

Assessment of the Effect of Petrol Subsidy Removal on Consumer Purchasing Power in Some Selected Local Government Areas of Borno State

Babagana Ibrahim Imam

Department of Marketing, Ramat Polytechnic Maiduguri, Borno State, Nigeria

Corresponding Email: babaganaimam@gmail.com

Abstract: *The study investigated the assessment of the effect of petrol subsidy removal on consumer purchasing power in selected local government areas of Borno State. To achieve this goal a statement of research problem alongside objective of the study was postulated which was aimed at identifying and exploring the contending views on subsidy removal on petroleum product, the problems and challenges facing the implementation of the policy on subsidy removal on petroleum products. The study adopted survey research design, the population of the included the entire residence of Maiduguri Metropolitan council and Jere Local Government Area of Borno state, out which a sample size of three hundred were drawn for the study, the sampling techniques adopted for the study is the stratified and simple random sampling techniques. Primary source of data collection was utilized in the study, structured questionnaire was also drawn and administered on the sample size, where 250 questionnaires were filled correctly and returned, as such, only 250 questionnaires were analyzed using the simple percentage statistical tool and the data were presented in a tabular form. At the course of the study it was noticed that the removal of subsidy on petroleum product have effect on the purchasing power of consumer and this was tested from the postulated statement of hypothesis. Chi-square statistical tool was used in the test; the 1% level of significance were it reveals that subsidy removal on petroleum product has effect on the purchasing power of the consumer. It was also recommended that government should create more awareness on the deregulation of the downstream petroleum sector and should also provide modalities that will ensure that the masses benefits from such policy.*

Key words: *Consumer, Petrol, and Subsidy Removal.*

Introduction

A subsidy is a reverse tax. It is a deliberate attempt by government to support a chosen economic agent –a consumer and a provider and it can be applied in any market that involves the buying and selling of products and or services. A subsidy as defined by the OECD (Organization for Economic Cooperation Development) in a study is basically government action that decreases the consumption price of the consumer and or increases the selling price of the producer UNEP, 2002 (United Nation Environment Programme). The application of the use of subsidies is not exclusive to developing economies. Subsidies span different types of economic activities the most featured in popular press tend to be agricultural and energy related subsidies. The subsidy could be direct in the form of price controls, tax exemptions or the provision of grants – this more or less entails the injection of cash back into the hands of either the consumer or the producer. The indirect form of subsidy is more in the form of the provision of industrial input requirements in the form of – favourable regulatory frameworks, research and development.

Ernest and Young (1988:34) posit that deregulation and privatization are elements of economic reform programmes charged with the ultimate goal of improving the overall economy through properly spelt out ways. For example, freeing government from the bondage of continuous financing of extensive projects which are best suited for private investment by the sale of such enterprises; encouraging efficiency and effectiveness in resources utilization; reducing government borrowing while raising revenue; promoting healthy market competition in a free market environment; improving returns from investment and broadening enterprises share ownership thus engendering capital market development (Izibili and Aiya, 2007:228).

Put differently, deregulation in the economic sense means freedom from government control. According to Akinwumi *et al.*, (2005:8), deregulation is the removal of government interference in the running of a system. This means that government rules and regulations governing the operations of the system are relaxed or held constant in order for the system to decide its own optimum level through the forces of supply and demand (Ajayi and Ekundayo, 2008:212).

Research Methodology

Research Design

This research study used the survey method of research in the process of gathering data; primary source of data collection was utilized. In the primary source of data collection, questionnaires and oral interview method primary data collection were utilized. Questionnaires were administered to some of the target population and oral interview were conducted on the remaining target population under study.

Area of the Study

The area of the study for this research study is Maiduguri Metropolitan Area, the capital of Borno State, with an estimated population of (540,016) according 2006 population census result, and neighboring Jere Local Government Area with a population size of (209,107) as estimated by the result of the Nigerian population census of 2006 both of Borno State, Nigeria.

