

ANALYSIS OF THE PHYSICAL CAPACITY UTILIZATION IN THE SUGAR INDUSTRY IN NIGERIA

¹*Sunday Brownson Akpan, ²Obot Dominic Akpan and ¹Samuel James Udoka*

¹*Department of Agricultural Economics and Resources Management, Akwa Ibom state University, Ikot Akpaden, Mkpato Enin, Akwa Ibom state, Nigeria*

²*Department of Agricultural Economics and Extension, University of Uyo, Akwa Ibom state, Nigeria*

E-mail: sundayakpan10@yahoo.com

ABSTRACT

The study analyzed the physical capacity utilization rates in the sugar industry in the period 1970 to 2010 in Nigeria. Secondary data were obtained from the sugar firms, Central Bank of Nigeria, National Bureau of Statistics and Federal Ministry of Finance. Stochastic Cobb-Douglas production functions for the sugar industry were estimated from which indices of physical capacity utilization rates were obtained. Factors which affect the physical capacity utilization of the industry were investigated. Empirical results revealed that the physical capacity utilization rates in the sugar industry was influenced by the industry's labour productivity, per capita real GDP, sugar import, federal government expenditure on the sugar industry and the quantity of domestic sugarcane used in sugar production. The result of the regression further revealed that the sugar industry in Nigeria was demand unconstrained but resource constrained. It is recommended that appropriate policy measure that should aimed at expansionary aggregate demand as a means of promoting capacity utilization in the sugar industry should be introduced. Such policy measure should be designed to avoid inflationary tendencies. A restrictive policy measure on sugar imports should be adopted in the country. Researches should be intensified to develop good hybrids of industrial sugarcane and indigenous technology in sugar production. In addition, there are needs to widen the scope of the National Sugar Development Council and implementation of enhanced welfare packages for workers in the industry.

Keywords: Sugar, capacity, physical, utilization, industry, Nigeria

1. INTRODUCTION

The sugar sub-sector in the Nigerian economy has contributed to the development of the nation as a whole [16]. The importance of the sub-sector is derived from its contribution to

employment and food self sufficiency as well as its impact on the rural economy in the country [36, 2 and 3]. Sugar is an important food item and also a critical raw material in food, beverage and pharmaceutical industries. In Nigeria, the demand for direct household sugar consumption remains firm, the soft drink production alone accounts for about half of the total industrial sugar usage in Nigeria [32]. According to reports by the [9] and [34], the current domestic consumption of sugar in Nigeria is in excess of one million five hundred thousand tonnes per annum. Domestic production of sugar in the country had suffered considerably in the past years. For instance, the domestic output declined from 51,080 tonnes in the period 1988 to 1990 to 5,597 tonnes in the period 2001 to 2003 [49, 37, 42 and Table 1]. Currently, domestic production of sugar is slightly less than 5% of the country's annual requirement [9, 34].

From 2000 to 2003, the domestic sugar production declined significantly reaching all time low value of less than 1.00% of domestic sugar consumption in the country (Table 1). The dismal performance of the sub-sector had been attributed to multifarious factors including inadequate supply of sugarcane to factories, few operating sugar factories, deteriorating capacity utilization in the sub-sector, myriad of factory and field production problems and lack of improved indigenous sugar production technology as well as inadequate domestic private investments in the sub sector [29 and 49].

Table 1: Sugar Supply and Import Price of Sugar in Nigeria (1970-2008)

Year	Average domestic output (tons)	Average import (tons)	Average total supply (tons)	Average Import Price ₦/ton	Share of domestic to total output (%)	Share of import to total output (%)
1970-1972	38141	114158	152299	144.4	33.41	66.59
1973-1975	42594	99335	141929	424.6	30.01	69.99
1976-1978	34074	327382	361458	332.6	9.43	90.57
1979-1981	36296	632379	668675	349.8	5.43	94.57
1982-1984	37778	571562	609340	293.7	6.20	93.80
1985-1987	51872	450130	502002	465.2	10.33	89.67
1988-1990	51080	292766	343846	1878.5	14.86	85.14
1991-1993	40735	485540	526275	6681.5	7.74	92.26
1994-1996	45577	390718	436295	7696.6	10.45	89.55
1997-2000	13654	729870	743524	10980	1.84	98.16
2001-2003	5597	903066	908663	25229	0.62	99.38
2004-2008	11194	350113	361307	42625	3.20	96.80

Sources: From [42], and [15].

Due to the importance of sugar in the Nigerian economy, two integrated sugar plants at Bacita in Kwara state and Numan in Adamawa state were established in 1961 and 1977 respectively, following the adoption of the import substitution industrialization policy in the country [22]. The aims were to encourage technological development, reduced the volume of imports and encouraged foreign exchange savings by producing locally some of the imported consumer goods [5 and 12]. The two sugar plants had a combined installed capacity of 105,000 tonnes per annum or less than 10% of the country's annual requirement [34]. Due to some rather complex factors, the major existing sugar companies in the country whose combined installed capacity was expected to climb to 165,000 tonnes per annum after their expansion programme initiated by the federal government in collaboration with African Development Bank and African Development Fund in 1989 and 1991 respectively could not fulfilled the sub-sector expectations. In early 1990s, the Nigerian sugar industry was still largely underdeveloped with untapped resources and potentialities. The four

* Tel.: +234-08036728337

E-mail address: sundayakpan10@yahoo.

existing companies were wholly government owned and were characterized by low productivity occasioned by managerial, financial and infrastructural constraints. In order to accelerate domestic sugar production, the National Sugar Development Council (NSDC) was established in 1993. The NSDC was mandated to develop strategies that would promote local production of sugar such that 70% of the country's sugar requirement would be met by domestic production [8 and 10].

