



Fuel Subsidy Removal and Employees' Performance in the Federal Capital Territory Administration (FCTA), 2023 – 2024

¹LAWAL Adamu Abubakar, FSI & ²USAMA Abdullahi Barde

^{1&2}Department of Political Science and Public Administration, Baze University, Abuja, Nigeria

Mobile: ¹+2348106422444 & ²+2349080159668

Corresponding Email: abubakar.lawal@bazeuniversity.edu.ng

Abstract

Recently, in Nigeria, fuel subsidy was removed which has led to a great macro-based debate. However, a study on the effect on an individual might better provide important information on the impact of the policy, especially on the well-being of the masses. Thus, this study assessed fuel subsidy removal and employee performance in the Federal Capital Territory Administration (FCTA). Descriptive design method was adopted and in determining the number of mandate secretariats, purposive random sampling was used. Five mandate secretariats were selected for the study. The study was guided by four research objectives and questions and four research hypotheses were formulated and tested at the 0.05 level of significance. A questionnaire survey and structured close ended interview were utilized for data collection to address the study objectives based on respondents' perspectives. In that, 335 questionnaires were distributed to the selected mandate secretariats out of which 220 (65.7%) were returned and 115(34.3%) copies were not returned. The data collected were analyzed using inferential statistics. Frequency and simple percentages were used for demographic data; mean score, and weighted average values were utilized using Microsoft Excel spreadsheet and Ordinal scales was used to rank the data in ascending order after which the chi-square statistic was used to test the hypotheses formulated. The result of the findings revealed that fuel subsidy removal has affected employee performance in the FCTA. More so, the study also revealed that the staff received little compensation to counter the effect of the fuel subsidy removal. It was concluded that removing subsidy on fuel had triggered a decline in prospect of employee performance due to increased cost. For the interview, the results showed that majority of the respondents affirmed to the FCTA implementing several measures to mitigate the impact of fuel subsidy removal. It is recommended that staff should be rightly compensated to enhance their performance level and also, the outlined promises made by the Federal Government for implementing the fuel subsidy removal should be fulfilled to encourage them and to maintain relevance before the staff.

Keywords: Employees, Employee Performance, Federal Capital Territory Administration, Fuel Subsidy, Fuel Subsidy Removal.

Introduction

Nigeria has the second largest proven oil reserve in Africa at 37.2 billion barrels, second only to Libya and it is the continent's largest producer of oil (Siddig et al., 2015, p.165; Adekoya, 2020, September 3; Oliseh, 2020, October 3) producing about 1.78 million barrels per day in March, 2020. Nigeria's economy is almost entirely supported by proceeds from oil sales.

Nigeria has four refineries with the production capacity of 485,000 barrels of fuel per day, thus; the old Port Harcourt refinery built by shell has an installed processing capacity of 60,000 barrels per day. The Kaduna refinery was commissioned in 1988 with processing capacity of 150,000 barrels per day. Warri refinery has installed processing capacity of 125,000

barrels per day (NNPC, 2009). The total petroleum capacity of the refineries is inadequate to meet the nation's domestic consumption requirement and even with surplus for export. In spite of all these, Nigeria is a large net exporter of gasoline and other petroleum products. Nigeria is also an importer of refined petroleum products due to the inability of the country to maintain its refineries.

Due to low income of the citizens and poor infrastructural development especially in transportation, communication system and electric power system, the effect of petroleum products price increase is easily felt by majority of Nigerian people. Despite huge earnings from oil export, successive Nigerian governments have failed to use the oil wealth to significantly reduce poverty, provide social amenities needed by its people, hence, the introduction of fuel subsidy in the mid-1980s (Agu et al., 2018:6) to ameliorate the suffering of the people due to the high cost of pump price of fuel.

The transformation of any society or system depends on the effectiveness and efficiency of its civil service, particularly, the developing societies as the civil service is one of the agents of development in any nation. The implication of the subsidy removal on the welfare of civil servants is of utmost importance since they form part of the economy and do contribute their quota towards the overall development of the economy. The work performance of employees tends to play a role that is critical as far as achieving the goals of an economy is concerned. Many factors influence employee performance which serves as a function of the employee's ability and motivation to produce effectively and contribute to organization's goals. Different industries experience diverse effects due to fuel subsidy removal as changes in fuel costs may impact employees' financial stability, stress levels, and work-life balance. Therefore, analysing employee performance will help gauge the indirect effects on staff well-being and job satisfaction.

Statement of the Problem

The Nigerian petroleum sector has played a dominant and strategic role in the economy growth trajectory and this has helped in shaping the "now and then" economic structure of the country. As magnificent as this contribution is, the idea to remove fuel subsidy has not only been met with great scepticism, but also has had tremendous economic and social impacts on the Nigerian populace. The fuel subsidy removal has already made significant changes in the stock market, economics, financial instability, the atmosphere, education, food retailing, investment banking, and many other areas resulting in significant changes in organizational behaviour, holiday entitlement, welfare, educational methods, and so forth.

The effect of the subsidy removal is widespread, the problems associated with the fuel subsidy removal and employee performance has resulted in an increase in the cost of living, transport fare, cost of accommodation, reduction in savings rate and investments among others. The decision to remove this subsidy have a notable impact on inflation, particularly concerning transportation costs, food prices, and this could seriously affect the employee performance of most organizations. Civil servants no longer feel motivated to go to work as their salaries no longer cater for their needs. These problems and more have affected staff

inner drive leading to a reduction in their performance. Hence, this study is needed to draw a finding on fuel subsidy removal on employee performance in the Federal Capital Territory Administration (FCTA).

