

CORPORATE TAX AND PERFORMANCE OF LISTED OIL AND GAS COMPANIES IN NIGERIA (2012-2021)

¹Duru Oluchi & ²Nnodim Eniwogho Ologhene

^{1&2}Department of Accountancy, Faculty of Management Sciences, Imo State University, Owerri, Nigeria

Email: ²eniwoghonnodim@gmail.com

K E Y W O R D S

A B S T R A C T

This study examined effect of corporate tax on performance of listed oil and gas companies in Nigeria. Secondary data were sourced from Conoil, Oando, Ukoromi and Sons Limited and Empire Energy Group Limited. Corporate tax was proxied by company income tax, education tax and petroleum profit tax as the independent variable while performance was proxied by return on equity and return on asset as dependent variable. Data were analysed using ordinary least square (OLS) using SPSS statistical package. Findings show that company income tax had negative and insignificant effect of on ROA and ROE of oil and gas companies in Nigeria. Education tax (EDT) had negative and insignificant effect on ROA of oil and gas companies in Nigeria. Education tax (EDT) had positive and insignificant effect on ROE of oil and gas companies in Nigeria. Petroleum profit tax (PPT) had positive and insignificant effect on ROA and ROE of oil and gas companies in Nigeria. The researcher, therefore, concluded that corporate tax had a positive and insignificant relationship with performance of oil and gas companies in Nigeria. The study, therefore, recommended among others that Government should consider revising its corporate tax policy to provide greater incentives for investment in the oil and gas industry by reducing the overall tax burden for companies that demonstrate strong financial performance and contribute to the development of the industry.

Background of the Study

Companies aim for high net income to increase their earnings per share (EPS), but a number of factors can have an impact on their income and the amount of money they can return to shareholders (dividend). One of these aspects is tax. Ojukwu (2017) defined tax as a compulsory contribution to state revenue levied by the government on

workers income and business profit or added to the cost of some goods, services and transactions.

According to Appah (2011), the development of any nation depends on the amount of revenue generated for the provision of infrastructural facilities for the common good of all. One major source of generating this revenue is taxation. Bello, Idris and Adejumobi (2018) stated that tax is a major source of government revenue all over the world, including Nigeria. Governments use tax proceeds to render their traditional functions such as the provision of public goods, maintenance of law and order, defense against external and internal aggression, regulation trade and business to ensure social and economic justice. Brown (2016) also maintained that the economic effects of taxation include micro effects on the distribution of income and efficiency of resource use as well as macro effects on the level of capacity output, employment, prices and growth.

Corporate tax is one imposed by the government on the profits of corporations, including those in the oil and gas industry. Corporate tax is seen as a tax levied on the profit earned by a company. The impact of corporate tax on the performance of oil and gas companies can be substantial and far-reaching, influencing factors such as investment, exploration, production, and overall profitability. One way that governments can mitigate the negative impact of corporate tax on the oil and gas industry is by offering tax incentives for investment in the industry. For example, tax credits for drilling, exploration, and production activities can encourage investment and increase the competitiveness of the industry (Smith, 2017; 2018).

Corporate tax is a tax imposed by the government on the profits of corporations, which can have a significant impact on the performance of the oil and gas industry. The oil and gas industry is capital-intensive and generates large profits, making it a prime target for corporate taxation. Ali (cited in Ibeh & Ezeh, 2021) argued that corporate tax is an important tool for regulating business activities and promoting sustainable development. He suggests that the government should carefully design corporate tax policies to ensure that they are effective in promoting public interest.

Nigeria is a country with a rich oil and gas sector, which is a major contributor to its economy (Adenikinju, 2013).

In determining the performance of oil and gas industries, there are accepted variables along which it is discussed. The major two of these variables are the returns on asset and returns on equity. Return on Asset (ROA) refers to a financial ratio that measures the profitability of a company in relation to its total assets. It is calculated as net income divided by total assets (Olaleye & Abdu-Raheem, 2020). Similarly, Return on Equity (ROE) refers to a financial ratio that measures the profitability of a company

in relation to its shareholder equity. It is calculated as net income divided by shareholder equity (Ademola & Ogbaji, 2021).

The government of Nigeria implements various tax policies on the oil and gas industry in order to increase revenue and promote socio-economic development (Central Bank of Nigeria, 2020). Of the obvious impact of the proceeds of corporate tax, education, company income tax and petroleum profit tax are key indices. Education tax refers to a tax imposed by the government to finance education services and infrastructure whereas company income tax refers to a tax imposed on the taxable income of a business entity. Petroleum profit tax is a specific tax levied on upstream operations of the oil and gas industry. It covers taxes on rents, royalties, margins and profit-sharing elements associated with oil mining, prospecting and exploration leases. It is considered as the most important tax in Nigeria since it accounts for between 95% and 70% of foreign exchange earnings and government revenue respectively. However, the impact of these tax policies on the financial performance of listed oil and gas companies in Nigeria has not been fully understood (Bello et al., 2019).

Corporate tax is a key component of the tax policies implemented by the government of Nigeria (Adenikinju, 2013). The tax burden of companies can affect their financial performance (KPMG, 2016), as companies must allocate resources to pay for taxes (PWC, 2019). Therefore, the relationship between corporate tax and the financial performance of companies is of great interest to policy makers, investors, and stakeholders in the oil and gas industry (Bello et al., 2019).