Also, in Nigeria, most monetary and fiscal policies, among other things, were aimed at achieving full employment of resources and increase capacity utilization in the economy and at the same time curb inflation [4]. In the sugar industry, example of these fiscal policies employed over the years to boost sugar production in the country included 50% tariff on the importation of white sugar, 5% levy on imported raw sugar, free excise duties on sugar production, reduction of import duties on sugar industry machineries, 5-year tax holiday to sugar refineries and privatization of the major sugar firms in the country, as well as the sugar expansion programme in collaboration with the African Development Bank (ADB) and African Development Fund (ADF) in 1989 and 1991 respectively. These measures were meant to stimulate local production and increase the productivity and capacity utilization in the sub-sector. In spite of these measures, Nigeria is still importing more than 90% of its sugar. Nigeria is the largest consumer of sugar in the West African sub-region and second in Africa [2 and 3]. The country also has a large area of cultivable land, suitable for the growing of industrial sugarcane [8]. Despite the favorable agro-climatic and suitable soil conditions for the production of sugar-cane in addition to the long period of existence of sugar mills; sugar requirements of the country remain largely unmet from domestic sources [37].

One way to understand the dwindling problem in the industry is to study factors that affect capacity utilization in the sub-sector. The study on capacity utilization measures resource use in the production process [50]. It is often used in empirical studies to help explain investment and inventory behaviors, productivity measurement, and indicator of the strength of aggregate demand [25]. A good record of capacity utilization rates in the manufacturing sector have been used to forecast inflationary pressures in developed countries [10 and 18]. Capacity utilization has an important bearing on the financial performance of any firm and the entire industry. It is widely used in business cycle analysis to characterize the situation of individual industry or the whole economy and to assess the appropriateness of economic policies [11]. In spite of the benefits of capacity utilization rates, there are no reliable data on capacity utilization rates in the sugar industry in Nigeria. Data on manufacturing capacity utilization rates as reported by independent official sources such as the Central Bank of Nigeria (CBN), National Bureau of Statistics and Manufacturing Association of Nigeria etc. are inconsistent with one another and need to be examined to reconcile the discrepancies. The concept of capacity utilization is broad and could be sub-divided into economic, physical and technology based capacity utilization rate among others. In Nigeria, the issue on physical capacity utilization rates especially in the agro-based industries is relatively new in the literature [13, 48, 44, 46, 1 and 39]. Most studies on the concept were based on the survey of opinion of firms relating to capacity utilization rate rather than empirical estimation in the individual industry through optimization of the industry's resource endowment [44 and 1]. Other studies based their analyses on data published by the official sources such as Central Bank of Nigeria (CBN) and Manufacturing Association of Nigeria (MAN) with no consideration on capacity utilization estimation procedures [13, 48, 46 and 39].

Therefore, this study differs from the previous ones conducted in Nigeria as it estimated the physical capacity utilization rates for the sugar industry using the sugar industry production data. In addition, it analyzed the factors which influenced the physical capacity utilization rates in the Nigerian sugar industry. Hence, the result of the study is a reliable quantitative fact and source of reference to policy makers to efficiently make relevant policies that can promote the sugar industry's performance in Nigeria. In addition, the results serve as a

useful screen board for future analysis of capacity utilization in any sector of the economy. Furthermore, the study provided a frame of reference for agricultural economists, economists, manufacturers, planners and students who might be carrying out studies on capacity utilization in Nigeria.

FACTORS THAT INFLUENCE PHYSICAL CAPACITY UTILIZATION RATES (PCUR) AMONG MANUFACTURING FIRMS

Relationship between capacity utilization rates (CUR) of firms and other variables have been extensively investigated by many researchers in developed and in some developing economies. [46], employed regression analysis to data from 291 firms in Columbia to investigate determinants of the physical capacity utilization rates among firms. He discovered that firm's capital, market structure, quality of entrepreneur, and firm's age were the major determinants of the physical capacity utilization rates among firms in the country. [21], in their independent investigations in U.S.A found significant positive relationship between capacity utilization rates in the industrial sector and the country's exports. [30], investigated the relationship between capacity utilization rate in the industrial sector and inflation rate in U.S.A. she obtained a significant and positive relationship between the two variables. Earlier [17] discovered that capacity utilization rate depends more on inflation than on unemployment in both U.S.A and Germany economies. Similar results were obtained by [18]. In India, [19 and 45], examined the determinants of capacity utilization among industries in the manufacturing sector and found that most of the industries were demand constrained.

[31], carried out empirical study on the relationship among capacity utilization rate, capital investment, input prices and labor productivity in U.S.A. He used industry data on capital, labor, energy and material for 54 industries. The estimation yielded independent estimates of capacity utilization rates that were positively related to labor productivity, input prices and investment capital. [43], established a positive link between industrial capacity utilization rates in India and public investment in infrastructures, capital, intermediary import and adoption of liberal policy. [35], used firm level data from the Indian private corporate sector, to examine the impact of economic reforms on productive capacity creation and utilization across 802 firms for the period 1993 to 1998. The results suggested that substantial achievements occurred initially in the creation and utilization of productive capacities in the various industries. However the results further revealed that, there was significant room for further improvement in productive capacity utilization rates. The results in addition, showed that capital goods import and share of government's current expenditure in the total GDP had significant negative relationship on the productive capacity utilization rate. On the other hand, credit, sales growth, export intensity had positive correlations with the capacity utilization rate of firms. In Bangladesh, [40] investigated the impact of trade policy reform in the 1980s and 1990s on industrial capacity utilization rate and employment generation. Empirical results revealed significant positive impact of the periods on capacity utilization rate and employment capacity. He further stressed that industrial growth was more predominant in export –oriented industries. In Nigeria, [1] employed the survey and expert opinion approach to estimate capacity utilization rate among Nigerian firms. They discovered that firm's capacity utilization rates were affected by erratic power supply, variations in demand, insufficient capital and insufficient imports and domestic raw materials. [24], analyzed the investment behavior of South Korean manufacturing industries and reported that the sector's capacity utilization rate was affected by cost of energy, material price, rental price of capital and firm's output. [20], presented an estimate of capacity utilization rate in India's industrial sector at the aggregate level covering the period 1981 to 1997. The estimates indicate that there was an upward trend in the capacity utilization rate in the 1980s and a downward trend in the period 1990 to 1997. On the other hand, [38] provided