Population of the Study

The population of the research consists of the entire population of Maiduguri, and Jere Local Government Areas of Borno State, Nigeria.

Sample and Sampling Techniques

The sample size for the research work is 300, the technique used in the selection process of the sample size out of the population of the study is the simple random sampling technique, this because each individual in the population has an equal chance of being picked.

Instruments for Data Collection

The instruments used for the collection of data for the purpose of this research work are questionnaire and oral interview, a structured questionnaire was designed and administered on some of the target population for the purpose of seeking their response on the questions asked and an oral interview were conducted on the remaining sample size that cannot read nor write to seek their opinion on the subject matter under study.

Validation of Instrument

Validation is the process of checking to make sure that the right questions were asked and proper procedures were followed in the collection, organizing and analysis of the data collected. The questionnaire was designed by the researcher, and the questionnaires were distributed among the lecturers in the school of management of Ramat Polytechnic Maiduguri, for observation and corrections to make sure that questions asked can elicit the data required, before it was taken to the research supervisor for final observation and approval.

Method of Data Analysis

According to Osuala (2001), Data analysis refers to the ordering and breaking down of data into constituent parts". It consists of statistical calculations performed with raw data collected to provide answers to questions initiated in the research. The analysis of an investigation is the means by which problems are answered. In this study frequency and percentage distributions were used in data induction as the first in data analysis. This yielded a number of tables that portray the true feelings / options of the sample respondents as well as facts on key aspects of their personality and social status. The tables thus generated were used in testing the hypothesis formulated in 1.4. Chi-square statistics was used in the test of the hypothesis at 5% level of significance. A chi-square is a sample statistic and is computed as follows;

$$X^2 = \sum \frac{(F_o - F_e)^2}{F_e}$$

The chi-square test examines the extent to which the frequencies that are actually observed in the study differ from the frequencies that are expected if the null hypothesis is correct.

Result and Discussion

Data Presentation and Analysis

As earlier stated, a total number of three hundred (300) copies of the questionnaire were administered to the total sample size under study. The response rate is as shown in the table below: -

Table 1: Questionnaire Administration Table

	MMC L.G.A	JERE L.G.A	Total
Sample size	150	150	300
Questionnaire	150	150	300
Questionnaire retrieved	125	125	250
Questionnaire un-retrieved	25	25	50
Total of response	125	125	250

Source: Field Survey 2012

Table 1 above indicated the administration of questionnaire to the sampled respondents, it shows the sample size and the numbers of questionnaire administered and retrieve from the sampled respondents. Therefore, the analysis and presentation of data depends on the retrieved questionnaire which is 250 questionnaires.

Table 2 Gender

Sex	No of Respondents	Percentage %
Male	150	60%
Female	100	40%
Total	250	100%

Source: Field survey, 2012.

Table 2, shows that more than half of the respondents who participated in the study were male as compared to female this was because most of the respondents in the sampled area were male and are willing to participate in the research. From the above table it shows that there are more of male than female in the sampled respondent for the study.

Table 3 Ages of the Respondents

Marital	No Respondent	Percentage %
20-30years	100	40%
31-40years	60	24%
41-50years	50	20%
Above 50	40	16%
Total	250	100%

Source: Field Survey, 2012

Table 3 shows that the age of various respondents who participated in the research study. The table presents that 40% of the respondents were within the age bracket of 20-30 years. This was mainly because this group represents the working class of the population. Those between the ages of 30-40years, which constitute 24% of the respondents, while those that fall between the ages of 41-50years and 50 and above were 50 and 40 respectively which constitute 20% and 16%. This implies that 20-30year of the sample sized constituted majority of the respondents used for the study and they constituted the working of the population.

