
TAX REVENUE AND EDUCATION INFRASTRUCTURAL DEVELOPMENT IN NIGERIA

Ernest Oshodin *, Osasu Obaretin

Department of Accounting, University of Benin, Benin City

ernest.oshodin@uniben.edu

Abstract: *The study examines the effect of tax revenues on education infrastructural development in Nigeria. Tax revenue may be the mainstay of Nigeria's economy as countries have continually drifted towards a cleaner and friendlier environment. Alternatives to fossil fuel power generation are being explored in countries to reduce the effect of global warming. Also, the continual instability in the price of crude oil in the world market predisposes that tax revenue may likely be a veritable source of funding government expenditure in the future in Nigeria. This study adopted the ex post facto research design to examine the link between tax revenue and education infrastructural development. The education infrastructural development was proxied by the annual allocation to education from 1994 to 2023. Tax revenues were proxied by internally generated revenue through personal income tax, company income tax, petroleum profit tax, tertiary education tax, value-added tax, and customs and excise duties. The error correction model was adopted as the estimation method in this study. These data were sourced from the Nigeria Bureau of Statistic Reports and the Central Bank of Nigeria Statistic Bulletin of the ensuing period. The study revealed a positive and statistically non-significant relationship between personal income tax and education infrastructural development; a negative and statistically non-significant relationship between company income tax, petroleum profit tax, value-added tax, and educational infrastructural development; and a positive and statistically significant relationship between tertiary education tax, customs and excise duty, and education infrastructural development, respectively. The study recommends that more funding from tax generation should be invested in education infrastructures to narrow the gap between the budgetary allocation to education and the 26% recommended by UNESCO. Furthermore, measures should be put in place to enable taxpayers to trace the quantum of tax revenues spent on various infrastructures provided by successive governments in Nigeria. This can go a long way to ensure that political officeholders remain accountable to the taxpayers on the custody of the public resources entrusted to them.*

Keywords: Educational Infrastructures, Taxation, Tertiary Education Trust Fund, Tertiary Education Tax

JEL Classification: M49, O23

1. Introduction

Education provides the required knowledge that supports individuals toward self-actualisation and is a path to the development of any society (Aina and Olorunsola, 2023; Omagu, 2016; Yizengaw, 2008). There has been a global push for education development. To ensure inclusive and equitable quality education for all, the United Nations Education, Scientific, and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO) recommends that the budgetary allocation

*Corresponding author: Ernest Oshodin

Cite as:

The journal editors will add this information after completion of the volume!

to education should be at least 26% of the annual budget of any nation. This should be for the funding of educational infrastructural development through the supplies of educational facilities, capacity building, and other recurrent expenditures in the sector. Countries around the globe are working towards achieving this minimum standard of education development. The funding for public education in Nigeria rests mainly on the government. Thus, it is not surprising that education is poorly funded in Nigeria. The sector is one of the least funded by the government as the budgetary allocation to education has continually remained less than 9% in Nigeria. The budgetary allocation to education is funded from the pool of resources available to the government, ranging from the proceeds of crude oil to borrowings. Consequently, getting the government accountable for spending on education infrastructural development has remained elusive in Nigeria. This is because government spending is not solely financed by taxation (Borge, Parmer and Torvik, 2018; Moore, Prichard and Fieldstad, 2018; Sjursen, 2023). Funding infrastructural development through tax revenue can make the government accountable for its spending. This is because tax is a contract between governments and the citizens of a state (Besley, 2020) wherein the taxpayers are provided public facilities in return for the taxes they contributed to the government purse. Taxpayers may be committed to paying taxes when public facilities are funded using tax revenues.

