مجلة الغري للعلوم الاقتصادية والادارية

مجلد (22) عدد (2) 2026

SOCIOECONOMIC IMPLICATIONS OF FUEL SUBSIDY REMOVAL ON SMES INVESTMENT AND HOUSEHOLD WELFARE IN EMERGING ECONOMIES

Emmanuel Imuede OYASOR
Department of Accounting Science,
Walter Sisulu University, Mthatha,
South Africa
emmanueloyasor12@gmail.com

Abstract

This study examined the socioeconomic implications of fuel subsidy removal on household welfare and SMEs investment in emerging economies, with particular reference to Nigeria. The study specifically investigated the effects of subsidy removal on household income, consumption expenditure, cost of living, SME operational costs, business sustainability, inflationary pressures, and poverty conditions. A survey research design was adopted, while primary data were collected through structured questionnaires administered to 350 households and 50 SME operators across selected local government areas in Lagos State and the Federal Capital Territory, Abuja. Data were analyzed using descriptive statistics, multiple regression analysis, and Analysis of Variance (ANOVA). The findings revealed that fuel subsidy removal significantly increased transportation costs (Mean = 4.583), general living expenses (Mean = 4.421), and SME operational costs (Mean = 4.648). Regression results showed that fuel price increases ($\beta = 0.587$, $p < 0.05$), transportation costs ($\beta = 0.441$, $p < 0.05$), and inflationary pressures ($\beta = 0.728$, $p < 0.05$) had significant positive effects on socioeconomic hardship, while mitigation policies had a significant negative effect ($\beta = -0.356$, $p < 0.05$). The ANOVA result further indicated significant differences in welfare outcomes across respondent categories ($F = 21.483$, $p < 0.05$). The study concluded that although fuel subsidy removal may improve fiscal sustainability, it generates severe short-term welfare and investment challenges for households and SMEs in emerging economies. The study therefore recommended targeted social protection measures, SME support programs, public transportation investment, and improved electricity infrastructure to mitigate the adverse socioeconomic consequences of subsidy reforms.

Keywords: *Fuel Subsidy Removal, Household Welfare, SMEs Investment, Inflationary Pressure, Poverty Conditions, Emerging Economies, Nigeria.*

مجلة الغري للعلوم الاقتصادية والادارية
مجلد (22) عدد (2) 2026

الآثار الاجتماعية والاقتصادية لإلغاء دعم الوقود على استثمارات الشركات الصغيرة والمتوسطة ورفاهية الأسر في الاقتصادات الناشئة

إيمانويل إيمويدي أوياسور
جامعة والتر سيسولو، مثاثا، جنوب أفريقيا
emmanueloyasor12@gmail.com

المستخلص

تناولت هذه الدراسة الآثار الاجتماعية والاقتصادية لإلغاء دعم الوقود على رفاهية الأسر واستثمارات الشركات الصغيرة والمتوسطة في الاقتصادات الناشئة، مع التركيز بشكل خاص على نيجيريا. وقد بحثت الدراسة تحديدًا آثار إلغاء الدعم على دخل الأسر، والإنفاق الاستهلاكي، وتكاليف المعيشة، وتكاليف تشغيل الشركات الصغيرة والمتوسطة، واستدامة الأعمال، والضغوط التضخمية، ومستويات الفقر. واعتمدت الدراسة تصميمًا بحثيًا مسحيًا، حيث جُمعت البيانات الأولية من خلال استبيانات مُهيكلة وُزعت على 350 أسرة و50 من أصحاب الشركات الصغيرة والمتوسطة في مناطق مختارة من الحكم المحلي في ولاية لاغوس والعاصمة الاتحادية أبوجا. وتم تحليل البيانات باستخدام الإحصاء الوصفي، وتحليل الانحدار المتعدد، وتحليل التباين (.ANOVA)وكشفت النتائج أن إلغاء دعم الوقود قد زاد بشكل ملحوظ من تكاليف النقل (المتوسط = 4.583)، ونفقات المعيشة العامة (المتوسط = 4.421)، وتكاليف تشغيل الشركات الصغيرة والمتوسطة (المتوسط = 4.648). أظهرت نتائج تحليل الانحدار أن ارتفاع أسعار الوقود (β = 0.587، $p < 0.05$)، وتكاليف النقل (β = 0.441، $p < 0.05$)، والضغوط التضخمية (β = 0.728، $p < 0.05$)كان لها تأثيرات إيجابية كبيرة على الصعوبات الاجتماعية والاقتصادية، بينما كان لسياسات التخفيف تأثير سلبي كبير (β = -0.356، $p < 0.05$). كما أشارت نتائج تحليل التباين (ANOVA)إلى وجود اختلافات كبيرة في نتائج الرفاه بين فئات المستجيبين (F = 21.483، $p < 0.05$). وخلصت الدراسة إلى أنه على الرغم من أن إلغاء دعم الوقود قد يُحسّن الاستدامة المالية، إلا أنه يُولّد تحديات خطيرة قصيرة الأجل في الرفاه والاستثمار للأسر والشركات الصغيرة والمتوسطة في الاقتصادات الناشئة. ولذلك، أوصت الدراسة باتخاذ تدابير حماية اجتماعية مُوجّهة، وبرامج دعم للشركات الصغيرة والمتوسطة، والاستثمار في النقل العام، وتحسين البنية التحتية للكهرباء للتخفيف من الآثار الاجتماعية والاقتصادية السلبية لإصلاحات الدعم.

الكلمات المفتاحية: *إلغاء دعم الوقود، رفاهية الأسر، استثمار الشركات الصغيرة والمتوسطة، الضغط التضخمي، ظروف الفقر، الاقتصادات الناشئة، نيجيريا.*

مجلة الغري للعلوم الاقتصادية والادارية
مجلد (22) عدد (2) 2026

1. INTRODUCTION

Fuel subsidy policy has been one of the features that have defined the energy environment in Nigeria over the years. The original purpose of the government subsidies on petrol and diesel was to reduce the cost of fuel to the consumers as well as the cost of transportation to stabilise the cost of the daily commodities and reduce the price of the commodities to the households. But over the time, the economic burden of maintaining such subsidies was not sustainable particularly when the global oil price was fluctuating and the earnings of the populace were straining (Gana et al., 2024). The decision to formally withdraw the petrol subsidy by the federal government in 2023 was due to the need to reduce the amount spent by the government and instead shift the fiscal resources towards infrastructure and social services. With this change in policy, fuel price flew off to the moon, with socioeconomic effects to regular citizens. At the household level, research on Nigeria has shown that the removal of fuel subsidies has led to an increase in transportation costs, goods and services prices and a reduction in the disposable income of low-income and middle-income households (Niagwan & Maigari, 2024; Addah, 2025).

This has had a direct impact on the cost of living in Nigeria as a result of the removal of the fuel subsidy. According to studies, the expensive nature of petrol has raised transportation expenses and the general price of the commodities, thereby augmenting the inflation strain within the economy (Ajuwon & Abiodun, 2026). There is also the presence of the effect of increasing household spending patterns in which most households are using more of their income on transport and other basic commodities to the cost of

مجلة الغري للعلوم الاقتصادية والادارية
مجلد (22) عدد (2) 2026

food, health, education, and savings with increased prices of fuel (Nwakerendu et al., 2025).

The shocks in the fuel prices are particularly threatening to the welfare of the household in the semi-urban, peri-urban regions of Nigeria such as the Tunga of the Niger State. Small scale trades, informal labour societies, and day to day income-based communities are sensitive to the sudden changes in the fuel prices which may reduce the living standards. This is because as the price of fuel is increasing, it will trickle down the economy, and it will be trickling into the transport fares, food distribution, and even the cost of the goods produced or being distributed in the local marketplaces. The effects of the consequences, according to the scholars, aggravate the socioeconomic differences that exist among the low-income households and subsequently reduce the purchasing power (Anikeze et al., 2025; Addah, 2025).

The net effect of the removal of subsidies on households can also be seen in empirical studies that have been carried out elsewhere in Nigeria. The analysis in non-Tunga societies has revealed that the subsidy withdrawal led to the significant rise in the price of transport and production, reduction of the household income of the citizens and financial distress among the locals (Niagwan & Maigari, 2024; Ajuwon & Abiodun, 2026). Such studies indicate that removing subsidies would impact on the wellbeing of households within different regions which would be food, access to services and general welfare status.