Table 4: Educational Levels

Educational Level	No Respondent	Percentage %
Secondary Level	100	40%
College Level	90	36%
University Level	60	24%
Total	250	100

Source: Field Survey, 2012

Table 4 above shows the level of education held by the respondents who participated in the research study. The table indicates that a larger number of the respondents had a secondary school education level, as compared to those with both college and university education. This is represented by 40%, 36%, and 24% of the respondents respectively. This indicates that most of the respondents had academic qualification and thus they easily understood the effects of subsidy removal on petroleum products on the purchasing power of the consumers.

Table 5: Working Experience

Working Experience	No Respondent	Percentage
Less than 5years	120	48%
5years to 10years	100	40%
11years to 13years	30	12%
Total	250	100

Source: Field Survey, 2012

Table 5 shows that 48% of the respondents who participated in the study had a working experience of less than 5years. This could be noticed in the table indicating the age brackets of the respondents because those already in the working class of the population were aged between 31-40years. The remaining groups represented 40% and 12% of the respondents respectively. The table above indicates that majority of the sampled size have less than 5years of working experience.

Table 6: Understanding of Deregulation of the downstream petroleum sector

Responses	No Respondent	Percentage
Yes	153	61.2%
No	97	38.8%
Total	250	100

Source: Field Survey, 2012

Table 6 reveal that 153 out of the sampled respondents agreed that they have knowledge of deregulation of downstream petroleum sector. This is indicated in the empirical section of the study. The above figure presents that 61.2% of the respondents agree that they have understanding on the activities of the deregulation of the downstream petroleum sector and 38% of the respondents were of the opinion that they do not have understanding of what deregulation of the downstream petroleum sector. This implies that majority of the sampled respondents do have understanding of what the deregulation of downstream petroleum sector is all about.

Table 7: Importance of pricing in the deregulation of the downstream petroleum sector

Responses	No. of Respondents	Percentage
Yes	200	80%
No	80	20%
Total	250	100

Source: Field Survey, 2012

Table 7 shows the respondents rated the importance of pricing in the deregulation of the downstream petroleum sector. The above figure reveals that pricing is very important in the deregulation of the petroleum sector this is because, majority of the respondent constituting 80% of the respondents are of the opinion that pricing is important in the deregulation of the petroleum sector while only few of the respondents constituting 20% of the respondents do not think so. This indicates that pricing is an important factor in the deregulation of the petroleum sector.

Table 8” Rehabilitating refineries as a strategy for the deregulation of the downstream petroleum sector

Responses	No. of Respondents	Percentage
Yes	180	72%
No	70	28%
Total	250	100

Source: Field Survey, 2012

Table 8 above, shows that the study reveals that 72% of the respondents attest that the rehabilitation of the refineries is also a strategy for the deregulation of the petroleum downstream sector. While the remaining 70 respondents constituting 28% of the respondents do not see the rehabilitation of the refineries as a part of strategy for the rehabilitation of the downstream petroleum sector. Table 4.8, above therefore reveals that the rehabilitation of refineries a strategy for effective deregulation of petroleum downstream sector.

Table 9 Deregulation of the downstream petroleum sector by other countries

Responses	No. of Respondents	Percentage
Yes	153	61.2%
No	97	38.8%
Total	250	100

Source: Field Survey, 2012

Table 9 above, reveals that some countries have deregulation their downstream petroleum sector and have removed subsidy on petroleum products. Majority of the respondents are of the opinion that some countries have deregulated their petroleum sector this constitutes 61.2% of the respondents, while the remaining respondents constituting 38.8% do not think so. This implies that some countries have successfully deregulated the downstream petroleum sector.

Table 10: Success in the deregulation of the other sector of the Nigeria economy

Responses	No. of Respondents	Percentage
Yes	50	20%
No	200	80%
Total	250	100

Source: Field Survey, 2012

Table 10 shows the respondents opinions on the level of success recorded in other deregulated sectors of the Nigeria economy. The figure above presents that 20% of the respondents' expressed that the government have recorded success in the deregulation of other sectors of the Nigerian economy, while majority of the respondents constituting 80% of the respondents are of the opinion that they have never recorded success in relation to the other sectors of the Nigerian economy that have been deregulation. The table above reveals that other sector of the economy that has been deregulated has not recorded success.

