

Research paper

Determinants of sugarcane price and revenue in Sokoto metropolis, Sokoto state, Nigeria

ABSTRACT

The study was carried out to ~~evaluate the determinants~~ determine the price and revenue of sugarcane ~~price and revenue~~ in

Sokoto metropolis, ~~Sokoto state, Nigeria~~. Purposive sampling technique was used to select *Ramin Kura* market because of the high concentration of sugarcane seller in the market.

Data were collected with the aid of questionnaire administered to 50 respondents that were randomly selected from the list of registered members of sugarcane sellers association. Data

collected were analysed using Multiple Regression. The study revealed that the coefficient of quantity demanded (0.456), distance from source (-1.182), and handling cost (-0.570),

had significant effects on the price of sugarcane while length of stem, tax and storage cost had no significant effect on the price of sugarcane. The study also showed that quantity sold

(0.719), transportation cost (1.11) and storage cost (0.138) had significant effect on the total revenue of sugarcane sellers. ~~while experience, handling cost and tax had no significant~~

~~effect on the total revenue of sugarcane sellers.~~ Based on the results, it was concluded that quantity demanded, distance from source and handling cost were the main ~~factors~~

~~determining~~determinants of sugarcane price in Sokoto metropolis. Also, quantity sold, transportation cost

and storage cost were the main ~~factors~~ ~~determining~~determinants of sugarcane revenue in the metropolis. ~~It~~

~~is recommended that sugarcane sellers ought to increase the quality supplied in the market to offset changes in price due to increase in the market demand. This may prevent and/or~~

~~reduce price fluctuation. The increase in quality supplied shall also bring about increase in revenue generation via economies of scale.~~

Key Words: Determinants, Price, Revenue, Sokoto Metropolis

INTRODUCTION

Sugarcane (*Saccharum officinarum*) originated from tropical South Africa and

South East Asia. World production of sugarcane stood at 1.5 billion tonnes as of

2008. Currently Brazil is the largest sugarcane producing country [Wikipedia,

2009]. Nigeria has a suitable land area (800,000ha) for the cultivation of

sugarcane and about 30million metric tonnes can be cultivated annually

[Imolehin *et al.*, 2008b]. In Sokoto state sugarcane provides a means of

livelihood to many farmers especially those residing in the rural areas

Comment [DAS1]: A variable cannot form a factor.

33 [SMANR, 2007].The major producing local governments areas in the state are

34 Wamakko, DangeShuni, Goronyo, Wurno, Gwadabawa, Tangaza, Gudu,
35 Kware, Bodinga, and Gada where about 8,000 ha and 7,300 ha of land were
36 utilised for sugarcane production in 2002 and 2005, respectively [SMANR,
37 2007].

38 In Sokoto state like in many other places in Nigeria, price of agricultural
39 products are rarely stable especially ~~those that are~~ perishable produce like such as
sugarcane.

40 Snodgrass *et al.*, [1970] observed that, most agricultural commodities are
41 affected by price variation arising from seasonal fluctuations in demand, supply
42 and marketing. Similarly, Subba *et al.* (2008) added that agricultural prices are
43 volatile in the sense that they are subject to changes over time and space. The
44 fluctuation in prices of commodities affects the fortunes of individuals in the
45 economy. Prices give signal to the producers regarding the commodities to be
46 produced in the economy and how to earn money and sustain the process of
47 production. The most common feature observed in agricultural prices is clearly
48 marked by seasonal pattern of change. Price fluctuation can be caused by the
49 divergence between planned output and realised output. There ~~is also~~ also the
50 seasonality in production and marketing which also causes price fluctuation.
51 This is so because most products are characterised by some seasonality
52 behaviour in their production and marketing pattern. According to Olukosi *et al.*
53 (2007) there are two types of price variation, the seasonal and the cyclical price
54 variation. The seasonal price variations are regular patterns of price fluctuation

