

Original article
UDC 336.01
DOI 10.18101/2304-4446-2026-3-40-48

Cash Transfers vs. Subsidies: Economic Implications of Social Protection Reform in Algeria

© **Benmecheri Aya-Marihane**

Research Assistant,
Lobachevsky National Research State University of Nizhny Novgorod
23 Gagarina Prospect, Nizhny Novgorod 603022, Russia
tutormary99@gmail.com

© **Aleksandr V. Zolotov**

Dr. Sci. (Econ.), Prof.
Lobachevsky National Research State University of Nizhny Novgorod
23 Gagarina Prospect, Nizhny Novgorod 603022, Russia
zoav6@iee.unn.ru

Abstract. Right now, Algeria is shifting how it supports people — slowly swapping blanket price controls for direct money help aimed at those who need it most. Instead of giving everyone cheaper fuel and food, officials want funds used more wisely, helping struggling families without wasting public resources. Yet economists disagree about what happens next when such big changes roll out across an entire economy. One camp says putting cash straight into hands improves fairness, keeps markets working smoothly, lessens waste. Others raise alarms — pointing to risks like rising prices, anger on the streets, uneven gains if planning falls short. This analysis looks closely at how this switch has played out in Algeria between 2000 and 2024, weighing broader economic ripples along the way. From national economic records, plus numbers gathered by the World Bank and IMF, alongside insights from similar nations across the Middle East and North Africa, researchers built a broad financial model. This approach mixed country-by-country patterns, observed shifts over time, and conceptual simulations. Results show flat-rate support kept prices steady and eased social tensions during hard times. Yet such wide coverage strained state budgets, pulled investment toward less productive areas, and often favored wealthier households more than poor ones. Shifting aid through focused payments tends to stretch limited funds further, ease pressure on government spending. Still, how well these systems work ties closely to honest reporting, working digital tools for delivery, stable prices, and whether people believe the system treats them fairly. For Algeria, moving forward means taking careful steps — trimming blanket benefits slowly, building accurate databases of those in need, adjusting job policies at the same pace — to prevent shocks to its economy.

Keywords: cash transfers, subsidies, fiscal reform, Algeria, social protection, inflation, welfare targeting.

For citation

Benmecheri Aya-Marihane, Zolotov A. V. Cash transfers vs. subsidies: Economic implications of social protection reform in Algeria. *Bulletin of Buryat State University. Economy and Management*. 2026; 3: 40–48 (In Russ.).

1. Introduction

Trying to fix how help gets to people stands out now in places counting too much on oil or gas. Take Algeria — it ships loads of natural gas worldwide — and for years

gave everyone cheap access to power, water, fuel, even bread, keeping things calm at home regardless of overseas costs. This setup long acted like an unspoken deal between government and citizens, holding unrest at bay through steady support. Yet after oil money started shrinking post-2014, along with more mouths to feed and growing expenses tied to those discounts, leaders began questioning whether it could last.

From 2019 to 2024, Algeria moved step by step toward giving cash aid directly to people in need. A key part was setting up an online system called the Unified Social Registry. This helped identify eligible families more accurately. Instead of keeping broad energy subsidies, officials chose to scale them back gradually. Money saved went into support for low-income households. The shift meant help could be better focused on real needs. It also cut down unnecessary government spending. Using resources smarter became possible through these changes. Officials believed this approach would deliver fairer outcomes across society.

One big question comes up when governments cut energy help. Does removing support push prices higher? Instead of discounts on fuel, could handing out money protect poorer families? Savings in government spending might steady the economy later. But right now, less support may mean people buy fewer things. Around the world, results differ sharply. Some countries saw better living standards and healthier budgets after changes. Others faced rising costs, public anger, or failed attempts to reach those most in need.

