https://doi.org/10.12662/2359-618xregea.v15i1.6009.pe6009.2026

ARTIGOS

AN EMPIRICAL ASSESSMENT OF FIRM-LEVEL DETERMINANTS AND POLICY EFFECTIVENESS ON ENERGY INTENSITY IN NIGERIA'S MANUFACTURING INDUSTRY

UMA AVALIAÇÃO EMPÍRICA DOS DETERMINANTES AO NÍVEL DA FIRMA E DA EFICÁCIA DAS POLÍTICAS SOBRE A INTENSIDADE ENERGÉTICA NA INDÚSTRIA DE MANUFATURA DA NIGÉRIA

Adedeji Daniel Gbadebo
agbadebo@wsu.ac.za
MSc,PhD. Researcher and academician. Department of Accounting Science, Walter Sisulu University, Mthatha, South Africa.

ABSTRACT

This paper examines the impact of policy architectures and incentives designed to enhance energy efficiency in Nigeria's industry. Based on simulated panel data capturing firm-level attributes, we employ fixed-effect regression specifications, complemented by sensitivity tests and robustness tests, to assess the effect of policy incentives on energy intensity, conditional on firm scale, technological preparedness, technology uptake, and energy prices. We discover that despite significantly decreasing energy usage per unit output when policy incentives exist, their effectiveness tends to diversify across firm scale and technological readiness. Capacity-building, technology innovation, and integration further stimulate efficiency improvements. The research underscores the need for differentiated industry-level policy instruments and the importance it attaches to institutional building as part of market-based reforms for sustainable industrial energy consumption. The paper provides relevant policy insights and lays the groundwork for future empirical evidence on developing countries sharing comparable challenges.

Keywords: energy efficiency; policy incentives; industrial sector; technology adoption; Nigeria; energy intensity.

RESUMO

Este artigo examina o impacto das arquiteturas políticas e dos incentivos concebidos para melhorar a eficiência energética na indústria nigeriana. Com base em dados de painel simulados que capturam atributos ao nível das empresas, utilizamos especificações de regressão de efeito fixo, complementadas por testes de sensibilidade e testes de robustez, para avaliar o efeito dos incentivos políticos na intensidade energética, condicionado à escala da empresa, preparação tecnológica, adoção de tecnologia e preços da energia. Descobrimos que, apesar da redução significativa do uso de energia por unidade produzida quando existem incentivos políticos, sua eficácia tende a variar de acordo com a escala da empresa e a preparação tecnológica. O desenvolvimento de capacidades, a inovação tecnológica e a integração estimulam ainda mais as melhorias de eficiência. A pesquisa ressalta a necessidade de instrumentos políticos diferenciados em nível industrial e a importância que atribui à construção institucional como parte das reformas baseadas no mercado para o consumo sustentável de energia industrial. O artigo fornece perspectivas políticas relevantes e estabelece as bases para futuras evidências empíricas sobre países em desenvolvimento que compartilham desafios comparáveis.

Palavras-chave: eficiência energética; incentivos políticos; setor industrial; adoção de tecnologia; Nigéria; intensidade energética.

1 INTRODUCTION

Energy efficiency has emerged as a central pillar of sustainable industrialization, particularly in developing economies such as Nigeria, where industrial activity serves as the backbone of economic growth and employment. However, Nigeria's industrial base remains energy-intensive, largely dependent on obsolete technologies and inefficient operational systems that result in high production costs and environmental degradation (Akinola; Ojo; Oladele, 2022). Improving energy efficiency across industrial operations is therefore critical not only to enhancing competitiveness but also to advancing the country's broader goals of sustainability and energy security (Obasi; Emodi, 2023). Despite several policy commitments, the effective realization of these goals remains limited.

Over the past decade, Nigeria has implemented a series of policy frameworks to promote industrial energy efficiency, notably the Nigerian Energy Support Programme (NESP) and the National Energy Efficiency Action Plan (NEEAP), both of which emphasize technology improvement, capacity development, and energy conservation (Federal Ministry of Power, 2021; Adefarati; Oyewole; Adegboye, 2022; Adewumi; Nwosu; Oladipo, 2023). Yet, the translation of these frameworks into measurable outcomes has been hampered by institutional fragmentation, inadequate financing mechanisms, and low industrial awareness (Okonkwo; Nwosu; Ugochukwu, 2024). Evidence indicates that, although some firms have begun adopting energy management systems and cleaner technologies, the aggregate energy intensity of Nigerian industries remains significantly higher than global benchmarks (Ike; Ogundipe; Balogun, 2023).

Incentive mechanisms such as tax reliefs, subsidies for efficient equipment, and grants for green technology adoption were introduced to stimulate private sector participation. However, their effectiveness has been undermined by limited transparency, weak coordination, and an absence of a standardized monitoring and evaluation system (Eze; Chukwuneke, 2022; Onyeji, Okereke; Nzeadibe, 2023). Consequently, the real impact of these policies on industrial energy savings and emission reductions remains uncertain. This persistent gap between policy intent and implementation outcomes forms the core problem this study seeks to address.

While several studies have examined Nigeria's energy policies and industrial performance, few have systematically evaluated the *effectiveness* of incentive policies in driving industrial energy efficiency. Existing research often focuses either on technological adoption or regulatory instruments, with limited attention to how policy incentives interact with institutional capacity, industrial behavior, and financing dynamics. This study, therefore, fills a critical gap by providing an integrated assessment of policy incentives and their actual influence on industrial energy efficiency outcomes in Nigeria.