Table 11: meaning of subsidy

Responses	No. of Respondents	Percentage
Yes	150	60%
No	100	40%
Total	250	100

Source: Field Survey, 2012

Table 11 above shows how the respondents expressed their views on the meaning of subsidy. The above figure reveals that majority of the respondents constituting 60% of the respondents agree that they have knowledge of what subsidy is, while 100 of the respondent are of the view that they do know the

meaning of subsidy. The above reveals that majority of the respondents are aware of the meaning of subsidy

Table 12: the party that benefits from the government subsidy

Responses	No. of Respondents	Percentage
Masses	50	20%
Government	50	20%
Investors	150	60%
Total	250	100

Source: Field Survey, 2012

Table 12 above shows that the party benefits most in the government fuel subsidy, from the table above it can be seen that majority of respondents which 60% of the respondents strongly agreed that it is the investors that benefit mostly in the petroleum regime, follow by the masses and the government which constitute 20% respectively. The table above indicates that it is the investors that usually benefits from the subsidy removed by government.

Table 13 Effects of petroleum subsidy removal on the purchasing power of consumer

Responses	No. of Respondents	Percentage
Yes	190	76%
No	60	24%
Total	250	100

Source: Field Survey, 2012

Table 13 above shows that the removal petroleum subsidy on petroleum product affects the purchasing power of both the rich and the poor in the society. This was expressed by 76% of the respondents who agreed as compared to 24% who had differed in their opinion.

Table 14 Awareness on the amount government spend on subsidy

Responses	No. of Respondents	Percentage
Yes	70	28%
No	180	72%
Total	250	100

Source: Field Survey, 2012

The information collected in table 14 above, shows how the respondents expressed their views about their knowledge on the amount government spend on fuel subsidy. The figure represents that majority of the

respondents which constitute 72% of the respondents are of the view that they have no knowledge of the amount spend by the government on petroleum subsidy, while the remaining 28% of the respondents agreed that they are aware of the amount spend by the government on petroleum subsidy.

Table 15: Provision for petroleum subsidy in the Nigerian budget

Responses	No. of Respondents	Percentage
Yes	230	92%
No	20	8%
Total	250	100

Source: Field Survey, 2012

Table 15 reveals that there is provision in the Nigeria budget by the government for petroleum subsidy. This was expressed by 92% of the respondents who indicated that the government make provision for petroleum subsidy in it budget, while only of few the respondents which constitute 20% of the respondents have a different opinion. This indicates that the government has special provision for petroleum subsidy in it budget.

Table 16: Government should fix the refineries before removing subsidy on petroleum products

Responses	No. of Respondents	Percentage
Strongly agree	200	80%
Agree	50	20%
Total	250	100

Source: Field Survey, 2012

Table 16 above shows that most of the respondents which constitute 80% respondents strongly agree that the government should fix the Nigerian refineries before removing subsidy on petroleum products so that the products can be made available to consumers, while 50 respondents which constitute 20% of the respondents do to think so, the government can remove subsidy on petroleum products without fixing the refineries into good shape. The table above shows that it is important, that the governments should fix the refineries before removing subsidy on petroleum products.

Table 17: the petroleum products should remain subsidized

Responses	No. of Respondents	Percentage
Strongly agree	200	80%
Agree	50	20%
Total	250	100

Source: Field Survey, 2012

Table 17 above shows that most of the respondents which constitute 80% respondents strongly agree that petroleum products should remain subsidized as long as we still have opec countries whose petroleum products are still subsidized, while 50% of the respondents which constitute 20% of the respondent do not think so, that the government should remove subsidy on petroleum products even though we still have opec countries that petroleum products to be subsidized. The above table indicates that the petroleum products should remain subsidies as long as we have opec countries that have subsidies the prices her petroleum products.

