it allows them to obtain necessary nutrients for their overall well-being. Because of its nutritional profile and availability, fish offers immense potential to combat hunger and malnutrition worldwide. Notably, the consumption of aquatic foods (excluding algae) has been steadily growing, with an average annual increase of 3.0 percent since 1961. This growth in consumption has outpaced the population increase, which has risen by 1.6 percent annually over the same period. Per capita consumption rose from 9.9 kg in the 1960s to a record 20.5 kg in 2019, dipping slightly to 20.2 kg in 2020. Factors like rising incomes, urbanization, post-harvest improvements, and dietary changes are expected to drive a 15 percent increase to 21.4 kg per capita by 2030 (FAO, 2022). Moreover, India's promising fisheries sector provides livelihood, employment, and entrepreneurship opportunities to over 2.8 crores fishers and fish farmers at the primary level, with several lakhs more benefiting along the value chain. India's fish production has witnessed a remarkable growth over the years (DoF, 2023). The state Chhattisgarh per capita fish consumption is reported to be 19.7 kg (Department of Fisheries, Chhattisgarh, 2021).

Comment [JWH12]: Include citation

Comment [JWH13]: Paragraph breakage not required

In light of the significant growth in fish production and its importance as a protein source, a study was initiated to assess the investment and development potential in both urban and rural households within the study area. The objectives of the study are as follows:

1. To analyze and understand the fish consumption patterns in both rural and urban areas, identifying the frequency and quantity of fish consumed by the respondents.
2. To explore the preferences of fish species among the respondents, examining the most preferred and commonly consumed fish varieties.
3. To investigate the factors influencing fish consumption in the study area, including socio-economic, cultural, and dietary factors.
4. To identify and assess the constraints faced by fish consumers in the region, such as availability, quality, affordability, and market accessibility.

Comment [JWH14]: This is not the way of writing the objectives. Include as part of the introduction and make it concise.

METHODOLOGY

The study was conducted in the Kawardha block (Kabirdham district) of Chhattisgarh, encompassing both urban and rural areas. A total of 100 household samples were taken, with 50 samples collected from each urban and rural area. The sample selection process involved random sampling. Data collection was performed through face-to-face interviews using a pre-structured questionnaire. Additionally, secondary data from the state department and other relevant reports were utilized for the study. The households were categorized into different income groups, namely low-income group (LIG), middle-income group (MIG), and high-income group (HIG), based on their income levels. Data analysis was conducted using simple frequency percentage calculations. To analyze the constraints faced by fish consumers, a Rank based Quotient (RBQ) approach was employed. RBQ quantifies the data collected through preferential ranking techniques by assigning ranks to the parameters and then calculating the RBQ value.

$$RBQ = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{(F_i)(n+1-i)}{N*n} * 100$$

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

(i) **Fish consumption pattern:** Out of the 50 samples taken from rural areas, 42 households were found to be fish consumers, indicating that 84% of rural households consume fish. On the other hand, in urban areas, out of the 50 samples, 40 households were fish consumers, accounting for 80% of urban households. The remaining households in both rural and urban areas (16% and 20%, respectively) were non-fish consumers.




Fig 1. Percentage of Fish consumption pattern in rural and urban area

Comment [JWH15]: Include citation

Comment [JWH16]: Discussion part is not written. Results should be highlighted based on the previously studied reports. No such discussion part is mentioned.

Comment [JWH17]: Supporting citation is missing for fish consumption pattern

Comment [JWH18]: changed

Comment [JWH19]: Changed to non-italics

(ii) **Frequency of fish consumption:** The analysis of the present study reveals that in urban households, 15% of the people prefer fish consumption once a month, 15% twice a month, 7.5% twice a week, and the majority, 62.5%, consumes fish on a weekly basis. Similarly, in rural households, the study found that 14.2% consume fish once a month, 26.1% consume fish twice a month, 14.3% consume fish twice a week, and the majority, 45.25%, consumes fish on a weekly basis. These findings suggest that the frequency of fish consumption varies among different regions and can be influenced by factors such as cultural practices, availability of fish, and dietary preferences of the population.




Fig 2. Graphical representation of Frequency of fish consumption in different time periods by rural people and urban people.