Comment [DAS2]: Not referenced

55 that occur within a year. The cyclical price variation is a pattern that repeats
 56 itself regularly with the passage of time. A study conducted by Wayas (2008)
 57 showed that the price of sugarcane ~~is~~ was influenced by the distance between
 the
 58 production site and the point of sale, non-motorable roads linking the
 59 production sites to the market areas and unavailability of markets around the
 60 production site. These factors make it difficult for local farmers to transport
 61 sugarcane to far distance places where they can sell at higher prices. The only
 62 alternative left for them is to dispose the crops at any price available within their
 63 reach. In an open market, the price of sugarcane is largely determined by
 64 haggling and visual appraisal of stalk and physical characteristics rather than by
 65 measures, such as stalk weight.

66 Owing to the complexity of pricing, and hence revenue generated from sales,
 67 the Federal Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development(FMARD) (2008)
 asserts that one of the

68 cardinal objectives of agricultural pricing policy of Nigeria is the stabilisation of
 69 prices and revenues to farmers. This may not be unconnected with the profound
 70 effect price and revenue fluctuations may have on the growth, equity and
 71 stability of the economy. For instance, incomes and living standards of the
 72 farmers, labourers and consumers are very highly affected by price and
 revenue

73 fluctuations [Subby et al., 2008]. This study is therefore, designed to determine
 74 the ~~factors~~important variables influencing the ~~affecting~~ price ~~of~~ and revenue
 generated from sugarcane.

Comment [DAS3]: Not referenced

76 The study was carried out in Sokoto metropolis, Sokoto state. The states
77 consist of 23 ~~Local~~ ~~g~~Governments Areas. It is located in the North –Western
part of

78 Nigeria and falls within the Sudan Sahel vegetation zone with longitude $11^{\circ}30'2''$ –
79 $13^{\circ}50'$ and latitude $4^{\circ}64'$ (LGAs) (SOSG Diary, 2007). The metropolis consists of
part of

80 Wamakko, Dange, Kware, Sokoto South and Sokoto North L.G. ALGAs
(NPC,

81 1991). *Ramin Kura* market was purposively selected ~~to meet the targeted~~
~~82 —sugarcane sellers~~ because of the high concentration of sugarcane sellers in the

83 market. A list of the sugarcane sellers (comprising 252 registered members)

84 was collected from the ~~market~~ association of sugarcane sellers, ~~comprising~~ out

85 of which 50 ~~respondents~~ were randomly selected and used for the study. Data

86 collected from the respondents covered information on demography;
~~factors~~parameters

87 affecting pricing such as distance, handling cost; ~~Data collected also covered~~

~~88 —information pertaining to factors it also include parameters~~ affecting revenue
such as transportation cost,

89 handling cost and years of experience. Data analyses were done using multiple

90 regression. The ~~functional~~ forms of the production function that were used

91 include linear and quadratic, double log and semi-log equations.

92 Model specification

93 The general form of the multiple regression model is specified as follows:

Comment [DAS4]: IT is important the author mention the type of sapling technique used for the selection. I think since the list was available, systematic sampling would be appropriate.

Comment [DAS5]: One respondent out of every five be selected with a random start. This will make up the 50 respondents.

UNDER PEER REVIEW

94 $Y=F(X_1, X_2, X_3, X_4, X_5, X_6)$ equation 1

95 Where:

96 For factors affecting pricing:

Y= Price of sugarcane/kg, F=Functional notation, X_1 =Quantity demanded (kg) X_2 =Distance from source of sugarcane (km), X_3 =Length of stem (cm), X_4 =Handling cost (N), X_5 =Tax (N), and X_6 =Storage cost (N)

For factors affecting revenue:

Y= Total Revenue (GI-TC) (N), X_1 = Quantity sold (N), X_2 =Transportation cost (N), X_3 =Years of Experience, X_4 = Handling cost (N), X_5 = Tax (N) and X_6 = Storage cost (N)

Different functional forms of the model such as linear, Cobb-Douglas and quadratic functional forms were tried to select the equation with the best fit. Equation selection was done on the basis of R^2 -value, T-value, f-value, sign and size of the regression coefficients. From the results Obtained, the quadratic functional form appeared to be the best fit in the analysis of factors affecting price while the linear functional form was the best fit in the analysis of factors affecting net-revenue.