The impact of corporate tax on the oil and gas industry can be both positive and negative. High corporate tax rates can discourage investment in the industry and reduce the profitability of oil and gas companies, leading to reduced exploration, development, and production activities. However, extant literature indicates that there is no consensus as to the positive or negative impact of corporate tax on the performance of oil and gas industries in Nigeria. Therefore, this study was conducted to ascertain corporate tax and performance of listed oil and gas companies in Nigeria.

There is no gainsaying the fact that the tax burden placed on corporate companies affects their performances positively or negatively. It is not uncommon to hear companies complain of high taxes from the government. However, scholars differ on the outcome of such burdens. Specifically, the oil and gas industry is faced with numerous challenges, in addition to their task burden, struggles with the fluctuating price of crude oil, insecurity, and inadequate infrastructure (Ogaji, Owhoko, & Obi 2020). To this end, Abdul-Rahman, Taufiq and Razak (2019) found that high corporate tax rates can reduce a company's profitability, while lower tax rates can increase it. Similarly, Agbebi and Ajayi (2018) reported that corporate tax has a significant

negative impact on the return on assets (ROA) of Nigerian companies, particularly those in the oil and gas sector. Onyekuru and Uche (2020) stated that due to high task burden, oil companies have not been able to engage in Research and Development (R&D), which would have increased their marginal output. Adeleye and Abdu-Raheem (2020) found that investment opportunities of oil companies reduced due to high tax burden.

However, although there are many studies that have investigated the nexus between corporate tax and performance of oil and gas industries in Nigeria, there is an obvious dearth of empirical studies on specific variables of performance. Therefore, it will be difficult to speak in specific terms how corporate tax affects oil and gas industries. Against this backdrop this study was conducted to find out how corporate tax impacts the performance of oil and gas industries in Nigeria from 2012-2021.

Objectives of the Study

The main objective of the study is to evaluate the effect of corporate tax on performance of listed oil and gas companies in Nigeria.

Specifically, the study was conducted to:

1. Assess the effect of corporate income tax on return on assets in Nigeria.
2. Examine the effect of company income tax on return on equity in Nigeria.
3. Evaluate the influence of education tax on return on asset in Nigeria.
4. Investigate the influence of education tax on return on equity in Nigeria.
5. Ascertain the effect of petroleum profit tax on return on asset in Nigeria.
6. Evaluate the effect of petroleum profit tax and return on equity in Nigeria.

Research Questions

In line with the objective of the study the following are the research questions.

1. What is the effect of company income tax on return on assets in Nigeria?
2. What is the effect of company income tax on return on equity in Nigeria?
3. To what extent does education tax influence return on asset in Nigeria?
4. What is the effect of education tax on return on equity in Nigeria?
5. What is the effect of petroleum profit tax on return on asset in Nigeria?
6. To what extent does petroleum profit tax affect return on equity in Nigeria.

Research Hypothesis

The following hypotheses were developed

H₀₁: There is no significant relationship between company income tax and return on asset in Nigeria.

H₀₂: There is no significant relationship between company income tax and return on equity in Nigeria.

- H₀₃:** Education tax has no significant relationship with return on asset in Nigeria.
- H₀₄:** There is no significant relationship between education tax and return on equity of oil and gas companies in Nigeria.
- H₀₅:** There is no significant relationship between petroleum profit tax on return on asset in Nigeria.
- H₀₆:** There is no significant relationship between petroleum profit tax and return on equity in Nigeria.

Scope of the Study

This study evaluated corporate tax and performance of listed oil and gas companies in Nigeria. These include Conoil, Oando, Ukoromi and Sons Limited and Empire Energy Group Limited. Data were sourced from their annual reports for a period of 10 years (2012-2021). Ten year study period became necessary since studies cited did not cover corporate tax and performance of listed oil companies up to 2021. The performance variables were delimited to return on equity and return on assets as the dependent variable while corporate tax was studied against the backdrop of company income tax, Education tax and petroleum profit tax as the independent variable.

Literature Review

Conceptual Review

Corporate tax

Nwezeaku (2005) postulated that tax is a compulsory payment made by a citizen for which there is no immediate commensurate return.

Tax is a compulsory levy imposed on a subject individual or cooperate or upon his property income or consumption for the government to generate revenue to provide security, social amenities and create condition for economy growth (Appah, 2011). Danbatta (cited in Appah, 2011) defined tax as a compulsory contribution made by an individual and organization towards defraying the expenditure of the government, these taxes can be direct or indirect tax which are impose on the income or consumption of a tax payer who bear the burden of taxation. The indirect tax are imposed on the goods and services on which the tax payer does not bear the burden of taxation, but it can be transferred to the final consumer who bears the burden in form of price. Nzotta (cited in Adebayo, 2019) maintained that tax is a compulsory levy contribution made by the citizens to the state or even an alien, subject to the jurisdiction of the government, for reasons of residence or property and this contribution is for general common use.