Objectives of the Study

- i. To examine the effect of fuel subsidy removal on employee performance in the Federal Capital Territory Administration (FCTA)
- ii. To determine how fuel subsidy removal impact performance and job satisfaction of staff in the Federal Capital Territory Administration (FCTA)
- iii. To examine the effect of fuel subsidy removal on better working conditions of staff in the Federal Capital Territory Administration (FCTA)
- iv. To examine the effect of fuel subsidy removal on compensation of staff in the Federal Capital Territory Administration (FCTA)
- v. To examine the palliative measures put in place by FCTA to cushion the effects of fuel subsidy removal

Research Hypotheses

Ho₁: There is no significant relationship between fuel subsidy removal and employee performance in the Federal Capital Territory Administration (FCTA)

Ho₂: Fuel subsidy removal has no impact on performance and job satisfaction of staff in the Federal Capital Territory Administration (FCTA)

Ho₃: Fuel subsidy removal does not have a positive significance on better working conditions of staff in the Federal Capital Territory Administration (FCTA)

Ho₄: Fuel subsidy removal does not have a positive significance on compensation of staff in the Federal Capital Territory Administration (FCTA)

Ho₅: FCTA palliative measure has no significant impact on mitigating the effects of fuel subsidy removal

Concept of Fuel Subsidy

Energy consumption subsidy is common in developing countries and it is defined as any government action that lowers the cost of energy production, raises the revenue of energy producers, or lowers the price paid by the energy consumers (Udonne and Akinyemi, 2018 :3). This kind of government support allows the energy to be purchased below the current market rate, hence, resulting in a saving to the public (Harun et al., 2018 :10). Energy subsidy and specifically fuel subsidy, which is the subject of this review, has a long history and has been applied in different forms with differing outcomes internationally (Onyeizugbe et al., 2012 :12). The main rationale behind subsidy is to help businesses and individuals purchase needed goods and services which they may under normal circumstances not be able to afford (Abdullateef et al., 2018 :60).

Employee performance

Employee performance can be defined as a means by which organizations achieve their goals either privately or publicly through its recurring activities. It can also be defined as the degree of accomplishing a task that makes up an employee's job (Nmadu, 2013 :13). It can

also be defined as the degree to which employees perform their duties and responsibilities (Sheilds et al., 2015:206).

Every organization is established with set objectives and human resources which are the basic tools needed for achieving desired goals and the reward system for every organization is employee performance. In order to achieve these goals, emphasis is laid on staff performance on an assigned task (Addison and Barnett, 2009 :145; Oravee, 2014:25). To contribute to the organization goals, managers must ensure that employee's activities and output contributes a lot to the growth and development of that organization. When staff are able to meet their intrinsic (needs such as added responsibility, achievement, advancement, recognition and so on) (Sapru, 2011 :628) and the extrinsic needs (such as pay, promotion, interpersonal relationship, status, and so on) (Sapru, 2011:628), they put in more efforts for the achievement of organizational goals (Oravee et al., 2018:59). If these needs are not met by the organization, a dissatisfied employee is created who then becomes so relaxed and thus exhibits nonchalant attitudes towards organizational activities (Oravee et al., 2018 :70).

History of Fuel Subsidy removal in Nigeria (1978-2024)

The history of fuel subsidy in Nigeria dates back to 1st October, 1978 when the military government of General Olusegun Obasanjo reviewed upward, the pump price of fuel which was at 8.4 kobo to 15.37 kobo, causing an 83% increase. The concern was for Government to generate enough money to run the administration particularly when it was preparing for the 1979 democratic elections and also to cater for the social needs of Nigerians (Ering and Akpan, 2012 :12). In 20th April, 1982, the civilian regime of Alhaji Shehu Shagari also raised the pump price to 20 kobo from 15.37 kobo, causing a 30% increase. Money realized from the fuel increase was used by members of the regime to buy properties in major capitals of European nations (USA, UK, Spain, France, and others) as against using same money to put in place social services that Nigerians badly needed then. The inept leadership of the then National party of Nigeria (NPN) national government and the corruption that bedevilled the administration led to its overthrow.

Then came the military junta of General Babangida who also increased the pump price to 39.50 kobo on March 31st, 1986, causing a 98% increase. This regime was notorious for numerous pump price increases. On April 10th, 1988, the regime increased it to 42 kobo from 39.50 kobo per litre, 6.3% increase and then again to 60 kobo for private cars on January 1st, 1989. On December 19th, 1989, he also moved it to a uniform price of 60k (0%). On March 6th 1991, the price of a litre increased from 60k to 70k (16.67% increase) and that was the price when General Ibrahim Babangida stepped aside in August 1993 (Olujobi et al., 2020 :252). These increases came at the time the regime chose to adopt a home-grown Structural Adjustment Program (SAP) as against external borrowing. His decision was greeted with massive protests by Nigerians. The economic down turn coupled with the increases made life really unbearable and Nigerians reacted angrily.

Chief Enerst Shonekan increased the price of a litre of fuel from 70kobo to #5 (614% increase) on November 8th, 1993 but a hectic mass protest saw General Abacha take over power. The incoming Abacha regime reduced the increment to #3.25 on November 22nd,

1993. A year later on October 2nd, 1994, it was again raised to #15.00, a 362% increase only to be reduced two days later to #11.00, 27% decrease by the General Abacha's regime on 4th October, 1994. The reduction was as a result of mass protests and coupled with the need to win the support of Nigerians. That was the price until General Abacha passed on 8th of June 1998 and the General Abdul Salami Abubakar caretaker regime raised the price from #11 to #25 (127.27% increase) on December 20th, 1998 and after days of sustained protest, it was forced to reduce the increment to #20 on January 6th, 1999 (Baghebo and Beauty, 2015 :134). This was during General Abdulsalami Abubakar brief transitional reign as a military ruler (Anyanwu, 1997:17).

He like others before him did not spare Nigerians the pains of fuel price increase. The decision witnessed sustained protests by Nigerians, the organized labour and the civil society organizations (CSOs). It is necessary at this point to place on record that it was only the military junta of Buhari/Idiagbon and Umaru Shehu Yar'adua that Nigerians were spared the ordeal of price increase. Others before and after them inflicted enormous pains on Nigerians as a result of the increases in fuel prices. This however may be because of the brief tenure of the regime and ill-health of Buhari and Yar'adua respectively, and it's focus on fighting corruption and indiscipline in the Nigerian society.

General Olusegun Obasanjo second counting as a civilian President did not help matters as he unleashed a reign of terror on Nigerians. In his eight years' reign, the nation witnessed several rounds of fuel price increases. The first started on June 1st, 2000 where the petrol price per litre was raised to #30.00 but only to be reduced to #25.00, a 17% decrease one week after, due to massive protests by organized labour, civil society organizations, and the ordinary Nigerians. Five days later on June 13th, 2000, the pump price was further adjusted to #22.00, a 12% decrease (George et al., 2014:7).

