

- X₅ = Years of formal education (years)
- X₆ = Household head monthly income (₦)
- X₇ = Monthly of household head transfer earnings (₦)
- X₈ = Rice brand consumed (Local rice=1, Otherwise=0)
- X₉ = Ease of preparation (yes=1, no=0)
- X₁₀ = Grain quality (yes=1, no=0)
- X₁₁ = Grain colour (yes=1, no=0)
- X₁₂ = Grain aroma (yes=1, no=0)
- X₁₃ = Grain length (yes=1, no=0)
- X₁₄ = Health reasons (yes=1, no=0)
- X₁₅ = Price perception on local rice (yes=1, no=0)
- X₁₆ = Monthly expense on local rice (₦)
- μi = Error term
- a₀ = Constant term
- a₁-a₁₆ = Regression coefficient (parameters)

n = Likert Scale (strongly agree=5, agree=4, undecided=3, disagree=2, strongly disagree=1)

IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The result of the study from Table 1, reveals that local rice is strongly perceived to be healthier than the foreign brand (Ajala et al, 2019). Local rice was as well perceived to taste better than foreign rice, this was shown by an odd ratio of 3.00 for local rice taste. That local rice is worse than foreign rice was also disagreed with from the study though that's not enough justification to assert that local rice is better off. From the study also, it's obvious that local rice is less attractive to foreign rice and as well not as neat as foreign rice bran. This agrees with the findings of (Ajala and Ghana 2015) that the local rice in Nigeria market is characterized by the unattractiveness and the presence of foreign bodies which make local rice less appealing to consumers. The study also shows that local rice is still largely difficult to prepare owing to the stringent effort required to ensure it's served at a good serving quality. Nonetheless, local rice was perceived as superior in quality in the study area.

Table 1: Perceptions about Local Rice Brand

Perception Statements	SA	A	I	D	SD	S.D±X	Inference
Local rice is healthy	3.52	0.75	0.17	0.07	0.01	0.880±1.48	SA
Local rice has superior in quality	2.72	0.53	0.31	0.13	0.01	1.314±1.93	SA
Local rice has better taste	3.04	0.53	0.23	0.26	0.06	1.316±1.91	SA
Local rice is worse than foreign rice	0.47	0.32	0.55	0.74	0.28	1.232±3.65	D
Local rice is more expensive	1.51	0.43	0.43	0.49	0.21	1.550±2.93	SA
Local rice is more attractive	0.62	0.32	0.21	0.77	0.34	1.346±3.73	D
Local rice is not harmful	2.13	1.17	0.25	0.28	0.08	1.490±2.23	SA
Local rice is neater	0.47	0.19	0.10	0.66	0.54	1.088±4.25	D
Local rice is easy to prepare	0.23	0.37	0.12	0.68	0.49	1.195±4.09	D

Source: computed from field survey, 2018

Preference for Local Rice

Table 2 revealed that 64% of the respondents preferred local rice to foreign one while 36% didn't prefer local rice. This

implies that under normal circumstances if consumers are to choose, local rice will be selected over foreign one.

Table 2: Distribution of Respondents by Preference for Local Rice Brands

Preference for Local Rice	Number of Consumers	Percentage (%)
Yes	96	64.0
No	54	36.0
Total	150	100.0

Source: computed from field survey, 2018

Preference Index for Local Rice

Local rice (ofada) has the highest preference index of 0.81, followed closely by “Igbemo” rice with a preference index of 0.72. Lake rice was least preferred after “Abakaliki” and “Buhari” rice in the study area. These then implies that Ofada

rice is the most preferred rice brand in the study area, and having “Igbemo” rice sharing close preference range. Therefore, consumers will prefer to choose “Ofada” rice over every other rice brands in the study area. This could owe in part to its nativity to South West Nigeria where the study area is located.

Table 3: Distribution of Respondents Preference Level Based of Selected Local Rice

Local Rice Brands	NP(1)		LP(2)		P(3)		MP(4)		PI
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	
Igbemo rice	31	23.3	11	8.5	34	26.4	54	41.9	0.72
Abakaliki rice	68	51.9	41	31.8	6	4.7	7	5.4	0.38
Lake rice	79	61.2	28	21.7	10	7.8	0	0	0.32
Ofada rice	29	22.5	11	8.5	23	17.8	75	58.1	0.81
Buhari rice	88	67.4	18	14	7	5.4	7	5.4	0.33

Source: computed from field survey, 2018

Tobit Regression Estimation for Determinants of Preference for Local Rice

Table 3 presented the results of the estimated Tobit model of the factors influencing consumers’ preference for local rice. The Tobit model is significant at 1% level as indicated by the likelihood ratio value (LR χ^2 (19) = 57.44; $p \leq 0.003$).

The study also shows that grain quality, and ease of preparation were significant and positively influence preference for local rice. Household size and market price were also significant but have negative relationship with the preference for local rice.

The 5% significance of grain quality implies that increase in grain quality of local rice increases consumer’s likelihood of preferring it to foreign or imported one. This finding contradicts Lancon 2007 that household’s preferred imported rice to local rice in Nigeria. Grain quality therefore have a positive influence on local rice preference as the study reveals.

Ease of preparation was significant at 1% significant level implies that as local rice becomes easier to prepare, the probability of preferring local rice to foreign rice increases by 0.014.