evidence of the impact of liberalization policies on the industrial performance in India and UK. [48] studied the determinants of the manufacturing capacity utilization rate in Nigeria in the period 1970 – 1988. He employed OLS method on secondary data published by the Central Bank of Nigeria. The result revealed that, the real exchange rate, federal government capital expenditure on the manufacturing sector and the per capita real income had positive effects on the manufacturing capacity utilization rate. On the other hand, the inflation rate and the real loans and advances to the manufacturing sector had negative effects on the capacity utilization rate of the sector.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Measurement of the physical capacity utilization rate

There are various approaches to derive the physical capacity utilization rate of firms over time. Among the approaches, the most widely used are; the ratio of firm's actual output to installed capacity also referred to as the technology based capacity; Peak-to-peak; Production based Data Envelopment Analysis (DEA) and stochastic production.

This study adopted stochastic production frontier methodology to measure the physical capacity utilization rates in the Nigerian sugar industry. Stochastic production frontier indicates the maximum expected output for a given set of inputs. It is derived from the production theory and based on the assumption that output is a function of inputs and the efficiency of the producer in using these inputs. The production frontier assumes that the boundary of the production function is defined by "best practice" firms. It therefore indicates the maximum potential output for a given set of inputs. The difference between observed output and the potential output is generally attributed to a combination of inefficiency and random error. Following [6], Stochastic Production Frontier (SPF) is defined as:

$$Y_j = (X_j; \beta) \exp(V_j - U_j) \dots \dots \dots (1)$$

Where Y_j is the output of j firm, X_j is a vector of factor inputs, V_j is the stochastic error term and U_j is a one sided error representing the technical inefficiency of firm j . Both V_j and U_j are assumed to be independently and identically distributed with constant variance and zero mean.

Technical efficiency (TE) of a firm using Stochastic Production Frontier is given as;

$$TE = \frac{Y_j}{Y_j^*} = \frac{\text{Observed Output}}{\text{Frontier Output}} = \frac{f(X_j; \beta) \exp(V_j - U_j)}{f(X_j; \beta) \exp(V_j)} \dots \dots \dots (2)$$

$$TE = \exp(-U_j) \dots \dots \dots (3)$$

While the technique has been developed primarily to estimate efficiency, [26, and 47] have modified the technique to produce estimates of capacity utilization. The original efficiency based Stochastic Production Frontier was modified to represent Technical efficiency capacity utilization (TECU) by incorporating only quasi-fixed inputs of firms into the production function. By excluding variable inputs, the frontier output is determined by efficient use of quasi-fixed inputs. It represents the ratio of actual output to capacity output that could be achieved if all fixed inputs were utilized fully and efficiently.

$$TECU = \frac{Y_j^+}{Y_j^{++}} = \frac{\text{Observed Output}}{\text{Frontier Output}} = \frac{f(X_j^*; \beta) \exp(V_j - U_j)}{f(X_j^*; \beta) \exp(V_j)} = \exp(-U_j) \dots \dots \dots (4)$$

Where X_j^* are only quasi-fixed inputs of j 's firm; the capital stock of j 's firm is approximated by the rate of manhour employment by the industry (Klein and Preston, 1967). The resulting

efficiency score is called technical efficiency capacity utilization (TECU), because it combines both capacity utilization and technical efficiency. However, this is a biased measure of capacity utilization rate, because under normal working conditions; it would be expected that most firms would be operating at less than full efficiency, due at least in part to mis-or unmeasured factors of production [47 and 51]. To reduce this distortion, an unbiased measure of capacity utilization rate was derived by dividing the technical efficiency capacity utilization rate (TECU) by the efficiency scores estimated in the traditional manner [51], such that;

$$PCUR = \frac{TECU}{TE} = \frac{(-U_j)_2}{(-U_j)_1} \dots \dots \dots (5)$$

Where TECU is as defined in equation (4) and TE is the technical efficiency (TE) index computed for the full production relationship with the contribution of the variable and fixed inputs. Stochastic production frontier (SPF) model has some advantages over other approaches. First, unlike the Peak-to-Peak Approach, Stochastic Production Frontier model can incorporate several independent inputs into firm's production function to generate indices of capacity utilization for a firm. Hence, all available production inputs could be used in the same analysis to produce a single measure of capacity output and utilization. Second, peak-to-peak method and the ratio of firm's actual output to installed capacity approach assume that change in capacity output and utilization is solely due to the technology changes, but Stochastic Production Function relaxes such rigid assumption and assumes that change in capacity utilization is due to inefficiency, technological change and unutilized capacity of a firm. Third, unlike Data Envelopment Analysis approach, the Stochastic Production Frontier is an econometric model that takes into account random variations in data. As such, frontier output is not overestimated. Thus Stochastic Production Frontier (SPF) model produces optimal capacity and utilization rate rather than an average index.