Based on the definitions given above, tax or taxation, in the researcher's view, is a mandatory levy the government requires from taxable individuals, corporate entities and goods and services for developmental purposes. The government of a country generate most of its revenue through taxation and it is from this revenue that they (the government) use to provide essential services like, road, electricity, pipe-borne water etc every corporate organization is expected as a requirement to pay taxes, from their profit and until taxes are paid dividend cannot be paid because dividend is paid from profit after tax of company.

Corporate Tax is a tax imposed by a government on the profits earned by companies, calculated as a percentage of the company's net income (Khan & Jain, 2015). Corporate Tax is a crucial source of government revenue, used to finance public goods and services, and support economic development (Smith, 2018). It can also play a role in shaping the behavior of companies and improving tax compliance (Davis & Parker, 2017).

Furthermore, Corporate Tax is a tax that is levied on the profits of a corporation or company. It is usually calculated as a percentage of the company's net income (Brown, 2016). Corporate Tax is a dynamic and constantly evolving area of taxation that requires companies to have a thorough understanding of the tax laws and policies in the countries where they operate (Smith, 2017).

Education tax

Introduced on 1st July 1983, 'Education Tax' is a compulsory wage based contribution system, the proceeds of which are used to assist the Ministry of Education with needed finance. Everyone within the workforce pays Education Tax, including employers, employees and the self-employed.

Education tax in Nigeria is a type of tax that is used to finance the country's education system (Adewole & Ojo, 2019). The tax is primarily levied on individuals and businesses, with the revenue generated being used to support public schools, colleges, and universities. In Nigeria, the education sector has long faced challenges, including inadequate funding and a lack of access to quality education for many students. As a result, the introduction of education tax in the country has been seen as a crucial step towards improving the state of education in Nigeria.

Petroleum Profit Tax (PPT)

A cardinal form of corporate tax levied on the oil and gas industry is petroleum profit tax (PPT). It is considered as a major revenue contributor to Nigeria (Usman & Adegbite, 2015). This has made the government pay great attention to such tax. Its proceeds affect both gross domestic product (GDP) and foreign exchange earnings of

Nigeria significantly. According to Ngu (2021), petroleum profit tax is defined as an act of the Federal Government of Nigeria (FGN) on oil and gas companies for the profits derived from oil mining and exploration activities. Olatunji and Adegbite (2014) opined that petroleum profit tax is a specific tax levied on upstream operations of the oil and gas industry. It covers taxes on rents, royalties, margins and profit-sharing elements associated with oil mining, prospecting and exploration leases. It is considered as the most important tax in Nigeria since it accounts for between 95% and 70% of foreign exchange earnings and government revenue respectively (Ezugwu & Akubo, 2014).

The major essence of the PPT, as hinted by Gbegi, Adebisi and Bodunde (2017), revolves around the upstream sector that is responsible for oil prospecting, mining, and production. The petroleum profit tax Act stipulates that crude oil production is taxed at the rate of 85% on export and 65.75% on domestic sale of oil within the periods under review. According to Lawal (2013), the Federal Inland Revenue Service (FIRS) is saddled with the responsibility for collecting and administering the PPT according to the authority vested on it by the PPT Act. Thus, the FIRS is statutorily responsible for the assessment and collection of taxes in the oil and gas sector of the economy. Collection of this tax is justified on the grounds that oil is Nigeria's economy mainstay, which yields the revenue needed by the government to meet her obligations to the citizens and the nation (Ilaboya & Ofiafor, 2014).

Tax Preference Theory

Tax Preference Theory is a tax theory that suggests that individuals and companies make economic decisions based on the tax implications of those decisions. The theory proposes that taxpayers consider the tax consequences of their actions when making decisions, and that taxes can influence the choices they make. This theory has implications for the design of tax policy, as tax incentives and disincentives can be used to influence behavior.

The theory was first propounded by Stanley Surrey, a leading tax scholar, in the 1950s. Surrey's work focused on the idea that tax considerations play a role in economic decisions, and that taxes can be used to shape economic behavior. Surrey's ideas about tax preference were influential in shaping the development of modern tax policy, and his theories continue to be relevant today.

The relevance of this theory to this study lies in the fact that the rate of tax burden on oil and gas industry can affect their overall attitude towards corporate. Where the burden is beyond their income vis-à-vis input and output, tax evasion may be last resort for the company.

Adeleye and Abdu-Raheem (2020) aimed to investigate the impact of corporate tax on the investment decisions of Nigerian oil and gas companies. They collected data from a sample of 30 companies operating in the Nigerian oil and gas industry over a period of 10 years from 2008 to 2018. The researchers used regression analysis to analyze the data and determine the relationship between corporate tax and investment decisions. The findings of the study suggested that high tax burdens can discourage investment and reduce the long-term growth potential of the industry. Specifically, the results showed that an increase in corporate tax by 1% leads to a decrease in investment by 0.64%.

The reviewed study was carried out in Nigeria just like the present one. Companies studied are all situated in Nigeria. However, the time periods of both studies differ: the reviewed study covered 2008-2018 whereas the present covered 2012-2021. More so, whereas the reviewed study involved 30 oil and gas companies, the present one covered only two. The reviewed study did not also cover the variables of returns and equity and did not use education tax to measure corporate tax.

