CONSTRAINTS TO INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT IN KANO STATE, NIGERIA

Ahmad Muhammad Tsauni & Abdullahi Muhammad Adamu

Department of Economics,
Bayero University, Kano
Email: ahmadutsauni@gmail.com & amakutama@yahoo.com

Abstract: *The paper investigates the constraints to industrial development in Kano - Nigeria. It starts by conceptualizing industry and industrialization as well as a brief on the various policies and incentives pursued toward attaining industrial development. With the aid of secondary data sources, basically survey findings extracted from some studies, the paper assesses the performance of the industrial sector in Nigeria generally Vis – a- Vis the plethora policies and incentives put in place from independence to date. It was observed that not much has been achieved as the major industrial indicators are not faring well. The poverty level, unemployment and rate of closure and distress of companies in Kano buttressed those findings. To that effect, a number of constraints to industrial development in the State have been identified ranging from infrastructural deficiencies, small home market and insecurity. In order to address these problems, the paper recommends among others that government policies should be fine-tuned to converge with economic progress and that government should have a strong commitment to the development of the sector.*

Keywords: Industrial Development, Policies, Incentive, Kano State.

Reference to this paper should be made as follows: Ahmad Muhammad Tsauni, & Abdullahi Muhammad Adamu (2016), Constraints to Industrial Development in Kano State, Nigeria. *J. of Social Sciences and Public Policy,* Vol. 8, Number 1, Pp. 23 – 34.

INTRODUCTION

Prior to 1960, the pattern of industrial development in Nigeria presented a strange spectacle, consisting a few industries which are mainly extracting and processing. The country had a narrow industrial base. The agricultural goods (such as coca, palm oil, rubber, plywood, cotton and groundnut) that were extracted and processed were meant for domestic market and little for export. Rudimentary implements and inappropriate ideas were adopted and the past industrial policies were proved to be counter-productive as they failed to diversify the industrial base (Tsauni, 2012). The ball for inclusive industrial development was set rolling with political independence in Nigeria in the 1960s. Such was noticed by changes in the pattern and structures of industries during the First National Development Plan, 1962 – 1968, where efforts were geared towards mobilizing Nigerian capital and encouraging a shift from commerce to processing and manufacturing industries. That emphasizes an inward looking industrial strategy meant to establish domestic industries that can produce consumer goods previously imported. Other

ISSN: 2277-0038

laudable efforts include the indigenization policy of 1972 and 1977, second national development plan (1970 – 1974), third national development plan (1975 – 1980) and forth national development plan (1981 – 1985). These policies were meant to transfer ownership and control to Nigerians in respect of those enterprises formally wholly or mainly owned and controlled by foreigners, initiate the establishment of heavy industries in the intermediate and capital goods sector, allocate public investments to large capital and skill intensive projects, particularly heavy and intermediate industries like steel, oil refineries and fertilizer, and to direct the industrial policy toward ensuring maximum growth of investment and output respectively. Yet, Nigeria witnessed a landmark in its industrial pursuit with the introduction of Structural Adjustment Programme (SAP) in the mid 1980s aimed at diversifying the productive and export base of the economy, where a lot have been done to remove distortions thereby paving way for free flow of exportable goods. Since then, guided deregulation policies of 1993 - 1998, reform policies of the 1999 – 2007, and transformation agenda, 2007 to date follow virtually the same path. But, the failure of Nigeria to reduce its dependence on oil exports, increasing food insecurity, rising poverty level, growing income inequality, heighten inflation rate, infrastructural decay, corruption, falling Naira value, debt accumulation, and increasing costs of imported raw materials is attributable to the non - performance of the sector. Indeed, the expected trickled down effect and positive externalities of the entire plethora of policies pursued in Nigeria have become a mirage. Thus, something is wrong somewhere. Although there are a number of researches on identifying the bottlenecks to industrial growth in Nigeria, no conclusive evidence has been reached. This paper examines the major constraints to industrial development in Kano and explores the various ways through which the constraints could be addressed. To this end, the paper is organized in four sections. Following this introduction is section two which constitutes conceptual framework. Section three captures discussions and the fourth section contains conclusions and recommendations.