On January 1st, 2002, Obasanjo regime increased the price from #22.00 to #26.00, an 18% increase and to #40.00, a 54% increase on June 23rd, 2003 just one year after. In June 2007, also the same regime raised the price of fuel per litre to #70.00, a 75% increase but the Yar'adua regime later reduced it down to #65.00, a 7% decrease on assumption of office in May 2008. This was how it remained until President Goodluck Jonathan regime decided an outright removal of fuel subsidy from #65.00 to #138.00 and #250.00 which is 112.31% and 284.62% increase respectively. Interestingly the then Nigeria Labour Congress, President Comrade Adams Oshiomhole who had led several fights against fuel subsidy removal including fighting Olusegun Obasanjo, and as a sitting governor of Edo state joined his fellow Governors and the Federal Government to argue strongly for the complete removal of fuel subsidy. The issue was that while the nationwide consultations and discussion on fuel subsidy removal was still going on, the PPPRA on January 1st, 2012 announced the outright removal of fuel subsidy. This decision by the Goodluck Jonathan administration did not go down well with the masses of Nigeria. It resulted in massive strike actions and protests by the Nigerian Labour Congress, Trade Union Congress of Nigeria, PENGASAN, Civil society organization, Academic Staff Union of Universities and the generality of Nigerians. This prompt the Government to enter into a negotiation with the organize labour and rescinded its decision of an outright removal to a partial removal and reduced the pump prove to

between #138.00 naira and #250.00. On February 2015, election approaches reduced the price to #87.00 that is during Jonathan's administration (Ouyang and Lin, 2014 :933).

On Thursday May 12th, 2016, the Federal Government of Nigeria announced the removal of subsidy for the sale of petrol with immediate effect, placing the price at #145.00 per litre from #86.00. The Federal Government increased the price of petroleum from #86.50 to a maximum of #145.00 per litre. The 80% increase was announced to State House reporters by the Minister of State for petroleum Ibekachukwu in Daily trust in 2016. In same May 2016, the President Muhammadu Buhari administration announced the complete removal of fuel subsidy. This led to a significant increase in fuel prices, which resulted in nationwide protests (Solomon, 2016, October, 14). The government argued that removing the subsidy was necessary to address corruption, inefficiency, and the drain on public finances. However, due to the public backlash, the decision was reversed, and subsidies were partially reinstated (Bagirov and Mateus, 2019, :288). At his inauguration on Monday, May 29th, 2023, President Ahmed Bola Tinubu announced the total removal of the highly controversial but popular fuel subsidy, resulting in high prices and long queues nationwide. The fuel price jumped from the official pump price of #165.00 naira to between #350.00 and #550.00 (Abdulrahman, 2023, June 5). This is expected to have widespread economic consequences in Nigeria where 133 million people live in multidimensional poverty, according to the United Nations. Almost two months after Nigerian President Bola Tinubu scrapped a popular but costly fuel subsidy, petrol prices have risen to 617 naira (\$0.78) per litre, the highest in the history of Africa's largest oil producer (Abdulrahman, 2023, June 5). From May 2023 to May 2024, different fuel prices have been recorded with the highest being #700.00.

Impact of Fuel Subsidy removal

Fuel subsidy policies have extensive and multifaceted impacts on a nation's economy. These impacts can be both positive and negative, influencing various economic indicators and sectors.

Economic Impact

The economic impacts of fuel subsidy removal include:

1. **Inflation control:** By keeping fuel prices low, subsidies help stabilize the prices of goods and services, particularly in economies where transportation costs significantly affect overall prices. Lower fuel prices can help control the cost of living, making basic goods and services more affordable for consumers (Gberevbie et al., 2015 :129).
2. **Economic growth:** With lower fuel costs, households have more disposable income, which can boost consumer spending and stimulate economic growth. Also, businesses especially those in energy intensive industries benefit from reduced operational cost, potentially leading to higher profitability and investment (Onyeizugbe et al., 2012 :15).
3. **Sectoral Support:** Lower fuel prices can reduce the expenses associated with agricultural production such as irrigation and transportation, benefiting farmers and the agricultural sector. Also, reduced fuel prices lower the cost for public and private transportation, which can improve logistics and supply chain efficiency (Barkindo, 2010 :23).
4. **Fiscal burden:** Fuel subsidies can impose a significant fiscal burden on governments, especially when global fuel prices are volatile or increasing. Governments need to allocate

substantial financial resources to fund these subsidies, which can strain public budgets and limit resources available for other essential sectors like education, healthcare, or infrastructure (Lares, 2020 :18).

5. **Inefficiency and Market Distortions:** Subsidies can lead to inefficient allocation of resources and distort market dynamics. By artificially reducing fuel prices, subsidies can encourage excessive consumption and waste. They may also discourage investment in renewable energy sources and energy efficiency measures, hindering the transition to a more sustainable energy system (Oktaviani et al., 2007:.207).
6. **Environmental impact:** Fuel subsidies often lead to increased energy consumption, which in turn contributes to higher greenhouse gas emissions and environmental degradation. Subsidized fuel can incentivize the use of fossil fuels, exacerbating climate change and air pollution (Chelminski, 2018:.193).

Transportation Impact

This rise in transportation costs disproportionately affects low-income earners, who heavily rely on public transport for their daily activities. Moreover, the increased cost of fuel translates to higher operating costs for commercial vehicles, which may result in reduced profitability for transport businesses (Ajide et al., 2019: 122). Furthermore, the removal of fuel subsidy has broader implications for the efficiency and reliability of the transportation system. With higher fuel costs, transport operators may resort to cost-saving measures such as reducing vehicle maintenance or overcrowding vehicles to maximize revenue. This could potentially compromise passenger safety and exacerbate congestion on roads, further impeding the flow of traffic and exacerbating environmental pollution. According to Owoeye & Sanusi (2020: 102) there is a shift in consumer preferences towards alternative modes of transportation, such as motorcycles and tricycles, which are perceived as more fuel-efficient and cost-effective options in the absence of subsidized fuel

Employee Welfare and Well-being Impact

With the price of premium motor spirit (PMS) increased; the economy will face a sudden surge of inflation. Inflation is defined as a general and progressive increase in prices for goods and services. As inflation rate sets in, more naira will purchase fewer goods causing depreciation in its value (Edmund, 2013 :30).

Employees are also affected by the removal of the fuel subsidy, as they have to pay more for transportation to and from work. Many employees rely on public transport, such as buses, taxis and motorcycles, which have also increased their fares due to the higher cost of fuel (Babayomi, 2014:.189). Some employees may have to spend more than half of their salaries on transportation alone, leaving little for other expenses such as food, rent and health care. Some employees may have to look for alternative sources of income or seek employment closer to their homes to reduce their transportation costs. Some employees may also face the risk of losing their jobs if their employers cannot afford to pay them or sustain their businesses (Onyishi et al., 2012 :15).