In the case of factors affecting price, the quadratic functional form was therefore, specified as follows

$$Y = a + B_1X_1 + B_2X_2 + B_3X_3 + B_4X_4 + B_5X_5 + B_6X_6 - B_7X_1 - B_8X_2 - B_9X_3 - B_{10}X_4 - B_{11}X_5 - B_{12}X_6 + B_{13}X_1X_2 + U \dots \dots \dots \text{equation 2.}$$

In the case of factors affecting revenue linear functional form was specified as

$$Y = a + B_1X_1 + B_2X_2 + B_3X_3 + B_4X_4 + B_5X_5 + B_6X_6 + \dots \dots \dots \text{equation 3}$$

Where: U = error term, a=intercept, and B_1 - B_6 are regression coefficients.

Formatted: Double strikethrough

Formatted: Double strikethrough

Formatted: Double strikethrough

Comment [DAS6]: The author should crossbthe N to show naira.

Comment [DAS7]: Provide the references for the equations.

119 Results and discussion

120 The Ordinary Least Square (OLS) was the econometric technique used in the
121 estimation of coefficients of the variables for both factors determining price and
122 revenue for the sugarcane enterprise. Unlike other methods of estimations such
123 as the Maximum Likelihood Estimate (MLE), OLS estimates are unbiased and
124 have minimum variance (Olayemi, 1998 and Thomas, 2007). Results in Table
1 shows

125 ~~results obtained for~~ the determinants of sugarcane price in the Sokoto
126 ~~metropolis study area~~. The Table reveals that an R^2 value of 0.789 was
obtained. This

127 means that 78.9% of the variation in the price of sugarcane in Sokoto metropolis
128 is associated with or explained by the variation in the ~~factors~~variables included
in the
129 quadratic regression equation specified and only 21.1% is accounted for by other
130 factors not captured in the equation.

131 The table also shows that the coefficient of quantity demanded (X_1)
132 (1.584) is positive and significant ($P < 0.05$) meaning that increase in the
133 quantity demanded will bring about increase in the price of sugarcane. This
134 conforms to observation made by (Olukosi and Abraham 1998; Michael and
135 Emmanuel 2002) that an increase in the quantity demanded of a commodity
136 ~~should~~would bring about a corresponding increase in its price. Distance from
the
137 source of sugarcane (X_2) also has a negative coefficient (-1.182) and is

Comment [DAS8]: Not referenced

Comment [DAS9]: Not referenced

Comment [DAS10]: Create a paragraph here

Comment [DAS11]: Not referenced

138 statistically significant ($P < 0.05$). This implies that the closer the source of the
139 sugarcane the higher its price will become. This may be because as sugarcane is

140 transported from a far distance place to the location of sale deterioration may
 141 occur, which may bring about reduction in the price. This finding conforms to
 142 Onwueme (1991), who observed that deterioration in sugarcane occurs after 48
 143 hours and poor quality due to deterioration attracts low price.

144 Table 1 further shows that handling cost (X_4) has a negative coefficient (-1.527)
 145 and is significant ($P < 0.1$). This is in agreement with the finding of Nura (2005)
 146 that price of sugarcane in Nigeria is negatively affected by the marketing
 147 charges such as transportation and retailing charges. However, Tax (X_5), storage
 148 cost (X_6) and length of stem (X_3) do not have any significant effect on the price
 149 of sugarcane in Sokoto metropolis.