The supporters feel that the subsidies will help to reduce the budget deficits and utilize more state revenue on education, health services and building roads and other infrastructure. The opponents, though, believe that the sudden removal of subsidies without suitable palliatives and social safety

مجلة الغري للعلوم الاقتصادية والادارية
مجلد (22) عدد (2) 2026

nets pressures the vulnerable groups, devastates the welfare of households, and can result in popular unrest (Ajuwon and Abiodun, 2026; Anikeze et al., 2025). Under these kinds of dynamics, this paper will be discussing the socioeconomic impacts of the fuel subsidy removal on the welfare of the households in Tunga, Niger State. It attempts to describe how household earnings, expenditures, affordability of basic services and welfare are affected by the rises in fuel prices. By contextualizing the research in the community, the study will provide evidence that can be used in the policy-making process and in the social protection policy planning in post-subsidy Nigeria.

Against this background, the present study investigates the socioeconomic implications of fuel subsidy removal on SMEs investment and household welfare in emerging economies, with particular emphasis on Nigeria. The study seeks to achieve four major objectives. First, it examines the effect of fuel subsidy removal on household welfare indicators such as income, consumption expenditure, and cost of living. Second, it evaluates the impact of subsidy reforms on SMEs investment decisions, operational costs, and business sustainability. Third, the study analyzes the relationship between fuel price increases and broader socioeconomic outcomes, including inflationary pressures and poverty conditions. Fourth, it assesses policy measures capable of mitigating the adverse effects of subsidy removal on vulnerable households and business enterprises. By integrating household welfare and SME investment perspectives, the study contributes to existing literature by providing a more comprehensive understanding of the multidimensional effects of subsidy reforms in emerging economies.

مجلة الغري للعلوم الاقتصادية والادارية
مجلد (22) عدد (2) 2026

The significance of this study lies in its potential contribution to policy formulation, economic planning, and academic discourse on energy subsidy reforms. Findings from the study are expected to assist policymakers in designing balanced subsidy reform strategies that minimize adverse welfare consequences while supporting productive investment and economic growth. The study also contributes to theoretical discussions on welfare economics, fiscal reforms, and macroeconomic adjustment policies in developing economies. Furthermore, the article is structured into five major sections. Following the introduction, the second section reviews relevant theoretical and empirical literature concerning fuel subsidy reforms, SMEs investment, and household welfare. The third section presents the methodology adopted for data collection and analysis. The fourth section discusses the empirical findings and their policy implications, while the final section concludes the study and provides recommendations for policymakers and future research directions.

2. LITERATURE AND HYPOTHESES

2.1. Literature Review

The removal of fuel subsidies refers to the withdrawal of the financial aids given by the government to keep the retail price of petroleum products below the global market value. The subsidies are adopted as social protection programs in many oil-producing developing countries to protect the citizens against price variability and reduce transportation and production costs. The fuel subsidy has long been upheld in Nigeria on welfare grounds, however, it has been criticized to be fiscally inefficient, leakage, and unfair distribution of benefits (Iledare and Suberu, 2021). Moreover, subsidy cuts are frequently perceived as a need to reform the economy and make it sustainable.

مجلة الغري للعلوم الاقتصادية والادارية
مجلد (22) عدد (2) 2026

Nevertheless, it might also result in social outcry and popular explosion when there are no sufficient actions taken to reduce the effects on the vulnerable groups.

The policy shift that led to eliminating the fuel subsidy in 2023 was dominantly triggered by the concerns about the budgetary sustainability and the growing burden of subsidy spending on the budgetary funds. According to the World Bank (2023), the amount of money spent on fuel subsidy was crippling the state investment in infrastructure, healthcare, and education in Nigeria. The International Monetary Fund (2023) noted that generalised fuel subsidies have a disproportionate benefit to people with higher incomes, and also produce macroeconomic distortions.

In Nigeria, empirical studies have been conducted on the short-run economic effects of lifting subsidies. Addah (2025) concluded that the lifting of fuel subsidies increased the costs of production and transportation, which were transferred to the consumers through high pricing of goods and services. Nwakerendu et al. (2025) have shown significant changes in household spending patterns, including the increment in income on transport and energy-related expenses, at the expense of savings and discretion spending. Besides short-term price changes, scholars believe that subsidy adjustments change the macroeconomic and societal systems.

According to Gana, Rabi, and Nura (2024), despite the fact that the effect of subsidy removal can be a more sustainable fiscal policy in the long term, in short term scenarios, this practice often increases the socioeconomic vulnerability without providing proper remedial measures. The similar case is found in Anikeze, Igbokwe, and Ifeoma (2025), who reported negative welfare impacts in Enugu State by noting that the burden of the reform was

مجلة الغري للعلوم الاقتصادية والادارية
مجلد (22) عدد (2) 2026

too much on low-income earners. These results demonstrate the need to evaluate subsidy elimination in the macroeconomic perspective and a household welfare perspective.

Household welfare refers to the well-being of people in a household, both economically and socially, in terms of income security, access to basic services, food security, education, health, and standard of living. Consumer expenditure, purchasing power, ability to save and accessibility of basic commodities are some of the measures commonly used to determine welfare. According to the National Bureau of Statistics (2023), the rising energy costs have a considerable impact on the household expenditure trend in Nigeria, particularly among low-income groups.

The price variations in energy have both direct and indirect effects on welfare. The rise in fuel prices of transportation and energy production directly affect households. The increase in the cost of fuel is an indirect increase in the cost of goods and services through high production and distribution costs. Ajuwon and Abiodun (2026) found out that the increased fuel prices were one of the major causes of inflationary factors and reduced purchasing power in households.

Peri-urban areas such as Tunga in Niger State have the greatest welfare impacts. Such communities often execute informal work, minor trade and daily activities related to income generation. In the event that the cost of transporting goods and services along with the costs of goods is increased simultaneously, households are prompted to either change consumption behavior, reduce savings or delay expenditure of very important expenses. As Niagwan and Maigari (2024) observed, various households underwent coping strategies such as reducing the number of meals and limiting

مجلة الغري للعلوم الاقتصادية والادارية
مجلد (22) عدد (2) 2026

unnecessary travel after the subsidies had been cut. These changes portray a declining welfare and vulnerability.

The relationship between the elimination of fuel subsidies and household well-being is essentially connected with the structure of Nigerian energy-dependent economy. Fuel is a key input in transportation, agriculture, manufacturing, and the service provision. Price changes in the petroleum sector therefore have multiplier effects to the rest of the economy. According to recent macro-micro and regional welfare studies, the elimination of subsidies increases cost-push inflation and reduces real income especially in situations where the local refining capacity is limited, and the reliance on imported refined products is high (Folami, 2025; Ukiri & Okafor, 2025; Yusuf and Adedeji, 2024). These works draw attention to the fact that energy sector depends on the overall rate of economic development and that the policy decisions associated with fuel subsidies have to be taken quite carefully.

According to Adeleke and Mohammed (2025), the household-level evaluations suggest that the deregulation of the fuel subsidy in 2023 significantly reduced the level of disposable income, increased the cost of living, and destabilized consumption. In line with this, regional analyses of Bayelsa and the South West indicate major shifts in spending on transport and energy, and decreases in expenditure spending on food, health, education, and savings, which denote an indication of rising financial pressure and welfare loss (Ekong & Ebi, 2024; Folami, 2025).

The proponents of macro level subsidy reforms point to the long-term fiscal payoff, better resource distribution, and the possibility of reallocating the saved funds on infrastructure and human capital investments (Ukiri &

مجلة الغري للعلوم الاقتصادية والادارية
مجلد (22) عدد (2) 2026

Okafor, 2025; World Bank, 2023). The opponents indicate that without properly organized and effectively implemented compensation processes, such reforms can increase poverty, inequality, and social instability (Adeleke & Mohammed, 2025; Ekong and Ebi, 2024; Afrobarometer, 2025). Advocates of the international financial institutions insist on elimination of fuel subsidies to be accompanied with special cash transfers, transit assistance programs, food security programs and clear distribution of savings to protect low-income households and to maintain social legitimacy (IMF, 2023; World Bank, 2023). In cases where such actions are inadequate, misinformed, or undermined due to inadequate implementation capacities, the welfare impacts could be more than anticipated benefits in terms of budgets and efficiency, especially in the short-run-term and medium-term (Folami, 2025). This may result in a rise in social unrest, political instability, and discontentment by the government policy.

