



MODELLING INTERDEPENDENCE OF SOME NIGERIAN INDUSTRIES USING A NUMERICAL METHOD.

PETER, ONYEDINMA CHINEDU, E. N EKAKA-A & N. M NAFO

Department of Mathematics and Computer Science, Faculty of Science, Port Harcourt University, Nkpolu-Oroworukwo, Port Harcourt

ABSTRACT

While a technological matrix is not a recent construction in the theory of linear algebra, its effective application due to the variation of the demand elements and its impact on the gross productions of agricultural products, steel and coal can be considered as a mathematical problem that requires a MATLAB algorithm solution. The novel results of this study that we have not seen elsewhere are clearly presented and discussed quantitatively.

Keywords: *Modelling, Interdependence, Industries, Numerical, Method.*

INTRODUCTION

It is a common Knowledge that industrialization can affect sustainable development either negatively or positively. In the context by three key elements such as agricultural products, steel and coal, the vital research question is on the effect of varying each of these elements on the gross production of agriculture, steel and coal otherwise called the solution of a technological matrix of three (3) – rows and three (3)-columns. To tackle this relatively technological matrix problem, we have proposed to apply a MATLAB algorithm. Other related work to the present study can be found in the contributions of Armstrong and Davies (2003), K. E. (2008), Lial, et al (2002), Goldstein, Schneider and Siegel (2004), Harshbarger and Reyonolds (2000), Gohbery et al (2006), Wiley (1996), Luca et al (2007), Gantmacher and Providence (2000), Tellis, et al (2009).

Method of Analysis

The core method of analysis is based on a MATLAB algorithm with the following technological matrix

Ag Steel Caol

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} 0.1 & 0.01 & 0.01 \\ 0.02 & 0.13 & 0.20 \\ 0.05 & 0.18 & 0.05 \end{bmatrix} \begin{matrix} \text{Ag} \\ \text{Steel} \\ \text{coal} \end{matrix}$$

and the demand matrix

$$D = \begin{bmatrix} 2350 \\ 4552 \\ 911 \end{bmatrix}$$

The technological matrix is solved using the technological matrix equation:

$$X = (1 - A)^{-1}D$$

We have calculated the gross production, of the three industries to be 2700 tons of agriculture, 5800 tons of steel and 2200 tons of coal.

When the demand elements of 2350 tons of agricultural products, 4552 tons of steel and 911 tons of coal are varied at 100 percent the gross productions of the three industries are calculated to be 2700, for agricultural products, 5800 for steel and 2200 for coal. In this study, we are interested to vary only the first element of the demand matrix which is 2350 tons of agricultural products and study the effect of this variation on the gross products of the three industries.

Results

The key results of this study are presented in the Table 1 and Table 2 as shown below:

Table 1: Evaluating the effect of D (1) modified (from 10 percent to 55 percent) ne solution of 3 by 3 technological matrix

Example	D (1)	D (1) m	D (2)	D (3)	X (1)	X (2)	X (3)	X (1) m	X (2) m	X (3) m	PD (GP) %	PD (Steel) %	PD (Coal) %
1	2350	235	4552	911	2700	5800	2200	348	5.714	2060	87	1.48	6.36
2	2350	352.5	4552	911	2700	5800	2200	478	5.719	2068	82.30	1.41	6.02
3	2350	470	4552	911	2700	5800	2200	609	5.723	2075	77.4	1.33	5.68
4	2350	587.5	4552	911	2700	5800	2200	704	5.733	2083	72.11	1.24	5.32
5	2350	705	4552	911	2700	5800	2200	870	5.733	2091	67.81	1.16	4.95
6	2350	822.5	4552	911	2700	5800	2200	1001	5.738	20988	62.93	1.07	4.59
7	2350	940	4552	911	2700	5800	2200	13132	3743	2107	58	0.98	4.23
8	2350	1057.5	4552	911	2700	5800	2200	1262	5747	2114	53.26	0.91	3.91
9	2350	1175	4552	911	2700	5800	2200	1393	5752	2122	48.41	0.83	3.55
10	2350	1292.5	4552	911	2700	5800	2200	1524	5757	2130	43.41	0.74	3.18

Table2: Evaluating the effect of D (1) modified (from 60 percent to 98 percent) ne solution of 3 by 3 technological matrix

	D (1)	D (1)m	D (2)	D (3)	X (1)	X (2)	X (3)	X (1) m	X (2)m	X (3)m	PD (GP) %	PD (Steel) %	PD (Coal) %
11	2350	1410	4552	911	2700	5800	2200	1654	5762	2135	38.74	0.66	2.95
12	2350	1527.5	4552	911	2700	5800	2200	1785	5766	2146	33.89	0.56	2.45
13	2350	1645	4552	911	2700	5800	2200	1916	5771	2153	29.89	0.5	2.14
14	2350	1762.5	4552	911	2700	5800	2200	2047	5776	2161	24.19	0.41	1.77
15	2350	1880	4552	911	2700	5800	2200	2177	5781	2169	19.37	0.33	1.41
16	2350	1997.5	4552	911	2700	5800	2200	2308	5786	2177	14.52	0.24	1.05
17	2350	2115	4552	911	2700	5800	2200	2438	5790	2184	9.70	0.17	0.73
18	2350	2232.5	4552	911	2700	5800	2200	2569	5795	2192	4.85	0.09	0.36
19	2350	2256	4552	911	2700	5800	2200	2596	5796	2194	3.85	0.069	0.27
20	2350	2303	4552	911	2700	5800	2200	2648	5798	2197	1.93	0.03	0.14

Discussion of Result

When the surpluses of agricultural products is decreased from the value 348 to 1524, we have observed a quantified percentage depletion decreasing from 87 to 43.41 approximately.

While the volumes of steel and coal due to this variations of the surpluses of agricultural products are not more vulnerable to depletion compared to the vulnerability of the gross production of the industries with respect to agriculture

When the surpluses of agricultural products is decreased from the value 1604 to 2648, we have observed a quantified 38.74 to 1.93 approximately while the volumes of steel and coal due to these variation of the surpluses of agricultural products are not more vulnerable to depletion compared to the vulnerability of the gross production of the industries with respect to agriculture.

Conclusion

When 2350 tons of agricultural products is varied from 10 percent to 55 percent, the gross productions of agricultural products is vulnerable to depletion but the proportion that is depleted decreases from the value of 87 percent to 43.41 percent whereas when the same parameter value is varied form 60 percent to 98 percent the proportion that is depleted decreases from 38.74 percent to 1.93 percent.

The overall

References

Armstrong, and Davies (2003), Barneth, R. A., Ziegler, M.R. and Bylenn, K.E. (2008), Bellman, R. (1997), Chatelin,F.(1993), Gantmacher, F.R (2000), and Providence, R.T: American Mathematical society,
Gohbery, I P. et al (2006), Goldstein, L. J., Schneider, D.I., and Siegel M. J. (2004), Greub, W. H. (1975),
Harshbarger, R. J. Reynolds J. J. (2000),
Herstein, I. N. (1996),
Joshi, A. W. (1995),
Lang, S. (1996), Net, W. (1998),
Srinivasan et al (2002),
Luca et al (2007),
Tellis et al (2009).