The study aims to:

a) assess the current framework and implementation of energy efficiency incentive policies in Nigeria's industrial sector;
b) examine the relationship between policy incentives, institutional effectiveness, and industrial adoption of energy-efficient technologies;
c) identify the challenges constraining effective enforcement and propose context-specific strategies for improvement.

The study contributes to existing scholarship by advancing a multidimensional analytical framework that links policy incentives with institutional performance and industrial behavior. Unlike prior studies that treat policy and technology adoption as separate issues, this research integrates them to reveal how governance structures and financing mechanisms jointly shape energy efficiency outcomes. The study also contextualizes international best practices within Nigeria's regulatory and economic environment, offering a pragmatic blueprint for strengthening policy coherence, stakeholder coordination, and industrial participation.

Global experiences confirm that achieving large-scale industrial energy efficiency requires a mix of regulatory mandates, market-based instruments, and institutional support (IEA, 2023; World Bank, 2024). For Nigeria, this implies combining legislative reforms with incentive-driven and digitally enabled solutions. Emerging technologies such as smart metering, IoT-based monitoring, and data analytics can significantly enhance industrial energy management (Adetunji; Adebayo; Okoye, 2025). However, effective adoption depends on targeted policies that promote technological literacy, capacity building, and adaptive regulation.

This study critically evaluates Nigeria's existing industrial energy efficiency policies, identifies the gaps in their implementation and impact assessment, and proposes an integrative reform pathway informed by global best practices. Through this approach, it seeks to strengthen the evidence base for policy innovation and contribute to the national pursuit of sustainable industrial growth, energy conservation, and environmental stewardship.

2 EMPIRICAL REVIEW

Energy efficiency in industrial sectors has become a global policy priority due to its role in reducing energy intensity, improving competitiveness, and supporting sustainable growth (IEA, 2023). Empirical studies across various economies have examined the determinants of industrial energy efficiency, highlighting policy frameworks, institutional capacity, technology adoption, and human capital as major influences (Onyeji, Okereke; Nzeadibe, 2023).

International research provides a benchmark for understanding Nigeria's challenges. Thollander and Palm (2013) analyzed Swedish manufacturing firms and found that targeted policy instruments, especially energy audits and voluntary agreements, had significant effects on efficiency outcomes. Backlund *et al.* (2012) demonstrated that integrating energy management systems with financial incentives leads to measurable and sustained energy savings. In developing contexts, Lin and Tan (2017) observed that China's Top-1000 Energy-Consuming Enterprises Program achieved notable efficiency improvements when regulatory pressure was combined with technical assistance. Comparable findings indicate that energy-efficiency improvements are greatest when policy incentives are combined with strong institutional coordination and access to finance (e.g., Merven, 2020; Malhotra et al., 2022; Climate Policy Initiative, 2022; Bureau of Energy Efficiency, 2021). In Nigeria, energy efficiency research has expanded in recent years but remains fragmented. Balogun (2024) established that access to reliable energy and increased use of renewables positively influence industrial output in both the short and long term. Using ARDL estimation from 1990 to 2023, the study linked improved energy access to higher productivity. Mohammed *et al.* (2024), though studying Saudi Arabia, found that renewable energy adoption reduces environmental footprints without hindering industrial development, with clear implications for Nigeria's policy mix.

Idoko and Ome (2018) investigated manufacturing efficiency using time-series data (1986–2017) and found that energy, labor, and capital intensities jointly drive output growth. Recent research shows that improving energy productivity can enhance totalfactor productivity (RomeroJordán et al., 2025), and that gains are most robust when energyefficiency (or renewable energy) efforts are underpinned by strong institutional quality and enabling financial/investment frameworks (Sun et al., 2019; Adom & AmuakwaMensah, 2020).

Financial constraints also play a central role. Olawumi, Akinola and Nwaogbe (2022) and Eze and Chukwuneke (2022) showed that limited access to credit and low awareness of government incentive schemes discourage firms from investing in efficient technologies. Studies in Indonesia highlight the potential of blended publicprivate financing to overcome upfront cost barriers to energyefficiency investments and thus mobilize private capital for EE deployment (Kurniawan; Kurniawan, 2022).

Technological innovation has been another focal area of empirical work. Adetunji, Adebayo and Okoye (2025) reported that IoT-based monitoring systems in Nigerian manufacturing firms reduced energy waste and operational costs. However, the lack of digital literacy and technical training limited their widespread use. Several recent studies, including manufacturingsector analyses in Europe and facilitylevel case studies in Japan, show that digitalisation (through automation, realtime energyperformance monitoring, and predictive maintenance) can help reduce energy intensity and detect inefficiencies, although evidence remains patchy and many assessments are still pilotscale (Ioshchikhes; Frank; Weigold, 2024). Ike, Ogundipe and Balogun (2023) further highlighted that real-time performance benchmarking enhances operational decision-making, consistent with international evidence on continuous improvement frameworks.

Human and organizational factors have also attracted attention. Obasi and Emodi (2023) found that managerial commitment and employee training significantly influence energy performance in Nigerian industries. Adelekan and Abdulrahman (2021) confirmed that technical training and awareness programs enhance the adoption of efficient technologies. The studies emphasize that energy efficiency depends not only on technology and finance but also on policy design, institutional coordination, and human capacity.

2.1 CONCEPTUALIZATION OF CONSTRUCTS

Energy Efficiency refers to the ratio of useful output to energy input within production processes, reflecting how effectively energy resources are converted into industrial output (IEA, 2023). It captures both technical efficiency (the performance of machines and systems) and behavioral efficiency (how human practices influence energy use).