(iii) **Species preference:** From the present study, the preference of different fish species was observed among the respondents. In rural areas, the commonly consumed fish species were Rohu (32.78%), Pangasius (18%), Catla (9.8%), Tilapia (8.2%), Common carp (8.2%), Silver carp (8.2%), Puntius (8.2%), Eel (3.27%), Magur (1.64%), and Singhi (1.64%). In urban areas, the preferred fish species were Rohu (35.38%), Catla (23%), Silver carp (9.23%), Pangasius (7.3%), Common carp (4.62%), Mrigal (4.62%), Grass carp (3%), Tilapia (3%), Prawn (3%), Eel (3%), Magur (1.53%), and Puntius (1.53%). Table 1 highlights the variations in species preference among the consumers indicating the availability and popularity of specific fish species in those areas. Factors such as local taste preferences, cultural practices, and availability of different fish species influence the choices made by the consumers.

Comment [JWH20]: included

Comment [JWH21]: Supporting citation is missing for frequency of fish consumption

Comment [JWH22]: Not required

Comment [JWH23]: Sentence changed

Comment [JWH24]: Supporting citation is missing

Comment [JWH25]: changed

Table 1: Comparison of fish species preference in the study area

Sl.No.	Fish species	Common name	Percent of consumption	
			Rural (%)	Urban (%)
1	<i>Labeo rohita</i>	Rohu	32.78	35.38
2	<i>Catla catla</i>	Catla	9.8	23
3	<i>Cirrhinus mrigala</i>	Mrigal	-	4.62
4	<i>Hypophthalmichthys molitrix</i>	Silver carp	8.2	9.23
5	<i>Ctenopharyngodon idella</i>	Grass carp	-	03
6	<i>Cyprinus carpio</i>	Common carp	8.2	4.62
7	<i>Macrobrachium rosenbergii</i>	Prawn	-	03
8	<i>Pangasidon hypophthalmus</i>	Pangasius	18	7.6
9	<i>Clarias batrachus</i>	Magur	1.64	1.53
10	<i>Heteropneustes fossilis</i>	Singhi	1.64	-
11	<i>Oreochromis mossambicus</i>	Tilapia	8.2	03
12	<i>Puntius spp</i>	Puntius	8.2	1.53
13	<i>Anguilla anguilla</i>	Eel	3.27	03




Fig 3. Fish species preference between rural and urban consumers

(iv) **Fish consumption compared with monthly income:** The data analysis regarding the monthly income of households and fish consumption patterns revealed an interesting finding. Among the urban households, higher percentage (82.75%) of high-income group (HIG) households consume fish compared to low-income group (LIG) households (76.9%) and middle-income group (MIG) households (75%). The non-consumer percentage ranges from 17.25% to 23.1% across income groups.

Comment [JWH26]: corrected

Comment [JWH27]: Supporting citation is missing

Table 2. Fish consumption compared with monthly income between rural and urban consumers

Comment [JWH28]: All the table detail should be unique, no italic and no bold.

Monthly income	Urban			Rural		
	Total HH	Fish consumer	Non fish consumer	Total HH	Fish consumer	Non fish consumer
Low income group(LIG)	13 (26%)	10 (76.9%)	3 (23.1%)	34 (68%)	30 (88.23%)	4 (11.76%)
Middle income group(MIG)	8 (16%)	6 (75%)	2 (25%)	13 (26%)	10 (76.9%)	3 (23.1%)
High income group(HIG)	29 (58%)	24 (82.75%)	5 (17.25%)	3 (6%)	2 (66.6%)	1 (33.3%)

In rural households, a higher percentage (88.23%) of LIG households consumes fish compared to MIG households (76.9%) and HIG households (33.3%). These findings suggest that the fish consumption patterns can be influenced by the monthly income of households. Higher income households tend to have a higher percentage of fish consumers, while lower-income households also show significant fish consumption rates, particularly in rural areas.