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

Industry

Industry, in a general sense, is the production of goods and services in an economy. The term industry can be seen as a group of enterprises (private businesses or government operated corporations) that produce some specific type of good or service-for example, the beverage industry, the gold industry, or the music industry. Some industries produce physical goods, such as timber, steel or textiles. Other industries such as the airline, railroad, and trucking industries, provide services by transporting people or products from one place to another. Some other industries, such as the banking and restaurant industries provide services such as lending money and servicing food, respectively. The word industry comes from the Latin word industria, which means "diligence," reflecting the highly discipline way human energy, natural resources, and technology are combined to produce goods and services in a modern economy. The concept of an industry is important for any economic analysis to both the business men, the government, and research investigators

(Koutsoyiannis, 1979). As a result, the concept has been developed to include the firms, which are in some form of close relationship with one another. Therefore, firstly the concept allows a researcher to study behavioural interdependence of firms in an industry. Secondly, the concept makes it possible to derive a set of general rules from which we can predict the behaviour of the competing members of the group that constitute the industry. Thirdly, the concept provides the framework for the analysis of the effects of entry on the behaviour of the firm and on the equilibrium price and output. It is also believed that sectoral (agriculture, industry etc.) analysis in an economy is a leeway for analyzing the aggregate performance of the economy. For instance, the performance of manufacturing industry can metamorphose into the performance of the entire economy due to its direct and indirect, forward and backward, vertical and horizontal linkages with the rest of the economy. It is in view of that background that the concept is reviewed below. In spite of the diverse and numerous perceptions in conceptualizing industry, Amacher and Ulbrich (1986) consider industry as a group of firms producing similar or related products. According to Wannacott and Wannacott (1982), an industry refers to all the producers of good and service. Wannacott and Wannacott gave the automobile and airline industries as example, but, admitting that the term "industry" can refer to any good and service; it need not be manufactured as wheat and hotel industries are inclusive. McConnell and Brue (1999) operationalize industry as a group of (one or more) firms, which produces identical or similar products. On the same line of thought, Ferguson and Gould (1975) regard industry as a collection of firms producing homogeneous products. It is equally described as a group of producers of the same or similar commodities. Anyanwu, et. al (1997) defines an industry as a number of firms producing broadly similar commodities.

Having concurred with the other conceptualizations, Koutsoyiannis (1979) identified two criteria that are commonly used for the definition of industry. These are market criterion and technological criterion. While the former criterion groups firms in an industry according to the products (close substitutes) produced, the latter classifies firms in an industry on the basis of similar methods of production or raw materials used in production. Following the classifications of Koutsoyiannis, Stanlake and Grant (1999) noted that it is not easy to define an industry because economic activities can be grouped in a variety of ways. They may be classified according to the nature of the markets they serve, and this is how most people would define an industry, i.e., a group of firms making the same or very similar products. But economic units may also be grouped according to the process carried out, or on the basis of the kinds of factors of production they use, or the kind of technology they use. The most common definition of an industry given these classifications (Stanlake and Grant, 1999) is that used in official statistics which groups firms into industries according to the physical and technical properties of their principal products. This classification is often self evident as in the case of footwear, furniture or pottery where the nature of the product clearly defines the industry. Sometimes, it is not so easy-the extraction of chemicals from petroleum is a part of the oil industry or the chemical industry. Yet, Stanlake and Grant (1999) maintained that statistics of industrial production must be used with some caution because there are so many multi-product firms and the whole of such a firm's output might, under certain circumstances, be classified under the industry of its major product. The first criterion has been chosen as appropriate for this study, as only firms producing similar products are considered in the work. However, beside that classification, there are other ways by which industries are classified. An industry is often classified either by a major input (good or service used to produce the final product) or by the industry's final product. When a final product is used by another industry, it is called a producer good. Steel, which is used by other industries to produce automobiles, airplanes, construction materials, and numerous other products, is an example of a producer good. Final products, such as automobiles, which are purchased and used by individuals, are called consumer goods.

Industries may also be classified as primary, secondary or tertiary industries. Primary industries use raw natural resources as major inputs. Agriculture, commercial fishing, mining, and the forest industry are primary industries. They use farm land, oceans, mineral deposits, and forests respectively, as their major inputs. Secondary industries use producer goods to assemble their products. For example the construction industry produces houses, other buildings, and roads. Its inputs include timber manufactured by the forest industry. The largest group of secondary industries is the manufacturing industries. Manufacturing industries produce a vast array of consumer and producer goods, such as process food, clothing, heavy machinery, automobiles, electronics and household appliances. Final products manufactured by secondary industries are classified as durable goods and nondurable goods. Durable goods are products that are used repeatedly over long periods of time, such as automobiles and washing machines. Nondurable goods are products that are used for short period of time, such as disposable contact lenses, clothing, food, toothpaste, soap and other items. Tertiary industries are those that provide services. For example, retail stores, universities, hotels, banks, television stations, hospitals and travel agencies are all tertiary industries. All forms of government activity, ranging from local trash disposal to the armed forces are also classified as tertiary industries.

INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT/INDUSTRIALIZATION

Enang (2010) sees industrialization as a deliberate and sustained application and combination of an appropriate technology, infrastructure, managerial expertise, and other important resources. Industrialization has attracted considerable interest in development economics in recent times. This is because of the critical role industrialization plays in accelerating the pace of structural transformation and diversification of economies. It enables a country to fully utilize its factor endowment and to depend less on foreign supply of finished goods or raw materials for its economic growth, development and sustenance. As has been noted in the first section of the paper, Nigeria since independence has adopted various policies, incentives and schemes to promote industrialization. Some of these policies include the import substitution that gained currency in the 1960s; the indigenization policy that started in 1972; Structural Adjustment Programme (SAP) of the late 1980s; in 2000, Bank of industry, and small and medium equity investment schemes was established to reduce credit constraints faced by entrepreneurs. Thus, below are some of the programmes:

1. *Fiscal Incentives*: Income tax relief for some years, pioneer status, capital allowance, tax free dividends for say 3 years and import duty draw backs for raw-material for export production among others.
2. *Funding Scheme*: They include:
   a. World bank/SME scheme-operating through Participating Commercial Banks (PCBs);
   b. National Economic Reconstruction Funds (NERFUND) finance partly by Federal Government, Africa's Development Bank, and other multilateral agencies;
   c. Commercial banks lending schemes;
   d. Development banks;
   e. Small scale industries loan schemes;
   f. Entrepreneurial development scheme;
   g. Industrial infrastructural facilities and services schemes;
   h. Institutional support like Raw Materials Research and Development Council (RMR&DC) and the Nigerian Export Promotion Council (NEPC); and
   i. UNDP support programme for SMEs.

In 2007, the Federal Government adopted the National Integrated Industrial Development (NIID) blueprint. Presently, the transformation agenda is embracing a number of steps to reposition the industrial sector thereby reducing the overdependence of the country on the oil sector, create jobs and ensure growth and development. In ensuring the attainment of the goal of industrial development, the government has initiated a number of incentives aimed at positively influencing the performance and productivity of the industrial sector. Some of these incentives include tax holidays, tariff protection, outright ban on certain commodities to encourage domestic production, and building of industrial estates (export processing zones) among others. In general, industrialization is expected to: reduce the over-dependence on agriculture; replace imported goods with homemade ones; sustain independence; increase technical skills; diversify the economy; create more employment opportunities; secure the fullest utilization of available resources; relieve fluctuations and ensure stability of income; create market for other sectors; increase foreign exchange earnings; and ensure growth and development (Aderinto and Shuaibu 1999; Jhingan, 2005)

ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

This section of the paper assesses the growth of the industrial sector in Nigeria in the face of the plethora of policies and incentives and then, discussions on the major constraints to industrial development in Kano state follow. According to Enang (2010) despite all the policies and incentives, available statistics indicate that the industrial sector seems to be experiencing sluggish growth. The survey by Manufacturing Association of Nigeria carried out in 2005 and in the first quarter of 2006 paint a gloomy picture of the Nigerian industrial sector. For instance, the survey showed that only 10 per cent of manufacturing concerns in Nigeria could operate at 48.8 per cent of installed capacity. The survey also notes that about 60 per cent of the companies operating were barely able to cover their average variable costs, while 30 per cent had completely closed down. According to that report, most of the industrial areas around the country suffered an average of 14.5 hours of power outage per day as against 9.5 hours of supply, and the cost of generating power supply by firms for production constitute about 36 per cent of total cost of production (Okafor, 2008; Adegbamigbe, 2007 and Udaejah, 2006).