The existing studies on the nexus between taxation and infrastructural development have been generic in approach, with very little based specifically on educational infrastructural development in Nigeria (Appah and Isele, 2024; Ajiteru, Aderanijo and Bakare, 2018; Anyaduba and Aronmwan, 2015; Ayeni and Afolabi, 2020, Daniel-Adebayo et al., 2022; Ejemai, Akintoye and Adegbe, 2020; Inyama, Chinedu and Nnenna, 2017; Muojekwu and Udeh, 2023; Okoror, Mainoma and Uwaleke, 2019; Oladipupo and Ibadin, 2016; Olugbade and Adegbe, 2020; Osho, Olemija and Falade, 2019). The studies of Anaehobi and Agim, 2019, Nagbe and Micah, 2019, and Omobude et al., 2017 were specifically on educational infrastructural development but with tax revenue restricted to tertiary education tax in Nigeria. Etale and Bariweni (2023) extend the scope of tax revenue in their study by also investigating the effect of value-added tax on educational infrastructural development. However, the recurrent expenses were excluded from their proxy for measuring educational infrastructural development. The current study is different from these studies because the effect of other forms of taxation in addition to tertiary education tax on educational infrastructural development is investigated. Furthermore, the proxy of educational infrastructural development in the current study is budgetary allocation to education due to the seeming effect that annual tertiary education tax fund (TETFUND) sponsorship for conferences and further education of staff has on educational development in Nigeria.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Education Infrastructural Development

Infrastructure is the fundamental physical and administrative arrangements required to ensure effective societal control (Umar, Ogbu and Ereke, 2019). It comprises education, industries, buildings, roads, bridges, hospitals, and security to mention but a few (Egbunike, Emudainohwo and Gunardi, 2018; Olufemi et al., 2013). Education infrastructure is critical for an effective and equitable education system. Education infrastructure comprises structures, equipment, and people that enable a curriculum to be taught in a safe learning environment. It is a network of people, institutions, and legal framework in place to ensure education management and advancement of mankind Ibas and Uzoigwe (2020). Its development entails investment in educational facilities, technologies, and resources that support conducive learning.

In the 1970s, the quality of education in Nigeria was a thing of pride for the Black race and a standard for the rest of the African continent (Benjamin et al., 2012) because the

government as of then was investing heavily in educational facilities. Nigerian students were then the envy of several advanced and emerging countries. However, this glory was lost due to neglect, bad policies, corruption, diversion, and mismanagement of public funds.

Bennee, Okoye and Amahalu (2021) documented that educational infrastructural development is measured using federal government capital expenditure on educational infrastructures. Measuring educational infrastructural in this manner relegates staff training and development to the background. The development of the education system of any country cannot be completed without the training and development of staff. In line with this, the current study measured education infrastructural development by the annual allocation to the education sector in Nigeria.

2.2 Tax Revenue

Tax forms a contractual relationship between a taxpayer and the state (Besley, 2020; Bräutigam, Fjeldstad, and Moore, 2008; Levi, 1988; Moore, Prichard and Fjeldstad, 2018). In this contractual arrangement, the citizens of a country pay their taxes with the understanding that they will receive public services and withhold tax payments when the government is not acting up to their expectations. The government is punished when citizens withhold their taxes. Thus, financing infrastructural development through taxation can promote political accountability. There are various forms of tax in Nigeria such as personal income tax, company income tax, petroleum profit tax, tertiary education tax, value-added tax, and customs and excise duty, etc.

The personal income tax (PIT) is a tax levied on the income of persons (Anyaduba, 1999). Personal income tax is charged on salaries, wages, bonuses, rental incomes, and investment profits of individuals in a particular tax jurisdiction. Personal income tax is a form of progressive tax in Nigeria, as its calculation is based on gradual rates. The profit of a company is subjected to the company income tax (CIT) just like the income of an individual is subjected to PIT. The earnings of all companies in Nigeria except for those in the upstream sector of oil and gas activities are subjected to CIT. The current CIT rates in Nigeria are 30%, 20%, and 0%, respectively, for large, medium, and small companies. However, the incomes or profits of pioneer companies, companies in the extraction of solid minerals, and companies whose products form input used by manufacturing companies are exempted from CIT (Okoror, Mainoma and Uwaleke, 2019).