Onyekuru and Uche (2020) conducted a study to investigate the impact of corporate tax on the competitiveness of Nigerian oil and gas companies. The study analyzed the financial statements of 10 selected oil and gas companies listed on the Nigerian Stock Exchange (NSE) from 2010 to 2018. The study employed descriptive statistics and correlation analysis to examine the relationship between corporate tax and competitiveness of the companies. The findings of the study revealed that high tax burdens can reduce the competitiveness of oil and gas companies in Nigeria. The study found a negative correlation between corporate tax and research and development (R&D) expenditure, which indicates that higher tax burdens limit the ability of companies to invest in R&D activities. Additionally, the study found a positive correlation between tax incentives and R&D expenditure, which indicates that tax incentives can encourage companies to invest in R&D activities.

The reviewed study differs from the present one in terms of period of time covered as well as design and instrument for data analysis. While the former used descriptive survey design and correlation statistics, the present study used ex-post facto design and secondary data as well as regression statistics. The former study also was delimited to tax and company expenditure, research and development and tax incentives whereas the present one was delimited to returns and equity as well as education and company income tax.

Research Design

The study utilized secondary data to collect data from Conoil, Oando, Ukoromi and Sons Limited and Empire Energy Group Limited. The quantitative data collected covered the various proxies for independent and dependent variables of the study; namely, company income tax, education tax, return on equity and return on assets for the period of 10 years covering (2012-2021).

The data collected in the course of the research were analyzed using some statistical tools in line with the nature of the study's problem and objectives. A multiple regression model guided the analysis of the data collected on the key variables of the study. The study utilized the ordinary least square (OLS). The ordinary least square technique was adopted due to the properties of BLUE (Best, Linear and Unbiased Estimators). T-statistics was employed in establishing the individual relationship of each of the exogenous variable on the identified endogenous variable while F-statistics established the combine effect or relationship of the three exogenous variables on the endogenous variable. 0.05 level of significance was utilized in the study.

Data Analyses

The company income tax (CIT), education tax (EDT) and petroleum profit tax (PPT) are proxies for Corporate tax, which is the independent variable while the Return on assets (ROA) and Return on equity (ROE) are proxies for performance, which is the dependent variable.

To standardize to equal base the log of numbers is used

Year	ROA	ROE	CIT	EDT	PPT
2012	-1.07	0.758	5.5888	4.6983	6.1266
2013	0.5682	1.2309	6.3724	5.2404	6.9988
2014	-0.0164	0.7157	6.1782	4.9491	6.4550
2015	0.5229	1.1157	6.2265	4.7887	6.7001
2016	0.6063	1.1875	6.3617	5.2033	7.0007
2017	0.3980	0.9454	5.6236	4.5454	6.1265
2018	0.4721	0.9912	5.8201	4.8542	6.5011
2019	0.4910	1.0057	5.8545	4.8803	6.1041
2020	0.4721	0.8742	5.8285	4.7927	6.1000
2021	0.7533	1.1503	6.0473	4.9759	6.8000

Results of Regression Analyses

The multiple regression models of this study as stated in chapter 3 were analyzed using the ordinary least square (OLS) regressions. The results of the analysis are detailed in the appendix but have been summarized in table 4.2

Table 4.2 Results of the Regression Analysis

@ 5% level of significance	MODEL 1 (ROA)	MODEL 2 (ROE)
(Constant) b_0	-4.754	-1.504
(CIT) b_1	1.038	0.224
(EDT) b_2	-0.234	0.237
(PPT) b_3	1.888	0.777
Durbin Watson stat	1.785	2.508

Source: *Extracts from Appendix*

Table 4.2 shows that the intercept (b_0) of the regression model 1, and 2 is negative at -4.754, and -1.504 respectively, the result shows that when the proxies for independent variable in the models are zero, the dependent variable, (ROA) and (ROE) will be negative. Results from the table 4.2 also indicate that the coefficient of the first (CIT) independent variables in model 1 is positive as shown in the value (1.038), the second (EDT) is (-0.234) is negative and the third, (PPT) is positive (1.888) respectively. This indicated that the independent variables from the model 1 have a positive and negative relationship with the dependent variable (ROA).

On the other hand, in the second model the first (CIT), 0.224 independent variable shows a positive relationship with the dependent variable (ROE), the second (EDT) independent variable as indicated in the value 0.237 shows positive relationship with the dependent variable (ROE) and (PPT) is positive (0.777) respectively.

The Durbin Watson result for the model confirms that the data used in the analysis is free from autocorrelation or serial correlation shown in the value (1.785), and (2.508) respectively since it is close to 2, which further indicates that the data used in the analysis is valid.

Test for significance and decisions on the hypotheses of the study

The test for significance results using t-statistics are detailed in the appendix. However, a summary of the significance results which aids the decision for the six hypothesis of the study are summarized on table 4.3

Table 4.3 Test for significance results (Test of hypotheses)

@ 0.05% level of significance	Model 1 (ROA)		Model 2 (ROE)			HYP 5 (PPT)
	HYP 1 (CIT)	HYP 3 (EDT)	HYP 2 (CIT)	HYP 4 (EDT)	HYP 6 (PPT)	
P-Value	0.392	0.884	0.535	0.625	0.669	0.893
Remarks	INSIG.	INSIG	INSIG	INSIG	INSIG	INSIG

Source: *Extracts from appendix*

Hypotheses

H₀₁: There is no significant relationship between company income tax and return on asset of oil and gas companies in Nigeria.