Table 1: Status of Industries in Nigeria

S/NO.	Industries that have closed down	Ailing Industries	Industries operating at sustainable level
1.	Chalk manufactures	Textile firms	Food beverages and Tobacco sector
2.	Candle manufactures	Vehicles assemblers	Leather sub-sector
3.	Dry cell and automobile batteries	Cable manufacturers	House hold products
4.	Show polish industries	Paint manufactures	
5.	Matches industries	Steel firms petrochemical firms	

Source: Culled from Gatawa (2014)

From the table above, the ailing category according to sectoral analysis include textile firms, vehicle assemblers, paint manufactures etc. also, firms operating on the sustainable level are those in the food beverages and tobacco sector, leather subsector and house hold products such as detergents and cleaning material, tooth paste among others. Companies on the closed down group cut across all industrial products, but most affected are products such as chalk, candle, dry cell, shoes polish, matches etc. A number of measures taken by government to revive the industrial sector showed not much has been achieved. Statistics from the CBN indicated that manufacturing value added tax decline from 5.5% of Gross Domestic Product GDP in 1998 to 3% 2005. Further CBN indicated that capacity utilization which was 32.4% in 1998 increased to 53.4% in 2004 and dropped to 22.7% in 2006 far less than the NEEDs target of 70%. The CBN statistics also indicated that export of manufactured goods accounted for only 7.4% of non oil exports in 2005. FDI into the sector is still considered how despite the fact it rose from N165 billion in 2003 to 276 billion in 2005. Besides, the sector contributes less than 10% of the countries' GDP (see table 2 below).

Table 2: Selected Nigerian Manufacturing Sector Indicators

Indicator/Year	1980	1990	1996	2000	2005	2010	2014
Share in total exports (%)	0.30	0.67	0.53	0.60	0.60	0.68	0.51
Share in total imports (%)	60.3	73.3	65.6	88.8	80.7	82.6	84.2
Value of export (in million naira)	39.0	730.8	1095.5	4134.4	1270.7	1306.3	1461.2
Employment ('000)	294.2	340.1	-	328.0	347.1	-	321.0
Value Added MVA per capita (at 1984 constant price)	5194.1	7361.0	7657.2	6587.5	6596.0	6608.2	6517.1
Capacity utilization (%)	75.0	36.92	35.4	30.4	39.6	42.5	52.78

Source: CBN, Statistical Bulletin and Annual Reports and Statement of Account (various years)

Constraints to Industrial Development in Kano

Industrialization in Kano has been handicapped by a combination of some factors. These factors by extension have also retarded the growth of industrial development in Nigeria at large. This section of the work examines the constraint to industrial development in Kano state. MAN (2014) North reveals that industrial sector is at the receiving end. The problem started with the fuel shortage which eventually added to the cost of production. Kano being the commercial center probably produces only 10% to 15% of goods consumed locally. Among all factors that led to collapse of industries in Kano, epileptic power supply by the PHCN formally NEPA has taken the highest toll. Investigation by the Weekly Trust revealed that over 50% of distressed industries in Kano blame their misfortune on the NEPA. At a time electricity supply to Kano zone (Kano, Jigawa and Katsina) in 2000 decline to about 17 megawatts against the required 240mw while Lagos was allocated over 300mw. Power supply has not improved to the level required by the industries in Kano despite the claim by supplying agency (El Tayeeb, 2011). El tayeeb further remarks, that many of the surviving industries in Kano are surviving on generators with the NEPA as standby.

As at 2008, 126 industries were closed in both Bompai, Challawa, Zaria road and Sharada Industrial Layouts. Those closed include Northern Steel Mills (Furniture), Fatahi Enterprises limited (Prayer mat), Kano Sweet Factory (Sweet), Nipaco Industry Ltd (Iron), Ceader stationary (exercise books, biros), Arewa Metal Container (Trailer Body), Pioneer Food Industry Ltd (Biscuits), Media Confectionary (Sweets), Kano Sacks Industry (Sacks), Sa'adatu Plastic Manufactures (Plastics) Goldfish sweets limited (sweet), Monkarim Construction and Gen. (Roofing sheets), Nabegu Tannery Ltd (Tanning Skin), Arewa Steel Industrial Ltd (Iron Steel), and Sharada Oil Mills Ltd (Vegetable oil) among others. However the current performance of enterprises in Kano today is marred by the ongoing energy crisis. Industrial activities are gradually declining due to incessant power outages, fuel and diesel crisis hampered by changes in government policies and shift of emphasis on oil rather than agriculture which is the real sector of the economy. The situation continued to worsen to date with the emergence of more militating factors leading to progressive decline of industries. A recent study revealed a very disturbing figure as some of the known industrial establishments have completely winded off. The table below indicates the current status of each of the industrial estate/areas in Kano state.