Effect of Fuel Subsidy Removal on Employee Performance

Positive Impacts of Fuel Subsidy removal on Employee performance

1. **Cost Awareness:** With the removal of subsidies, employees may become more conscious of fuel costs, leading to better fuel consumption practices. This heightened awareness could result in more efficient use of company vehicles and reduced personal commuting expenses, positively impacting overall performance (Nmadu, 2013 :.23).
2. **Innovation and Efficiency:** Higher fuel costs might incentivize companies to seek innovative ways to improve efficiency and reduce fuel consumption. This drive for optimization can lead to streamlined processes and better resource management, potentially enhancing employee performance (Oravee, 2014 :22).
3. **Remote Work and Flexibility:** As fuel prices rise, companies may encourage remote work options or flexible schedules to help employees reduce commuting expenses. Offering such flexibility can boost employee morale and performance by reducing commuting stress and allowing a better work-life balance (Brazilian and Onyeji, 2012:.3).

Negative Impacts of Fuel Subsidy removal on Employee performance

1. **Increased Commuting Costs:** With fuel subsidies gone, employees may face higher transportation expenses, especially if they rely on personal vehicles for commuting. The increased financial burden could lead some employees to seek job opportunities closer to their homes or ones that offer better transportation benefits (Akinwale et al., 2013:.43).
2. **Economic Pressure on Companies /Ministries:** When fuel subsidies are removed, the cost of fuel typically rises, impacting operational costs for businesses. Companies / Ministries may respond by implementing cost-cutting measures, including layoffs or reduced benefits, which could lead to higher staff turnover (Fidelis and Egberere, 2013 :124).
3. **Job Insecurity:** The removal of fuel subsidies may signal economic uncertainty, leading employees to become more cautious about their job stability. This perception of job insecurity could encourage some employees to actively look for alternative job opportunities, increasing staff turnover (Babalola, 2014 :108).
4. **Industry-Specific Impact:** The impact of fuel subsidy removal on staff turnover can vary across industries. Sectors heavily reliant on fuel, such as transportation and logistics, may experience more significant effects compared to industries less dependent on fuel (Atah, 2019, p.6).
5. **Company Policies and Adaptation:** How companies adapt to the subsidy removal can play a crucial role. Some businesses might absorb the increased costs to retain their workforce, while others may not be able to do so. Companies with better strategies to manage the transition may have a lower turnover rate (Akinola, 2018, p.265).

Theoretical Framework

Hierarchy of Needs Theory

Abraham Maslow, a prominent psychologist, proposed the influential Hierarchy of Needs theory in the mid-20th century (Pichère, Probert & Cadiat, 2015:10-22). This theory suggests that human needs can be organized into a hierarchical structure, ranging from basic

physiological needs at the foundation to higher-order needs like self-actualization at the top. Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs has faced several critiques. Some argue that empirical validation is limited, while others claim cultural bias, suggesting that the hierarchy may not apply universally due to cultural variations. Despite these criticisms, Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs remains a highly influential and widely referenced theory in psychology and related disciplines, providing a framework for understanding human motivation and behaviour.

Maslow's hierarchy of needs theory is adopted to serve as the framework that underpins this study. The theory serves as the blueprint that guides the study enquiry into the possible effect of fuel subsidy removal on employee performance in the FCTA. In the context of the proposed study, the removal of fuel subsidies and the consequent increase in transportation costs could potentially impact the ability of employees to meet their lower-level needs, such as physiological and safety needs (Yunusa, Yakubu, Emeje, Ibrahim, Stephen & Egbunu, 2023:14-27)). This situation may arise due to the increased financial burden associated with commuting to work and fulfilling basic needs like food, shelter, and security.

According to Maslow's theory, if employees are preoccupied with meeting their basic physiological and safety needs due to the increased financial strain, their work motivation and effectiveness may suffer. Additionally, the stress associated with this situation could negatively impact their physical and mental well-being, further hampering their performance. By applying Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs theory, the study can explore how the removal of fuel subsidy and the subsequent changes in employees' ability to meet their fundamental needs may influence their overall performance in the FCTA.

Methodology

Research Design

This study employed a descriptive survey research design, in this design, population of the study was studied through collecting and analysing data from only representative sample of the entire group. The data was collected through qualitative and quantitative method by using structured close-ended interview, and close-ended questionnaire respectively.

Study Area

Federal Capital Territory Administration (FCTA) is the study area. It is an organ of Federal Government of Nigeria charged with responsibility of running affairs of the Federal Capital Territory. It operates on a functional pedestal of seven (7) mandate Secretariats which handle issues pertaining to all aspects of Human endeavour.

Population of the Study

The population of the study has over 28,000 staff strength which consists of all staff and management of Federal Capital Territory Administration (FCTA). This also comprises of all the departments and agencies under the administration. However, the staff from the various agencies and departments were already grouped into mandate secretariats The Seven Secretariats are; Transport (3280 staff), Education (5670 staff), Social Development (3250

staff), Agriculture (4040 staff), Area Councils (2856 staff), Health and Human Services (5900 staff), and Legal Services and Gender (3004 staff) recently introduced by the President Tinubu Administration.

Sample Size and Sampling Technique

Sampling Technique

Purposive random sampling method which is a non-probability sampling procedure usually used in qualitative research was used to select the mandate Secretariats and the staff population used for the study. The purposive random sampling was adopted because of the large number of staff in the Federal Capital Territory Administration (FCTA). Great care was exercised to get a fair representation of population of 400 as a sample for each secretariat and a total of 2000. The selected mandate secretariats are; Transport, Education, Agriculture, Health and Human Services, and Social Development.

Taro Yamane (Yamane, 1967) formula was used to determine the sample size thus:

$$n = N / 1 + N(e)^2$$

Where,

n = Sample size,

N= Population,

e = Level of precision (error limit)

For this study, 0.05 level of precision on the basis of 95% confidence level was used.

Using the formula,

$$n = 2,000 / 1 + 2,000(0.05)^2$$

$$n = 2,000 / 1 + 2,000(0.0025)$$

$$n = 2,000 / 1 + 5$$

$$n = 2,000 / 6$$

$$n = 333.33$$

Approximately, n = 333.

Therefore, the sample size of the research study was 333.