From table 4.3, $P > 0.05$ for hypothesis 1 with the P-value being 0.392. This indicates that there is an insignificant relationship between company income tax and return on asset of oil and gas companies in Nigeria. The null hypothesis which states that there is no significant relationship between company income tax and return on asset of oil and gas companies in Nigeria is accepted while the alternative hypothesis is rejected.

H₀₂: There is no significant relationship between company income tax and return on equity of oil and gas companies in Nigeria.

Table 4.3 shows that P-value in respect of the second hypothesis is 0.535 which implies that $P > 0.05$. With this, there is an indication of insignificant relationship between company income tax and return on equity of oil and gas companies in Nigeria. Therefore we accept the null hypothesis and reject the alternative hypothesis and conclude that there is no significant relationship between company income tax and return on equity of oil and gas companies in Nigeria.

H₀₃: Education tax has no significant effect on return on asset of oil and gas companies in Nigeria.

The hypothesis test table above further reveals that the P-value in respect of the third hypothesis is 0.884 ($P > 0.05$) which suggests an insignificant effect of the independent variable (EDT) on the dependent variable (ROA). The study therefore accepts the null hypothesis and rejects the alternative hypothesis and conclude that Education tax has no significant effect on return on asset of oil and gas companies in Nigeria.

H₀₄: There is no significant relationship between Education tax and return on equity of oil and gas companies in Nigeria.

From table 4.3, $P > 0.05$ for hypothesis 4 with the P-value being 0.625 this indicates that there is an insignificant relationship between Education tax and return on equity of oil and gas companies in Nigeria. The null hypothesis which states that there is no significant relationship between Education tax and return on equity of oil and gas companies in Nigeria is accepted while the alternative hypothesis is rejected.

H₀₅: There is no significant relationship between Petroleum profit tax and return on asset of oil and gas companies in Nigeria.

The hypothesis test table above further reveals that the P-value in respect of the hypothesis five is 0.893 ($P > 0.05$) which suggests an insignificant effect of the independent variable (PPT) on the dependent variable (ROA). The study, therefore, accepts the null hypothesis and rejects the alternative hypothesis. This leads to the conclusion that Petroleum profit tax has no significant effect on return on asset of oil and gas companies in Nigeria.

H₀₆: There is no significant relationship between Petroleum profit tax and return on equity of oil and gas companies in Nigeria.

From table 4.3, $P > 0.05$ for hypothesis 6 with the P-value being 0.669, implying an insignificant relationship between Petroleum profit tax and return on equity of oil and gas companies in Nigeria. The null hypothesis was, therefore, rejected and the alternative accepted. This means that there is significant relationship between Petroleum profit tax and return on equity of oil and gas companies in Nigeria.

Discussion of findings

The findings from the analysis and the test statistics are discussed in line with the objective of the study in the first chapter. Discussion of the findings is as follows:

The regression model analyzed in this study took care of the objectives and hypothesis of the study; which include objectives/hypothesis 1-6. In the models, each of the proxies for corporate tax was regressed against return on assets (ROA) and return on equity (ROE)(dependent variable).

In model 1, the result reveals that company income tax (CIT) has a positive and insignificant relationship with ROA. It means that a unit increase in CIT will lead to a 1.038 increase in ROA. On the other hand in model 2 company income tax (CIT) was found to have positive and insignificant impact on ROE. This means that a unit increase in company income tax (CIT) will lead to a 0.224 increase in ROE. This aligns with the work of Chen (2020) where he investigated the impact of tax policy on the financial performance of oil and gas firms in the United States and found that tax policy was positively associated with financial performance of oil and gas firms.

Furthermore, in model 1 the result reveals that Education tax (EDT) has a negative and insignificant relationship with ROA. It means that a unit increase in EDT will lead to a -0.234 decrease in ROA.

On the other hand in the model 2 Education tax (EDT) was found to have positive and insignificant impact on ROE. This means that a unit increase in Education tax (EDT) will lead to a 0.237 increase in ROE. This aligns with the work of Adegbite, and Owolabi (2022) where they investigated on the impact of corporate tax planning on the

performance of listed oil and gas companies in Nigeria and found that corporate tax planning positively affects the financial performance of listed oil and gas companies in Nigeria.

In model 1, result shows that Petroleum profit tax (PPT) has a positive and insignificant relationship with ROA, implying that a unit increase in PPT will result to a 1.888 corresponding increase in ROA. Similarly, in model 2, Petroleum Profit tax (PPT) shows a positive but insignificant impact on ROE. Therefore, a unit increase in Petroleum profit tax (PPT) will lead to a 0.777 increase in ROE.

The F-statistics results do not support this in both models as the independent variables are not jointly significant to the dependent variables as indicated in the value (0.382) and (0.177) respectively.

Also the data are free from serial autocorrelation as indicated from the value of Durbin Watson which is (1.785), and (2.508) that indicates that the data is valid since it is close to 2.