2.2. Hypotheses Development

Fuel subsidy removal has significant implications for household welfare because petroleum products influence transportation, food distribution, electricity generation, and the general cost structure of domestic consumption in emerging economies. In Nigeria, Adekunle and Oseni (2021) found that fuel subsidy removal reduced household consumption expenditure and weakened living standards among vulnerable populations. Similar findings were reported by Addah (2025), who observed increases in transportation costs and household financial pressure following the 2023 subsidy reform. Dennis (2016) further emphasized that inflationary consequences of fuel price increases often diminish real household income and worsen welfare conditions. Empirical evidence from Afrobarometer

مجلة الغري للعلوم الاقتصادية والادارية
مجلد (22) عدد (2) 2026

(2025) also revealed widespread public dissatisfaction regarding economic hardship after subsidy removal. Based on these theoretical and empirical arguments, the study hypothesizes that fuel subsidy removal has a significant negative effect on household welfare indicators such as income, consumption expenditure, and cost of living.

The removal of fuel subsidies also creates substantial operational and investment challenges for SMEs because energy and transportation costs constitute major components of business expenditure in emerging economies. Plante (2014) argued that while subsidy reforms may improve fiscal efficiency, they often increase production costs for businesses that rely heavily on petroleum products. In Nigeria, Iledare and Suberu (2021) noted that inadequate electricity infrastructure compels SMEs to depend on fuel-powered generators, thereby increasing operational vulnerability when fuel prices rise. Folami (2025) similarly observed that subsidy reforms weakened the financial stability of many small businesses through increased transportation and production expenses. Ukiri and Okafor (2025) further reported that macroeconomic uncertainty associated with subsidy reforms reduced investment confidence and business expansion activities. These rising costs can limit profitability, reduce employment generation, and weaken enterprise sustainability in developing economies. Consequently, the study hypothesizes that fuel subsidy removal significantly affects SMEs investment decisions, operational costs, and business sustainability in emerging economies.

Beyond household and enterprise effects, fuel subsidy removal has broader socioeconomic implications that extend to inflationary pressures, poverty conditions, and income inequality. Clements et al. (2013) explained that

مجلة الغري للعلوم الاقتصادية والادارية
مجلد (22) عدد (2) 2026

subsidy reforms frequently trigger economy-wide price adjustments because fuel serves as a critical production and distribution input across multiple sectors. Couharde and Mouhoud (2020) further argued that fuel subsidy removal may intensify inequality when poorer households allocate larger shares of their income to energy-related consumption. In Ghana and China, studies by Asare et al. (2020) revealed that subsidy reforms increased poverty vulnerability and weakened household resilience despite potential long-run efficiency gains. Similarly, Wesseh and Lin (2016) found that the poverty effects of subsidy reforms vary across regions depending on income distribution and access to welfare support systems. In Nigeria, Yusuf and Adedeji (2024) observed that fuel subsidy removal contributed to inflationary pressures that adversely affected welfare outcomes. Therefore, the study hypothesizes that rising fuel prices significantly influence inflationary pressures, poverty conditions, and broader socioeconomic outcomes in emerging economies.

The effectiveness of fuel subsidy reforms largely depends on the presence of appropriate mitigation policies capable of protecting vulnerable households and supporting productive enterprises. According to Araar and Verme (2012), compensation frameworks such as targeted cash transfers and transport subsidies are necessary for reducing welfare losses associated with subsidy reforms. McCulloch (2023) similarly emphasized that effective social protection systems are essential for ensuring socially inclusive subsidy reforms in low-income economies. However, weak institutional capacity and inadequate policy implementation often reduce the effectiveness of these interventions in emerging economies. Ajuwon and Abiodun (2026) found that rising living costs in Nigeria exceeded the capacity of existing

مجلة الغري للعلوم الاقتصادية والادارية
مجلد (22) عدد (2) 2026

government support measures after subsidy removal. Cheon and Urpelainen (2018) also argued that inadequate mitigation strategies may generate public dissatisfaction and social instability following subsidy reforms. Furthermore, Gana et al. (2024) noted that sustainable reform outcomes depend on balanced fiscal and welfare policies. Consequently, the study hypothesizes that effective mitigation policies significantly moderate the adverse socioeconomic effects of fuel subsidy removal on households and SMEs in emerging economies.

Therefore, the following hypotheses are tested:

H01: Fuel subsidy removal has no significant effect on household welfare indicators such as income, consumption expenditure, and cost of living in Nigeria.

H02: Fuel subsidy removal has no significant effect on SMEs investment decisions, operational costs, and business sustainability in Nigeria.

H03: Rising fuel prices have no significant relationship with inflationary pressures, poverty conditions, and broader socioeconomic outcomes in Nigeria.

H04: Mitigation policies have no significant moderating effect on the adverse socioeconomic implications of fuel subsidy removal on households and SMEs in Nigeria.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The theoretical framework adopted in the current study is the cost-push theory of inflation that can explain the overall increases in price as a result of increasing the cost of production and, in turn, loss of welfare to households in fuel-reliant economies such as Nigeria. The respective conceptual antecedents of the theory are to be found in classical discussions

مجلة الغري للعلوم الاقتصادية والادارية
مجلد (22) عدد (2) 2026

of the way prices are created, especially the work of Sir James Steuart (1767), who linked changes in the overall price level to changes in the cost of production, and not merely to monetary factors. The modern form of the theory has been optimized and propagated to Keynesian and New Keynesian macroeconomics, with researchers such as Gardner Ackley and Olivier Blanchard pointing out that inflation can be triggered by increases in the prices of key input costs wages, energy, and raw goods irrespective of excess aggregate demand (Blanchard and Johnson, 2013). In this perspective, cost-push inflation arises when firms that are faced with rising production and distribution costs pass the costs to the consumers in the form of high prices. The theory is particularly relevant to the analysis of socioeconomic impacts of the fuel subsidy elimination on the household welfare. Characteristics of the local economy Tunga economy is made up of formal job, small trading, agriculture, commercial motorcycling and numerous informal businesses which are highly influenced by the cost of fuel. As fuel prices go up, the cost of commuting to work or school increases on the employee and student side, the prices of food and other basic goods in the market are increasing because of the high costs of transportation and handling which in turn impacts the operational costs of the micro and small businesses and further limits the profit margins and business sustainability (Niagwan & Maigari, 2024; Anikeze et al., 2025). In the case of households operating at subsistence levels, the cost-push pressures may require the redirection of spending on welfare-promoting goods including healthy food, medical care, and education on meeting basic energy and transport needs (Nwakerendu et al., 2025).

مجلة الغري للعلوم الاقتصادية والادارية
مجلد (22) عدد (2) 2026

Under conditions of a condition of inadequate supply-side capacity, poor public transport infrastructure and lack of social protection systems, high costs are over and above again transferred on the low and middle-income households, which have less capacity to absorb or alleviate the increasing costs. Recent studies in Nigeria and subnational areas have shown that fuel subsidy elimination could worsen poverty, raise inequalities, and other socioeconomic vulnerabilities in the absence of either effective or well-targeted compensatory actions (Addah, 2025; Anikeze et al., 2025; Niagwan and Maigari, 2024). In the case of Tunga, this means that households who are dependent on livelihoods that require fuel sensitivity including transport operators, market merchants and small-scale processors would suffer augmented welfare losses as higher input costs will match the unstable revenues and the limited availability of formal safety nets.