MATHEMATICAL FRAMEWORK

KLEIN CAPITAL UTILIZATION MODEL

The relationship between capacity utilization rate of a firm and exogenous factors is found in [27] capital utilization model. In the model, they assume that;

$$\left\{ \frac{K_t^f}{K_t} \right\} = \left\{ \frac{L_t^f}{L_t} \right\} \dots \dots \dots (6)$$

Where, K_t^f and L_t^f are desired capital and manpower levels, while K_t and L_t are actual level of capital and manpower respectively. They also relate firm's output gap to manpower change as thus;

$$\left\{ \frac{Y_t}{Y_t^f} \right\} = \left\{ \frac{L_t^f}{L_t} \right\} \dots \dots \dots (7)$$

Where Y_t is the actual output and Y_t^f is the full employment level of output. Combining equation (6) and (7)

$$\left\{ \frac{Y_t}{Y_t^f} \right\} = f \left[\left(\frac{K_t^f}{K_t} \right), \left(\frac{L_t^f}{L_t} \right) \right] \dots \dots \dots (8)$$

267 Where the firm output gap, $\left\{\frac{Y_t}{Y_t^f}\right\}$ represents the capacity utilization rate at period “t” [27 and
 268 23]. Attaching log to both side of the equations and assuming Cobb- Douglas production
 269 function;

$$LnY_t - LnY_t^f = LnA_0 + Ln\left(\frac{K_t^f}{K_t}\right)^\alpha + Ln\left(\frac{L_t^f}{L_t}\right)^\beta + LnZ_t \dots\dots\dots (9)$$

270
 271 Following the flexible investment function;

272
 273 $I_t = \delta(K^* - K_{t-1})$ Where K^* is the desired capital stock. Then
 274 $K^* = K_t^f = \delta^{-1}(I_t - K_{t-1}) \dots\dots\dots (10)$
 275

276 Substituting (10) into (9) will produce;
 277

278 $LnY_t - LnY_t^f = LnA_0 + Ln[\delta^{-1}(I_t - K_{t-1})K_t^{-1}]^\alpha + Ln(L_t^f/L_t)^\beta + LnZ_t \dots\dots\dots (11)$
 279

280 Also, firm's demand for labour depends on the real wage rate in the economy. Hence at full
 281 employment level, wage rate corresponds to (W/P_0) , while (W/P_1) corresponds to wage rates
 282 below equilibrium level. Thus;
 283

284 $\left\{\frac{L_t^f}{L_t}\right\} = \frac{(W/P_0)}{(W/P_1)} \dots\dots\dots (12)$
 285

286 Where “W” is the labour wage and “P” is the general price level in the economy. Substituting
 287 equation (12) into (11) produces;
 288

289 $LnY_t - LnY_t^f = LnA_0 + Ln[\delta^{-1}(I_t - K_{t-1})K_t^{-1}]^\alpha + Ln[(W/P_0)/(W/P_1)]^\beta + LnZ_t \dots\dots\dots (13)$
 290

291 $LnY_t - LnY_t^f = LnA_0 + \alpha[Ln(\delta^{-1}(I_t - K_{t-1})K_t^{-1})] + \beta Ln[(W/P_0)/(W/P_1)] + LnZ_t \dots\dots (14)$
 292

293 In this framework, output gap defined as capacity utilization rate occurs as a result of the
 294 current investment level of a firm, the previous accumulated capital stock and the real wage
 295 rate influenced by the general price level in the economy. Their impact on firm output gap or
 296 capacity utilization rate is transmitted through factors specific elasticities. This framework
 297 assumes that, the output observed in any time period is the equilibrium level for observed
 298 rate of utilization of the inputs (Klein and Preston, 1967). Hence, other exogenous variables
 299 that affect capacity utilization can also be conceptualized in the same manner.
 300

301 MATERIALS AND METHODS

302 STUDY AREA

303
 304 The study was conducted in Nigeria. The country is situated on the Gulf of Guinea in sub
 305 Saharan Africa. It lies between 4^0 and 14^0 north of the equator and between longitude 3^0 and
 306 15^0 east of the Greenwich meridian. Nigeria has a total land area of 923,768.622km² or
 307 about 98.3 million hectares and a population of over 140 million [33]. Industrial sugarcane is
 308 cultivated in commercial quantities in the northern part of Nigeria, and is mostly cultivated in
 309 irrigated lands or swampy areas. Niger state, Kwara state, and Adamawa state are the major
 310 industrial sugarcane producers in the country [29]. There are four major sugar producing
 311 firms and two sugar refineries in Nigeria. These are; Nigeria Sugar Company at Bacita,
 312

Kwara State established in 1964 with initial installed capacity of 40,000tons/annum; Savannah Sugar Company Limited at Numan, Adamawa State established in 1980 with initial installed capacity of 65,000tons/annum; Lafiaji Sugar Company in Kwara State and Sunti Sugar Company in Niger State. The last two are mini sugar plants. The refineries are BUA and Dangote located in Lagos state. The refineries are not involved in direct production, but refined imported semi processed sugar from Brazil and other sugar producing countries [34]. Following the privatization and commercialization policy under the 2003-2007 reform agenda of the federal government; Savannah Sugar Company was taken over by Dangote in 2002. Nigeria Sugar Company was acquired by Josepdam & Sons in 2006, Lafiaji Sugar Company was bought by BUA Group in 2008 and Sunti Sugar Company was acquired by Flour Mills Nigeria in 2009.