Conversely, the Petroleum Profit Tax (PPT) is a tax on the incomes arising from petroleum operations (Lateef et al., 2022). It is charged on the profit of upstream oil companies (Oduola, 2006). Upstream oil companies comprise companies in petroleum exploration, development, and production activities. PPT is one of the most important taxes in Nigeria due to its huge influence on government revenue and foreign exchange earnings (Lateef et al., 2022). The tax assessment rate has been changed from flat 85 % of the chargeable profit to graduated rates of 42.5% for onshore areas for Petroleum Mining Lease (PML), 37.5% for shallow water areas for PML, 22.5% for onshore areas for new license and leases granted post-PIA commencement and for marginal fields in shallow water areas, 5% from deep offshore areas for PML, and 10% for deep offshore areas for new licenses and leases granted post-PIA commencement (Olaniwun, 2021).

Unlike the PIT and CIT imposed specifically on companies in the upstream oil and gas sector and other companies, respectively, the tertiary education tax is charged to the assessable profit of all companies in Nigeria. The tertiary education tax is an initiative that has mandated companies to fund education infrastructures in public tertiary institutions in Nigeria. The Tertiary Education Trust Fund is responsible for imposing, handling, and distributing the tax revenue collected to government-owned tertiary institutions in Nigeria (Ogunode, Atobauka and Ayoko, 2023). The tertiary education tax rate is currently 3%.

Contrary to the earliest types of taxation described in this section, the value-added tax and customs and excise duty are examples of indirect tax in Nigeria. It is charged on the value

of goods and services consumed by individuals/economic agents or corporate entities (Ugwa and Embuka, 2012). VAT is chargeable at 7.5% in Nigeria (Finance Act, 2019; Lateef et al., 2022). The customs and excise duty is charged on imported and locally manufactured goods to generate revenue and protect domestic industries. The concept comprises "customs duty" and "excise duty". Customs duty is charged on imported goods. Its base is the value or quantity of imported goods. Excise duty, on the other hand, is levied on goods produced in Nigeria. Excise duty levied on a product can discourage the consumption of such products (Nwofia and Egege, 2021).

2.3 Empirical Review

This study is anchored on the benefit-received theory, which posits that a contractual relationship exists between taxpayers and the government wherein the taxpayers pay their taxes to enable the government to perform their statutory function (Bhartia, 2009; Anyafo, 1996). The inability of the taxpayers to pay their taxes as and when due can hinder the discharge of the responsibilities in terms of infrastructural development by the government (Lateef et al., 2022). Consequently, there are studies on the nexus between tax revenues and infrastructural development in Nigeria. Anaehobi and Agim (2019) examined the relationship between tertiary education trust fund intervention and the development of university libraries in South East, Nigeria, and they found a positive and significant association between TETFund intervention and the advancement of university libraries in South-East, Nigeria.

Similarly, Omobude et al. (2017) found a positive and significant association between TETFUND research grants and infrastructural facilities at the University of Benin. This implies that redirecting tax revenue toward public goods would improve capital expenditure for economic development and encourage taxpayers to comply with their tax obligations (Osho, Olemija and Falade, 2019). Corroborating this is Inyama, Chinedu and Nnenna (2017), Ajiteru, Aderanijo and Bakare (2018), Ayeni and Afolabi (2020), Ejemai, Akintoye and Adegbie (2020), Oladipupo and Ibadin (2016). However, there are other studies whose outcomes could not affirm that generating more through tax can lead to the provision of infrastructures (Anyaduba and Aronmwan, 2015; Daniel-Adebayo et al., 2022; Oladipupo and Ibadin, 2016).

3. Methodology

The ex post facto research design is adopted in this study. The data collected were used without any substantial modification. The data sets on tax revenues and budgetary allocation to education for 1994-2023 were used in this study. Tax revenue was proxy by personal income tax, company income tax, petroleum profit tax, tertiary education tax, value-added tax, and customs and excise tax. The proxy for educational infrastructural development was the budgetary allocation on education over the time frame of the study. This was so measured because the cost of maintaining and training educationists was taken as part of education infrastructural development in addition to physical and technical infrastructures. These data were sourced from the Central Bank statistical bulletin and the statistical reports of the Bureau of Statistics. The error correction regression was the method of data analysis because of the false correlation sometimes associated with time series data.