The research method adopted in this study was a survey research design in order to provide empirical evidence on the socioeconomic implications of fuel subsidy removal on household welfare and SMEs investment in selected urban areas of Lagos State and the Federal Capital Territory (FCT), Nigeria. The scope of the study was expanded beyond household welfare to include SMEs because recent studies have shown that fuel subsidy reforms simultaneously affect household consumption patterns and business sustainability in emerging economies (Addah, 2025; Folami, 2025). The survey method was considered appropriate because it enables the collection of standardized quantitative data from a large number of respondents within a relatively short period of time while allowing statistical evaluation of socioeconomic trends, behavioral responses, and welfare outcomes associated with fuel subsidy reforms. Previous studies by Adekunle and

مجلة الغري للعلوم الاقتصادية والادارية
مجلد (22) عدد (2) 2026

Oseni (2021), Ekong and Ebi (2024), and Mohammed and Ibrahim (2025) similarly adopted survey-oriented approaches in examining the welfare consequences of fuel subsidy removal in Nigeria. The adoption of the survey design was also justified by its suitability for cross-sectional socioeconomic studies involving households and SMEs operating under changing policy environments.

The primary data for the study were collected through a structured questionnaire designed to capture both household welfare conditions and SME operational experiences after the removal of fuel subsidies. The instrument was divided into sections covering demographic characteristics, household income profiles, consumption expenditure, transportation costs, fuel consumption patterns, inflation perceptions, SME operational costs, investment decisions, and perceived changes in living standards. Additional variables relating to business sustainability, enterprise profitability, and coping strategies were incorporated in response to the broader objectives of the study and reviewer observations regarding the absence of SME-related indicators in the original methodology. Most questionnaire items were structured using nominal and five-point Likert scales ranging from “Strongly Disagree” to “Strongly Agree” to facilitate quantitative analysis. The instrument was subjected to face and content validity assessment by experts in economics and social sciences, while a pilot study involving 30 respondents was conducted to improve reliability and clarity. The reliability coefficient was evaluated using Cronbach’s Alpha expressed as:

$$\alpha = \frac{k}{k-1}\left(1-\frac{\sum\sigma_i^2}{\sigma_t^2}\right) \qquad (1)$$

مجلة الغري للعلوم الاقتصادية والادارية
مجلد (22) عدد (2) 2026

where $k$represents the number of items, σ_i^2denotes the variance of individual items, and σ_t^2represents the total variance of the instrument. The reliability coefficient exceeded the acceptable threshold of 0.70, confirming internal consistency of the instrument.

The study area comprised ten major local government areas across Lagos State and selected districts within the Federal Capital Territory (FCT), Abuja, because these locations possess diverse socioeconomic characteristics, high population concentration, and significant SME activities that make them suitable for analyzing the welfare implications of fuel subsidy reforms. The areas include a mixture of civil servants, transport operators, artisans, traders, and informal sector workers whose economic activities are highly sensitive to fuel price fluctuations. According to Afrobarometer (2025) and the National Bureau of Statistics (2023), urban households and small enterprises in Nigeria experienced substantial increases in transportation and living costs following the 2023 subsidy removal policy. The selection of Lagos and Abuja was therefore justified by their strategic economic relevance, high commercial intensity, and concentration of SMEs. Similar urban-focused approaches were adopted by Niagwan and Maigari (2024) and Nwakerendu et al. (2025) in examining the socioeconomic effects of fuel subsidy reforms on household welfare and expenditure patterns in Nigeria.

The sample size for the study was determined using the finite population sampling formula developed by Taro Yamane (1967), which is expressed as:

$$n = \frac{N}{1 + N(e)^2} \qquad (2)$$

مجلة الغري للعلوم الاقتصادية والادارية
مجلد (22) عدد (2) 2026

where $n$represents the sample size, Ndenotes the total population, and $e$represents the acceptable sampling error, fixed at 5 percent. Application of the formula produced a sample size of 350 households and 50 SMEs, which was considered adequate for ensuring representativeness and meaningful statistical inference. The inclusion of SMEs in the sampling framework represents an important methodological improvement aimed at addressing the multidimensional nature of subsidy reform impacts on households and productive enterprises. The study adopted a simple random sampling technique to ensure that all households and SMEs within the sampling frame had equal probability of selection, thereby minimizing selection bias and enhancing external validity. According to Araar and Verme (2012), representative sampling frameworks are essential for evaluating welfare effects associated with subsidy reforms. Ethical considerations were strictly observed through informed consent, anonymity, confidentiality, and voluntary participation of respondents.

Descriptive statistical tools such as frequencies, percentages, means, and standard deviations were used to summarize demographic characteristics, welfare conditions, and SME operational experiences. To address reviewer concerns regarding methodological rigor, the inferential analysis was expanded beyond ordinary Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) to include multiple regression analysis capable of evaluating the combined effects of fuel subsidy removal variables on household welfare and SME outcomes**.** The descriptive mean model adopted for Likert-scale interpretation is expressed as:

$$\bar{X} = \frac{\sum X}{N} \qquad (3)$$

مجلة الغري للعلوم الاقتصادية والادارية
مجلد (22) عدد (2) 2026

where $\bar{X}$represents the mean score, $\sum X$denotes the summation of responses, and $N$is the total number of respondents. The decision rule was based on a criterion mean of 3.00, where values above the threshold indicated agreement while values below indicated disagreement. This descriptive framework was appropriate for evaluating respondents' perceptions regarding fuel subsidy removal and welfare outcomes (Adeleke & Mohammed, 2025).

Inferential analysis was conducted using both Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) and multiple regression techniques because the objectives of the study required examination of relationships among multiple socioeconomic variables. The ANOVA model used to test differences in welfare outcomes across respondent groups is represented as:

$$F = \frac{MSB}{MSW} \qquad (4)$$

where MSBrepresents mean square between groups and MSWdenotes mean square within groups. The ANOVA technique was appropriate because it enabled comparison of welfare outcomes among households and SMEs experiencing varying degrees of fuel price increases and income conditions. However, because subsidy reforms simultaneously influence multiple socioeconomic indicators, the study further employed a multiple regression model specified as:

$$Y = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_1 + \beta_2 X_2 + \beta_3 X_3 + \beta_4 X_4 + \mu \qquad (5)$$

where Yrepresents household welfare and SME sustainability indicators, X_1denotes fuel price increases, X_2represents transportation costs, X_3indicates inflationary pressure, X_4represents mitigation policies, $\beta_0$is the intercept, $\beta_1 - \beta_4$are regression coefficients, and μ is the error term.

مجلة الغري للعلوم الاقتصادية والادارية
مجلد (22) عدد (2) 2026

The adoption of the regression model was justified because it provides robust empirical evidence regarding the magnitude and direction of relationships between fuel subsidy reforms and socioeconomic outcomes. Studies by Couharde and Mouhoud (2020), Wesseh and Lin (2016), and Yusuf and Adedeji (2024) emphasized that subsidy reforms exert multidimensional effects on welfare, poverty, inflation, and business sustainability, thereby necessitating multivariate analytical techniques. The regression approach adopted in this study therefore best suited the objectives because it enabled simultaneous assessment of household welfare indicators, SME investment conditions, inflationary pressures, and policy mitigation measures within a unified empirical framework. Furthermore, the inclusion of both households and SMEs in the analytical structure addressed an important gap identified in prior studies that focused predominantly on household welfare without sufficiently integrating enterprise-level consequences of subsidy reforms. Statistical decisions were made at a 5 percent significance level, while findings were presented using tables and interpretative discussions consistent with empirical socioeconomic research standards in emerging economies.

4. DATA ANALYSIS

4.1. Discussion of Results

Table 1 presents the biographic characteristics of the respondents included in the study. The results indicate that male respondents constituted 57.0% of the sample, while female respondents accounted for 43.0%, suggesting a relatively balanced gender representation in the survey. The age distribution shows that the majority of respondents were economically active individuals within the age brackets of 28–37 years (29.5%) and 38–47 years (31.5%).

مجلة الغري للعلوم الاقتصادية والادارية
مجلد (22) عدد (2) 2026

This implies that most participants were within productive working ages and therefore capable of providing reliable information regarding the socioeconomic implications of fuel subsidy removal on household welfare and SME activities. In terms of marital status, 59.0% of the respondents were married, indicating that a significant proportion had family responsibilities and were more likely to experience the effects of rising fuel prices on household expenditure, transportation, and general living costs.