Summary of Findings

The overall results of the analysis in the preceding chapter of this study provide the following findings:

1. There is positive and insignificant relationship between company income tax and return on asset of oil and gas companies in Nigeria
2. There is positive but insignificant relationship between company income tax and return on equity of oil and gas companies in Nigeria.
3. There is negative and insignificant effect of education tax (EDT) on the return on asset of oil and gas companies in Nigeria.
4. There is positive and insignificant relationship between education tax (EDT) on the return on equity of oil and gas companies in Nigeria.

Conclusion

Based on the major findings, the following conclusions were made:

Corporate tax has a positive but insignificant relationship with performance of oil and gas companies in Nigeria. This arises due to the fact that a positive change in corporate tax affects positively the performance of oil and gas companies in Nigeria. This aligns with the work of Ogbuji and Akanwa (2020) and Adegbite, and Owolabi (2022) that showed a positive relationship between Corporate tax and performance of listed oil and gas companies in Nigeria.

Recommendation

The following recommendations are made based on the results of the study.

1. Government should consider revising its corporate tax policy to provide greater incentives for investment in the oil and gas industry. This could include reducing the overall tax burden for companies that demonstrate strong financial performance and contribute to the development of the industry.
2. Oil and gas companies should continue to focus on improving their financial performance, both in terms of profitability and investment in research and development. This will not only help them to remain competitive in the market, but may also help to reduce their overall tax burden.
3. To mitigate the impact of corporate tax on their financial performance, Nigerian oil and gas companies should explore opportunities for tax planning and optimization. This could include taking advantage of tax credits and deductions, investing in tax-efficient structures, and seeking out professional advice from tax experts.

References

1. Adeleye, N. & Abdu-Raheem, K. (2020). Corporate tax and investment decision: Empirical evidence from Nigerian oil and gas industry. *International Journal of Energy Economics and Policy*, 10(2), 369-375.
2. Ademola, A. A., & Ogbaji, M. U. (2021). Corporate Tax and Financial Performance of Oil and Gas Companies in Nigeria. *Journal of Economics and Sustainable Development*, 12(2), 37-44
3. Adeleke, S. O., & Adekunle, O. (2021). Corporate tax and financial performance of listed oil and gas companies in Nigeria. *International Journal of Economics, Commerce and Management*, IX(2), 1-12.
4. Adegbite, E., & Lawal, M. (2019). Tax incentives and compliance behaviour in Nigeria. *International Journal of Economics, Commerce and Management*, 7(11), 1-10.
5. Adewole, O., & Ojo, O. (2019). The implementation of education tax in Nigeria: Challenges and opportunities. *Journal of African Education*, 55(3), 200-213.
6. Adeyemo, M. & Adekunle, A. (2015). An overview of taxation in Nigeria. *International Journal of Economics, Commerce and Management*, 3(11), 1-10.
7. Adesanya, A. (2022). Consequences of non-compliance with corporate tax obligations in Nigeria. *Journal of Tax Enforcement*, 10(3), 78-85
8. Adenikinju, A. (2013). The impact of tax policy on economic growth and development in Nigeria. *Journal of Policy Modeling*, 35(5), 779-793.

9. Agbebi, F. O., & Ajayi, R. A. (2018). Corporate tax, capital structure and firm performance: Evidence from Nigeria. *Journal of Accounting and Taxation*, 10(2), 19-27.
10. Ainsworth, R., Irwin, D., & Kendal, D. (2000). Introduction to accounting: An integrated approach booster. USA.
11. Ajibola, T., & Adewumi, A. (2018). The role of education tax in promoting equity in the Nigerian education system. *Journal of Education Policy*, 33(2), 135-140.
12. Anyaduba, J. O. (2004). Partnership taxation in Nigeria: Some basic issues. *ICAN Student Journal*, 9(2), 15-17.
13. Akinbode, A. (2018). Withholding tax obligations for companies in Nigeria. *Journal of Tax Administration*, 6(2), 56-62.
14. Akinwunmi, A. A., & Ajayi, E. O. (2021). Corporate tax and financial performance of Nigerian oil and gas companies during COVID-19 pandemic. *Journal of Accounting, Finance and Auditing Studies*, 7(3), 295-306.
15. Akinlolu, O., & Akinbode, S. (2023). The effects of tax evasion on the financial performance of Nigerian oil and gas companies. *Journal of Economics and Business Research*, 3(1), 23-38.
16. Ajayi, O. (2020). Corporate taxation in Nigeria: A review of historical developments and emerging trends. *Journal of African Business and Economic Development*, 15(1), 34-48.
17. Appah, E. (2011). Corporate tax incentives: A tool for the economic growth and development of Nigeria. *International Journal of Social Sciences*, 3(2), 20-27.
18. Auerbach, A. J., & Hassett, K. A. (2011). The corporate income tax in the 21st century. *American Economic Review*, 101(3), 394-400.
19. Ballard, C. L. (2013). Corporate taxation and investment: A study of the effects of the corporate tax on investment and economic growth. *Journal of Public Economics*, 97(1), 1-17. Congressional
20. Brunnermeier, M. K., & Saez, E. (2019). The future of corporate taxation in an era of globalization. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 33(4), 111-13.
21. Budget Office. (2017). *Corporate taxation in the United States: An overview*. Washington, DC: CBO.
22. Bello, M., Idris, A., & Adejumobi, A. (2018). The impact of tax policies on the financial performance of listed firms in Nigeria. *International Journal of Economics, Commerce and Management*, 6(12), 1-8.
23. Bosch, M. (2014). The role of tax policy in promoting economic growth and development. *International Journal of Economics and Finance*, 6(8), 166-174.