Household size was negatively related to consumers’ preference for local rice and was statistically significant at 10% level. This indicates that household size has inverse relationship with the probability of consuming local rice. By implication, this implies that, as household size increases, the probability of consuming local rice decreases. This could have resulted from the perceived difficulty in preparation as identified by the respondents which will increase preparation stress as the numbers of mouth to feed increases.

Market price perception is significant at 5% shows that grain price significantly influenced the preference for local rice though having a negative relationship. As grain price is perceived to increase by ₦1, the probability for preferring local rice dwindles by 0.05. This is consistent with the fact that it is still seen as an inferior good irrespective of its intrinsic quality.

Table 3. Determinants of Preference for Local Rice

Variables	Coefficients	Standard error	t-value	p-value
Age	-0.0036	0.00485	-0.7415	0.460
Sex	0.0076	0.02313	0.3321	0.740
Marital Status	0.0167	0.03522	0.4750	0.636
Household size	-0.0044*	0.00301	-1.4863	0.110
Year of Education	0.0038	0.00348	1.1060	0.271
Local rice awareness	0.0376	0.04331	0.8688	0.387
Year of awareness	-0.0001	0.00102	0.1111	0.912
Rice brand consumed	0.0248	0.03128	0.7957	0.428
Grain quality	0.0351**	0.01578	2.2245	0.028
Grain length	-0.0078	0.02871	-0.2750	0.784

Preparation ease	0.0140***	0.00240	4.9981	0.009
Grain aroma	-0.0136	0.02452	-0.5565	0.579
Grain price	-0.0509**	0.02600	-1.9620	0.052
Grain packaging	0.0313	0.02937	1.0674	0.288
Health reasons	0.0299	0.02847	1.0522	0.295
Household income	-5.04e-02	1.19e-07	-0.0431	0.966
Constant	0.2613**	0.10734	2.4345	0.016

Source: computed from field survey, 2018

* Significant at 10%, ** Significant at 5%, *** Significant at 1%

V. CONCLUSION

Preference for local rice was ascertain by its characteristics of being healthy to consume, good taste and superior in quality than the foreign rice. The study showed that consumers' preference for local rice is influenced by household size, grain quality, ease of preparation and grain price.

Rice quality was positively related to consumers' preference and was significant at 5% significant level. Increase in grain quality of local rice increases consumers' likelihood of preferring it to foreign one. Ease of preparation increases the probability of preferring local rice to foreign rice. Household size negative significance indicates that household size has inverse relationship with the probability of preferring local rice and more importantly, the preference of local rice is more sensitive because price have a sensitive effect on utility and preference attached to a product.

REFERENCES

- [1]. Accent (2010). Review of Stated Preference and Willingness to Pay Methods. Competition Commission. Retrieved from: http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/+http://www.competition-commission.org.uk/our_role/analysis/summary_and_report_combined.pdf
- [2]. Ajala, A., and Gana A. (2015). Analysis of Challenges Facing Rice Processing in Nigeria. *Journal of Food Processing*. 4(3):23-29. Retrieved from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1155/2015/893673>
- [3]. Demont, M., Zossou, E., Rutsaert, P., Ndour, M., Van-Mele, P., and Verbeke, W. (2012). Consumer valuation of improved rice parboiling technologies in Benin. *Food Quality and Preference* 23: 63–70.
- [4]. Demont, M., Rutsaert, P., Ndour, M. and Verbeke, W. (2013). Reversing urban bias in African rice markets: evidence from Senegal. *World Development* 45, 63–74.
- [5]. Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO, 2016). *Rice Market Monitor*. 14(1): 1-44.
- [6]. Food and Agriculture Organization Statistics (FAOSTAT, 2012). *Food Balance Sheets, Commodity Balances, Crops Primary Equivalent*. Retrieved August 17, 2012(WIKI)
- [7]. Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO, 2000). *Agriculture towards 2015/30 Technical Interim Report*. April, 2000. Rome
- [8]. Federal Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development, (FMARD, 2012). *Agricultural Transformation Agenda: Repositioning Agriculture to drive Nigeria's Economy*.
- [9]. Lançon, F. and Benz, H. (2007.) *Rice imports in West Africa: trade regimes and food policy formulation*. A Paper presented at the 106th seminar of the European Association of Agricultural Economics (EAAE), Pro-poor Development in Low Income Countries: Food, Agriculture, Trade and Environment. Montpellier, France, 25–27 October
- [10]. Sowunmi, F., Omigie O., and Daniel D. (2014). Consumers' Perception on Ofada Rice in Ibadan North Local Government Area of Oyo State, Nigeria. *Journal of Economics and Sustainable Development*. ISSN 2222-2855 (Online). 5(16): pp
- [11]. Singh, B., Fagade, S., Ukungwu, M., William, C., Jagtap, S., Oladimeji, O., Effisue, A., Okhidieubie, O. (1997). *Rice Growing Environment and Biophysical Constraints in Different Agro Ecological Zones of Nigeria*. *Metrology Journal*. 29:35-44.
- [12]. Terwase, I., and Madu, A. (2014). *The Impact of Rice Production, Consumption and Importation in Nigeria: The Political Economy Perspectives*. *International Journal of Sustainable Development & World Policy*, 2014, 3(4): p91