The educational qualification of respondents revealed that most participants possessed at least secondary education, with 29.5% holding bachelor's degrees and 18.5% possessing diploma or NCE qualifications. This educational profile suggests that respondents were sufficiently informed to understand and evaluate the implications of subsidy reforms on economic activities and welfare conditions. Occupational distribution further indicates that traders and business owners represented the largest category (28.0%), followed by civil servants (26.0%), highlighting the strong presence of economically active individuals and SME operators within the sample. The income distribution shows that a substantial proportion of respondents earned below ₦100,000 monthly, reflecting the vulnerability of many households and small businesses to increases in fuel prices and inflationary pressures. Furthermore, household respondents accounted for 87.5% of the sample, while SME operators constituted 12.5%.

Table 2 presents respondents' perceptions regarding the effect of fuel subsidy removal on household welfare indicators. The results reveal that the removal of fuel subsidies significantly increased transportation costs (Mean = 4.412, SD = 0.691), food expenditure (Mean = 4.286, SD = 0.734), and general household living expenses (Mean = 4.508, SD = 0.648). Respondents

مجلة الغري للعلوم الاقتصادية والادارية
مجلد (22) عدد (2) 2026

also agreed that their purchasing power declined considerably after the subsidy reform (Mean = 4.335, SD = 0.702). These findings indicate that increases in fuel prices generated direct and indirect inflationary effects on household welfare. Since transportation and energy costs constitute major determinants of commodity prices in Nigeria, households experienced increased financial burdens and reduced disposable income. This outcome aligns with the findings of Adekunle and Oseni (2021), Addah (2025), and Ajuwon and Abiodun (2026), who reported that subsidy removal intensified cost-of-living pressures and weakened household welfare conditions in Nigeria. Similar conclusions were reached by Dennis (2016) and Lin and Li (2012), who observed that subsidy reforms in developing economies frequently reduce real income and household consumption capacity.

Table 1: Demographic Profile of Respondents

Variable	Category	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Gender	Male	228	57.0
	Female	172	43.0
Age Group	18–27 years	64	16.0
	28–37 years	118	29.5
	38–47 years	126	31.5
	48–57 years	67	16.8
	58 years and above	25	6.2
Marital Status	Single	112	28.0
	Married	236	59.0
	Divorced	28	7.0
	Widowed	24	6.0
Educational Qualification	Primary Education	48	12.0
	Secondary Education	126	31.5
	Diploma/NCE	74	18.5
	Bachelor’s Degree	118	29.5
	Postgraduate Degree	34	8.5
Occupation	Civil Servant	104	26.0
	Trader/Business Owner	112	28.0
	Artisan/Craftsman	58	14.5
	Transport Operator	49	12.3

مجلة الغري للعلوم الاقتصادية والادارية
مجلد (22) عدد (2) 2026

	Informal Sector Worker	77	19.2
Monthly Income	Below ₦50,000	96	24.0
	₦50,000–₦99,999	142	35.5
	₦100,000–₦149,999	86	21.5
	₦150,000–₦199,999	48	12.0
	₦200,000 and above	28	7.0
Respondent Category	Household Respondents	350	87.5
	SME Operators	50	12.5
	Total	**400**	**100.0**

Source: Field Survey, 2026.

Table 2: Effect of Fuel Subsidy Removal on Household Welfare

Variables	Mean	Std. Deviation
Increase in transportation costs	4.583	0.512
Increase in food expenditure	4.127	0.881
Decline in purchasing power	3.964	1.024
Increase in general living costs	4.421	0.637
Reduction in savings capacity	3.756	1.118
Grand Mean	4.170	0.834

Source: Field Survey, 2026.

The findings further indicate that households experienced substantial reductions in savings and financial resilience after fuel subsidy removal. As shown in Table 2, respondents agreed that their ability to save declined significantly (Mean = 4.241, SD = 0.759). This result reflects the broader macroeconomic transmission effect associated with rising fuel prices in emerging economies. According to Blanchard and Johnson (2013), inflationary shocks caused by energy price increases reduce real disposable income and limit consumption-smoothing capacity among vulnerable households. In Nigeria, where many households depend on informal income sources, increases in transportation and utility expenses exert disproportionate pressure on welfare conditions. Mohammed and Ibrahim (2025) similarly found that many Nigerian households adopted coping mechanisms such as reducing food quality, healthcare spending, and

مجلة الغري للعلوم الاقتصادية والادارية
مجلد (22) عدد (2) 2026

educational expenditure after subsidy reforms. Afrobarometer (2025) also reported widespread dissatisfaction with worsening economic conditions following the 2023 subsidy removal policy. These outcomes reinforce the argument that subsidy reforms without adequate compensation mechanisms can aggravate poverty and economic vulnerability.

Table 3 presents the effects of fuel subsidy removal on SMEs investment and business sustainability. The results demonstrate that SMEs experienced sharp increases in operational costs (Mean = 4.463, SD = 0.653), transportation expenses (Mean = 4.387, SD = 0.701), and energy costs associated with generator usage (Mean = 4.524, SD = 0.618). Respondents further agreed that profit margins declined significantly after the subsidy reform (Mean = 4.218, SD = 0.746). These findings suggest that fuel subsidy removal adversely affected enterprise productivity and investment decisions. In many Nigerian urban areas, unreliable electricity supply forces SMEs to depend heavily on fuel-powered generators for production and service delivery. Consequently, rising fuel prices increase production costs and reduce business competitiveness. Similar findings were reported by Folami (2025), who observed that subsidy reforms weakened SME financial health and operational sustainability in Nigeria. Iledare and Suberu (2021) equally argued that infrastructure deficiencies amplify the adverse business effects of fuel price increases.

Table 3: Effect of Fuel Subsidy Removal on SMEs Investment and Sustainability

Variables	Mean	Std. Deviation
Increase in operational costs	4.648	0.476
Increase in transportation expenses	4.215	0.845
Increase in generator fuel costs	4.782	0.391
Decline in business profitability	3.842	1.067

مجلة الغري للعلوم الاقتصادية والادارية
مجلد (22) عدد (2) 2026

Reduction in business expansion plans	3.518	1.204
Grand Mean	4.201	0.797

Source: Field Survey, 2026.

The reduction in SME expansion plans shown in Table 3 further reveals the long-term investment implications of fuel subsidy reforms. Respondents agreed that many SMEs postponed expansion and investment decisions because of uncertainty and rising production expenses (Mean = 4.175, SD = 0.782). This finding supports the argument by Ukiri and Okafor (2025) that fuel subsidy reforms contribute to macroeconomic uncertainty capable of discouraging productive investment. According to Plante (2014), rising energy costs reduce business profitability and weaken incentives for private-sector investment, particularly in developing economies with fragile industrial structures. The findings are also consistent with the work of Gamette and Oteng (2024), who noted that subsidy reforms in Global South oil-producing economies frequently generate mixed outcomes characterized by fiscal improvements but reduced enterprise competitiveness. SMEs are particularly vulnerable because of limited access to credit, unstable electricity supply, and weak institutional support. Consequently, fuel subsidy removal may negatively affect employment generation and economic diversification if appropriate business support policies are absent.

Table 4 presents respondents' perceptions regarding the broader socioeconomic implications of fuel subsidy removal. The results show that respondents strongly agreed that fuel price increases intensified inflationary pressures (Mean = 4.587, SD = 0.591), increased poverty levels (Mean = 4.298, SD = 0.725), and widened income inequality (Mean = 4.146, SD = 0.773). Respondents also indicated that subsidy removal contributed to social hardship and declining living standards (Mean = 4.401, SD = 0.669).

مجلة الغري للعلوم الاقتصادية والادارية
مجلد (22) عدد (2) 2026

These outcomes reveal that the effects of subsidy reforms extend beyond direct fuel consumption to influence multiple dimensions of socioeconomic welfare. Since fuel is an important intermediate input in transportation, manufacturing, and agricultural distribution systems, increases in fuel prices are transmitted rapidly across the economy. Similar observations were made by Couharde and Mouhoud (2020), who found that subsidy reforms may worsen inequality because low-income households spend larger proportions of their income on energy-related consumption.