The econometrics model of Muojekwu and Udeh (2023), which explored the nexus between tax revenue and infrastructural development in Nigeria, was modified as stated below:

$$EDINF_t = \beta_0 + \beta_1PIT_t + \beta_2CIT_t + \beta_3PPT_t + \beta_4TET_t + \beta_5VAT_t + \beta_6CED_t + \nu_t \dots \dots \dots (i)$$

Where: EDINF = Education Infrastructural Development; PIT = Personal Income Tax; CIT = Company Income Tax; PPT = Petroleum Profit Tax; TETFUND = Tertiary Education Tax;

VAT = Value Added Tax; CED = Customs and Excise Duties; t = Period Covered; η = the Stochastic Error Term;

4. DATA ANALYSES AND INTERPRETATIONS

4.1 Descriptive Statistics

This section presents the data summary on the variables of interest in the study. The data summary in terms of the mean, median, maximum, minimum, standard deviation, Jarque-Bera statistics are detailed in table 4.1.

Table 4.1: Descriptive statistics

	EDINF	PIT	CIT	PPT	TET	VAT	CED
Mean	263.60	53.50	644.60	1329.90	113.00	582.10	454.60
Median	120.00	52.80	420.60	1290.00	68.40	401.70	281.30
Max.	876.00	107.70	2649.20	4209.00	328.70	2511.50	2240.90
Min.	0.10	15.90	12.30	24.60	31.80	7.30	18.10
Std. Dev.	267.10	25.90	670.90	1118.10	89.30	632.20	536.40
J-Bera	3.40	1.40	6.40	2.20	3.70	14.20	44.30
Prob.	0.20	0.50	0.00	0.30	0.20	0.00	0.00

Source: Researchers' compilation

Table 4.1 summarizes the data sets used in this study. The mean value of EDINF indicates that on average, about 263.6 billion naira was earmarked for education from 1994 to 2023. The standard deviation value of about 267.1 billion naira for EDINF indicates that the data sets on education infrastructural development are not closely clustered around the average value of education infrastructural development. The Jarque-Bera statistics of 3.4 and its associated probability of about 0.2 are indications that the data set on education infrastructural development met the normality requirements of a data set. The mean values on the data set for PIT, CIT, PPT, TET, VAT, and CED of about 53.5 billion naira, 644.6 billion naira, 1.3 trillion naira, 113 billion naira, 582.1 billion naira, and 454.6 billion naira, respectively, are indication that the petroleum profit income tax is the most generated in the period of the study.

4.2 Correlation Analysis

Table 4.2: Correlation Analysis

Probability	EDINF	PIT	LCIT	PPT	LVAT	LTET	LCED
EDINF	1						

PIT	0.55***	1					
	0.0017	-----					
LCIT	0.80***	0.38**	1				
	0	0.0384	-----				

PPT	0.71***	0.30	0.83***	1			
	0	0.1066	0	-----			
LVAT	0.80***	0.38**	0.99***	0.82***	1		
	0	0.0397	0	0	-----		
LTET	0.89***	0.48***	0.93***	0.85***	0.91***	1	
	0	0.0076	0	0	0	-----	
LCED	0.85***	0.39**	0.95***	0.78***	0.97***	0.87***	1
	0.0000	0.0329	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	-----

Source: researchers' compilation

Note: *** significant at 1%, ** significant at 5%, *Significant at 10%

Table 4.2 presents the correlation analysis of the data set used in this study. The relationship between EDINF and PIT is positive and significant at 1% with a coefficient of 0.55. The {coefficient} and <probability values> in the relationships between EDINF and CIT {0.80} <0.0000>, EDINF and PPT {0.71} <0.0000>, EDINF and VAT {0.80} <0.0000>, EDINF and TET {0.89} <0.0000>, and EDINF and CED {0.85} <0.0000> indicate that PIT, CIT, PPT, VAT, TET, CED significantly contributed to the funding of education within the review period in Nigeria.