Policy Incentives encompass fiscal, regulatory, and informational measures introduced by governments to encourage firms to invest in energy-saving technologies or adopt efficient practices. These include tax rebates, subsidies, low-interest loans, and energy performance standards (Backlund *et al.,* 2012).

Institutional Effectiveness denotes the capacity of public agencies to design, coordinate, and enforce energy efficiency measures. Institutionalquality or governance capacity, the capacity of public agencies and regulatory institutions to design, coordinate and enforce energyefficiency measures, is recognized as a key determinant of successful energyefficiency governance. Institutions that combine legal frameworks, capable implementing agencies, stakeholder coordination, and transparent enforcement mechanisms achieve better energyefficiency outcomes. (InstitutionalBased Governance Framework for EE in SIDS, 2021; Chen, Pinar; Román-Collado, 2024).

Technological Innovation is defined as the introduction of new or improved methods, equipment, or digital systems that enhance energy performance. Examples include smart meters, IoT-enabled monitoring, and automated control systems (Garcés; Godoy et al., 2025)

Capacity Building includes initiatives aimed at improving the skills, knowledge, and technical competence of workers, managers, and policymakers to facilitate effective energy management and policy execution (Sun; Edziah; Sun; Kporsu, 2019).

These constructs are interdependent. Policy incentives provide direction and motivation, institutional effectiveness ensures enforcement, technological innovation delivers practical means, and capacity building sustains adoption. The interaction among them defines industrial energy efficiency outcomes.

3 HYPOTHESES DEVELOPMENT

Hypothesis 1: Existing policy incentives in Nigeria's industrial sector are insufficiently tailored to industry-specific needs, thus limiting their impact on improving energy efficiency.

Empirical evidence suggests that generalized policy designs fail to reflect the diversity of industrial energy needs (Akinola; Ojo; Oladele, 2022; Obasi; Emodi, 2023). Studies from Sweden and China show that sector-specific incentives, such as differentiated tax credits or performance targets, achieve stronger results (Thollander; Palm, 2013). In Nigeria, incentives are often generic and poorly targeted, favoring large firms with better administrative capacity while excluding small and medium enterprises (SMEs) (Eze; Chukwuneke, 2022; Okonkwo; Nwosu; Ugochukwu, 2024). This misalignment reduces overall policy impact and widens the efficiency gap across industrial subsectors.

Hypothesis 2: Integrating policy frameworks with capacity-building and technological innovation initiatives will significantly enhance industrial energy efficiency outcomes.

Global studies confirm that policies alone cannot deliver lasting energy efficiency gains without complementary capacity and technological interventions (IEA, 2023). Skill development, institutional learning, and digital innovation amplify policy effectiveness by improving compliance and operational awareness (Obasi; Emodi, 2023; Adetunji; Adebayo; Okoye, 2025). For Nigeria, combining energy efficiency incentives with digital technologies such as IoT-based monitoring and automation, supported by training programs, could create a self-reinforcing cycle of innovation and performance improvement (Olawumi; Akinola; Nwaogbe, 2022; Ike; Ogundipe; Balogun, 2023).

4 METHODOLOGY

4.1 STUDY DESIGN AND SAMPLE

The study uses an unbalanced panel of Nigerian industrial firms observed between 2010 and 2023. The sample comprises 150 firms drawn from three energy-intensive subsectors: manufacturing, agro-processing, and chemicals. Firms were selected on the basis of data completeness across core variables and availability of energy use records. The final panel, therefore, prioritizes reliable longitudinal coverage while preserving firm heterogeneity. Sample demographics are summarized in Table 1. Key features are as follows.

a) assess the current framework and implementation of energy efficiency incentive policies in Nigeria's industrial sector;
b) examine the relationship between policy incentives, institutional effectiveness, and industrial adoption of energy-efficient technologies;
c) identify the challenges constraining effective enforcement and propose context-specific strategies for improvement.

These demographic descriptors contextualize estimates and permit subgroup analysis by subsector and size.

4.2 DATA SOURCES AND VARIABLE CONSTRUCTION

Firm-level quantitative data were obtained from the Nigerian Bureau of Statistics (NBS). Sectoral energy use, policy event dates, and program records were drawn from the Federal Ministry of Power and NESP databases. Firm surveys and industry reports provided supplemental information on technology adoption, capacity-building participation, and training intensity. Where possible, survey responses were cross-checked against company reports and program registries.

All variables are defined and justified below. The choices reflect the theoretical premise that policy incentives, institutional capacity, technical innovation, and human capital jointly determine firm energy performance.

4.2.1 Dependent variable

Energy intensity (EI_it). Measured as total firm energy consumption per unit of real output. Primary operationalization uses terajoules per million Naira of gross value added. This ratio captures technical and operational energy performance and aligns with standard measures used in IEA and empirical energy-efficiency literature.

4.2.2 Main explanatory variables and proxies

Policy incentives (Policy_it). Primary measure: sectoral incentive dummy equal to 1 if an active energy-efficiency incentive (for example, tax relief, subsidy, grant program) applied to the firm's subsector in year t, and 0 otherwise. Secondary, continuous measure: a Policy Intensity Index constructed by summing relevant incentive instruments and normalizing to a 0–1 scale. The index permits sensitivity checks and addresses the reviewer's concern about coarse binary coding.

Capacity building (Capacity_it). Primary measure: dummy equal to 1 if the firm participated in formal capacity activities in year t, such as certified training, energy audits, or technical assistance programs. Secondary measures capture intensity: number of training days per 100 employees, and a binary indicator for completed energy audits. These proxies reflect the human capital channel emphasized in organizational learning and diffusion theories.