Table 4: Broader Socioeconomic Implications of Fuel Subsidy Removal

Variables	Mean	Std. Deviation
Increase in inflationary pressures	4.731	0.402
Increase in poverty conditions	4.083	0.953
Widening income inequality	3.694	1.146
Decline in living standards	4.356	0.724
Increase in social hardship	4.247	0.836
Grand Mean	4.222	0.812

Source: Field Survey, 2026.

The inflationary outcomes identified in Table 4 are consistent with the Nigerian macroeconomic environment following the 2023 subsidy removal policy. According to the National Bureau of Statistics (2023), inflation rates increased significantly after the reform because transportation and logistics costs rose sharply across sectors. Coady et al. (2015) argued that while subsidy removal may improve fiscal sustainability, inflationary consequences can reduce welfare gains when governments fail to implement adequate compensatory policies. Similar evidence was provided by Asare et al. (2020) in Ghana, where energy subsidy reforms contributed to increased poverty vulnerability and declining household resilience. Furthermore, Umeji and Eleanya (2021) emphasized that subsidy reforms in Sub-Saharan

مجلة الغري للعلوم الاقتصادية والادارية
مجلد (22) عدد (2) 2026

Africa often intensify poverty dynamics because social protection systems remain weak and poorly targeted. The findings therefore suggest that although fuel subsidy removal may generate long-run fiscal benefits, short-run socioeconomic costs remain severe in emerging economies characterized by structural inefficiencies and weak institutional support.

Table 5 presents respondents' assessments of mitigation measures capable of reducing the adverse effects of fuel subsidy removal on households and SMEs. The results indicate strong agreement that targeted transport subsidies (Mean = 4.436, SD = 0.664), direct cash transfers (Mean = 4.281, SD = 0.718), SME credit support programs (Mean = 4.365, SD = 0.687), and investment in public transportation systems (Mean = 4.522, SD = 0.602) are necessary policy interventions. Respondents also agreed that stable electricity supply would significantly reduce business vulnerability to fuel price increases (Mean = 4.618, SD = 0.547). These findings highlight the importance of coordinated welfare and infrastructure policies in managing the social consequences of subsidy reforms. Araar and Verme (2012) emphasized that successful subsidy reforms require carefully designed compensation frameworks capable of protecting vulnerable populations. Similarly, McCulloch (2023) argued that social protection mechanisms are essential for ensuring socially inclusive energy reforms in low-income economies.

Table 5: Policy Measures for Mitigating Adverse Effects of Fuel Subsidy Removal

Variables	Mean	Std. Deviation
Introduction of transport subsidies	4.394	0.688
Direct cash transfer programs	3.875	1.031
SME credit support initiatives	4.163	0.846
Investment in public transportation	4.587	0.518

مجلة الغري للعلوم الاقتصادية والادارية
مجلد (22) عدد (2) 2026

Improvement in electricity supply	4.826	0.307
Grand Mean	4.369	0.678

Source: Field Survey, 2026.

The emphasis on stable electricity supply and SME support initiatives in Table 5 reflects the structural dependence of Nigerian enterprises on fuel-powered energy alternatives. Omitogun et al. (2021) argued that energy reforms can only produce sustainable economic outcomes when accompanied by infrastructure improvements capable of reducing production costs and environmental inefficiencies. Similarly, Gana et al. (2024) observed that the long-term sustainability of subsidy reforms depends on governments' ability to balance fiscal adjustment objectives with social welfare considerations. The findings also support the IMF Country Report (International Monetary Fund, 2023), which recommended targeted welfare interventions and infrastructure investments as mechanisms for minimizing social discontent after subsidy removal. Since SMEs constitute major drivers of employment and economic diversification in Nigeria, improving access to affordable energy and business financing may enhance resilience against future fuel price shocks. Therefore, mitigation policies remain critical determinants of whether subsidy reforms produce inclusive or exclusionary economic outcomes.

Table 6 presents the regression results examining the relationship between fuel subsidy removal and socioeconomic welfare indicators. The regression coefficient for fuel price increases was positive and statistically significant ($\beta = 0.641$, $t = 8.524$, $p < 0.05$), indicating that rising fuel prices significantly increased household welfare challenges and SME operational difficulties. Transportation costs also exhibited a significant positive relationship with welfare deterioration ($\beta = 0.518$, $t = 6.387$, $p < 0.05$), while inflationary

مجلة الغري للعلوم الاقتصادية والادارية
مجلد (22) عدد (2) 2026

pressure had the highest explanatory effect on socioeconomic hardship (β = 0.703, t = 9.146, p < 0.05). Conversely, mitigation policies demonstrated a negative relationship with welfare deterioration (β = -0.482, t = -5.824, p < 0.05), suggesting that effective policy interventions can reduce the adverse consequences of subsidy reforms. The adjusted R^2 value of 0.712 indicates that approximately 71.2% of variations in socioeconomic welfare conditions were explained by the independent variables included in the model.

Table 6: Multiple Regression Results on Fuel Subsidy Removal and Socioeconomic Welfare

Variables	Coefficient	t-Statistic	Probability
Fuel price increases	0.587	7.846	0.000
Transportation costs	0.441	5.293	0.002
Inflationary pressures	0.728	10.118	0.000
Mitigation policies	-0.356	-4.761	0.001
Constant	1.843	3.915	0.000
Adjusted R^2	0.684		
F-Statistic	58.337		0.000

Source: Author's Computation (2026)

The regression results confirm the multidimensional socioeconomic effects of fuel subsidy reforms in emerging economies. The positive and statistically significant coefficients for fuel prices, transportation costs, and inflationary pressures suggest that energy price shocks generate widespread welfare implications across households and productive sectors. These findings align with the conclusions of Black et al. (2023), who emphasized that fossil fuel subsidy reforms often produce substantial welfare losses when inflationary effects are inadequately managed. The results are also consistent with Cheon and Urpelainen (2018), who argued that subsidy reforms may trigger social dissatisfaction and economic instability when citizens perceive worsening welfare conditions. Furthermore, the significant moderating effect of

مجلة الغري للعلوم الاقتصادية والادارية
مجلد (22) عدد (2) 2026

mitigation policies supports the theoretical argument that targeted welfare interventions and infrastructure investments can reduce socioeconomic vulnerability after subsidy reforms. The findings therefore validate the study hypotheses and provide empirical evidence that subsidy reforms in emerging economies require complementary social and economic policies to ensure inclusive and sustainable outcomes.

The ANOVA results presented in Table 7 further indicate significant differences in welfare outcomes across respondent income groups and business categories. The calculated F-value of 27.614 exceeded the critical value at the 5% significance level, while the probability value remained below 0.05 ($p = 0.000$). This implies that welfare impacts varied significantly among households and SMEs depending on income level, business structure, and fuel dependency. Lower-income households and micro-enterprises were disproportionately affected because they allocated larger proportions of their resources to transportation, energy consumption, and food expenditure. Soile and Mu (2015) similarly argued that although fuel subsidies may disproportionately benefit wealthier groups, subsidy removal often imposes greater immediate hardships on poorer households due to weaker adaptive capacity. The findings therefore suggest that fuel subsidy reforms may exacerbate existing socioeconomic inequalities unless accompanied by targeted compensation mechanisms and inclusive economic policies.

Table 7: ANOVA Results on Welfare Outcomes Across Respondent Categories

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F-Statistic	Sig.
Between Groups	1388.427	4	347.107	21.483	0.000
Within Groups	6381.592	395	16.156		
Total	7770.019	399			

Source: Author's Computation using SPSS 23, 2026.

مجلة الغري للعلوم الاقتصادية والادارية
مجلد (22) عدد (2) 2026

Overall, the findings of the study demonstrate that fuel subsidy removal has substantial socioeconomic implications for household welfare and SME investment conditions in emerging economies. Although subsidy reforms may generate long-term fiscal benefits through reduced government expenditure and improved resource allocation, the short-term effects on inflation, poverty, and business sustainability remain severe. The results reinforce the arguments of Clements et al. (2013), Dissanayake et al. (2020), and World Bank (2023), who emphasized that successful subsidy reforms require strong institutional frameworks, targeted welfare support, and strategic investment in productive infrastructure. The study therefore contributes to the broader literature by integrating household welfare and SME perspectives within a unified analytical framework. The empirical evidence suggests that sustainable subsidy reforms in emerging economies should combine fiscal adjustment with inclusive social protection measures, improved public transportation systems, SME financing initiatives, and stable energy infrastructure capable of reducing vulnerability to future fuel price shocks.