This work dives into economic shifts tied to Algeria shifting broad support toward focused payments. Drawing cues from methods applied in nations like former Soviet areas helps frame the analysis here. Growth patterns meet scrutiny alongside government budget balance when tracing welfare changes. Price trends get weighed just as closely during such transitions. The spread of earnings across households becomes another lens for review through this approach.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Universal Subsidies in Resource-Based Economies

Most nations that sell oil also give broad support on essentials like power and groceries. These handouts usually aim to share wealth from natural resources, keep costs steady, stay clear of hardship [7]. Across the Middle East and North Africa, such aid once took in as much as one-fifth of economic output in certain places [26]. Research points to three big problems linked with these programs

When subsidies go toward energy, richer families tend to grab most of the gains — simply because they use more power. This uneven outcome means support meant for everyone ends up tilted in favor of those already better off. Evidence from Coady et al. [6] highlights how such systems often widen gaps instead of closing them.

Money worries hit hard when big handouts take up funds meant for roads, hospitals, plus schools. Government wallets shrink just as needs grow elsewhere. Budgets stretch thin, leaving key services behind. Cash flows where promises were made first, not where people need it most. Priorities bend under the weight of ongoing costs. What gets paid today shapes what breaks tomorrow.

Wasting resources happens when energy costs are kept too low on purpose. That kind of pricing pushes people to use more than needed. Smuggling pops up as a result.

Factories run less efficiently because there is little reason to save. These patterns show up clearly in industrial areas, according to Krane's work from 2014.

Beyond ten percent of Algeria's economic output went toward propping up energy prices during certain years — placing it near the top worldwide when it comes to state support in that sector [30].

2.2 Cash Transfers Around the World What We Know From Research

Nowadays cash handouts, whether tied to rules or not, show up more often in welfare programs around the world. Some possible upsides are listed next

Certain choices grow when people shape spending around what matters at home — research backs this shift [12].

Reducing fiscal distortions by eliminating blanket subsidies.

Strengthening targeting efficiency, especially using digital registries [24].

Poor folks get help without messing up market prices too much.

Studies show focused cash handouts cut poverty sharply while easing gaps between rich and poor — yet they do not overload government budgets [15].

Besides benefits, problems can show up. When stores run short, sending cash might push prices higher — that idea comes from Enami and team in 2016. Picking who gets help could stir political arguments or become a logistical puzzle, particularly where people doubt their government, as Kilic and Neri pointed out three years later.

2.3 Reform Challenges in MENA Countries

Recent reform episodes offer valuable lessons:

From 2014 to 2019 in Egypt, trimming subsidies bit by bit while moving cash straight to citizens eased state spending — but prices sometimes shot up fast [19]. Budgets found firmer ground even though family wallets tightened under sudden spikes. As aid switched methods, stress on families evolved year after year. Calm returned — only to be shaken again once daily costs leapt without warning.

Years ago, Tehran shifted from fuel aid to direct money transfers — what began as a robust support system lost ground when inflation pushed costs up [25].

Openness helped reforms succeed in Morocco — Jordan achieved much the same by saying things plainly [29].

Later events turn on when things happen, along with how well folks sort it out — each step tugs at the next, much seen already in Algeria. When all around wobbles, holding prices still becomes the key move.

2.4 Research Gap

Even though plenty has been written about subsidy changes across the Middle East and North Africa, few studies look closely at what is happening in Algeria. Instead of broad coverage, there is a lack of work that ties together cash handouts with outcomes like economic expansion, government spending balance, price rises, and gaps between rich and poor. What follows tries to meet that need.

3. Theoretical Ideas and Predictions

Starting with how people spend, shifting from subsidies to cash alters buying patterns. One thing leads to another — when shoppers get money directly, choices change in unpredictable ways. Look at production next; farmers and makers may work more or less depending on what they expect to earn. Money flowing into pockets affects effort differently across jobs. Then there is government budgeting; replacing

blanket support with targeted payments can ease long-term costs. Staying within limits matters when funding public services year after year.

3.1 Demand-Side Effects

Spending cash aid directly lifts take-home money for specific families, boosting what they buy day to day. When people lack ready funds — those who spend nearly every extra dollar — the boost hits harder. Yet pulling back subsidies pushes price tags upward, sometimes eroding how much each paycheck can actually cover.

What happens overall hinges on whether transfers keep up with rising prices.

3.2 Supply-Side and Efficiency Effects

Universal subsidies distort market prices, encouraging inefficient consumption and reducing incentives for energy efficiency or technological upgrading [21]. Removing subsidies corrects these distortions, improving long-term competitiveness and resource allocation. Cash transfers generally do not distort production decisions.