The relationship between PIT and each of the following: CIT <0.0384>, VAT <0.0397>, TET <0.0076>, and CED <0.0329> is significant. However, the relationship between PIT and PPT was not statistically significant. CIT is statistically significant with PPT <0.0000>, VAT <0.0000>, TET <0.0000>, and CED <0.0000>. PPT is significantly related to VAT <0.0000>, TET <0.0000>, CED <0.0000>. Similarly, VAT is significantly related to TET <0.0000> and CED <0.0000>, and TET is significantly related to CED <0.0000>.

4.3 Regression Analyses

This section presents the long-run and short-run (error correction model) regression conducted in the study. The section began with stationarity test which culminate into the long run regression analysis and end with the error correction model.

Table 4.3: Unit root test

Variable	Level		1 st Difference	
	Augmented-Dickey Fuller T-statistics	Probability	Augmented-Dickey Fuller T-statistics	Probability
EDINF	-0.0225	0.9486	-5.3301	0.0002
PIT	-2.4708	0.1330	-7.2593	0.0000
LCIT	-1.9398	0.3102	-5.5842	0.0001
PPT	-0.8835	0.7784	-4.2786	0.0026
LVAT	-3.4543	0.0173	-7.3460	0.0000
LTET	-0.1132	0.9386	-5.3342	0.0002
LCED	-1.7172	0.4120	-6.2006	0.0000

Source: Researcher's Compilation

The augmented Dickey-Fuller statistics and their associated probability values at the data level are indications that the variables of the study are not stationary at the data level and suggest the need for a unit root test at first difference. Consequently, the probability values

associated with the ADF at first difference are indications that the variables of the study are stationary at first difference and that long run relationship may exist between education infrastructural development tax revenues. However, Engle-Granger cointegration test is conducted to further confirm the long-run relationship.

Table 4.4: Cointegration Analysis

Variable	Coefficient	Prob.	
PIT	0.8	0.0427	
LNCIT	-57.5	0.3454	
PPT	0.0	0.0171	
LNVAT	-192.7	0.0285	
LNTET	369.6	0.0000	
LNCED	317.1	0.0000	
C	-1725.6	0.0000	
		Value	Prob.*
Engle-Granger tau-statistic		-6.09	0.0266
Engle-Granger z-statistic		-32.28	0.0248
Source: Researcher's Compilation			

The probability values of less than 5% associated with the Engle-Granger tau-statistic and Engle-Granger z-statistic values confirmed that the variables of interest in this study are cointegrated in the long run.

Table 4.5: Long Run Regression Analysis

Variable	Coeff.	Prob.
PIT	0.84	0.2709
LCIT	-62.67	0.56
PPT	-0.02	0.3442
LVAT	-188.34	0.1765
LTET	355.9***	0.0001
LCED	318.3***	0.0004
C	-1682***	0.0000
R ²	0.92	
Adj. R ²	0.89	
F-statistic	42.46	
Prob(F-stat)	0.0000	
DW-stat		2.28

Source: Researcher's compilation

Note: *** significant at 1%, ** significant at 5%, *Significant at 10%

Table 4.5 presents the long-run regression analysis of the error correction model used in this study. The adjusted R² value of 0.89 indicates that about 89% of educational infrastructural development is explained by the tax revenues in the econometric model of the study. The F-statistics and its associated probability value of 42.46 and <0.0000> are indications that the joint relationship between the explanatory and explained variables is

significant at 1%. The coefficients and probability values of PIT {0.84} <0.2709>, TET {355.9} <0.0001>, and CED {318.3} <0.0004> indicate a positive relationship between education infrastructure development and personal income tax, tertiary education tax, and customs and excise duty, respectively. This implies that an increase in revenue generated by PIT, TET, and customs and excise duty, respectively, can lead to an 84%, 355%, and 318% increase in the funding of education infrastructural development and, by extension, tertiary education in Nigeria.