24. Brown, J. (2019). The importance of education tax in providing stable funding for public schools. *Education Journal*, 44(1), 11-15.
25. Central Bank of Nigeria (2020). *Nigeria economic report*. Abuja, Nigeria: Central Bank of Nigeria.
26. Chen, L. (2020). The impact of tax policy on the financial performance of oil and gas firms. *Journal of Corporate Finance*, 55, 101329.
27. Davis, J., & Parker, R. (2017). *Corporate taxation: An introduction*. Palgrave: Macmillan.
28. Deloitte, I. (2017). *The impact of corporate tax rates on investment in the oil and gas industry*. Deloitte.
29. Egbulonu, K. C. (2007). *Statistical influence for science and business*. Owerri: Peace Publishers.
30. Ejiofor, R. A., Orji, I. J., & Ezeaku, P. I. (2020). The effect of oil price volatility on the financial performance of oil and gas firms in Nigeria. *Journal of Economic and Sustainable Growth*, 1(1), 1-13.
31. EY. (2020). *The impact of corporate tax on the oil and gas industry*. EY.
32. Eze, E. (2017). Corporate tax compliance in Nigeria: An analysis of the roles of the Federal Inland Revenue Service. *Journal of Accounting and Taxation*, 5(3), 56-63.
33. Ezugwu, C. I., & Akubo, D. (2014). Analysis of the effect of high corporate tax rate on the profitability of corporate organisations in Nigeria. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 5(20), 310-321.
34. Gbegi, D. O., Adebisi, J.F., & Bodunde, T. (2017). The effect of petroleum profit tax on the profitability of listed oil and gas companies in Nigeria. *American International Journal of Social Science*, 6(2), 40-46.
35. Graetz, M. J., & Schenk, A. (2010). The evolution of the corporate income tax. *National Tax Journal*, 63(4), 895-919.
36. Green, L. (2016). The need for dedicated education tax revenue. *Education Policy Analysis*, 33(3), 45-52.
37. Grubert, H., & Altshuler, R. (2015). The corporate tax in an era of globalization. *Journal of Economic Literature*, 53(1), 5-51.
38. Hasan, M. A., & Jütting, J. (2017). Tax incentives for foreign investment in developing countries: A review of the literature. *World Development*, 95, 130-147.
39. Hines, J. R., & Rice, E. M. (1994). Corporate flight: Corporate tax avoidance through transfer pricing. *American Economic Review*, 84(4), 922-939.

40. Ibe, C. (2021). The consequences of corporate tax non-compliance in Nigeria. *Journal of Financial Regulation and Compliance*, 29(2), 123-130.
41. Ibeh, E., & Eze, S. (2021). Corporate tax evasion and financial performance of Nigerian oil and gas companies. *Journal of Accounting and Taxation*, 13(2), 17-27.
42. Ilaboya, O.J., & Ofiafor, E. (2014). Petroleum profit tax and economic growth in Nigeria. *British Journal of Business and Management Research*, 1(2), 55-67.
43. International Monetary Fund (IMF). (2023). *The impact of corporate tax on the performance of oil and gas companies during economic cycles*. IMF.
44. Johnson, R. (2019). *Corporate taxation: An international perspective*. Routledge.
45. KPMG. (2019). The impact of corporate tax on the competitiveness of oil and gas companies. KPMG.
46. Khan, M. S., & Jain, P. K. (2015). *Corporate taxation: Principles and practice*. McGraw-Hill Education.
47. KPMG. (2016). *Corporate tax rate survey 2016*. KPMG International.
48. Kim, J. (2018). The impact of tax incentives on the financial performance of oil and gas firms. *Journal of Taxation*, 42(3), 295-310.
49. Lawal, K.T. (2013). Taxation of Petroleum Profit under the Nigeria's Petroleum Profit Tax Act. *International Journal of Advanced Legal Studies and Governance*, 4(2), 1-17.
50. Liu, X. (2009). Corporate tax and the financial performance of oil and gas companies. *Journal of Finance*, 64(4), 1703-1725.
51. Lee, J. (2020). *Corporate taxation: An international perspective*. Cambridge University Press.
52. McKinsey & Company. (2021). *Corporate tax and the oil and gas industry: Understanding the impact*. McKinsey & Company.
53. Mintz, J. M., & Smart, M. (2015). *The corporate tax in a global economy*. Washington, DC: Urban Institute Press.
54. Ngu, S. K. (2021). Petroleum profit tax and performance of listed oil and gas firms in Nigeria. *African Journal of Business and Economic Development*, 1(4), 1-13.
55. Nwabueze, R. C. (2018). The development of corporate taxation in Nigeria: A review of key reforms. *African Journal of Economic and Management Studies*, 9(3), 369-382.
56. Nwaeze, A. (2018). Corporate taxation in Nigeria: Issues and challenges. *International Journal of Economics, Commerce and Management*, 6(8), 1-7.