Data Collection Procedure

The study employed two methods to collect the required primary data for analysis;

1. **Questionnaire:** The questionnaire designed for this research was structured to ensure that appropriate variables that define the scope of the research were captured.
2. **Interview:** A structured close-ended interview was used to get response from the respondents on fuel subsidy removal and employee performance in the Federal Capital Territory Administration (FCTA).

Data Analysis and Results

Questionnaire

The objectives of the study were used to develop a questionnaire which was used to get answers from the sampled respondents. Several factors and problems of fuel subsidy removal and employee performance exist from a review from past research works. However, in this research, respondents were asked to mark the degree of agreement as it relates to fuel

subsidy removal and employee performance in their sectors. The responses were then analyzed and the following result was deducted as shown in the tables below.

Table 4.4: Effect of Fuel Subsidy Removal and Employee performance in Federal Capital Territory Administration (FCTA)

Variables	SA	A	UD	D	SD
1 My salary is no longer capable of meeting my needs	46	12	4	5	0
2 The change in transportation cost has affected my willingness to go to work	38	10	8	4	7
3 The proportion of my salary devoted to the purchase of consumable goods has increased	48	14	5	0	0
4 Fuel subsidy has influenced my willingness to take on additional work or responsibilities	45	20	1	0	1
5 There are changes in my punctuality and attendance at work since the fuel subsidy removal	54	10	3	0	0
6 Fuel subsidy removal has impacted my work-related expenses such as fieldwork and so on	44	14	3	0	6
7 I have noticed changes in my work performance since the fuel subsidy removal and the subsequent compensation changes	40	22	2	3	0

Source: Field Survey, 2023

Table 4.4 above shows the response for each variable. It can be observed from the table that there are changes in the respondents' punctuality and attendance at work since the fuel subsidy removal which had the highest number of strongly agreed respondents' 54(80.6%) and the least from the responses is change in transportation cost which has affected the respondents' willingness to go to work which recorded 38(56.7%).

There is a multifaceted relationship between fuel subsidy removal and employee performance, as it could be seen that with higher fuel prices, employees face increased transportation cost, increased cost of living and so on. This in return contributes to a less effective and more stressful life for employees, directly impacting their performance.

Table 4.4.1: Mean and Standard Deviation of Respondents' Response

S/n	Junior Staff		Senior Staff		Executive		Ave Mean	Ave Rank
	Mean±SD	Rank	Mean±SD	Rank	Mean±SD	Rank		
1	2.04±2.73	4	5.79±4.59	4	14.28±7.23	5	21.93	4
2	1.82±2.52	6	5.17±4.24	7	12.80±6.67	7	19.31	7
3	2.11±2.80	2	5.98±4.71	2	14.80±7.42	2	22.89	2
4	2.10±2.79	3	5.76±4.56	5	14.38±7.17	4	21.78	5
5	2.17±2.87	1	5.94±4.69	3	14.71±7.38	3	23.74	1
6	1.97±2.69	5	5.59±4.52	6	13.85±7.12	6	21.32	6
7	2.04±2.71	4	6.13±4.83	1	15.19±7.61	1	22.70	3

Source: Field Survey, 2023

Table 4.4.1 above shows the mean score value (MS) and ranking of factors from each stakeholder's perspective and the overall analysis. For the Junior staff, for example changes in

punctuality and attendance at work since the fuel subsidy removal had the highest mean score (2.17±2.87). Changes also occurred for senior staff and Executives as in the table above.

Table 4.5: Fuel Subsidy Removal impact on Performance and Job satisfaction of Staff in Federal Capital Territory Administration (FCTA)

Variables	SA	A	UD	D	SD
1 Fuel subsidy removal has increased my job satisfaction	10	8	12	10	27
2 I am no longer motivated to work	42	14	6	0	5
3 Fuel subsidy removal has directly impacted my employee benefits such as health insurance, retirement plans, allowances	39	12	6	5	5
4 The changes in employee benefits resulting from the fuel subsidy removal has impacted my job satisfaction and motivation	34	12	0	12	9
5 The changes in working conditions has impacted my motivation and job satisfaction	36	13	6	8	4

Source: Field Survey, 2023

It can be observed from table 4.5 above that I am no longer motivated to work had the highest number of strongly agreed respondents' 42(70.1%), followed by other responses. This financial strain can contribute to dissatisfaction, as employees may feel the pinch of increased expenses without a corresponding increase in their wages. There is a strong correlation between job satisfaction and employee performance. Satisfied employees are generally more engaged, motivated, and committed to their work.

Table 4.5.1: Mean and Standard Deviation of Respondents' Response

S/n	Junior Staff		Senior Staff		Executive		Ave Mean	Ave Rank
	Mean±SD	Rank	Mean±SD	Rank	Mean±SD	Rank		
1	1.12±1.62	5	3.17±2.73	5	7.85±4.29	5	10.30	5
2	1.96±2.66	1	5.55±4.48	1	13.76±7.05	1	21.04	1
3	1.87±2.56	2	5.30±4.31	2	13.14±6.79	2	19.88	2
4	1.70±2.40	4	4.82±4.03	4	11.95±6.35	4	17.84	4
5	1.83±2.51	3	5.19±4.22	3	12.85±6.64	3	19.27	3

Source: Field Survey, 2023

For the Junior staff, respondents are longer motivated to work had the highest mean score (1.96±2.66), followed by other responses on the same variables recorded for Senior staff with mean scores of (5.55±4.48), (5.30±4.31) and (5.19±4.22) respectively, and Executives with mean scores of (13.76±7.05), (13.14±6.79), and (12.85±6.64) respectively.

Table 4.6: Effect of Fuel Subsidy Removal on Better working conditions of Staff in the Federal Capital Territory Administration (FCTA)

Variables	SA	A	UD	D	SD
1 Fuel subsidy removal has affected my daily commute to work	40	12	10	5	0
2 There are changes in transportation costs to and from work due to the subsidy removal	48	12	2	0	5
3 There have been adjustments to my organization's policies in response to the fuel subsidy removal	9	8	10	25	15
4 There have been adjustments to my working hours or schedule such as staggered shifts, flexible hours and so on	10	10	4	15	28
5 The fuel subsidy removal has influenced my organization's approach to remote work or telecommuting	11	12	10	32	2

Source: Field Survey, 2023

Table 4.6 above showed that there are changes in transportation costs to and from work due to the subsidy removal had the highest number of strongly agreed respondents' 48(71.6%), followed by other responses.