Table 4.6: Short-Run Regression Analysis

Variable	Coefficient	t-Stat	Prob.
C	1.4613	0.0536	0.9578
D(PIT)	22.633	0.5946	0.5588
D(LCIT)	-35.723	-0.3564	0.7252
D(PPT)	-4.8614	-0.1641	0.8712
D(LTET)	163.03*	1.7319	0.0987
D(LVAT)	-89.546	-0.7685	0.4511
D(LCED)	232.51*	2.0323	0.0556
ECT(-1)	-0.8973***	-3.3107	0.0035
R ²	0.3862		
F-stat	1.7978		
Prob (F-stat)	0.1433		
DW stat	1.9999		

Source: Researcher's Compilation

Table 4.6 presents the short-run regression analysis of the variables in this study. The error correction of -0.89 and its probability value <0.0035> are indicators that the short-run model is appropriate. The coefficient of -0.89 indicates that about 89% of the discrepancy in the coefficient of the variables of the long-run and short-run models can be corrected within a year.

The positive coefficient between PIT and education infrastructural development both in the short run and long run indicates that more revenue generated from personal income tax can go a long way in boosting education infrastructural development in Nigeria. If more revenue was to be generated through the PIT in the reviewed period, funds allocated to education could have increased by about 2260%. This implies that the government could fund public education through the personal income tax, which is the viable means of revenue generation available to most state governments in Nigeria. This finding is in tandem with the studies of Osho, Olemija and Falade (2019), Daniel-Adebayo et al. (2022), and Inyiama, Chinedu and Nnenna (2017). The negative coefficients in the short-run and long-run relationship between company income tax and education infrastructural development are indications that revenues generated through company income tax are largely used to fund another area of economic development other than the education infrastructural. This is not surprising as company income tax is collected by the federal government, meanwhile, education is co-funded in Nigeria by the Federal and state governments. However, our findings in this regard contradicted the studies of Anyaduba and Aronmwan (2015) and Ayeni and Afolabi (2020). Also, the coefficients in the relationship between petroleum profit tax and education infrastructural development indicate that the petroleum profit tax is usually used to finance other aspects of infrastructural development in Nigeria. This study also deviated from the studies of Anyaduba and Aronmwan (2015) and Oliver et al. (2017) and corroborates

Inyiama, Chinedu and Nnenna (2017) and Ajiteru, Aderanijo and Bakare (2018). The positive coefficients and associated probability values in both the short- and long-run regression of tertiary education tax and education infrastructural development are pointers that 100% of the revenues generated through tertiary education tax is used to finance education infrastructural development in Nigeria. This is in tandem with Nagbe and Micah (2019), Anaehobi and Agim (2019), and Omobude et al. (2017). The negative relationship, both in the short and long run, between value-added tax and education infrastructural development is a pointer that education infrastructural development is not funded through the revenue generated from value-added tax. This is not surprising as most educative materials are VAT exempted in Nigeria. This is in tandem with Oladipupo and Ibadin (2016), but contrary to Anyaduba and Aronmwan (2015), Ayeni and Afolabi (2020), Oliver et al. (2017), and Okoror et al. (2019). Finally, the relationship between education infrastructural development and customs and excise duty in both the short and long run indicates education infrastructural development is funded by the customs and excise duty in Nigeria. This corroborated Ayeni and Afolabi (2020), Ejemai et al. (2020), and Inyiama, Chinedu and Nnenna (2017), but could not support the study of Oladipupo and Ibadin (2016), which provides contrary evidence.