DATA SOURCE

Data used in the study were purposely collected from the two sugar producing firms in Nigeria. These firms depend fully on the domestic industrial sugarcane for the production of sugar and produced more than 95 percent of domestic produced sugar in the country [34]. Also, macro economic data published by the Central Bank of Nigeria (CBN), National Bureau of Statistics (NBS), Federal Ministries of Finance, Agriculture and Rural Development as well as labour and Productivity were used in the analysis. The sugar firms selected were; Bacita Sugar Company in Kwara state and Savanna Sugar Company in Adamawa state. The data collected covered the period of 1970 to 2010.

ANALYTICAL TECHNIQUES

The empirical models were specified based on the specific objectives of the study. The estimation of technical efficiency (TE), technical Efficiency capacity utilization rate (TECUR) and the physical capacity utilization rate (PCUR).

$$\text{i.e. } TE = \frac{SO_t}{SO_t^*} = \frac{f(X_t; \beta) \exp(V_t - U_t)}{f(X_t; \beta) \exp(V_t)} = \exp(-U_t) \dots \dots \dots (15)$$

The technical efficiency index in sugar production, presented in equation (2) was estimated from the sugar stochastic production function of equation (16) presented in log-linear as:

$$\ln SO_t = a_0 + a_1 \ln INW_t + a_2 \ln KS_t + a_3 \ln LA_t + a_4 \ln DSC_t + a_5 \ln EC_t + a_6 \ln FAS_t + a_7 \ln QOI_t + a_8 \ln TEP_t + V_t - U_t \dots \dots \dots (16)$$

Where:

SO_t = actual output of sugar (tonnes),

SO_t^* = frontier output of sugar (tonnes),

INW_t = non-production labour force employed in production (number of persons)
 $(\delta SO_t / \delta INW_t > 0)$

KS_t = capital utilization proxy by the rate of labour employment in sugar industry (number of persons)
 $(\delta SO_t / \delta KS_t > 0)$

LA_t = production labour input, measured by the number of production workers employed
 $(\delta SO_t / \delta LA_t > 0)$

DSC_t = domestic produced sugarcane used as input in the industry (tonnes)
 $(\delta SO_t / \delta DSC_t > 0)$

EC_t = energy consumption, proxies by annual expenditure on energy (N/KW)
 $(\delta SO_t / \delta EC_t > 0)$

FAS_t = sugarcane farm size (ha) $(\delta SO_t / \delta FAS_t > 0)$

QOI_t = quantity of other inputs used in sugar production (tonnes) $(\delta SO_t / \delta QOI_t > 0)$

TEP_t = technological progress captured by time trend $(\delta SO_t / \delta TEP_t > 0)$

* Tel.: +234-08036728337

E-mail address: sundayakpan10@yahoo.

363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411

Furthermore, in line with the equation (4), the technical efficiency capacity utilization rate (TECU) was given by;

$$TECU = \frac{SO_t}{SO_t^*} = \frac{f(X_t^*; \beta) \exp(V_j - U_j)}{f(X_t^*; \beta) \exp(V_j)} = \exp(-U_j)_2 \dots \dots \dots (17)$$

Where X_j^* are quasi-fixed inputs of j 's firm. SO_t and SO_t^* are the actual and frontier sugar output respectively realized by using only quasi-fixed inputs in the production functions, and on the assumption of optimum used of variable inputs.

The technical efficiency capacity utilization rate, presented in equation (4) was estimated using the following log-linear form of the stochastic frontier equation containing only quasi-fixed inputs of the industry:

$$\ln SO_t = b_0 + b_1 \ln INW_t + b_2 \ln KS_t + b_3 \ln FAS_t + b_4 \ln TEP_t + V_j - U_j \dots \dots \dots (18)$$

{The variables have the same meaning as in equations (16)}.

Finally the physical capacity utilization (PCUR) was computed from the following relationship:

$$PCUR = \frac{TECU}{TE} = \frac{\exp(-U_j)_2}{\exp(-U_j)_1} \dots \dots \dots (19)$$

To analyze the main objective of the study, capacity utilization rate equation model for the sugar industry in Nigeria was specified based on previous studies by [46, 48 and 7]. Dummy variable (D) was introduced into equation (20) to capture the industrial policy impact on physical capacity utilization rates of the industry [46 and 48].

Where;

$$CUR_t = \gamma_0 + \gamma_1 INFL_t + \gamma_2 PDSC_t + \gamma_3 LAP_t + \gamma_4 RER_t + \gamma_5 PGDP_t + \gamma_6 EC_t + \gamma_7 LOA_t + \gamma_8 SIM_t + \gamma_9 FCA_t + \gamma_{10} DSC_t + \gamma_{11} D + U_t \dots \dots \dots (20)$$

- CUR_t = Physical capacity utilization rate for the sugar industry in Nigeria.
- $INFL_t$ = inflation rate at period t (%)
- $PDSC_t$ = average annual price of domestic sugar cane (₦/tonne)
- LAP_t = labour productivity in the sugar industry [defined as total domestic output divided by total number of workers in the sugar industry (tonnes/person)]
- RER_t = real exchange rate (₦/\$)
- $PGDP_t$ = per capita real GDP (2003 =100) (₦)
- EC_t = energy consumption proxy by annual expenditure on energy (₦),
- LOA_t = real loans and advances to sugar industry (₦)
- SIM_t/GDP_t = ratio of sugar import to the GDP (%)
- FCA_t = share of Federal Government Capital expenditure on the sugar industry in the GDP
- DSC_t = domestic produced sugarcane used as input in the industry (tonnes)
- D = dummy variable which takes the value of 1 for the liberalization period (1986-2010), and 0 for otherwise (1970- 1985)
- U_t = stochastic error term.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 2 reports the estimates of various forms of physical capacity utilization equations in the Nigerian sugar industry. Following the results of the diagnostic tests and the number of significant independent variables, the double -log form was picked as the lead equation. In the lead equation, the R^2 showed that about 63.20% of the variations in the physical capacity utilization rates of the sugar industry in Nigeria (PCUR) were caused by the specified independent variables. The F-statistic is 4.369 and is significant at 1% probability level implying that the estimated R^2 is significant and that the model has goodness of fit. The RESET-test is significant at 5% probability level and this indicates that the equation is not mis-specified and that the assumption of log linearity among variables is correct.