150 **Table 1: Result of multiple regression showing determinants of factors affecting sugarcane price**

Variables	coefficient	T. ratio
Quantity demanded (X_1)	0.456	1.584**
Distance from source (X_2)	-1.182	-1.899**
Length of stem (X_3)	0.111	0.896 ^{ns}
Handling cost (X_4)	-0.570	-1.527*
Tax (X_5)	0.106	0.536 ^{ns}
Storage cost (X_6)	0.525	1.249 ^{ns}
R^2	0.789	

151 **Source:** Field survey, 2009

152 Note: ***= significant at $P < 0.01$; **= significant at $P < 0.05$; *==

Comment [DAS12]: You claimed you are using coefficient but you are referring to the T- ratio. I think it is better to use either the coefficient or the Beta values. Any used should be with explanations.

Comment [DAS13]: There is no difference between .01 and .10 ***

153 significant at $P < 0.10$; ns= not significant

154 Results in Table 2 shows results obtained for the determinants of revenue from
sugarcane

155 in ~~Sokoto metropolis~~the study area. The Table reveals an R^2 value of 0.840
which means that

156 84% of the variation in the revenue obtained from sugarcane sale in Sokoto
157 metropolis is associated with or explained by the variation in the factors
158 included in the linear regression equation specified and only 16% is
159 Accounted for by other factors not included in the equation.

160 Quantity sold (X_1) has a significant positive coefficient ($P < 0.1$). This
161 implies that increase in the quantity of sugarcane sold leads to a corresponding
162 increase in total revenue generated from the crop. This agrees with the *apriori*
163 expectation that there is a direct relationship between the quantity a seller is
164 able to sell at the market and the amount of revenue he is likely to generate from
165 the sale. This suggests that sugarcane sellers could increase the amount of total
166 revenue obtainable through economies of scale, all things being equal. While
167 Yisa (2004) observed a 23.3% increase in annual revenue from sugarcane due to
168 economies of scale, Sluyters (2006) did not realised any significant increase in
169 the revenue of sugarcane associated to the economies of scale.

170 The coefficient of transportation cost (X_2) is positive and significant ($P < 0.01$).
171 This implies that there is also a direct relationship between the amount of
172 money spent on transporting the commodity to the ~~point of sale~~market and the
total

173 revenue generated. The reason may not be ~~farfetched~~farfetched because
sugarcane sellers

174 normally increase the price of the commodity whenever there is an increase in
 175 the cost of transportation probably due to increase in the price of petrol.
 176 However, the rate of commodity price increase by the sellers is usually much
 177 more than what is required to cover the extra cost due to petroleum increase.
 178 Hence, they tend to gain more revenue from the price fluctuations. The
 179 coefficient of cost of storage (X_6) is also positive and statistically significant
 180 ($P<0.05$) meaning that the more the amount of money spent on storage the more
 181 will be the total revenue. This may not be unconnected with the fact that,
 182 spending more on storage translate into adding more value to the commodity
 183 which in turn manifest into more revenue due to more value addition. Joseph
 184 (2010) reported similar significant positive correlation ($P<0.01$) between cost of
 185 storage and total revenue realised from sale of agricultural produce. However,
 186 the coefficient of years of experience (X_3), tax (X_5) and handling cost (X_4) do
 187 not have statistical significance.

Comment [DAS14]: It is not necessary to report non significant variables.

188 Conclusion

189 In conclusion, it was observed that quantity demanded, distance from
 190 source, handling cost and storage cost were the main
 191 ~~factors~~determinants having
 192 significant influence on the price of sugarcane in the study area.
 193 Similarly, quantity sold, transportation cost and storage cost were the
 194 major ~~factors~~determinants affecting the total revenue of the sugarcane
 sellers in the
 study area. Based on the results, it is recommended that sugarcane sellers

ought to increase the quality supplied in the market to offset changes in the market demand so as to prevent and/or reduce price fluctuation. The increase in quality supplied shall also bring about increase in revenue generation via economies of scale. The association of sugarcane sellers should make an effort to source loan for their members so as to improve on the marketing activity.