Table 3: Status of the Industrial Estates in Kano

S/NO.	Estates/Areas	No. in operation	No. closed down	No. of winded off	Total
1.	Challawa	31	27	10	68
2.	Hadejia Road Tokarawa	47	21	19	97
3.	Sharada phase I, II and III	64	64	43	171
4.	Bompai	62	43	88	193
5.	Zaria Road	11	3	1	15
6.	Other	24	1	15	40
	Total	239	159	176	574

Source: Culled from Gatawa (2014)

From the above table, it can be seen that 243 industries are only operating out of 572 industries. The number of closed down industries amounted to almost 30% of the total industries in Kano. It is, indeed, worrisome to have 176 industries winding off in the State. These industries are those that have relocated to other states or have merged to form a new industry. However, as at 2000, only 126 industries were closed compared to 159 industries closed as at 2009. Thus, it is pertinent to examine in view of the overwhelming evidence of de-industrialization in the State, the constraints to industrial development with a view to proffering solutions that would go a long way in addressing the problems. Below are some of the constraints to industrial development in Kano arising from the findings of study conducted in 2014:

(i) *Lack/Shortage of Capital:* Because of low per capital income and poverty in the country, savings and investments are low. Investment has been largely financed with domestic or foreign loan at a higher interest rate.

(ii) *Inadequate skilled manpower*: Severe shortage of skilled workers in no small measure constraint industrialization in Kano. Many development projects and investments could not take off because of the shortage of skilled personnel such as doctors, engineers, and experienced mangers.

(iii) *Brain Drain:* The outflow of skilled workers to various parts of the world is detrimental to industrialization in Kano. It was observed that, because of instability, poor economic condition of the country among others, working abroad is more attractive than in Nigeria. The limited available industrial manpower leaves the state for greener pastures abroad or other parts of the country.

(iv) *Infrastructural Challenges:* one of the main constraints to industrial development in Kano is poor economic and social infrastructure: bad roads, erratic power supply, limited access to portable water and basic healthcare, and much more. Ensuring a vibrant economy or restoring the growth of the sector requires the use of available resources wisely, investment in advanced technology and rebuild the infrastructure. While the basic infrastructural facilities are desperately needed for efficient production;

unfortunately they are glaringly inefficient in Kano, which eventually proved to be the major reasons advanced by the industrialist in the state which led to the closure of hundreds of industries (Sani, 2001; Umar, 2003; Gatawa, 2014).

(v) *Small Home Market*: going by the current economic situation of the country that is characterized by poverty (over 70%) and overpopulation (Over 9 million people), people's income is very low and hence leading to comparatively small market and hence, low investment. Moreover poor communication services restricted market opportunities in the state.

(vi) *Poor Investment climate:* The poor investment climate in the State has rendered its economy uncompetitive. In the absence of adequate infrastructure (power, roads, water, etc.) the cost of doing business remain high, forcing to neighboring state and countries even companies that had existed in the State for upwards of four decades.

(vii) *Political Instability:* Unstable political climate discourages genuine domestic and foreign investors in the state. Ethnic, tribal and religions crises disrupt peace at so many occasions which upsets supplies of inputs and businesses. Industries normally source their investable fund from banks. With the liberalization of interest rate and of cause foreign exchange in the country, the high cost of investable fund or working capital serve as disincentive to most genuine investors. And some banks indulge in foreign exchange trading with individuals that will use them in unproductive activities. This finding concurred with Sani (2001).

(viii) *Multiple Taxation:* Industries, particularly in developing nations require stimulation from the government in the form of for instance, a tax policy. But, tax policy often hurt growth of industries in Kano because of its multiple nature (Babura, 2000). Babura (2000) cited in (Sani 2001) revealed that, there are approximately 22 different taxes and levies payable by industries in Kano state which are collected by all the three tiers of government. These are quite enough disincentives to industrialization.

(ix) *Poor Leadership:* Nigerian leaders are never committed to the pursuance of people progress. Reports of several tribunal have shown that the past and of cause present leaders have been concerned largely with their self enrichment. Leaders often sabotage and prolong the journey towards meaningful industrialization through failure to execute meaningful policies judiciously. In fact, Kano's industrial development has begun a downturn since mid 1980s with policies of every successive government taking its toll.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Going by the present economic situation in the country that is characterized by poverty, unemployment, illiteracy, hunger and starvation, diseases, corruption, political instability, poor leadership, depilated infrastructure, attainment of industrial development objective in Nigeria, appear overly pessimistic. By that it means that the policies and incentives have not satisfactorily promoted industrial growth in Kano and Nigeria at large. However, the paper made the following policy recommendations. Government policies (exchange rate, liberalization, interest rate etc) should continuously be fine turned to converge with economic progress. That can only be realized if government has a strong commitment to development. This suggestion should be pursued by all the tiers of government. Government should intensify its efforts in the provision of all the necessary industrial incentives discussed in the paper. To expand and diversify the industrial base of the state, the government should take major steps to improve industrial environment by providing energy facilities and other infrastructure to enhance rapids growth of the industries. The government should also ensure that appropriate policies are not only formulated but also implemented.