57. Ndi, N. E., & Nnanna, I. (2019). The role of tax culture in tax compliance: Evidence from Nigeria. *Journal of African Business*, 20(1), 38-54.
58. Nwezeaku, N. C. (2005). *Taxation in Nigeria: Principles & practice*. Owerri: Springfield Publisher.
59. Obasa, O. (2017). The effectiveness of education tax in Nigeria. *Nigerian Journal of Education Policy*, 22(4), 75-80.
60. Ogaji, M. J., Owhoko, P., & Obi, B. C. (2020). Government policies and their impact on the Nigerian oil and gas industry. *Journal of Petroleum Science and Engineering*, 195, 107667
61. Olatunji, T.E., and Adegbite, T.A. (2014). The Effects of Petroleum Profit Tax, Interest Rate and Money Supply on the Nigerian Economy. *Global Journal of Commerce and Management Perspective*, 3(3), 81-87.
62. Oyediran, O., & Alabi, O. J. (2019). Balancing revenue generation and economic growth in developing countries: A review of the literature. *African Journal of Economic Policy*, 8(2), 92-102.
63. Obamuyi, E. (2020). The impact of taxation on foreign direct investment in Nigeria. *Journal of Economics and Business Research*, 28(3), 123-139.
64. Olowo, O. & Odusola, A. (2017). Tax incentives and economic growth in Nigeria: An empirical analysis. *Journal of Public Economics*, 142(1), 45-58.
65. Ogundipe, O. (2020). Computation of taxable income for companies in Nigeria. *Journal of Tax Planning*, 8(1), 45-51.
66. Ojukwu, N. (2017). Corporate taxation in Nigeria: An overview of historical trends and current developments. *African Journal of Taxation*, 11(2), 102-117.
67. Ogbuji, M. C., & Akanwa, O. L. (2020). Corporate tax incentives and financial performance of Nigerian oil and gas companies. *International Journal of Energy Economics and Policy*, 10(1), 201-209.
68. Onyekuru, N., & Uche, C. (2020). Corporate tax and competitiveness of Nigerian oil and gas companies. *Journal of Accounting and Taxation*, 12(3), 27-36
69. Okafor, U. (2016). Corporate tax reforms in Nigeria: An analysis of key policy challenges and opportunities. *Journal of Economic Development*, 17(1), 41-55.
70. Oluwaseun, O. (2020). Corporate taxation in Nigeria: An overview. *Journal of Taxation and Regulation of Financial Institutions*, 3(4), 47-54.
71. Oyedele, O. (2021). Corporate taxation in Nigeria: An overview. *Journal of African Business*, 12(2), 35-43.
72. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). (2015). *Corporate tax reform: Issues and options*. Paris, France: OECD Publishing.

73. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). (2017). *The future of corporate tax*. Paris: OECD Publishing.
74. OECD Publishing. Romer, C. D., & Romer, D. H. (2019). The political economy of the corporate tax. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 33(4), 89-110.
75. Oyewole, O., Adegbite, E., & Owolabi, O. (2022). Corporate tax planning and firm performance: Evidence from the Nigerian oil and gas industry. *Journal of Accounting in Emerging Economies*, 12(2), 135-152.
76. Pandey, R. (2003). *Financial management*. Delhi: Vika Publishing House Ltd.
77. Parker, R. (2019). *Understanding corporate taxation*. Palgrave Macmillan.
78. PWC. (2018). *The impact of corporate tax on the oil and gas industry*. PWC
79. PWC. (2019). *Total tax contribution: Measuring the economic impact of taxes paid by companies*. PWC.
80. Smith, J. (2015). *Corporate tax as a levy on profit*. New York: Oxford University Press.
81. Ruggeri, A., & Zolt, E. M. (2016). Improving tax compliance in developing countries: A review of the literature. *World Development*, 79, 233-244.
82. Salami, A. (2000). *How are Nigeria companies funded?* Center for Research in Economic and Finance Discussion Paper Series. Lagos Business School.
83. Salid, G. (2012). Taxes and dividend policy: Case of Pakistan. *Research Journal of Finance and Accounting*, 3, 1-12.
84. Shaviro, D. (2013). The corporate income tax in the 21st Century. *National Tax Journal*, 66(2), 335-360.
85. Slemrod, J., & Bakija, J. (2017). *Taxing ourselves: A citizen's guide to the great debate over tax reform*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
86. Smith, J. (2017). *Corporate taxation: An introduction*. McGraw-Hill Education.
87. Smith, J. (2018). Limitations of education tax in financing education. *Education Finance Review*, 27(1), 25-30.
88. Smith, J. (2018). *The economics of corporate taxation*. Cambridge University Press.
89. Ugwuanyi, U., & Agu, F. (2020). Tax planning and financial performance of Nigerian oil and gas companies. *Journal of Accounting and Taxation*, 12(1), 1-11.
90. Watson, D., & Head, A. (2004). *Corporate finance: Principles & practice* (3rd ed.). Essex: Pearson Education Ltd.
91. Wei, S. J. (2011). *How tax policy can promote growth and reduce poverty*. Policy Research Working Paper 5612, The World Bank.
92. Wilson, S. (2017). Improving the distribution of education tax revenue. *Education Law Review*, 56(2), 78-85.