Table 18: the price of petroleum products, Nigerians should pay less on petroleum products

Responses	No. of Respondents	Percentage
Strongly agree	240	96%
Agree	10	4%
Total	250	100

Source: Field Survey, 2012.

Table 18 above shows overwhelming majorities of the respondents which constitute 96% of the respondents agreed that Nigerian should pay fewer prices on petroleum products since she is a major producer of the product, while on 4% of the respondents which constitutes 10 of the respondents have a contrary view.

Table 19: Effect of subsidy removal on infrastructural development

Responses	No. of Respondents	Percentage
Strongly agree	40	16%
Agree	210	84%
Total	250	100

Source: Field Survey, 2012.

Table 19 above shows how the respondents rated the effect of subsidy removal on infrastructural development of the Nigeria economy. The above table, presents that 16% of the respondents agreed that subsidy have to be removed on petroleum products before we can have infrastructural development in Nigeria, while an overwhelming majority of the respondents do not think so which constitute 84% of the respondents. The above table reveals that subsidy removal does not have any positive effect on the infrastructural development of Nigeria.

Table 20: Government plans on how to cushion the effect petroleum subsidy removal on the purchasing of consumers

Responses	No. of Respondents	Percentage
Yes	150	60%
No	100	40%
Total	250	100

Source: Field Survey, 2012

Table 20 reveals that majority of the respondents are aware of government plans to cushion the effect of subsidy removal on the purchasing power of consumers. The table present that 60% of the respondents are aware of such plans, while the remaining 100 respondents which constitutes 40% of the respondents have a contrary view. The implication is that majority of the respondents are aware of the plans government has to cushion the effect of the subsidy removal on petroleum products.

Table 21: Assurance that government will utilize the additional revenues realized from subsidy removal on petroleum products judiciously

Responses	No. of Respondents	Percentage
Very Strong	40	16%
Strong	20	8%
Not strong	190	76%
Total	250	100

Source: Field Survey, 2012

Table 21 above reveals that most of the respondents which constitutes 76% of the respondents are of the opinion that extra revenue generated by their government from subsidy removal from petroleum products will not be utilize to the benefit of Nigerians, while 16% of the respondents believe that the Nigerian government shall use the additional revenue derived from the subsidy removal on petroleum products judiciously and the 20 respondents which constitute 8% of the respondents have strong feeling that the government shall use the additional revenue for the betterment of Nigerians.

Table 22: Scarcity of petroleum products as a result of the removal of petroleum subsidy removal on petroleum product

Responses	No. of Respondents	Percentage
Yes	200	80%
No	50	20%
Total	250	100

Source: Field Survey, 2012

Table 22 above reveals that most of the respondents which constitute 80% of the respondents strongly agree that the removal of subsidy on petroleum products is a major factor that led to scarcity of petroleum products in the country, while the remaining respondents constituting 20% of the respondents do not think so. The table above therefore, reveals that the removal of subsidy on petroleum products is a factor that has contributed to the increase on prices of petroleum products.

Table 23: Comparison of Nigerian petroleum price to the countries

Responses	No. of Respondents	Percentage
High	200	80%
Low	50	20%
Total	250	100

Source: Field Survey, 2012

Table 23 above shows that most of the respondents constituting 80% of the respondents are of the view that the price of petroleum products in Nigeria is too high than that of the other major petroleum producing countries, while 20% of the respondents do not think otherwise, this indicates that the price of petroleum products in Nigeria is too high compare to other countries.

Table 24: the effect of petroleum subsidy removal on the purchasing power of consumers

Responses	No. of Respondents	Percentage
Yes	250	100%
No	0	0%
Total	250	100

Source: Field Survey, 2012

Table 24 reveals that all the respondents constituting 100% agreed that the removal of subsidy on petroleum products will definitely affect the purchasing power of the consumers.

Test of Hypothesis

The hypothesis formulated in chapter on is tested through the application of chi-square statistic, and for the test of significance, a null hypothesis of no difference with regard level of alpha. The test is presented below:

H0: Subsidy removal on petroleum products does not have significant effect on the purchasing power of consumer

H1: Subsidy removal on petroleum products has a significant effect on the purchasing power of consumers.