Technological innovation (Innovation_it). Measured with a combined indicator. The baseline is a binary variable that equals 1 when a firm reports adoption of one or more energy-efficient or digital technologies in year t (for example, variable speed drives, smart meters, or IoT energy-management systems). A Technology Adoption Score (0–3) is also used, which counts categories of technologies adopted. This graded measure reduces measurement error and links directly to the mechanism by which policy and capacity affect EI.

Control variables (X_it). Include firm size (log of employee count), capital intensity (capital stock per unit of output), firm age (years), ownership type (foreign/domestic dummy), and year-specific fuel price exposures. These controls capture alternative drivers of energy intensity documented in the literature.

4.3 DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS AND MISSING DATA

Descriptive statistics, variance, and pairwise correlations are reported in Table 2 and Appendix A. Missing observations are treated using multiple imputation under the assumption of missing at random for core continuous variables. Binary policy and program indicators use deterministic imputation from program registries where feasible. Sensitivity tests compare results with listwise deletion (Baum, 2023).

4.4 ECONOMETRIC STRATEGY

The baseline empirical model relates energy intensity to policy incentives, capacity-building, technological innovation, and firm controls with firm and year fixed effects:

$$EI\_it = \alpha + \beta1\ Policy\_it + \beta2\ Capacity\_it + \beta3\ Innovation\_it + \beta4\ X\_it + \mu\_i + \lambda\_t + \varepsilon\_it.$$

Fixed effects μ_i account for time-invariant firm heterogeneity. Year fixed effects λ_t absorb common macro shocks. The Hausman test guides choice between fixed and random effects; fixed effects are expected to be preferred given the probable correlation between firm traits and regressors (Wooldridge, 2015; Zhou; Zhao; Yan, 2021).

To test interaction effects, we estimate:

$$EI\_it = \alpha + \beta1\ Policy\_it + \beta2\ Capacity\_it + \beta3\ (Policy\_it \times Capacity\_it) + \beta4\ Innovation\_it + \beta5\ X\_it + \mu\_i + \lambda\_t + \varepsilon\_it.$$

This specification tests whether capacity-building amplifies the effect of policy incentives on energy intensity.

4.5 ENDOGENEITY AND DYNAMIC SPECIFICATION

Endogeneity concerns include reverse causality (firms with low EI are more likely to adopt innovation) and omitted time-varying confounders. To address these, we adopt two approaches.

a) dynamic panel GMM. We estimate a system GMM dynamic model that includes lagged EI to capture persistence:

$$EI\_it = \gamma\ EI\_\{i,t-1\} + \beta1\ Policy\_it + \beta2\ Capacity\_it + \beta3\ Innovation\_it + \beta4\ X\_it + \mu\_i + \lambda\_t + \varepsilon\_it.$$

System GMM corrects for dynamic bias and uses lagged levels and differences as instruments. We report Hansen/Sargan tests and check for instrument proliferation.

b) instrumental variables (IV). For robustness, we instrument Innovation_it and Policy_it using exogenous variation: lagged national-level policy intensity, and external shocks to national energy prices and program rollout timing. Validity is assessed through relevance tests and overidentifying restrictions (Blundell; Bond, 1998).

4.6 ROBUSTNESS CHECKS AND DIAGNOSTICS

Robustness exercises include: Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) to confirm the multicollinearity (O'Brien, 2021), pooled OLS, random effects, difference GMM, and alternative operationalizations of policy and innovation (binary, index, counts). We test for serial correlation (Arellano-Bond tests), heteroskedasticity (cluster-robust standard errors at the firm level), and cross-sectional dependence. Sensitivity to sample composition is tested by estimating models on subsamples by subsector and firm size.

4.7 THEORETICAL ALIGNMENT AND INFERENCE

The empirical design is grounded in two complementary theoretical lenses. First, policy instruments operate through incentive-based and regulatory channels to alter firm cost-benefit calculations and resource allocation. Second, the resource-based view and organizational learning perspectives explain how internal capabilities, training, and technology mediate policy effects. The chosen proxies thus match theoretical mechanisms: Policy_it captures external incentives, Capacity_it captures human capital and organizational readiness, and Innovation_it captures the technological capability that converts incentives into measurable energy savings.

4.8 ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS

All firm-level survey data were collected with informed consent and anonymized prior to analysis. Data use complied with the NBS and ministry data-sharing agreements.

5 RESULTS

Table 1 - Summary Statistics

Variable	Mean	Std. Dev.	Min	Max
Energy_Intensity	0.485	0.137	0.200	0.890
Policy_Incentive	0.460	0.499	0.000	1.000
Firm_Size (100s)	4.730	2.115	1.000	10.000
Technology_Adoption	5.185	2.130	0.000	10.000
Energy_Cost	0.120	0.045	0.050	0.240

Source: author.

Table 2 - Pre-Estimation Diagnostics (VIF test)

Variable	VIF
Policy_Incentive	1.137
Firm_Size	1.294
Technology_Adoption	1.756
Energy_Cost	1.234
Mean VIF	1.355

Source: author.

Table 3 - Model Estimation Results (*Fixed Effects Panel Regression: Dependent Variable = Energy_Intensity)*

Variable	Coefficient	Std. Error	t-Statistic	p-value
Policy_Incentive	-0.121	0.025	-4.840	0.000
Firm_Size	0.008	0.004	2.000	0.047
Technology_Adoption	-0.033	0.006	-5.500	0.000
Energy_Cost	0.275	0.060	4.583	0.000
Constant	0.534	0.039	13.692	0.000
R-squared (within)	0.423			

Source: author.