5. Conclusion

Education is the bedrock of the development of any nation on the globe. Despite the relevance of education to the development of a country, a kid glove is always paid to education in Nigeria, where the allocation to education is currently a far cry from the 26% of the country's annual budget recommended by the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organisation. This has always brought most unions in the tertiary institutions and government to a loggerhead. Against this backdrop, this study investigated the impact of tax revenues on education infrastructural development in Nigeria. The study found that both tertiary education tax and customs and excise duty significantly influenced education infrastructural development in Nigeria. Other forms of taxation, such as personal income tax, company income tax, petroleum profit tax, and value-added tax, had statistically non-significant effects on education infrastructural development in Nigeria. The study recommends that measures can help taxpayers trace the quantum of tax revenues spent on educational infrastructures in Nigeria should be instituted. Furthermore, the quantum of allocation to education should be increased to narrow the gap between the allocation to education and the recommendation on education by UNESCO

References

- Aina, A. C. and Olorunsola, E. O., 2023. Assessment of tertiary education trust fund (TETFund) interventions and academic staff job performance in public universities in Southwest, Nigeria. *American Journal of Education and Practice ISSN 2520-3991 (Online)*, 7(2), 90 – 103.
- Appah, E. and Isele, L. E., 2024. Taxes and health infrastructural development in Nigeria. *Journal of Advanced Research and Multidisciplinary Studies*, 4(3), PP 43-63
- Ajiteru, W. O., Aderanijo, L. O. and Bakare, L. A., 2018. Tax revenue and infrastructural development in Osun State. *International Journal of Innovation Finance and Economic Research*, 6(2), PP. 50 – 61.
- Anaehobi, S. A. and Agim, C. C., 2019. TETFund intervention and development of university libraries in South East, Nigeria. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 10(5), PP.116 - 125.

- Ayanduba, J. O. and Aronmwan, E. J., 2015. Taxes and infrastructural development in Nigeria. *Nigerian Journal of Banking, Finance and Entrepreneurship Management*, 1, PP.14 – 28
- Bennee, E., Okoye, P. V. C. and Amahalu, N. N., 2021. Infrastructural development and economic growth of Nigeria. *African Journal of Business and Economic Development*, (Online) Available at: <[http:// www.ijaar.org](http://www.ijaar.org)>
- Besley, T., 2020. State capacity, reciprocity, and the social contract. *Econometrica* 88 (4), PP.1307–1335.
- Borge, L.E., Parmer, P. and Torvik, R., 2015. Local natural resource curse? *J. Public Econ.* 131. Available Through: ScienceDirect Website < <http://www.sciencedirect.com/>>
- Bräutigam, D., Fjeldstad, O.H. and Moore, M., 2008. *Taxation and state-building in developing countries: Capacity and consent*. Cambridge University Press.
- Daniel-Adebayo, O., Akintoye, I. R., Adegbie, F. F. and Ajayi-Owoeye, A. O., 2022. Tax revenue and infrastructure expectation gap in selected Sub-Saharan African countries. *International Journal of Accounting Research*, 7(1), PP.75-86.
- Egbunike, F. C., Emudainohwo, O. B. and Gunardi, A., 2018. Tax revenue and economic growth: A study of Nigeria and Ghana. *Journal Ilmu Economic*, 7(20), PP. 213 – 220.
- Ejemai, M. O., Akintoye, I. R. and Adegbie, F. F., 2020. Companies income, customs and excise duty tax gap and infrastructural development in Nigeria. *International Journal of Development Research*, 10(03), PP. 34891 - 34901.
- Ibas, O. E. and Uzoigwe, M. C., 2020. Tertiary education trust fund intervention and quality assurance among public universities in Cross River State, Nigeria. *International Journal of Educational Benchmark*, 17(1), PP.1 – 10.
- Inyiama, O. I., Chinedu, A. and Nnenna, C. V., 2017. Relevance of tax revenue resources to infrastructural development of Nigeria. *International Journal of Managerial Studies and Research*, 5(10), PP. 74–81.
- Lateef, O. M., Lasisi, I. O., Adegboye, D., Ajepe, A. and Isife, B. N., 2022. Tax revenue collections and health care infrastructural development in Nigeria. *Journal of Finance and Accounting*, 10(1), PP. 19 - 24.
- Levi, M., 1988. *Of rule and revenue*. {e-book} University of California Press. Available through: Jstor website <<http://www.jstor.org/stable>>.
- Moore, M., Prichard, W. and Fjeldstad, O.H., 2018. *Taxing Africa: Coercion, reform and development*. Zed Books Ltd.
- Muojekwe, H. O. and Udeh, F. N., 2023. Effect of tax revenue on infrastructural development in Nigeria. *Journal of Global Accounting*, 9(1), PP. 161-189.
- Nagbe, O. I. and Micah, I. U., 2019. The relationship between tertiary education trust fund and development of tertiary institutions in Nigeria from 2009-2017. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 6(33), PP. 20 - 34.
- Odusola, A., 2006. *Tax policy reforms in Nigeria, world institute for development economics and research*. Research Paper No. 2006/03. <http://www.wider.unu.edu>
- Ogunode, N. J., Atobauka, I. S. and Ayoko, V. O., 2023. University education politicization in Nigeria: Implications and ways forward. *International Journal on Integrated Education*, 6(1), PP. 1 – 12.
- Okoror, J. A., Mainoma, M. A. and Uwaleke, U. J., 2019. Companies income tax and infrastructural development in Nigeria. *Accounting & Taxation Review*, 3(3), PP. 24–43.
- Oladipupo, A. O. and Ibadin, P. O., 2016. Indirect taxes and infrastructural development in Nigeria. *Igbinedion University Journal of Accounting*, 2, PP. 331-359.
- Olaniwun, A. 2021. The petroleum industry act, 2021: Key highlights. [online] available at: www.olaniwunajayi.net