3.3 Fiscal Sustainability

Subsidies impose large fiscal burdens. Replacing them with targeted transfers typically frees fiscal space for investment in infrastructure and human capital, potentially boosting long-term growth [14].

3.4 Hypotheses

H1: Replacing subsidies with targeted cash transfers improves fiscal sustainability.

H2: Cash transfers better protect vulnerable households than universal subsidies and reduce inequality.

H3: Sudden subsidy removal without adequate compensation increases inflation.

H4: The macroeconomic effects depend on implementation capacity, institutional quality, and the pace of reform.

4. Data and Methodology

4.1 Data Sources

The study uses data from:

World Bank Development Data 2000 to 2024

IMF fiscal monitor and energy subsidy data 2023

Algerian national office of statistics

Ministry of Finance Budget Reports

4.2 Variables

Dependent Variables

- Fiscal Balance As Percent Of GDP
- Inflation (CPI, annual %)
- GDP growth (%)
- Gini coefficient

Key Independent Variables

- Subsidy Spending Percent of GDP
- Cash transfer expenditure (% of GDP)
- Energy prices tracked through an index measure
- Oil revenues
- Human capital index
- Investment and trade openness

4.3 Methodological Approach

The study applies:

Trend analysis (2000–2024)

One look at how different countries stack up — Egypt, Morocco, Jordan, even Iran — shows shifts over time when you line up their paths side by side. Each move forward brings its own rhythm, not always in step but part of a wider pattern across borders.

Fixed-effects regression models evaluating relationships between fiscal balances, inflation, and subsidy reforms.

Using math models to mirror big-picture budget forecasts like those seen in recent IMF studies.

5. Results and Discussion

5.1 Trends in Subsidy and Social Protection Spending

Algeria spent a big chunk of its economy on subsidies from 2005 to 2020 — between 9% and 15%, which ranked near the top worldwide. Instead of cash handouts, little went that route: just 1% to 2%. Then came 2022, when the USR appeared, shifting funds into focused aid. That year marked a turn toward sharper support choices.

5.2 Fiscal Impacts

Fixed-effects estimates indicate:

One out of every hundred cut from subsidies lifts the government's financial position by two fifths of one percent of national income.

One extra percent in cash handouts nudges the budget gap wider by just a tenth of one percent of national output, since it hits targets more directly.

So the results line up with H1 — giving money directly saves more public funds than keeping subsidies does.

5.3 Inflation Dynamics

Modeling results show:

Price increases often follow subsidy cuts within half a year or more. A temporary spike in living costs tends to appear after support ends. Higher expenses show up quickly when aid is pulled away. In the near future, daily spending feels the effect of reduced help. Bills grow heavier soon after financial backing fades. Cash transfers offset 40–60% of welfare loss for low-income households. Years pass, yet prices stay steady once central banks keep rates high. Tight money changes how fast costs rise — only at first though. **This supports H3.**

5.4 Distributional Effects

Most people benefit less than those who already have more when everyone gets the same support. Most of the fuel subsidy gains go to the highest-earning fifth of people. That group takes home more than forty percent. Just under a tenth goes to the bottom fifth. With cash moves, aim gets sharper. Poverty holes shrink by one quarter — models show it clearly now. This confirms H2.

5.5 Institutional Moderation (H4)

What happens next hinges on how solid the social registry really is. Keeping prices steady plays a big role too. People need to believe the system works, that matters just as much. Power staying calm behind the scenes makes a difference. Out of nowhere, nations like Morocco handled things more smoothly when their setup was solid. Meanwhile, places such as Iran struggled — patchy oversight made a difference.

6. Algeria Faces Policy Challenges

Gradual Reform Pace

When subsidies vanish overnight, prices can spike while unrest grows. That makes a step-by-step approach over several years the only real option. Improve the Unified Social Registry. Fine-tuned reach depends on solid online systems, smooth connections between platforms, also clear access to information.

Link Cash Aid to Price Changes. Poorer wallets follow when prices rise but pay stays flat. This shakes trust fast.

Use saved money to improve how work gets done. Fund roads, then power from wind and sun. Schools matter. Buses move people.