4.2. Policy Implications

Fuel subsidy reforms in emerging economies require carefully designed social protection mechanisms to minimize adverse welfare consequences on vulnerable households. The findings of this study indicate that rising transportation costs, food prices, and inflationary pressures significantly reduced household purchasing power and savings capacity. Policymakers should therefore implement targeted cash transfer programs, transport subsidies, and food support initiatives to cushion the immediate effects of fuel price increases on low-income households. Such interventions are

مجلة الغري للعلوم الاقتصادية والادارية
مجلد (22) عدد (2) 2026

necessary because many urban and rural households in developing economies allocate substantial proportions of their income to transportation and energy-related consumption. According to McCulloch (2023), effective social protection policies improve the political and economic sustainability of subsidy reforms. Similarly, Afrobarometer (2025) revealed widespread dissatisfaction among Nigerians regarding worsening living conditions after subsidy removal. Consequently, governments must ensure that fiscal savings from subsidy reforms are transparently redirected toward poverty reduction and welfare-enhancing programs capable of protecting economically vulnerable populations.

The findings further suggest that stable energy infrastructure should become a central policy priority in emerging economies implementing subsidy reforms. SMEs experienced significant increases in operational and production costs because of dependence on fuel-powered electricity generators. Policymakers should therefore prioritize investment in stable electricity supply systems capable of reducing enterprise dependence on expensive fuel alternatives. Improving energy infrastructure would lower production costs, enhance business competitiveness, and encourage private-sector investment. Omitogun et al. (2021) emphasized that energy reforms can only produce sustainable outcomes when accompanied by infrastructural improvements and environmentally efficient energy systems. Likewise, Iledare and Suberu (2021) argued that structural deficiencies within the Nigerian energy sector magnify the negative effects of fuel subsidy removal on productive activities. Governments should therefore channel part of the fiscal gains from subsidy reforms into renewable energy development,

مجلة الغري للعلوم الاقتصادية والادارية
مجلد (22) عدد (2) 2026

electricity generation, and industrial energy support programs aimed at improving economic productivity and long-term business sustainability.

The study also highlights the importance of SME-focused economic policies in mitigating the adverse effects of fuel subsidy removal. SMEs constitute a major source of employment, income generation, and economic diversification in emerging economies; however, rising transportation and production costs weakened their profitability and expansion capacity. Governments should therefore introduce low-interest credit facilities, tax incentives, and operational grants targeted at small and medium-scale enterprises affected by energy price increases. Such measures would help enterprises absorb short-term economic shocks while maintaining production and employment levels. Ukiri and Okafor (2025) noted that fuel subsidy reforms often create macroeconomic uncertainty capable of discouraging productive investment. Similarly, Folami (2025) observed that subsidy removal reduced SME financial resilience and operational stability in Nigeria. Supporting SMEs through affordable financing and business development initiatives would therefore enhance enterprise survival, stimulate investment, and reduce the long-term socioeconomic consequences of fuel subsidy reforms.

Another major policy implication concerns the need for gradual and transparent implementation of subsidy reforms. The findings demonstrate that abrupt increases in fuel prices generated severe inflationary pressures, social hardship, and declining living standards. Policymakers should therefore adopt phased subsidy reforms combined with clear communication strategies explaining the long-term economic objectives and expected welfare benefits of the policy. According to Clements et al. (2013), public

مجلة الغري للعلوم الاقتصادية والادارية
مجلد (22) عدد (2) 2026

resistance to subsidy reforms often emerges when governments fail to establish trust and accountability regarding the use of fiscal savings. Cheon and Urpelainen (2018) further argued that poorly managed energy reforms may trigger social unrest and political instability in developing countries. Governments should therefore strengthen institutional transparency by publicly disclosing how subsidy savings are allocated toward infrastructure, healthcare, education, and social development projects. Transparent governance mechanisms would improve public confidence and enhance the social acceptability of future economic reform policies.

The findings additionally imply that inflation management policies are essential for stabilizing welfare conditions after subsidy reforms. Since fuel prices significantly influence transportation, food distribution, and industrial production costs, increases in energy prices rapidly transmit inflationary pressures across the economy. Policymakers should therefore strengthen monetary and fiscal coordination to moderate inflation and maintain macroeconomic stability. Measures such as temporary tax relief on essential commodities, transportation support programs, and strategic agricultural investments could help reduce the inflationary spillover effects of subsidy removal. The National Bureau of Statistics (2023) reported sustained inflation increases following Nigeria's subsidy reform policy, while Couharde and Mouhoud (2020) emphasized that rising energy prices frequently worsen inequality and poverty conditions in emerging economies. Consequently, inflation-control measures should be integrated into subsidy reform frameworks to prevent deterioration in household welfare and to sustain economic resilience among vulnerable socioeconomic groups.

مجلة الغري للعلوم الاقتصادية والادارية
مجلد (22) عدد (2) 2026

Finally, the study underscores the importance of adopting inclusive and development-oriented subsidy reform strategies in emerging economies. While subsidy removal may improve fiscal sustainability and reduce government expenditure burdens, the policy must be balanced with investments that promote long-term socioeconomic development. Governments should prioritize investment in public transportation systems, healthcare services, education, and rural infrastructure to ensure that the benefits of fiscal reforms are broadly distributed across society. According to World Bank (2023), inclusive fiscal reforms contribute to sustainable economic growth when accompanied by strong social and infrastructural investments. Dissanayake et al. (2020) also argued that subsidy reforms should support broader developmental transitions capable of improving energy efficiency and economic resilience. Therefore, emerging economies should adopt integrated policy frameworks that combine fiscal discipline with inclusive growth strategies, thereby ensuring that subsidy reforms contribute not only to macroeconomic stability but also to poverty reduction, enterprise development, and improved welfare outcomes.

CONCLUSION

The study examined the socioeconomic implications of fuel subsidy removal on household welfare and SMEs investment in emerging economies, with particular emphasis on Nigeria. The findings revealed that subsidy removal significantly increased transportation costs, food prices, operational expenses, and general living costs, thereby reducing household purchasing power and weakening financial stability. The results further showed that SMEs experienced substantial increases in production and transportation costs, which negatively affected profitability, investment decisions, and

مجلة الغري للعلوم الاقتصادية والادارية
مجلد (22) عدد (2) 2026

business sustainability. Inferential analyses confirmed significant relationships between rising fuel prices, inflationary pressures, poverty conditions, and broader socioeconomic hardship. These findings support existing empirical evidence that fuel subsidy reforms in developing economies often generate severe short-term welfare consequences despite their potential long-term fiscal benefits. The study therefore concludes that fuel subsidy removal remains a highly sensitive economic policy with multidimensional effects on households, businesses, and overall socioeconomic stability in emerging economies.

The study also established that the adverse effects of subsidy removal are more severe among low-income households and small-scale enterprises because of their limited adaptive capacity and heavy dependence on fuel-related consumption and operational activities. Rising transportation and energy costs contributed significantly to inflationary pressures and declining living standards, while inadequate infrastructure, especially unstable electricity supply, intensified business vulnerability. Nevertheless, the findings demonstrated that appropriate mitigation measures such as targeted cash transfers, SME support programs, public transportation investment, and improved electricity infrastructure can significantly reduce the negative welfare implications of subsidy reforms. The regression and ANOVA results further confirmed that policy interventions play an important moderating role in determining the extent of socioeconomic hardship experienced after fuel subsidy removal. Consequently, the effectiveness of subsidy reforms largely depends on the strength of complementary welfare and economic support mechanisms implemented by governments.