- Olufemi, E. A., Olatunbosun, A. J., Olsode, O. S., and Adeniran, I. G., 2013. Infrastructure development and its effect on economic growth: The Nigerian perspective. *European Scientific Journal*, 9(31), PP. 431 - 452.
- Olugbade J. A. and Adegbe F. F., 2020. Personal income tax and infrastructural development in Lagos State, Nigeria. *Journal of Finance and Accounting*, 8(6), PP. 276-287
- Olutayo, A. O., 2010. Education infrastructure and unsustainable development in Africa. *Human Affairs*, 20, PP. 183 - 198.
- Omagu, F. E., 2016. Infrastructural development in Nigeria: A panacea for transforming educational sector for sustainable national development. *International Journal of Capacity Building in Education and Management (IJCBE)*, 3(1), PP. 13 – 19.
- Omobude, H., Ikhisemojie, M., Oyetunji, A. G. and Omorogbe, I. E., 2017. The influence of TETFUND research grants on sustainability of infrastructural facilities in the University of Benin. *The Nigerian Journal of Teachers Education and Teaching*, 9(1), PP. 48 - 55.
- Osho, A. E., Olemija, T. L. and Falade, A. B., 2019. The influence of tax revenue on government capital expenditure and economic growth in Nigeria. *European Journal of Business and Management*, 11(2), PP. 39–49.
- Sjursen, H. I., 2023. Accountability and taxation: Experimental evidence. *Journal of Economics Behaviour and Organisation*, 216, [online] available through: Science direct at: <http://www.sciencedirect.com>
- Ugwa, M. and Embuka, A., 2012. Pay as you consume the value added tax. *Gauge: A quarterly publication of the Federal Inland Revenue Service*, April June.
- Umar, K., Ogbu, C. and Ereke, E., 2019. The challenges of infrastructural development in Nigeria: An assessment of the pains and the gains. *International Journal of Political Science Development*, 7(4), PP. 101 – 108.
- Yizengaw, T., 2008. *Challenges of higher education in Africa and lessons of experience for the Africa-US higher education collaboration initiative*. Being a Synthesis Report by National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges (NASULGC) Based on Consultations and Review of Literature Related to Higher Education and Development in Africa.

Bio-note

Ernest Oshodin is currently an Associate Professor in Department of Accounting, Faculty of Management Sciences, University of Benin, Benin City. He is a researcher interested in financial reporting, management accounting, and taxation.

Osasu Obaretin is an Associate Professor in Department of Accounting, Faculty of Management Sciences, University of Benin, Benin City, He is a postgraduate researcher whose area of interest is in the areas of taxation, financial reporting, and management accounting