The result revealed that the physical capacity utilization (PCUR) in the sugar industry in Nigeria had a significant positive relationship (at 1% level) with the industry's labour productivity (LAP_t). The result implies that physical capacity utilization rate in the sugar industry in Nigeria had inelastic relationship with respect to the industry's labour productivity. This means that a 10% increase in the labour productivity in the sugar industry would increase physical capacity utilization rate by 3.0%. It further indicates that the industry could increase physical capacity utilization rate if the rate of increase in output is greater than the rate of increase in the workforce of the industry. The result corroborates the findings of [31].

Table 2: Physical capacity Utilization rate equations for the Nigerian sugar industry (1970-2010)

Variable	Linear	Exponential	Semi-log	Double- log(L)
Constant	0.743 (11.40)***	-0.282 (-3.875)***	0.422 (2.41)**	-0.664 (-3.38)***
$INFL_t$	-2.70 (-0.08)	-1.12e-005 (-0.03)	0.0009 (0.12)	-0.002 (-0.20)
$PDSC_t$	1.77e-006 (1.27)	2.25e-006 (1.44)	0.007 (0.39)	0.011 (0.54)
LAP_t	0.009 (2.54)**	0.010 (2.57)**	0.262 (3.24)***	0.30 (3.27)***
RER_t	-0.001 (-2.60)**	-0.001 (-2.75)**	-0.0158 (-1.42)	-0.020 (-1.58)
$PGDP_t$	1.24 (0.92)	1.42e-005 (0.94)	0.028 (1.93)*	0.031 (2.39)**
EC_t	2.30e-011 (0.51)	2.97e-011 (0.59)	-0.006 (-1.04)	-0.007 (-1.02)
LOA_t	-5.71e-013 (-0.52)	-5.97e-013 (-0.49)	-0.002 (-1.00)	-0.002 (-0.94)
$SIMP_t/GDP_t$	0.08 (1.40)	0.091 (1.37)	0.018(2.67)**	0.021 (2.95)***
FCA_t	-6.24 (-0.48)	-7.99e-012 (-0.55)	0.002 (0.79)	0.002 (1.75)*
DSC_t	-1.19e-007 (-1.30)	-1.38e-007 (-1.35)	-0.041 (-2.14)**	-0.047 (-2.29)**
Dummy	-0.03 (-0.90)	-0.041 (-0.97)	0.010 (0.34)	0.016 (0.45)
R^2	0.638	0.648	0.625	0.632
F-Statistic	4.481***	4.686***	4.24***	4.369***
DW-test	1.70	1.65	1.45	1.45
Normality test	3.846 (0.146)	3.139 (0.208)	10.01(0.006)***	10.343(0.005)***
Hetero-test	0.420 (0.935)	0.437 (0.926)	0.545 (0.859)	0.537 (0.865)
RESET -test	4.814 (0.037)**	5.296 (0.029)**	2.332 (0.138)	3.009 (0.094)*
Schwarz Criterion	-141.46	-132.45	-140.04	-130.66
Akaike Criterion	-161.73	-152.70	-160.31	-150.93
Hannan- Quinn C.	-154.41	-145.39	-152.98	-143.59
Loglikelihood	92.86	88.36	92.15	87.56

Note: Asterisk *, ** and *** represent 10%, 5% and 1% significance levels respectively. Figure in brackets are t-values and variables are as defined in equation (20). L means lead equation.

The result also showed that the physical capacity utilization in the sugar industry had a significant positive association (at 5% level) with the per capita real GDP ($PGDP_t$) in the country. The result implies that increase in $PGDP_t$ will increase the physical capacity

* Tel.: +234-08036728337

E-mail address: sundayakpan10@yahoo.

utilization rate in sugar industry in Nigeria. For instance, a 10% increase in $PGDP_t$ will increase physical capacity utilization rate in the sugar industry by 0.31%. The finding satisfies the *a priori* expectation as increase in $PGDP_t$ is expected to increase domestic consumption. The implication of this finding is that the sugar industry in Nigeria was not demand constrained. This result implies that the dwindling performance in the sugar industry in Nigeria was not actually caused by demand shortage.

The coefficient of sugar import ($SIMP_t/GDP_t$) exhibited significant positive relationship with the physical capacity utilization rate in the sugar sub-sector. This is contrary to the expected result and the reason can be linked to the internal competition generated in the sub-sector due to increase in the domestic demand for sugar and corresponding increase in sugar imports in the late 1980's to mop up excess domestic demand (NSDC, 2008). This might be substantiated by the fact that, the industry obtained loans from the African Development Fund (ADF) and African Development bank (ADB) in 1989 and 1991 respectively in attempts to increase sugar production in the country. Despite the utilization of the loans and subsequent increase in sugar output in the preceding years, the sugar import also increased due to increased in the domestic demand [9 and 34].