Industries in Kano need market; therefore, government should fine-tune the free trade policy (liberalization) that made Kano market a dumping ground for foreign goods, to suit our industrial growth. Consequently, market for home manufactured goods could be expanded. The state government in conjunction with the federal tier of government should create a healthy political climate for both local and foreign investors.

REFERENCE

Adegbamide, A. 2007. Obasanjo's Legacies, The News, Vol.28 (21)

Aderento, A. and Shu'aibu, A. (1999), Comprehensive Certificate Economics, University, Press, Plc, Ibadan.

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

Babura, S.Y. (2003), Submissions made in Weekly Trust, August 16-22, 2003. PP. 22. CBN, Statistical Bulletin and Annual Reports and Statement of Account (various years)

Committee Report (2001), Reasons Behind the Collapse of Industries in Kano, Ministry of Trade and Commerce, Kano State.

Enang, U.B. (2010), Industrial Development, Electricity Crisis and Economic Performance in Nigeria, European Journal of Economics, Finance and Administrative Sciences ISSN 1450-2275 Issue 18 http://www.eurojournals.com

Federal Ministry of Industry (1995), The Promotion of Small and Medium Scale Enterprises as a Strategy for Nigeria's Economic Development.

Federal Ministry of Industry (1988), Industrial Policy in Nigeria: Policy Incentives, Guidelines and Institutional Framework.

Ferguson, C.E. and Gould, J.P. (1975), Economic Analysis: Theory and Applications, Third Edition, Richard D. Irwin Inc, Ontario, USA.

Gatawa, M.I. (2014), Energy Crisis and Enterprises Growth and Development, Unpublished Graduate Thesis Submitted to the Department of Economics, Bayero University, Kano

Jhingan, M.L. (2002), The Economic of Development and Planning, 35th edition Vrinda Publisher's ltd.

Koutsoyiannis, A. (1979), Modern Microeconomics, Second Ed. Macmillan Education Limited, London and Basingstoke.

Mamman, A. and Sani, B. M. (2003), Skills Needs of Small and Medium Sized Enterprises: An Investigation of the Interface between Labour Market and Vocational Education and Training Provision in Nigeria.

McConnell, C.R. and Brue, S.L. (1999), Economics: Principles, Problems and Policies. Fourteen Editions, Irwin McGraw-Hill, WI New York, Great Britain.

Okafor, E.O. 2008. 'Development Crisis of the Power Supply and Implications for Industrial Sector in Nigeria', *Kamla-Raj Journal*, Vol. 6.

Sani, B.M. (2001), The Collapse of Industries in Kano: Causes and Solutions, Paper Presented at the AGM Meeting of the Manufacturers Association of Nigeria, MAN held at Central Hotel, Kano.

Sanusi, L.S. (2010), Growth Prospects for the Nigerian Economy, Convocation Lecture delivered at the Igbinedion University, Eighth Convocation Ceremony, Okada, Edo State, November.

Stanlake, G.F. and Grant, S.J. (1999), Introductory Economics, 6th edition, Pearson Education Limited, England.

Tsauni, A.M. (2003) Privatization: A Panacea for Nigeria's Socio-economic Problems. Paper Delivered at a Seminar Series Organized by the School of Technology, Kano State Polytechnic, Kano.

Tsauni, A.M. (2012), Policy Stability: A Hope for Industrial and Economic Development in Nigeria, International Journal of Research in Commerce & Management, Volume No. 3 (2012), Issue No. 2 (February) *ISSN 0976-2183*, www.ijrcm.org.in

Tsauni, A.M. (2012), Productivity in Nigeria: Conceptual, Measurement and Empirical Issues, Ahmadu Bello University Press (forthcoming)

Udeajah, G. 2006, 'Industrial Firms Lose #38 billion to Power Outage, The Guardian, August, 29

Umar, M. (2003), Kano's Fast Collapsing Industries, Daily Trust News paper, 16-22 August.

Wannacott, P. and Wannacott, R. (1982), Economics, Second Ed., McGraw-Hill Book Company, New York, St Louis San Francisco.