The following chi-square (X^2) formulation is used in the test.

Statistical explanation for chi-square

Ho:	Null Hypothesis
Hi:	Alternative hypothesis
Oct:	Observed frequency
Ei:	Expected Frequency
X^2_0 :	Chi-Square Observed
X^2_c :	Chi-Square
Σ :	Summation
$><$:	Greater than and less than signs
Df:	Degree of freedom
r:	row
k:	Column

Assumption

- Degree of freedom (Df) = (K-DCr-1)
- Level of Significance (∂) = 0.05 (5%)

Decision Criteria

- Accept Null hypothesis (H0), if $X^2_c < X^2_0$
- Reject Null hypothesis (H0), if $X^2_c > X^2_0$

In other words if Ho is rejected, Hi is accepted.

Formula

- Expected frequency (Ei) = $\frac{\text{row total} \times \text{column}}{\text{Grand Total}}$

i.e. $\frac{r \times k}{T}$

T

2. Computed Chi-Square $X^2_c = \frac{\sum (O_i - \sum E)^2}{\sum E}$

Table 25: Actual Frequency Table

Response Table No	Yes	No	Total
Table 4.6	153	97	250
Table 4.8	180	70	250
Table 4.10	50	200	250
Table 4.24	250	0	250
Table 4.23	200	50	250
Total	833	417	1250

Expected value = $\frac{\text{Row total} \times \text{Column Total}}{\text{Grand Total}}$

Grand Total

Determination of expected value for Yes

$$\text{Table 4.6} = \frac{250 \times 833}{1250} = 166.60$$

$$\text{Table 4.8} = \frac{250 \times 833}{1250} = 166.60$$

$$\text{Table 4.10} = \frac{250 \times 833}{1250} = 166.60$$

$$\text{Table 4.24} = \frac{250 \times 833}{1250} = 166.60$$

$$\text{Table 4.23} = \frac{250 \times 833}{1250} = 166.60$$

Determination of expected value for No

$$\text{Table 4.6} = \frac{250 \times 417}{1250} = 83.40$$

$$\text{Table 4.10} = \frac{250 \times 417}{1250} = 83.40$$

1250

Table 4.12= $\frac{250 \times 417}{1250} = 83.40$

1250

Table 4.24= $\frac{250 \times 417}{1250} = 83.40$

1250

Table 4.23= $\frac{250 \times 417}{1250} = 83.40$

1250

Table 26: Computed Table

Fo	fe	fo-fe	(fo-fe) ²	(fo-fe) ² /fe
153	166.5	-13.5	182.25	0.4736
180	166.5	13.5	182.25	0.2105
50	166.5	-116.5	13572.25	0.2105
250	166.5	83.5	6972.25	0.4736
200	166.5	33.5	1122.25	0.2105
97	83.4	13.5	182.25	2.5714
70	83.4	-13.4	182.25	1.1428
200	83.4	116.6	13572.25	1.1428
0	83.4	-83.4	6955.56	2.5714
50	83.4	-33.4	1112.56	1.1428
Total	450	0	240	10.1499

Therefore, the computed value is 10.1499

The degree of freedom (DF) is determined as:

$$DF = (R-1)(K-1)$$

Where R = Row and K = Column

Hence DF (5-1) (2-1)

= (4) (1)

= 4

Assuming a confidence level of 95% then the significant level will be = 1% = 1/100 = 0.01, and the critical table value is $X^2 = 7.779$.