The elasticity of physical capacity utilization rate with respect to the share of federal government capital expenditure in sugar industry in GDP (FCAt) was positive and statistically significant at 10% probability level. The result implies that as the federal government subvention to the sugar industry increases, the physical capacity utilization rate of the industry also increases. For instance, one million naira increase in the federal government subvention to the sub-sector will result in 0.002 gains in physical capacity utilization rate in the industry. The reason for this result might be attributed to the fact that the sub-sector was wholly owned by the federal government before it was privatized in 2003.

The coefficient of quantity of domestic sugarcane used in sugar production (DCS_t) was statistically significant at 5% probability level and inversely related to the physical capacity utilization in the sugar industry. The result means that 10% increase in the quantity of domestic sugarcane used in sugar production by the industry will result in 0.47% decrease in the rate of physical capacity utilization. The result might suggests the presence of obsolete technology, poor quality of sugarcane, insufficient quantity of sugarcane or increasing depreciation of the capital stock as well as the deteriorating capacity in the industry. This finding implies that the sugar industry in Nigeria was resource constrained.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

The study used sugar industry based data and macro-economic data from 1970 to 2010 to analyze the physical capacity utilization rates in the sugar industry in Nigeria. The macro-economic data used were inflation rate, exchange rate, GDP, tariff rates on sugar import, consumer price index, parallel and official exchange rates among others. Multiple-regression equation of various forms was estimated based on the ordinary least squares method and used to determine factors that influence the physical capacity utilization rate of the sugar industry in Nigeria. The result of the diagnostic tests and number of significant variables were used as criteria for selecting the lead equations. The empirical results revealed that the physical capacity utilization rate in the sugar industry in Nigeria had a significant positive relationship with the industry labour productivity, share of federal government expenditure on sugar industry in the GDP, per capita real GDP and sugar import. On the other hand, the quantity of domestic sugarcane used in sugar production has significant negative relationship with the physical capacity utilization rates in the industry.

493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545

RECOMMENDATIONS

Increase in per capita real GDP increases the capacity utilization rate in the sugar industry in Nigeria. It is recommended that an appropriate policy measure that aim at expansionary aggregate demand as a means of promoting capacity utilization in the sugar industry should be introduced. Such policy measure should be designed to avoid inflationary tendencies. A restrictive policy measure on sugar imports should be adopted in the country such as; periodic review of tariff rates on sugar imports and quantity restriction on sugar import as a mean of boosting domestic sugar production and promoting capacity utilization rate in the sugar industry. Researches should be intensified to develop good hybrids of industrial sugarcane and indigenous technology in sugar production. This could be achieved through strengthening the existing sugar research institutes and widening the scope of the NSDC in the country. Incentives and enhanced welfare packages should be initiated to workers in the sub-sector as these will help to improve the productive capacity of the industry.

REFERENCES

1. Adeel, Malik; F. Teal and Simon B. (2004). The Performance of Nigerian Manufacturing Firms. *Report on the Nigeria Manufacturing Enterprise Survey*.

2. African Development Bank (ADB) document (2000).

3. African Development Fund (ADF) (2000). Operations Evaluation documents.

4. Anyanwu, J. C., Oyefusi A. Oaikhenan H., and Dimowo, F. A. (1997). The Structure of the Nigerian Economy (1960-1997). Onitsha Joanee Educational Publisher.

5. Ayeni, B. (1981). The Spatial Distribution of Manufacturing Industries in Nigeria. Technical Report No. 2 Department of Geography, University of Ibadan.

6. Battese, G. E. and Coelli, T. J. (1995). A Model for Technical Inefficiency Effects in a Stochastic Frontier Production Function for Panel Data. *Empirical Econ.*, 20:325- 332.

7. Boccardo, J. (2004). Firm capacity utilization and its relationship with foreign competition in selected countries. A thesis submitted to faculty of Arts and Sciences' Georgetown University, Washington D.C U.S.A.

8. Busari, L. D., and S. M. Misari, (1996). Sugar and sugarcane in Nigeria. A Publication of NCRI in Nigeria.

9. Central Bank of Nigeria (CBN), Statistical Bulletin 2008.

10. Christiano, L. (1981). A Survey of Measures of Capacity Utilization: Technical paper Presented at the General Annual Meeting of Central Bank of Ireland.

11. Danish, A. H. (2003). Capacity Utilization in Indian Airlines. A Postdoctoral Fellowship Study at the Institute of Economic Growth, Delhi, India.

12. Ekeocha, P. C. (2009). Evaluation of the effectiveness of industrial policy reforms in Nigeria 1999-2003: A computable general equilibrium simulation. Analysis presented at the 50th annual conference of the Nigerian Economic Society (NES) in Abuja September, 22 – 24th, 2009.