Table 4.6.1: Mean and Standard Deviation of Respondents' Response

S/n	Junior Staff		Senior Staff		Executive		Ave Mean	Ave Rank
	Mean±SD	Rank	Mean±SD	Rank	Mean±SD	Rank		
1	1.95±2.62	2	5.53±4.41	2	7.61±4.42	5	20.71	2
2	2.03±2.75	1	5.75±4.62	1	9.47±4.82	3	22.08	1
3	1.17±1.62	4	3.28±3.06	4	8.19±4.28	4	10.51	4
4	1.08±1.59	5	3.07±2.68	5	14.23±7.28	1	9.98	5
5	1.35±1.82	3	3.30±2.72	3	13.71±6.94	2	12.47	3

Source: Field Survey, 2023

Table 4.6.1 above showed that for the Junior staff, changes in transportation costs to and from work due to the subsidy removal had the highest mean score (2.03±2.75) followed by other variables with corresponding responses on other category of staff.

Table 4.7: Effect of Fuel Subsidy Removal on Compensation of Staff in the Federal Capital Territory Administration (FCTA)

Variables	SA	A	UD	D	SD
1 I feel adequately supported by my organization during this period of fuel subsidy removal	14	12	14	16	11
2 The changes in compensation has affected my overall financial situation	10	10	12	10	25
3 The fuel subsidy removal has directly impacted my compensation such as salary, allowances, bonuses and so on	38	14	4	5	6
4 The fuel subsidy removal has affected my financial planning and budgeting, considering changes in benefits	54	10	0	3	0
5 I have made adjustments to my lifestyle or expenses due to the changes in compensation after the fuel subsidy removal	44	14	3	2	4

Source: Field Survey, 2023

It can be observed from table 4.7 above that the fuel subsidy removal has affected respondents' financial planning and budgeting, considering changes in benefits had the highest number of strongly agreed respondents' 54(80.6%), followed by other variables with corresponding responses.

Table 4.7.1: Mean and Standard Deviation of Respondents' Response

S/n	Junior Staff		Senior Staff		Executive		Ave Mean	Ave Rank
	Mean± SD	Rank	Mean± SD	Rank	Mean± SD	Rank		
1	1.38±1.91	4	3.90±3.22	4	9.66±5.07	4	13.14	4
2	1.16±1.67	5	3.28±2.81	5	8.14±4.42	5	10.75	5
3	1.86±2.55	3	5.26±4.30	3	13.04±6.78	3	19.73	3
4	2.14±2.86	1	6.07±4.81	1	15.04±7.57	1	23.52	1
5	1.99±2.69	2	5.63±4.53	2	13.95±7.13	2	21.43	2

Source: Field Survey, 2023

From table 4.7.1 above, it can be observed that for the Junior staff, fuel subsidy removal has affected respondents' financial planning and budgeting, considering changes in benefits had the highest mean score (2.14±2.86), followed by other variables with corresponding responses for each category of staff.

Table 4.8: Palliative Measures placed by FCTA to cushion the effect of Fuel Subsidy removal

Variables	SA	A	UD	D	SD
1 I am aware of the palliative measures implemented by FCTA in response to fuel subsidy removal	10	12	10	0	35
2 The palliative measures provided by the FCTA adequately addressed the economic challenges caused by the fuel subsidy removal	5	6	0	18	38
3 I have personally received assistance from FCTA in form of grains (maize, rice, etc.)	5	6	0	12	44
4 I have observed a community-based initiative or support in my locality aimed at mitigating the effects of fuel subsidy removal	11	8	4	10	34
5 The FCTA has implemented subsidies for public transportation to help ease burden on commuters facing increased transportation costs	14	5	0	0	48
6 The Government has introduced initiatives to stimulate economic growth thereby helping the public cope with financial challenges	4	2	3	44	14

Source: Field Survey, 2023

Table 4.8 above showed that the FCTA has implemented subsidies for public transportation to help ease burden on commuters facing increased transportation costs had the highest number of strongly agreed respondents' 14(20.9%), followed by other variables with corresponding responses for each category of staff.

Table 4.8.1: Mean and Standard Deviation of Respondents' Response

S/n	Junior Staff		Senior Staff		Executive		Ave Mean	Ave Rank
	Mean± SD	Rank	Mean± SD	Rank	Mean± SD	Rank		
1	1.11±1.65	1	3.13±2.78	1	5.57±3.05	7	10.40	1
2	0.83±1.18	6	2.36±3.77	6	5.85±3.14	6	6.95	6
3	0.79±1.15	7	2.25±1.94	7	7.71±4.17	2	6.62	7
4	1.04±1.56	3	2.94±2.63	3	7.28±4.14	3	8.89	4
5	0.93±1.52	5	2.65±2.55	5	6.57±4.02	5	9.60	3
6	0.94±1.95	4	2.67±2.01	4	6.61±3.16	4	7.50	5
7	1.10±1.57	2	3.11±2.65	2	7.76±4.38	1	9.96	2

Source: Field Survey, 2023

For the Junior staff, I am aware of the palliative measures implemented by FCTA in response to fuel subsidy removal had the highest mean score (1.11±1.65), followed by other variables with corresponding responses for each category

Close-ended Interview

Close-ended questions were used to get answers from the respondents. A total of 220 persons were interviewed and the responses were analyzed as follows:

Table 4.9: Measures set by the FCTA to cushion the effect of Fuel Subsidy removal

S/n	Variables	Yes	No
1	I am aware of the palliative measures implemented by the FCTA to mitigate the impact of fuel subsidy removal on employees	168	52
2	I have personally received support from the FCTA since fuel subsidy removal	94	126
3	The FCTA has implemented measures to mitigate the impact of subsidy removal on employee performance	116	104
4	The FCTA has reviewed and potentially adjust compensation and benefit packages to support employees	163	57
5	There are designated channels provided by the FCTA for employees to seek assistance or information related to the effects of fuel subsidy removal	147	73

Source: Field Survey, 2023

The table above showed that majority of the respondents 168(76.3%) are aware of the palliative measures implemented by the Federal Capital Territory Administration (FCTA) to mitigate the impact of fuel subsidy removal on employees. This is most likely because the organization has an improved and effective communication channels, transparent policies, and a supportive work culture, hence, most of the employees were well informed.

On the contrary, majority of the respondents 94(42.7%) disagreed to personally receiving support from the FCTA since fuel subsidy removal.