Fig 4. Fish consumption compared with monthly income in rural and urban area

(v) *Monthly expenditure compared with expenditure on fish:* The present study revealed the total average expenditure and expenditure specifically on fish in different income groups. In rural households, the total average expenditure for low-income group (LIG) is Rs. 4,645.2, for middle-income group (MIG) is Rs. 9,300, and for high-income group (HIG) is Rs. 11,000. The expenditure on fish for LIG is Rs. 670.9, for MIG is Rs. 1,350, and for HIG is Rs. 566.6. In urban areas, the total expenditure for LIG is Rs. 7,555, for MIG is Rs. 10,000, and for HIG is Rs. 11,625. The expenditure on fish for LIG is Rs. 530, for MIG is Rs. 980, and for HIG is Rs. 812.5. These findings indicated variations in the monthly expenditure on fish among different income groups and between rural and urban areas. Generally, higher-income groups tend to have higher expenditure on fishes for food compared to lower-income groups. The expenditure on fish can be influenced by factors such as income level, availability of fish, and personal preferences.

Table 3. Monthly expenditure compared with expenditure on fish

Income group	Rural		Urban	
	Total expenditure	Expenditure on fish	Total expenditure	Expenditure on fish
LIG	4645.2	670.9	7555	530
MIG	9300	1350	10000	980
HIG	11000	566.6	11625	812.5

(vi) *Occupational lifestyle compared with fish consumption:* In the present study, the analysis of fish consumption patterns in relation to occupational lifestyle revealed the following trends. In rural areas, households with a moderate occupational lifestyle (100%) were the dominant fish

Comment [JWH29]: Extra comma is there, remove it

Comment [JWH30]: Supporting citation is missing

Comment [JWH31]: corrected

Comment [JWH32]: Word size should be same for all the table

Comment [JWH33]: Which currency? Dollar or Rupee?

consumers, followed by households with a heavy occupational lifestyle (84.61%) and sedentary lifestyle (71.42%). Similarly, in urban areas, households with a heavy occupational lifestyle (84.61%) were the dominant fish consumers, followed by households with a sedentary lifestyle (81.4%) and moderate occupational lifestyle (70%). These results suggested that there is a correlation between occupational lifestyle and fish consumption patterns. In rural areas, households with moderate occupational lifestyles tend to have higher fish consumption, while in urban areas, households with heavy occupational lifestyles show higher fish consumption rates. Sedentary lifestyles are also associated with significant fish consumption, particularly in urban areas.

Comment [JWH34]: Supporting citation is missing

Table 4. Occupational lifestyle compared with fish consumption in rural and urban areas

Occupational Lifestyle	Rural			Urban		
	Total households	Fish consumers	Non fish consumers	Total households	Fish consumers	Non fish consumers
Sedentary	7 (14%)	5 (71.42%)	2 (28.57%)	27 (54%)	22 (81.4%)	5 (18.51)
Moderate	3 (6%)	3 (100%)	0 (0%)	10 (20%)	7 (70%)	3 (30%)
Heavy	40 (80%)	34 (85%)	6 (15%)	13 (26%)	11 (84.61%)	2 (15.38%)
Total	50 (100%)	42 (84%)	8 (16%)	50 (100%)	40 (80%)	10 (20%)

Comment [JWH35]: % is missing

(vii) **Factors affecting fish consumption:** The study revealed the major factors affecting fish consumption in both rural and urban areas. In rural areas, the price of fish (38.0%), quality of fish (19.8%), and convenience of visiting the market (9.52%) were identified as the primary factors influencing fish consumption. In urban areas, the taste of fish (27.5%), convenience of visiting the market (18.75%), and variety of fish (13.34%) were the major factors affecting fish consumption. The results indicated that factors such as price, quality, taste, variety, and convenience of access to fish markets play crucial roles in shaping the consumption patterns of

Comment [JWH36]: Supporting citation is missing

fish. These factors influence consumers' decision-making processes and their preferences for fish consumption in both rural and urban settings.

Table 5. Factors affecting fish consumption in rural area and urban area

Attributes	Rural		Urban	
	RBQ score	Rank	RBQ score	Rank
Quality of fish	19.8	II	7.5	VI
Variety of fish	0.79	VI	13.34	III
Price of fish	38.0	I	3.34	IV
Taste of fish	3.58	IV	27.5	I
Hygiene of fish market	3.96	V	0.83	VI
Convenience to visit market	9.52	III	18.75	II

Comment [JWH37]: Value is missing on both urban and rural score? %????