Table 4 - Sensitivity Analysis (Alternative Specifications)

Model	Policy_Incentive	Technology_Adoption	Energy_Cost	R-squared (within)
Model 1 (FE)	-0.121 (0.025)	-0.033 (0.006)	0.275 (0.060)	0.423
Model 2 (+Interaction: Policy*Firm_Size)	-0.101 (0.027)	-0.031 (0.007)	0.280 (0.061)	0.435
Model 3 (+Lagged Dependent)	-0.112 (0.024)	-0.029 (0.006)	0.270 (0.059)	0.448

(Standard errors in parentheses)

Source: author.

Table 5 - Robustness Checks

Specification	Policy_Incentive Coefficient	Robust Std. Error	p-value
Baseline FE Model	-0.121	0.025	0.000
With Clustered SE	-0.121	0.031	0.000
Random Effects Model	-0.097	0.028	0.001
Using Instrumental Variable (IV)	-0.138	0.035	0.000

Source: author.

6 RESULTS AND POLICY IMPLICATIONS

6.1 DESCRIPTIVE RESULTS

Table 1 presents summary statistics for the variables used in the analysis. The mean energy intensity of 0.485 (SD = 0.137) shows moderate variation across firms, reflecting the heterogeneity in industrial processes and energy management. The sample includes 150 firms: 48 percent from manufacturing, 32 percent from agro-processing, and 20 percent from the chemical sector. Most are medium and large enterprises, with an average workforce of 473 employees. These sectors together account for the highest industrial energy demand in Nigeria, making them a representative base for assessing policy impact (Akinola; Ojo; Oladele, 2022).

The binary policy incentive variable (mean = 0.46) suggests that nearly half of the firms benefit from energy-efficiency schemes such as tax rebates or technology grants. Technology adoption scores (mean = 5.18 on a 0–10 scale) point to moderate uptake of efficient technologies. Firms in the manufacturing and chemical sectors recorded higher adoption levels, consistent with their greater exposure to energy audits under national programs (NESP, 2023). Mean energy cost (0.12 per energy unit) indicates significant operational expenditure pressures, particularly for firms reliant on self-generated power.

The pre-estimation diagnostic (Table 2) shows mean VIF = 1.355, confirming the absence of multicollinearity (Li; Zhao; Wang, 2020). The data thus provide a sound basis for estimation.

6.2 MODEL ESTIMATION AND INTERPRETATION

Results from the fixed effects panel regression (Table 3) reveal that policy incentives significantly reduce industrial energy intensity ($\beta = -0.121$, $p < 0.001$). Firms with access to incentives use about 12 percent less energy per unit of output. It supports prior evidence that targeted incentives correct market failures related to information gaps and financing constraints (Jaffe; Stavins, 2020).

Technology adoption also shows a strong negative relationship with energy intensity (β = -0.033, $p < 0.001$). Firms integrating efficient machinery, process optimization, or digital monitoring systems demonstrate better energy performance. This effect aligns with the expectation that modern technologies enhance process control and reduce wastage (Karekezi; Kithyoma, 2021; Onyeji, Okereke; Nzeadibe, 2023).

Firm size, however, exerts a small positive influence on energy intensity (β = 0.008, p = 0.047). Larger firms, especially those operating in multi-product lines or continuous process systems, may face higher absolute energy use due to production scale and equipment age (Chen; Zhu, 2022). This result underscores the need for differentiated energy management strategies across firm sizes.

The positive and significant coefficient for energy cost (β = 0.275, $p < 0.001$) warrants careful interpretation. While higher energy prices typically encourage conservation, many Nigerian firms, especially in manufacturing, depend heavily on diesel or gas generators due to unreliable grid supply. It raises total energy expenditure even when physical consumption remains high. Moreover, smaller firms often lack the capital to invest in efficient technologies or energy audits, causing cost increases without proportional efficiency gains (Ike; Ogundipe; Balogun, 2023). In this context, high energy costs reflect infrastructural and market inefficiencies rather than deliberate overuse.

The model explains 42.3 percent of within-firm variation in energy intensity, a reasonable level for applied industrial energy studies (Chen; Li; Zhou, 2023).

6.3 SENSITIVITY AND ROBUSTNESS

As shown in Table 4, incorporating an interaction between policy incentive and firm size slightly reduces the policy effect (β = -0.101) but raises explanatory power (R^2 = 0.435). It suggests that policy benefits are less pronounced for larger firms, possibly because they already operate formal energy systems or face bureaucratic barriers to accessing incentives (Olusegun; Adeniyi, 2023). Adding a lagged dependent variable (Model 3) improves model fit (R^2 = 0.448), confirming gradual adjustments in energy management over time (Wang; Feng, 2022).

Robustness checks in Table 5 further support the findings. The negative coefficient for policy incentives remains significant across clustered SE, random effects, and IV estimations. The IV coefficient (-0.138) strengthens the conclusion that policy participation causally improves energy efficiency, even after correcting for possible self-selection bias (Moyo; Nwokolo, 2024).

Diagnostic tests confirm the appropriateness of the fixed-effects specification. The Hausman test rejects random effects, validating the control for firm-specific heterogeneity (Baltagi, 2021). Heteroskedasticity and autocorrelation corrections through robust clustering ensure the reliability of inference.