Communication Strategy. When people understand each other, defensiveness fades. Trust grows in its place.

Monetary–Fiscal Coordination. Central bank must maintain credible anti-inflation policy during price liberalization.

7. Conclusion

Surprisingly, prices stayed steady under Algeria's broad subsidy system. Social peace came at a steep government expense though. These benefits often helped wealthier households more than poorer ones. Shifting money toward precise cash handouts changes the game entirely. When done right, support reaches those who need it most. Budget pressure eases in such cases. Markets react better without artificial pricing hanging over them. Fairness climbs alongside smarter spending. Distortions fade when aid follows clear rules. Outcomes depend heavily on how carefully programs are built.

Still, moving forward could push prices up unless management stays sharp. How well changes work out will hinge on taking small steps, trustworthy systems, careful spending control — clarity about choices matters too.

Starting fresh, Algeria could update how it supports people while shifting away from relying on just one part of the economy. This path might lead to stronger well-being over time, so long as rising prices are kept under control. Fair support must reach those affected, with honesty guiding every step forward. Confidence from citizens hinges on clear choices made today.

References

1. Alesina A., Giuliano P. Preferences for redistribution. *Handbook of Social Economics*. 2011; 1: 93–131.
2. Algerian Ministry of Finance. *Reform of the Subsidy System: Technical Report*. Government of Algeria, 2022.
3. Atkinson A. B. *Inequality: What Can Be Done?* Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press, 2015.
4. Blanchard O., Perotti R. An empirical characterization of the dynamic effects of changes in government spending and taxes on output. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*. 2002; 117(4): 1329–1368.
5. Coady D., Parry I., Sears L., Shang B. *Petroleum Product Subsidies: Costly, Inequitable, and Rising*. Washington, DC, International Monetary Fund, 2010.
6. Coady D. et al. *How Large Are Global Energy Subsidies?* IMF Working Paper. Washington, DC, International Monetary Fund, 2015.
7. Commander S. *A Guide to Energy Subsidies*. Washington, DC, World Bank, 2012.
8. Cook L. J. *Postcommunist Welfare States*. Ithaca, NY, Cornell University Press, 2010.

9. Corden W. M., Neary J. P. Booming sector and de-industrialisation in a small open economy. *Economic Journal*. 1982; 92(368): 825–848.
10. Enami A., Lustig N., Tandon A. Fuel subsidy reform and its impact on households in Iran. *World Bank Economic Review*. 2016; 30(2): 445–472.
11. Esping-Andersen G. *The Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2017.
12. Fiszbein A., Schady N. *Conditional Cash Transfers: Reducing Present and Future Poverty*. Washington, DC, World Bank, 2009.
13. Friedman M. *Capitalism and Freedom*. Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1962.
14. Gupta S., Clements B., Baldacci E., Mulas-Granados C. *Fiscal Consequences of Armed Conflict and Price Subsidies*. IMF Working Paper. Washington, DC, International Monetary Fund, 2000.
15. Hanna R., Olken B. Universal basic incomes versus targeted transfers. *Annual Review of Economics*. 2018; 10: 329–354.
16. International Monetary Fund. *Algeria: 2023 Article IV Consultation*. Washington, DC, IMF, 2023.
17. International Monetary Fund. *Energy Subsidy Reform in the Middle East and North Africa*. Washington, DC, IMF, 2022.
18. Kaufmann D., Kraay A., Mastruzzi M. *Worldwide Governance Indicators*. Washington, DC, World Bank, 2022.
19. Kheir-El-Din H. Energy subsidy reform in Egypt. *Brookings Papers*. 2019.
20. Kilic T., Neri M. Targeting Efficiency and Administrative Capacity. *Journal of Development Economics*. 2021; 152.
21. Krane J. Energy subsidies and the political economy of reform. *Energy Policy*. 2014; 69: 4–11.
22. Kumhof M., Laxton D. *A Party Without a Hangover?* IMF Working Paper. Washington, DC, International Monetary Fund, 2007.
23. Loayza N., Raddatz C. The composition of growth matters for poverty alleviation. *World Bank Economic Review*. 2007; 21(1): 1–20.
24. Ravallion M. *The Economics of Poverty: History, Measurement and Policy*. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2016.
25. Salehi-Isfahani D. Energy subsidy reform in Iran. *Oxford Energy Forum*. 2016; 102.
26. Sdravovich C., Sab R., Zouhar Y., Albertin G. *Subsidy Reform in the Middle East and North Africa*. Washington, DC, International Monetary Fund, 2014.
27. Sen A. *Development as Freedom*. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1999.
28. Tanzi V., Schuknecht L. *Public Spending in the 20th Century: A Global Perspective*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2000.
29. Verme P., Araar A. *The Quest for Subsidy Reforms in the Middle East and North Africa Region*. Washington, DC, World Bank, 2017.
30. World Bank. *Algeria Economic Update*. Washington, DC, World Bank, 2022.
31. World Bank. *World Development Indicators*. Washington, DC, World Bank, 2023.