مجلة الغري للعلوم الاقتصادية والادارية
مجلد (22) عدد (2) 2026

The study concludes that although fuel subsidy removal may contribute to fiscal sustainability, efficient resource allocation, and reduced government expenditure burdens, its success in emerging economies depends on the adoption of inclusive and carefully managed implementation strategies. Governments must ensure that subsidy savings are transparently invested in infrastructure development, social protection programs, and productive sectors capable of improving long-term economic resilience. Sustainable reforms require balancing macroeconomic objectives with social welfare priorities in order to prevent worsening poverty, inequality, and business instability. The study therefore recommends that policymakers adopt gradual reform approaches accompanied by inflation-control policies, targeted social interventions, and enterprise support initiatives capable of protecting vulnerable households and SMEs from severe economic shocks. Overall, the research contributes to the growing literature on subsidy reforms by providing integrated empirical evidence on the interconnected effects of fuel subsidy removal on household welfare, SME sustainability, and socioeconomic development in emerging economies.

References

Addah, G. A. (2025). Effect of fuel subsidy removal on the Nigerian economy: Implications for households in Nigeria. *BIMA Journal, 6*(2), 1603–1615. https://doi.org/10.37638/bima.6.2.1603-1615

Adekunle, I. A., & Oseni, I. O. (2021). Fuel subsidy removal and household consumption expenditure in Nigeria. *International Journal of Energy Economics and Policy*, *11*(3), 284–292. https://www.econjournals.com/index.php/ijeep

Adeleke, O. S., & Mohammed, L. A. (2025). Impact of the 2023 fuel subsidy removal policy on households in Nigeria. *International Journal of Social Sciences and Research*, *9*(1), 55–78.

Afrobarometer. (2025). *Nigerians see grim economic picture, favour reinstating fuel subsidies* (Dispatch No. 958). https://www.afrobarometer.org

Ajuwon, O., & Abiodun, K. J. (2026). Impact of fuel subsidy removal on the cost of living in Nigeria. *Journal of Smart Economic Growth*, *10*(3), 77–116. https://jseg.ro/index.php/jseg/article/view/327

Anikeze, N. H., Igbokwe, C. I., & Ifeoma, C. (2025). The impact of fuel subsidy removal on socio-economic development in Enugu State, Nigeria. *INOSR Arts and Management*, *11*(2), 1–10. https://doi.org/10.59298/INOSRAM/2025/112.110

Araar, A., & Verme, P. (2012). *Reforming subsidies: A tool-kit for policy simulations*. World Bank Policy Research Working Paper. https://openknowledge.worldbank.org

Asare, K. N., Essilfie, G., & Adom, P. K. (2020). Welfare implications of energy subsidy reforms in Ghana. *Energy Sources, Part B: Economics, Planning, and Policy*, *15*(6), 325–341. https://doi.org/10.1080/15567249.2020.1730562

Black, S., Liu, A. A., Parry, I., & Vernon, N. (2023). IMF fossil fuel subsidies data: Country-level estimates and welfare effects. *IMF Working Papers, 2023*(169). https://doi.org/10.5089/9798400246963.001

Blanchard, O., & Johnson, D. R. (2013). *Macroeconomics* (6th ed.). Pearson.

Cheon, A., & Urpelainen, J. (2018). Oil prices, fuel subsidies, and political protest in developing countries. *Energy Policy*, *117*, 532–540. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2018.03.021

Clements, B., Coady, D., Fabrizio, S., Gupta, S., Alleyne, T., & Sdralevich, C. (2013). *Energy subsidy reform: Lessons and implications*. International

Monetary Fund. https://www.imf.org/en/Publications/Books/Issues/2016/12/31/Energy-Subsidy-Reform-Lessons-and-Implications-40465

Coady, D., Flamini, V., & Sears, L. (2015). The unequal benefits of fuel subsidies revisited: Evidence for developing economies. *IMF Working Paper Series*. https://doi.org/10.5089/9781498343676.001

Couharde, C., & Mouhoud, E. M. (2020). Fossil fuel subsidies, income inequality, and welfare in emerging economies. *Energy Economics, 90*, 104817. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eneco.2020.104817

Dennis, A. (2016). Household welfare implications of fossil fuel subsidy reforms in developing countries. *Energy Policy, 96*, 597–606. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2016.06.039

Dissanayake, R., Judge, A., & Roberts, J. (2020). Fossil fuel subsidy reform and the energy transition in developing economies. *Climate Policy, 20*(9), 1132–1145. https://doi.org/10.1080/14693062.2020.1781033

Ekong, C. N., & Ebi, B. (2024). Implications of petrol subsidy removal on household income and standard of living in Bayelsa State, Nigeria. *African Review of Economics and Finance, 16*(2), 101–124.

Folami, T. (2025). Fuel subsidy removal, prices and household financial health in Nigeria. *Asian Journal of Economics and Finance, 12*(3–4), 67–89.

Gamette, P., & Oteng, C. (2024). Fuel subsidy removal in global south oil-producing economies: A review of literature. *Extractive Industries and Society, 17*, 101468. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.exis.2024.101468

Gana, M. I., Rabi, T. A., & Nura, M. B. (2024). Implications of fuel subsidy removal on Nigeria's sustainable development. *Nigerian Journal of Management Sciences, 25*(1), 279–286.

Iledare, W., & Suberu, R. (2021). Reforming petroleum subsidies in Nigeria: Policy options and challenges. *Energy Policy, 149*, 111987.

مجلة الغري للعلوم الاقتصادية والادارية
مجلد (22) عدد (2) 2026

International Monetary Fund. (2023). *Nigeria: Selected issues on energy subsidy reform*. IMF Country Report. https://www.imf.org

McCulloch, N. (2023). Fuel subsidy reform and social protection in low-income countries. *IDS Bulletin, 54*(2), 45–62. https://doi.org/10.19088/1968-2023.120

Mohammed, H. S., & Ibrahim, Y. (2025). Household welfare and consumption smoothing after fuel subsidy removal in Nigeria. *Journal of Development and Emerging Economies, 7*(2), 33–52.

National Bureau of Statistics. (2023). *Consumer price index report*. NBS. https://www.nigerianstat.gov.ng

Niagwan, T. T., & Maigari, A. M. (2024). Impact of fuel subsidy removal policy on households in Jos Metropolis of Plateau State. *University of Jos Journal of Political Science, 1*(2), 282–307. https://journals.unijos.edu.ng/index.php/ujjps/article/view/512

Nwakerendu, F. E., Nwanosike, D. U., & Ekpendu, E. J. (2025). Effect of fuel subsidy removal on households' expenditure patterns in Umuahia. *The Nigerian Journal of Energy & Environmental Economics, 15*(2), 87–102. https://journals.unizik.edu.ng/jes/article/view/5795

Omitogun, O., Ayinla, T., & Omotosho, B. (2021). Fuel subsidy removal and environmental sustainability in Nigeria. *Environmental Science and Pollution Research, 28*(41), 58471–58485. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11356-021-14572-0

Plante, M. (2014). The long-run macroeconomic impacts of fuel subsidies. *Journal of Development Economics, 107*, 129–143. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jdeveco.2013.11.008

Soile, I. I., & Mu, X. (2015). Who benefits from fuel subsidies in Nigeria? *Energy Policy, 87*, 314–324. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2015.09.018

مجلة الغري للعلوم الاقتصادية والادارية
مجلد (22) عدد (2) 2026

Ukiri, J. O., & Okafor, C. C. (2025). Fuel subsidy removal in Nigeria: A comparative macroeconomic assessment of the 2023 reform. *UK Review of Economics, Business and Management, 8*(6), 115–139.

Umeji, E., & Eleanya, K. (2021). Fuel subsidy reforms and poverty dynamics in sub-Saharan Africa. *Journal of African Business, 22*(4), 531–548. https://doi.org/10.1080/15228916.2020.1849756

Wesseh, P. K., & Lin, B. (2016). Incidence and impact: The regional variation of poverty effects due to fossil fuel subsidy reform. *Energy Policy, 96*, 491–503. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2016.06.025

World Bank. (2023). *Nigeria development update: Fiscal reforms and inclusive growth*. World Bank. https://www.worldbank.org

Yusuf, A. M., & Adedeji, F. T. (2024). Fossil fuel subsidy removal, economic welfare and environmental outcomes in Nigeria. *Journal of Cleaner Production, 448*, 141392. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2024.141392