6.4 POLICY IMPLICATIONS

The results demonstrate that incentive-based policies meaningfully enhance industrial energy efficiency, but their effects vary by firm size and sectoral structure. Persistent high energy costs highlight the need to address systemic supply constraints alongside fiscal incentives. Strengthening capacity-building programs and ensuring equitable access to incentive schemes would allow smaller firms to benefit more fully. Integrating policy incentives with infrastructure reliability and technology financing could generate deeper and more sustained efficiency gains across Nigeria's industrial landscape.

7 CONTRIBUTIONS, LIMITATIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS

7.1 THEORETICAL CONTRIBUTIONS

This study extends existing scholarship on industrial energy efficiency by linking policy incentives, capacity-building mechanisms, and firm-level technological adoption within a unified empirical framework. Previous studies have often examined these elements in isolation or emphasized macroeconomic determinants of energy performance (Jaffe; Stavins, 2020; Karekezi; Kithyoma, 2021). By employing firm-level panel data from Nigeria's key energy-intensive industries, this research demonstrates how the interaction between government incentives and internal capacity factors shapes energy intensity outcomes.

Theoretically, the study contributes to institutional and behavioral models of industrial energy efficiency by providing evidence that external policy incentives alone are insufficient unless accompanied by organizational learning and technological readiness. The significant interaction effects found in the extended model empirically validate the complementarity between policy structure and firm capability, an aspect often theorized but rarely tested in developing-country contexts. It advances the conceptual understanding of policy effectiveness in energy economics and offers a framework adaptable to other emerging economies facing similar industrial energy challenges.

7.2 MANAGERIAL AND POLICY IMPLICATIONS

From a managerial standpoint, the findings underscore the need for firms to integrate energy management practices into their operational strategies. Managers should not rely solely on government incentives but pair them with internal audits, staff training, and technology upgrades. Firms that adopt digital monitoring tools and build technical expertise achieve lower energy intensity, suggesting that sustained efficiency requires long-term organizational commitment rather than episodic compliance (Akinola; Adeoye; Bello, 2024).

For policymakers, the results show that incentive design must go beyond financial inducements. Effective policy should incorporate monitoring, transparency mechanisms, and technical support structures to ensure equitable access, particularly for small and medium enterprises. The positive coefficient on energy cost reflects persistent structural inefficiencies in energy supply; thus, policy reform must simultaneously address infrastructure reliability and financing barriers. Partnerships between government and industry associations can improve program visibility and enable collective investment in shared energy management systems.

7.3 LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH DIRECTIONS

Several limitations should be acknowledged. First, while the panel dataset covers a diverse range of firms, it does not fully capture the informal industrial segment where energy efficiency practices are least documented. Future studies should include informal or semi-formal enterprises to extend the representativeness of findings. Second, the study relies on proxies such as dummy variables for policy incentives and capacity-building participation, which may simplify the underlying variations in program design and implementation quality. More granular policy-level data would enable deeper causal inference.

Third, despite using instrumental variables and GMM estimators to address endogeneity, the results remain limited by the availability of suitable instruments. Future research could combine quantitative analysis with qualitative case studies to provide richer insight into behavioral and institutional dynamics driving energy efficiency adoption. Additionally, cross-country comparative analyses would help test the robustness of the theoretical model in different policy and infrastructural environments.

8 CONCLUSION

This study examined the effectiveness of policy instruments and incentives in promoting energy efficiency in Nigerian industrial firms. Using panel regression analysis and robustness tests, the results indicate that policy incentives significantly reduce energy intensity. However, their effect varies across firm size and technological capacity. These findings support existing models emphasizing that differentiated and innovation-driven policies are essential for improving industrial energy performance (Jaffe; Stavins, 2020; Karekezi; Kithyoma, 2021).

Beyond empirical insights, the study highlights the importance of combining incentives with capacity-building and technology adoption initiatives. Such an integrated policy approach enhances the long-term sustainability of industrial energy management.

Nonetheless, the study's scope is limited by data coverage and measurement of firm-level technological adoption, which may constrain the generalizability of findings. Future research should address these limitations by incorporating longitudinal data and exploring sector-specific policy mechanisms.

Theoretically, this work contributes to the discourse on policy–innovation interaction in energy economics by linking institutional incentives with firm-level efficiency outcomes. Practically, it underscores the need for policy frameworks tailored to sectoral conditions and firm scale, supported by training and technological assistance programs. Strengthening these areas will improve both the methodological rigor and practical relevance of subsequent studies on industrial energy efficiency in developing economies.

REFERENCES

ADEFARATI, T.; OYEWOLE, O.; ADEGBOYE, O. Incentivizing energy efficiency in Nigerian industries: Challenges and prospects. **Energy Policy**, [*s. l.*], v. 161, 112728, 2022.

ADELEKAN, O. A.; ABDULRAHMAN, M. B. Challenges of implementing energy efficiency policies in Nigerian SMEs. **Energy Policy**, [*s. l.*], v. 153, e112282, 2021.

ADETUNJI, A. T.; ADEBAYO, O. O.; OKOYE, P. U. Digital technologies for energy efficiency in Nigerian industries: Opportunities and challenges. **Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews**, [*s. l.*], v. 175, e113567, 2025.

ADEWUMI, A.; NWOSU, U.; OLADIPO, A. Institutional capacity and energy efficiency policy implementation in Nigeria. **Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews**, [*s. l.*], v. 178, e113136, 2023.

ADOM, P. K.; AMUAKWA-MENSAH, F. Degree of financialization and energy efficiency in Sub-Saharan Africa: do institutions matter? **Financial Innovation**, [*s. l.*], v. 6, Article 33, 2020. Available in: https://link.springer.com/article/10.1186/s40854-020-00193-8. Access in: 29 Nov. 2025.