Constraints faced by fish consumers: The study identified the major constraints faced by fish consumers in both rural and urban areas. In rural areas, the constraints reported were a limited variety of fish (23.80%), inadequacy of the desired size (18.36%), and lack of hygiene. On the other hand, in urban areas, the major constraints faced were lack of hygiene (21.95%), higher price fluctuations (17.14%), and inadequate sanitation. These results indicate that constraints related to variety, size availability, hygiene, price fluctuations, and sanitation are significant challenges faced by fish consumers. Addressing these constraints is crucial for improving the overall fish consumption experience and ensuring consumer satisfaction in both rural and urban areas.

Comment [JWH38]: Supporting citation is missing

Table 6. Constraints faced by the fish consumers in rural and urban areas

Constraints	Rural		Urban	
	RBQ score	Rank	RBQ score	Rank
Inadequate sanitation facilities	8.16	IV	12.5	III
Lack of hygiene (cleanliness)	13.60	III	25.0	I
Less number of fish variety	23.80	I	4.28	V
Higher price fluctuation	0.34	VII	17.14	II

Lack of freshness of fish	2.0	VI	2.14	VI
Distantly located market	5.10	V	0.7	VII
Unavailability of the desired size	18.36	II	8.57	IV

Reasons for not consuming fish: The study identified the reasons behind not consuming fish in both rural and urban areas. In rural areas, the major reasons reported were bones (28%), religious beliefs (23%), smell and taste (16%), unavailability of desired fish (11%), difficulty in cleaning (9%), hygiene in fish markets (7%), and cost (6%). In urban areas, the reasons included religious beliefs (25%), bones (23%), cost of fish (19%), hygiene in fish markets (15%), smell and taste (8%), difficulty in cleaning (6%), and unavailability of desired fish (4%).

Comment [JWH39]: Citation is missing

These findings highlight the diverse reasons why individuals choose not to consume fish, including concerns related to bones, religious beliefs, taste, cost, hygiene, and cleaning difficulties. Understanding these reasons can help in addressing misconceptions, improving accessibility to desired fish varieties, and promoting the benefits of fish consumption to overcome barriers and increase fish consumption rates.




Fig 5. Reasons for not consuming fishes in both rural and urban areas

Conclusions

The importance of this study lies in its contribution to understanding the regional differences in fish consumption patterns and the factors influencing them. By exploring the fish

Comment [JWH40]: Include some points highlighting the future aspect for policy makers

consumption patterns in both rural and urban areas of the Kawardha block, Chhattisgarh, the study provides valuable insights that can inform policy decisions and interventions to promote sustainable and healthy fish consumption practices. The findings of this study shed light on various factors influencing fish consumption patterns in both rural and urban areas of the Kawardha block, Chhattisgarh. Understanding these factors and their implications can inform targeted interventions and policies aimed at promoting sustainable and healthy fish consumption practices. Efforts should be directed towards addressing constraints and improving factors such as availability, quality, hygiene, and affordability. Creating awareness about the nutritional benefits of fish, dispelling misconceptions, and enhancing access to a variety of fish species can encourage higher fish consumption rates among different communities. Overall, this study provides valuable insights into the regional differences in fish consumption patterns, influencing factors, and constraints faced by fish consumers. It emphasizes the need for comprehensive strategies to support and promote the sustainable growth of the fisheries sector while ensuring the availability of safe and nutritious fish for all segments of society.

Comment [JWH41]: Include district name

Comment [JWH42]: Include district name

References

Comment [JWH43]: Include some more references.

Department of Fisheries, 2023. Report on 9 years of the Indian Fisheries Sector. Ministry of Fisheries, Animal Husbandry and Dairying. Govt of India.

Comment [JWH44]: Changed to non-italics

Department of Fisheries, Govt. of Chhattisgarh (2020-21) Annual Report. 31 p.

FAO. 2022. The State of World Fisheries and Aquaculture 2022. Towards Blue Transformation. Rome, FAO. <https://doi.org/10.4060/cc0461en>.

Handbook on Fisheries Statistics (2020) Department of Fisheries, Ministry of Fisheries, Animal Husbandry & Dairying Government of India. p. 23 – 28.