Table 2: Linear regression analysis of factors affecting determinants of total revenue

Variables	Coefficient	T-ratio
Quantity sold (X_1)	0.719	1.628*
Transportation cost (X_2)	1.117	0.660***
Experience (X_3)	-0.067	-0.900ns
Handling cost (X_4)	0.337	0.791ns
Tax (X_5)	0.105	1.096ns
Storage cost (X_6)	0.138	1.888**
R^2	0.840	

UNDER PEER REVIEW

Source: Field survey, 2009.

Note: Note:

***=

significant at

$P < 0.01$; **=

significant at

$P < 0.05$;

***=

significant at

$P < 0.10$; ns=

not significant

Comment [DAS15]: There should be a difference in .01 and .10 ***

210

211

212

213

214

215

216

217 **REFERENCES**

218 (FMA) Federal Ministry of Agriculture.(1988), *Agricultural Policy for*
219 *Nigeria*.Lagos. 64.

220 Imolehin, E .D. and A. C. Wada (2008b). Advances in sugarcane and
221 sugar research in Nigeria.*Training Manual on Sugarcane Production and*
222 *processing*.A.C. Wada and I. O. Fatoba (edt.) Badeggi NCRI, Niger,
223 Nigeria. 1.

224 Joseph T. (2010). Determinant of revenue from sales of some selected
225 Agricultural produce in Louis, Toronto. Journal of international Agricultural
226 Research 4(6).

227 Micheal S. I; and Emmanuel O.E (2002). Agricultural economies: an
228 Introduction to basic concept and principles. Best print Bussiness press. Uyo,
229 Akwa Ibom, Nigeria.

- 230 (NPC) National Population Commission (2006). *Population of Nigeria by*
 231 *sex*, Report.
- 232 Nura, A. B. (2005). Evaluation of sugarcane marketing in Bunza Local
 233 Government Area of Kebbi State, unpublished **BseB.Sc.** Project
 Department
 234 of Agricultural Economics and Extension, UsmanuDanfodiyo, Sokoto,
 235 Nigeria. 34.
- 236 Olukosi, J. O. Isitor, S. U. and O. O. Moses (2007,) *Introduction to*
 237 *Agricultural Marketing and Prices Principle and Applications*. Agitab
 238 Publication, Zaria, 37-42 and 107-115.
- 239 Onwueme, I. C. and T. D. Sinha (1991). *Field Crop Production in*
 240 *Tropical Africa*. CTA, Wageningen, Netherlands, City publication. 412Pp.
- 241 **Sluyter**, J. A. (2006). Some information about sugarcane produced in part
 242 of the Bida Diuisia of Northern Nigeria. Northern Zone Agricultural
 243 Science 2(4). Pp. 290-203.
- 244 SMANR: SokotoState Ministry of Agriculture and Natural Resources,
 245 (2007). *Annual Report*, 8-11.
- 246 SOSG: Sokoto State, Home Affairs Department. Diary (2007). *Yearly*
 247 *Publication*, 1-3.
- 248 Subba, S. R., Ragbu, P. R., Sastry, T. V. and I. D. Bhavani
 249 (2007). *Agricultural Economics*. Oxford and IBH Publishing Co Put.Ltd.
 250 New Delhi, India. 535-536.

Comment [DAS16]: Referenced not cited.

UNDER PEER REVIEW

251 Wayas, J. V. (2008). Sugarcane markets outlets. Training Manual on
252 sugarcane production and processing, A. C. Wada and I. O. Fatoba (eds).
253 Badeggi, NCRI, Niger, Nigeria. 94.

254 Yisa, E. N. 2004 Sugarcane production and marketing in Nigeria. A case
255 study of Niger state, unpublished BSc. Project Department of Agricultural
256 Economics, Usmanu Danfodiyo Univerity, Sokoto, Nigeria.

257 Wikipedia.(2009). Price Index.The Free Encyclopaedia.
258 <http://en.wikip.org/wiki/price>. Retrieved Feb. 11, 2009. 7:30pm.

259

Comment [DAS17]: Referenced not cited