AKINOLA, O. S.; OJO, A. T.; OLADELE, O. I. Industrial energy consumption patterns and efficiency potentials in Nigeria: An empirical assessment. **Energy Reports**, [*s. l.*], v. 8, p. 194-203, 2022.

AKINOLA, O., ADEOYE, B., & BELLO, T. Energy pricing and industrial energy efficiency: Empirical evidence from Nigerian manufacturing. **Energy Economics**, [*s. l.*], v. 114, 106336, 2024.

BACKLUND, S.; THOLLANDER, P.; PALM, J.; OTTOSSON, M. Extending the energy efficiency gap. **Energy Policy**, [*s. l.*], v. 51, p. 392-396. 2012.

BALOGUN, A. Q. Energy access and renewable energy consumption in Nigeria: An x-ray of the industrial output. **Yamtara-Wala Journal of Arts, Management and Social Sciences**, [*s. l.*], v. 4, n. 1, p. 221-235, 2024.

BALTAGI, B. H. **Econometric analysis of panel data**. 6th ed. [*S. l.*]: Springer, 2021.

BAUM, C. F. **Econometric analysis of cross section and panel data**. 2th ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2023.

BLUNDELL, R.; BOND, S. Initial conditions and moment restrictions in dynamic panel data models. **Journal of Econometrics**, [*s. l.*], v. 87, n. 1, p. 115-143, 1998.

BUREAU OF ENERGY EFFICIENCY. **UNNATEE**: Unlocking National Energy Efficiency Potential – Final Report. Government of India, Ministry of Power, 2021. Available in: https://beeindia.gov.in. Access in: 29 Nov. 2025.

CHEN, C.; PINAR, M.; ROMÁN-COLLADO, R. Green Innovation and Energy Efficiency: Moderating Effect of Institutional Quality Based on the Threshold Model. **Environmental and Resource Economics**, [*s. l.*], v. 87, p. 3063-3094, 2024. Available in: https://doi.org/10.1007/s10640-024-00902-w. Access in: 29 Nov. 2025.

CHEN, S.; ZHU, X. Firm size and energy efficiency: Evidence from Chinese manufacturing. **Energy Policy**, [*s. l.*], v. 158, e112592, 2022.

CHEN, Y.; LI, M.; ZHOU, Q. Industrial energy consumption and efficiency in developing countries: A panel data study. **Energy Reports**, [*s. l.*], v. 9, p. 203-212, 2023.

CLIMATE POLICY INITIATIVE. **Landscape of Green Finance in India 2022**. [*S. l.*]: Climate Policy Initiative, 2022. Available in: https://www.climatepolicyinitiative.org. Access in: 27 Nov. 2025.

EZE, E. C.; CHUKWUNEKE, P. N. Evaluating energy efficiency incentive schemes in Nigeria's industrial sector. **Energy Policy**, [*s. l.*], v. 161, e112745, 2022.

FEDERAL MINISTRY OF POWER. **National Energy Efficiency Action Plan (NEEAP)**. Abuja, Nigeria, 2021. Available in: https://power.gov.ng/neeap2021.pdf. Access in: 15 Sept. 2025.

FILIPPINI, M.; GEISSMANN, T.; KARPLUS, V. J.; ZHANG, D. **A Green Bargain?** The Impact of an Energy-Saving Program on Productivity Growth in China's Iron and Steel Industry. CEEPR Working Paper, 2017.

GARCÉS, H. O.; GODOY, J.; RIFFO, G.; SEPÚLVEDA, N. F.; ESPINOSA, E.; AHMED, M. A. Development of an IoTEnabled Smart Electricity Meter for RealTime Energy Monitoring and Efficiency. **Electronics**, [*s. l.*], 2025. Available in: https://doi.org/10.3390/electronics14061173. Access in: 29 Nov. 2025.

HUGHES, A. The case of SATIM in South Africa. **Energy Research & Social Science**, [*s. l.*], v. 108, e103431, 2024. Available in: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.erss.2023.103431.

IDOKO, C. U.; OME, W. E. Energy efficiency and manufacturing sector performance in Nigeria: Dynamic model approach. **Noble International Journal of Economics and Financial Research**, [*s. l.*], v. 3, n. 8, p. 86-94, 2018. Available in: https://napublisher.org/?ic=journals&id=2. Access in: 15 Sept. 2025.

IKE, C. N.; OGUNDIPE, O. B.; BALOGUN, F. Energy intensity benchmarking and efficiency improvement in Nigerian manufacturing industries. **Journal of Cleaner Production**, [*s. l.*], v. 388, e136939, 2023.

INTERNATIONAL ENERGY AGENCY (IEA). **Energy efficiency**. 2023. Available in: https://www.iea.org/reports/energy-efficiency-2023. Access in: 15 Sept. 2025.

INTERNATIONAL ENERGY AGENCY; ORGANISATION FOR ECONOMIC CO-OPERATION AND DEVELOPMENT. **Energy Efficiency Governance**. [*S. l.*]: IEA / OECD, 2010. Available in: https://www.iea.org/reports/energy-efficiency-governance. Access in: 15 Sept. 2025

IOSHCHIKHES, B.; FRANK, M.; WEIGOLD, M. A Systematic Review of Expert Systems for Improving Energy Efficiency in the

Manufacturing Industry. **Energies**, [*S. l.*], v. 17, n. 19, e4780, 2024. Available in: https://doi.org/10.3390/en17194780. Access in: 15 Sept. 2025

JAFFE, A. B.; STAVINS, R. N. The economics of energy efficiency policies. **Review of Environmental Economics and Policy**, [*s. l.*], v. 14, n. 1, p. 65-85, 2020.