Majority of the respondents 116(52.7%) agreed that the Federal Capital Territory Administration (FCTA) has implemented measures to mitigate the impact of subsidy removal and employee performance.

The Federal Capital Territory Administration (FCTA) has already reviewed and potentially adjust compensation and benefit packages to support employees in response to fuel subsidy removal. These benefits include; reviewing salary structures to account for

increased cost of living, provision of alternative transportation options to alleviate the increased commuting expenses, flexible work arrangement, establishing clear communication channels to address the impact of fuel subsidy removal and offer counselling services to help employees manage any resulting stress or concerns. Therefore, majority of the respondents 163(74.1%) agreed to the statement.

There are designated channels provided by the Federal Capital Territory Administration (FCTA) for employees to seek assistance or information related to the effects of fuel subsidy removal recorded an affirmative for majority of the respondents.

Findings

- i. From the result of the analysis, it can be seen that most of the respondents' 40(59.7%) stated that fuel subsidy removal is not a good idea as it has affected their attitude and performance level at work. More so, majority of them 46(68.6%) also stated that their salary is not enough to meet their needs as their savings together with purchasing power has reduced as a result of fuel subsidy removal and has therefore affected their quality of life.
- ii. Changes in punctuality and attendance at work since the fuel subsidy removal had the highest number of strongly agreed respondents' 54(80.6%). The proportion of respondents' salary devoted to the purchase of consumable goods has increased recorded 48(70.6%), followed by respondents' salary is not enough to meet their needs which recorded 46(68.6%). The least record for strongly agreed is change in transportation cost has affected respondents' willingness to go to work which recorded 38(56.7%). Thus, it can be concluded that the performance of workers has declined as a result of fuel subsidy removal.
- iii. It was observed that respondents are no longer motivated to work had the highest number of strongly agreed respondents' 42(70.1%). Next is fuel subsidy removal has directly impacted respondents' employee benefits such as health insurance, retirement plans, allowances which recorded 39(58.2%). The least record for strongly agreed is fuel subsidy removal has increased respondents' job satisfaction which recorded 10(14.9%). Thus, it can be concluded that fuel subsidy removal has a direct impact on high job satisfaction and performance of staff in the Federal Capital Territory Administration (FCTA).
- iv. Changes in transportation costs to and from work due to the subsidy removal had the highest number of strongly agreed respondents' 48(71.6%). Next is fuel subsidy removal has affected respondents' daily commute to work which recorded 40(59.7%). The least record for strongly agreed is there has been adjustments to respondents' organization's policies or work arrangements in response to the fuel subsidy removal which recorded 9(13.4%). Thus, it can be concluded that fuel subsidy removal has a direct impact on better working conditions of staff in the Federal Capital Territory Administration (FCTA).
- v. Fuel subsidy removal has affected respondents' financial planning and budgeting, considering changes in benefits had the highest number of strongly agreed respondents' 54(80.6%). Next is respondents' have made adjustments to their lifestyle or expenses due

to the changes in compensation after the fuel subsidy removal which recorded 44(65.7%). The least record for strongly agreed is the changes in compensation has affected respondents' overall financial situation which recorded 10(14.9%). Thus, it can be concluded that fuel subsidy removal has a direct impact on compensation of staff in the FCTA.

- vi. FCTA has implemented subsidy for public transportation to help ease burden on commuters facing increased transportation costs had the highest number of strongly agreed respondents' 14(20.9%). Next is respondents' have observed a community-based initiative or support in their locality aimed at mitigating the effects of fuel subsidy removal which recorded 11(16.4%). The least record for strongly agreed is the government has introduced initiatives to stimulate economic growth thereby helping the public cope with financial challenges which recorded 4(5.8%). Thus, it can be concluded that Palliative measures placed by FCTA has a direct influence on fuel subsidy removal.
- vii. Majority of the respondents affirmed to the FCTA implementing several measures to mitigate the impact. 168(76.3%) are aware of the palliative measures implemented by the FCTA to mitigate the impact of fuel subsidy removal on employees, 116(52.7%) agreed that the FCTA has implemented measures to mitigate the impact of subsidy removal and employee performance., 163(74.1%) agreed that the FCTA has already reviewed and potentially adjust compensation and benefit packages to support employees in response to fuel subsidy removal, and 147(66.8%) agreed that there are designated channels provided by the FCTA for employees to seek assistance or information related to the effects of fuel subsidy removal. Thus, it can be concluded that the FCTA reflects its dedication to the well-being of its stakeholders.

Conclusion

There was an evidence of a linear relationship between fuel subsidy removal and employee performance and also between fuel subsidy removal and compensation of staff, hence the null hypothesis was rejected. However, the null hypothesis stating that there is no significant relationship between fuel subsidy removal and better working conditions of staff, and FCTA's palliative measures has no significant relationship on fuel subsidy removal

The respondents are not financially motivated during and after the fuel subsidy removal and the condition of them to be effective in their job description becomes optional. This is because the removal of fuel subsidy had given birth to a high standard of living in the Federal Capital Territory (FCT).

Changes in punctuality and attendance at work, salary is no longer capable of meeting my needs, proportion of respondents' salary devoted to the purchase of consumable goods has increased were the critical factors that contributed to the effect of fuel subsidy removal and low employee performance in the study area.

Although most of the respondents were aware of the palliative measures implemented by Government in response to fuel subsidy removal, majority of them have not benefitted from financial incentives such as sundry increase because it has not been implemented yet.

Majority of the respondents affirmed to the Federal Capital Territory Administration (FCTA) implementing several measures to mitigate the impact of fuel subsidy removal. Thus, it can be concluded that the FCTA reflects its dedication to the well-being of its stakeholders.

The survey therefore, indicates that removing subsidy on fuel had triggered a decline in prospect of employee performance due to increased cost. Most staff experienced decline in their day-to-day activities ranging from reduction in hour of work per day, and reduction in income. In a nutshell, it could be said that fuel subsidy removal has a negative impact on the welfare of staff as well as their performance level.

Recommendations

- 1) The remuneration of staff should be properly reviewed using the present economic situation in the country as the basis.
- 2) The outlined promises made by the Federal Government for implementing the fuel subsidy removal should be fulfilled to maintain relevance before the citizens.
- 3) Staff should be motivated to work to promote the furtherance of the mission statement of the civil service of the federation so as to save it from extinction.
- 4) Government should sufficiently involve the public servants in the process of decision and policy making particularly on issues and policies that affect their lives such as the subsidy removal.