Decision Rule

Therefore, in determining the table value from the chi-square table, we pick out the value where the significance level 0.01 intersects the degree of freedom (4) Hence the table value = 7.779, If computed value is greater than the table value (H_1) will be accepted and (H_0) rejected. On the other hand, if the table value is greater than the computed value, we accept H_0 and reject H_1 . Based on the decision rule, the determination above reveals that the table value being 7.779 is less than the computed value which is 10.1499, hence H_1 will be accepted which stipulates that: Subsidy removal on petroleum products has a significant effect on the purchasing power of consumers and reject H_0 : which states that Subsidy removal on petroleum products does not have significant effect on the purchasing power of consumer.

Conclusion

This study investigated an assessment of the effect of petrol subsidy removal on consumer purchasing power in selected local government area of Borno State. A questionnaire was developed and administered on the valid sampled size of the respondents. The data gathered was analyzed using frequency and percentage distribution. Hypothesis advanced, that the removal of petroleum subsidy have a significant effect on the purchasing power of the consumer, it was tested using the chi-square test statistics at 0.01 level of significance, it was revealed that majority of the sampled respondents do have understanding of what the deregulation of downstream petroleum sector is all about, yet again it was also observed that pricing policy is an important factor in the deregulation of downstream petroleum sector, it was also noticed that the rehabilitation of the refineries will go a long in determining the success of the policy, in addition, the study also revealed that other countries have deregulated their downstream petroleum sector and that the deregulation of other sector of the Nigerian economy has not been successful. It was also noticed that the beneficiaries of the programme are the investors, rather than the citizenry, and it was also noticed that the removal of the subsidy on petroleum products affect the purchasing power of both the rich and the poor in the society this was clearly stated in table 4.14 of the study. It was also observed at the course of the study that the government has a provision for petroleum subsidy in its budget and it was also noticed that the price of petroleum products in Nigeria is too high compared to other oil producing country and that the removal of subsidy does not have positive impact on the infrastructural development of Nigerian economy. It was also noticed at the course of the study that government have not been utilizing the additional funds generated as a result of the subsidy removal on petroleum products and that the removal of the subsidy on petroleum products also lead to artificial scarcity of petroleum products in Nigeria.

References

- Ajayi, A.I., and Ekundayo, (2008), "The Deregulation of University Education in Nigeria: Implication or Quality Assurance" *Nebuta* 5.4 (December), Pp. 21-28.
- Akanbi, F. and Agbo, M. (2012), "Strike: Nigerians Count their Losses," *This Day*, Sunday, January 15, P.24
- Akinwumi, F.S, Isuku, E.j. and Agwaranze, D.Q. (2005), "University Education Deregulation: Pros and Cons" in G.O. Akpa, S.U. Udoh and E.O. Fagbamijie (Eds) *Deregulating the Provision and Management of Education in Nigeria*, Jos: NAEAP Publication. Pp. 151-158
- Ernest, P. and Young, C. (1988), "The Colonial State and Postcolonial Crisis" in Ernest P. and Young, C. *The Transfers of power, 1960 – 1980*, New Haven and London Yale University press. Pp. 120-135
- Ezeagba, C.E., (2005), "Deregulation of Nigerian Economy: Implications for the Downstream Petroleum Industry," *Certified national Accountant*, July – September.
- Iba, L. (2009), "Fuel Crisis: Will deregulation roll away all our problems?," *Daily Sun*, October 5, Pp3,39.
- Izibili, M. and Aiya, F. (2007), "Deregulation and Corruption in Nigeria: An Ethical Response", *Kamal – Raj. Journal of Sciences*. 14(3): 229 – 234.
- Maduabuchi, E. (2012), Fuel Subsidy: Courting the Big Bang?" *Sunday Independent*, December 18, Pp. 15 – 17.
- Oladesu, E., Alli, Y., Yishau, O. and Ajetunmobi, W., (2012), "Petrol Prices go Wild", *The Nation*, Tuesday, January 3, Pp. 1- 6.
- Oladesu, O., Olaoye – Osinkolu, Olugbamila, A., Olaniyi, B., and Omokhunu, G., (2012), "Fuel Subsidy: Employers arm Government to Avert Crisis," *The Nation*, Monday, December 19, Pp. 1-2.