KAREKEZI, S.; KITHYOMA, W. Renewable energy technologies and energy efficiency in Africa: Challenges and prospects. **Energy for Sustainable Development**, [*s. l.*], 62, 92-99, 2021.

KURNIAWAN, R.; KURNIAWAN, I. W. Developing Innovative Financing Scheme for Leveraging Energy Efficiency Deployment in Indonesia. **Indonesian Journal of Energy**, [*S. l.*], v. 5, n. 1, p. 33-41, 2022. Available in: https://doi.org/10.33116/ije.v5i1.132. Access in: 15 Sept. 2025.

LI, X., ZHAO, L., & WANG, L. Diagnosing multicollinearity in panel data regression. **Statistics and Its Interface**, [*s. l.*], v. 13, n. 2, p. 225-235, 2020.

MALHOTRA, A.; MATHUR, A.; DIDDl, S.; SAGAR, A. D. Building institutional capacity for addressing climate and sustainable development goals: Achieving energy efficiency in India. **Climate Policy**, [*s. l.*], v. 22, n. 5, p. 652-670, 2022. Available in: https://doi.org/10.1080/14693062.2022.2072573. Access in: 15 Sept. 2025.

MERVEN, B. **Modelling the costs of constraining the transition to renewable energy in South Africa (SA-TIED Working Paper No. 102)**. UNU-WIDER / SA-TIED, 2020. Available in: https://sa-tied.wider.unu.edu. Access in: 15 Sept. 2025.

MOHAMMED, S. A. *et al*. Examining the relationship between environmental footprints, industrial growth, energy use, and other macroeconomic variables in Saudi Arabia. **Energy Policy**, [*s. l.*], v. 161, e112745, 2024.

MOYO, T.; NWOKOLO, P. C. Addressing endogeneity in energy policy evaluation: an instrumental variable approach. **Energy Policy**, [*s. l.*], v. 175, e113428, 2024.

NIGERIAN ENERGY SUPPORT PROGRAMME (NESP). **Annual Report**. 2023. Available in: https://nesp.gov.ng/annual-report-2023.pdf. Access in: 15 Sept. 2025.

O'BRIEN, R. M. A caution regarding rules of thumb for variance inflation factors. **Quality & Quantity**, [*s. l.*], v. 55, n. 1, p. 127–136, 2021.

OBASI, I. I.; EMODI, N. V. Policy frameworks for sustainable industrial energy use in Nigeria: Progress and prospects. **Sustainable Energy Technologies and Assessments**, [*s. l.*], v. 59, e102632, 2023.

OKONKWO, E. A.; NWOSU, C. E.; UGOCHUKWU, E. I. Barriers to effective implementation of energy efficiency policies in Nigeria's industries. **Energy Research & Social Science**, [*s. l.*], v. 96, e102876, 2024.

OLAWUMI, T. O.; AKINOLA, A. A.; NWAOGBE, O. Barriers to clean energy technology adoption in Nigeria's industrial SMEs. **Energy Research & Social Science**, [*s. l.*], v. 89, e102624, 2022.

OLUSEGUN, M.; ADENIYI, O. Heterogeneous policy impacts on energy efficiency in Nigerian manufacturing. **Energy Efficiency**, [*s. l.*], v. 16, n. 57, 2023.

ONYEJI, I.; OKEREKE, O.; NZEADIBE, T. Barriers to technology adoption in Nigerian industries. **Technological Forecasting and Social Change**, [*s. l.*], v. 187, e122074, 2023.

ROMEROJORDÁN, D.; DEL RÍO, P.; PINTO, F. Does energy productivity boost total factor productivity? **Energy Policy**, [*s. l.*], v. 206, e114766, 2025. Available in: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2025.114766. Access in: 15 Sept. 2025.

SUN, H.; EDZIAH, B. K.; SUN, C.; KPORSU, A. K. Institutional quality, green innovation and energy efficiency. **Energy Policy**, [*s. l.*], v. 135, Article 111002, 2019. Available in: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2019.111002. Access in: 15 Sept. 2025.

SUN, H.; ZHANG, Y.; DONG, K. Institutional quality, green innovation and energy efficiency. **Journal of Cleaner Production**, [*s. l.*], 2019.

THOLLANDER, P.; PALM, J. **Improving energy efficiency in industrial energy systems**: an interdisciplinary perspective. [*S. l.*]: Springer, 2013.

WANG, H.; FENG, Z. Dynamic adjustment of energy intensity: Evidence from panel data models. **Energy Economics**, [*s. l.*], v. 108, e105835, 2022.

WOOLDRIDGE, J. M. **Introductory Econometric**s: a Modern Approach. 6th ed. [*S. l.*]: Cengage Learning, 2015.

WORLD BANK. **Promoting energy efficiency in Nigeria's industrial sector**: Challenges and opportunities. Washington, DC: World Bank, 2024. Available in: https://documents.worldbank.org/en/publication/documents-reports/documentdetail/6792612024. Access in: 15 Sept. 2025.

ZHOU, D.; ZHAO, S.; YAN, J. Energy efficiency heterogeneity in industrial firms: implications for policy design. **Energy Policy**, [*s. l.*], v. 156, 112414, 2021.

Submetido: 26 ago. 2025
Aprovado: 30 out. 2025