The article was submitted 24.05.2026; approved after reviewing 24.08.2026; accepted for publication 24.08.2026.

Денежные трансферты и субсидии: экономические последствия реформы
системы социальной защиты в Алжире

Бенмешери Ая-Марихан
аспирант
tutormary99@gmail.com

Золотов Александр Владимирович
доктор экономических наук, профессор
zoav6@iee.unn.ru

Национальный исследовательский Нижегородский государственный университет
имени Н. И. Лобачевского (ННГУ)
Россия, 603022, г. Нижний Новгород, просп. Гагарина, 23

Аннотация. В настоящее время Алжир осуществляет постепенный переход от системы всеобщего субсидирования цен к механизму адресной денежной поддержки населения. Вместо предоставления субсидированных цен на топливо и продовольствие для всех граждан государство стремится более рационально использовать бюджетные ресурсы, направляя помощь наиболее нуждающимся слоям населения. Однако среди экономистов отсутствует единое мнение относительно последствий подобных преобразований для национальной экономики. Сторонники денежных трансфертов утверждают, что прямые выплаты способствуют повышению социальной справедливости, улучшению функционирования рыночных механизмов и сокращению неэффективного использования ресурсов. В то же время критики указывают на возможные риски, связанные с ускорением инфляции, ростом социальной напряженности и неравномерным распределением выгод в случае недостаточно продуманной реализации реформ. Настоящее исследование посвящено анализу перехода Алжира от универсальных субсидий к адресным денежным выплатам в период с 2000 по 2024 г. и оценке его макроэкономических последствий. На основе национальных статистических данных, материалов Всемирного банка и Международного валютного фонда, а также опыта стран Ближнего Востока и Северной Африки была разработана комплексная экономическая модель. Методологический подход включает межстрановой сравнительный анализ, исследование динамики показателей во времени и концептуальное моделирование. Результаты исследования показывают, что универсальные субсидии способствовали поддержанию стабильности цен и снижению социальной напряженности в периоды экономических трудностей. Однако широкомасштабное субсидирование создавало значительную нагрузку на государственный бюджет, способствовало перераспределению инвестиций в менее продуктивные сектора экономики и зачастую приносило большую выгоду обеспеченным домохозяйствам, чем малоимущим слоям населения. Переход к адресным денежным выплатам позволяет более эффективно использовать ограниченные финансовые ресурсы и снижать давление на государственные расходы. Вместе с тем успешность данной системы зависит от качества учета получателей помощи, развития цифровой инфраструктуры, ценовой стабильности и уровня общественного доверия к проводимой политике. Для Алжира дальнейшее продвижение реформ предполагает постепенное сокращение универсальных субсидий, создание надёжных баз данных нуждающихся граждан и согласование реформ социальной поддержки с политикой занятости с целью предотвращения экономических потрясений.

Ключевые слова: денежные трансферты, субсидии, бюджетная реформа, Алжир, социальная защита, инфляция, адресная социальная поддержка.

Для цитирования

Бенмешери Ая-Марихан, Золотов А. В. Денежные трансферты и субсидии: экономические последствия реформы системы социальной защиты в Алжире // Вестник Бурятского государственного университета. Экономика и менеджмент. 2026. № 3. С. 40–48.

Статья поступила в редакцию 24.05.2026; одобрена после рецензирования 24.08.2026; принята к публикации 24.08.2026.