- 546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
13. Fabayo, A. (1981). Production Function Measure of Capacity Output and Rate of Capacity Utilization in Selected Nigerian Industries: 1974-1975. *Ife Social Sciences Review*, Vol. 2, No. 2 Pp. 0-27.
 14. FAO Corporate Document on Capacity Utilization in Fishery Sub-sector (2006).
 15. FAO Corporate Document on Sugar Production, (2011).
 16. Federal Ministry of Industry Abuja (FMI), Nigeria (2003). "National Sugar Policy". A Publication of National Sugar Development Council of Nigeria.
 17. Franz, W. and R. J. Gordon, (1993). German and American Wage and Price Dynamics: *European Economic Review* May, pp 719-762.
 18. Garner, C. Alan, (1994). Capacity Utilization and USA Inflation. Federal Reserve Bank of Kanakas City, *Economic Review*, 79 (4), 1 -21.
 19. Goldar, B. N, and V S Ranganathan, (1991), "Capacity Utilization in Indian ndustries", *The Indian Economic Journal*, 39 (2), pp. 82-90.
 20. Goldar, B., and Anita Kumari, (2003). "Import Liberalization and Productivity Growth in Indian Manufacturing Industries in the 1990s", *Developing Economies*, 41(4): 436-60.
 21. Hayes, S. and J. Stone, (1983). Specification of Supply Behaviour. *Review of Economics and Statistics*, Vol. 64: Pp 271 -281.
 22. ISYB, (1978). International Sugar Year Book (1978), Publication of the Federal Ministry of Industry.
 23. Johansen, L. (1968). Production Functions and the Concept of Capacity, *Economic Mathematique et Econometri*, 2.
 24. Kim, H. Y. (2003). Intertemporal Production and Asset Pricing: A Duality Approach. *Oxford Economic Papers*, 55, 344-379.
 25. Kim, H. Y. (1999). Economic capacity utilization and its determinants: theory and evidence. *Review of industrial organization*, 15; 321-339.
 26. Kirkley, J. F., Morrison P., C. J. and Squires, D. E. (2001). Capacity and Capacity Utilization in Fishing Industries: Definition, Measurement, and a comparison of Approaches. (Manuscript).
 27. Klein, L. R. and R. S. Preston, (1967). Some new results in the measurement of capacity utilization. *American economic Review* 57, Pp 34-58.
 28. Kumar, S., and Nitin A. (2009). Analyzing regional variations in capacity utilization of Indian sugar industry using non- parametric frontier technique. *Eurasian Journal of Business and Economics*, 2(4), 1-26.
 29. Lafiagi, M. S. (1984). Towards Self-Sufficiency in Sugar Production in Nigeria. Memo Submitted to Federal Ministry of Commerce and Industry pp 1 – 46.

30. McElhattan, R. (1985). Inflation, Supply Stock and the Stable Inflation Rate of capacity Utilization. Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco, *Economic Review winter No. 1*, Pp 45-63.
31. Meade D. S. (1998). The Relationship of Capital Investment and Capacity Utilization with Prices and Labour Productivity. Paper Presented at the twelfth International Conference on Input-Output Technique, New York, 18-22, May.
32. Michael David, USDA foreign Agricultural service on sugar imports in Nigeria, 2010.
33. National Population Commission (NPC), 2006 National Census Data. www.population.gov.ng/. Retrieved 10-12-2010.
34. National Sugar Development Council Document (NSDC) 2010. A Publication of National Sugar Development Council, Federal Ministry of Industry, Abuja, Nigeria.
35. Nitsure, R. R., and Mathew J. (1999). Liberalization and the Behavior of Indian Industry (A Corporate-Sector Analysis Based On Capacity Utilization). A paper Presented at 1999 ABAS International Conference on Globalization and Emerging Economies" at Barcelona, Spain (July 12-14, 1999).
36. Nwaobi, G. C. (2005). The Nigerian sugar industry (1960- 1987). 0501001, *EconsWPA*.
37. Olomola. A. S. (2007). Competitive commercial Agriculture in Africa study (CCAA), Nigeria case study. A final report submitted to the Canadian International Development agency (CIDA) and the World Bank.
38. Philippe, A. and Robin B. (2002). Liberalization and Industrial Performance: Evidence from India and UK. Harvard University, Landon School of Economics.
39. Raimi, L., I. Adeleke, (2009). A Review and Measurement of Capacity Utilization in the Nigerian Economy. *Humanomics*, Vol. 25 (4): Pp 274 – 284.
40. Rashid, M. A. (2000). Impact of Trade Policy Reforms on Industrial Capacity and employment in Bangladesh. Structural Adjustment Participatory Review Initiative, Dhaka, Bangladesh.
41. Salimonu, K. K., O. A. Gafar, and J. O. Akintola, (2006). Trend Analysis of Capacity Utilization of Agro-based Industries in Nigeria. *Agricultural Journal* 1 (4): 311-314.

42. Savannah Sugar Company limited (SSC) (2010). Production Data for Savannah Sugar Company Ltd., Numan, 1983-1999. The Punch Newspaper, Thursday Sept. 14,2000, pg 23.
43. Seth, K., (1998). “Economic Reforms and Capacity Utilization in Indian Industry”, *Productivity*, 39 (3), pp.391-98.
44. Soderbom, M., and F. Teal, (2002). The Performance of Nigerian Manufacturing Firms. Report on the Nigerian Manufacturing Enterprise Survey 2001.
45. Srinivasan, P. V. (1992), “Excess Capacities in Indian Industries, Supply or Demand Determined?” *Economic and Political Weekly*, November 7, pp. 2437-41.
46. Thoumi, F. E. (1972). Industrial Capacity Utilization in Colombia: Some Empirical Findings. Discussion paper No. 14, Center for Economic Research University of Minnesota.
47. Tingley, D., Pascoe, S. and Mardle, S. (2003). Estimating Capacity Utilization in Multi-Purpos, Multi-Metier Fisheries. *Fishing Resource*, 63(1): 121-134.
48. Ukoha, O. O. (2000). Determinants of Manufacturing Capacity Utilization in Nigeria, 1970-1988. *Nigerian Journal of Economic and Social Studies*, Vol. 42, No. 2 Pp. 121 – 129.
49. Wada, A. C., G. Agidi, M. N. Ishaq and L. D. Busari, (2001). Current Status of Sugar Research and Development in Nigeria. *Sugar Technology*, Vol. 3 (1 and 2): Pp4-12.
50. Zoltan, S. (1999). Capacity Analysis of a Sugar Production Process Based on the Costof Unused Capacity. *Periodica Polytechnica Serie*.
51. FAO Corporate Document on Capacity Utilization in Fishery Sub-sector (2006).