REFERENCES

- Abdullateef, R.M., Abubakar, Y.S., Lanre, A.R., Adeshina, I.O., Abdulbaqi, S.Z., Joseph, A.O. and Raji, A.A. (2018). Fuel subsidy removal and the lives of rural dwellers in Nigeria. *International Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities Reviews*. 8(1):60-68.
- Addison, J.T. and Barnett, A.H. (2009). The impact of unions on performance. *British Journal of Industrial Relations*. 20(2):145-162.
- Agu, A.O., Ekwutosi, O.C. and Augustine, A.N. (2018). Effect of subsidy removal on Nigerian economy. *Advance Research Journal of MultiDisciplinary Discoveries*. 23(1):6-12.
- Ajide, K.B., Ibrahim, M., & Opeyemi, A. (2019). Subsidy Removal and Public Transportation in Nigeria: The Case of Ondo State. *International Journal of Humanities, Art and Social Studies*, 4(2), 108-122.
- Akinola, A.O. (2018). Oil subsidy administration in Nigeria. *Globalization, Democracy and Oil Sector Reform in Nigeria*. 1(3):231-265.
- Anyanwu, J.C. (1997). *The Structure of the Nigerian Economy from 1960-1997*, published by Joance Educational Publisher ltd. ISBN: 978-278-17-6.
- Atah, C.A. (2019). Principals' leadership style and role performance as predictor for security measure in secondary school in Obudu Local Government area of Cross River State, Nigeria. *International Journal of Education and Evaluation*. 5(1):1-6.
- Babalola, O.O. (2014). An evaluation of the Nigerian oil sector in Nigerian association of energy economics. *Proceedings of the 2014 IAEE Conference, Energy Access for Economic Development Policy, Institutional Frameworks and Strategic Options*. 2014:106-125.

- Babayomi, O. (2014). Review of the key provisions of the petroleum industry Bill and the implications on deregulation. *Journal of Sustainable Development, Law and Policy*. 3(2014):189-201.
- Bagirov, M. and Mateus, C. (2019). Oil prices, stock markets and firm performance: Evidence from Europe. *International Review of Economics & Finance*. 61:270-288.
- Barkindo, M. (2010). Assessment of the implication of full-scale deregulation of the downstream oil sector on the Nigerian economy in global. *Journal of Political Science Administration*. 1(2):23-48.
- Bazilian, M. and Onyeji, I. (2012). Fossil fuel subsidy removal and inadequate public power supply: Implications for businesses. *Energy Policy*. 45(1):1-5.
- Chelminski, K. (2018). Fossil fuel subsidy reform in Indonesia. The politics of fossil fuel subsidies and their reform. 4(1):193-211.
- Fidelis, E.A. and Egbere, M.I. (2013). The perception of Nigerians on the deregulation and privatisation moves of the government in the oil and gas industry in Nigeria. *International Journal of Public Administration and Management Research*. 2(1):124.
- Gberevbie, D.E., Ibietan, J., Abasilim, D. and Excellence-Oluye, N.U.O. (2015). Deregulation policy and development in Nigeria: the petroleum sector experience, 1999-2014. *Journal of Social Development in Africa*. 30(2):129.
- George, T., Elegbeleye, A., Chukwuedozie, O. and Idowu, E.A. (2014). Social and Psychological Effects of the Removal of Fuel Subsidy on the Nigerian Family. *Global Journal of Human Social Science*. 14(1):1-7.
- Harun, M., Mat, S.H., Fadzim, W.R., Khan, J.M. and Noor, M.S.Z. (2018). Effects of Fuel Subsidy Removal on Input Costs of Productions: Leontief Input-Output Price Model. *International Journal of Supply Chain Management*. 7(5):10-15.
- Lares, D.M. (2020). Financial work incentives: what is the impact on motivation for exceptional performance? *International Journal of Business Research and Information Technology*. 7(1):13-18.
- Oktaviani, R., Hakim, D.B. and Sahara, S. (2007): Impact of a Lower Subsidy on Indonesian Macroeconomic Performance, Agricultural Sector and Poverty Incidences: A Recursive Dynamic Computable General Equilibrium Analysis. *MPIA Working Paper 2007-2008*. P:207
- Oliseh, C. (2020). Federal government gives reasons for fuel subsidy removal, discloses alternative to kerosene. Retrieved from www.nairametrics.com. Accessed on: 3rd October, 2020.
- Olujobi, O.J., Olujobi, O.M. and Ufua, D.E. (2020). A critical appraisal of legal framework on deregulation of the downstream sector of the Nigerian Petroleum Industry. *International Journal of Management*. 11(6):252-268.
- Onyishi, A.O., Eme, O.I. and Emeh, I.E. (2012). The Domestic and International Implications of Fuel Subsidy Removal Crisis in Nigeria. *Kuwait Chapter of Arabian Journal of Business and Management Review*. 1(6):10-15
- Oravee, A. (2014). Human Resource Development and Employee Performance: A study of University of Agriculture, Makurdi, Lapai. *Journal of Management Sciences, Special Edition*. Pp:1-25.

- Ouyang, X. and Lin, B. (2014). Impacts of increasing renewable energy subsidies and phasing out fossil fuel subsidies in China. *Renewable and sustainable energy Reviews*. 37:933-942.
- Owoeye, T.S., & Sanusi, A. A. (2020). An Analysis of the Impact of Fuel Subsidy Removal on Transportation Cost and the Nigerian Economy. *European Journal of Business, Economics and Accountancy*, 8(2), 102-111.
- Sapru, R.K. (2011). *Administrative Theories and Management Thought*. India: Prentice Hall India Learning Private Limited, New Delhi. 3rd Edn. Pp:628.
- Shields, J., Brown, M., Kaine, S., Dolle-Samuel, C., North-Samardzic, A., McLean, P., Johns, R., O'Leary, P., Robinson, J. and Plimmer, G. (2015). *Managing employee performance and reward: Concepts, practices, strategies*. Cambridge University Press. 2nd Edn. Pp:206.
- Siddig, K., Aguiar, A., Grethe, H., Minor, P. and Walmsley, T. (2014). Impacts of removing refined oil import subsidies in Nigeria on poverty. *Energy Policy*. 69(C):165-178.
- Udonne, J. and Akinyemi, O. (2018). Prospect of utilization of modular refinery to solve emerging problems in Nigeria petroleum industry. *Recent Advance in Petrochemical Sciences*. 4(3):1-62.