



OGUYA INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF CONTEMPORARY ISSUES

Kogi State College of Education (Technical) Kabba.



ISSN: 2795-3734

Vol. 2, No 2, Mar. 2023

VOTE BUYING AND CREDIBLE ELECTIONS IN SELECTED LOCAL GOVERNMENT AREAS OF KOGI STATE

Oju, Olusegun¹; Akomolafe, Margaret²; Adebayo, Stephen³.

^{1,3} Department of Technical Education,

² Department of Integrated Science Education,

Kogi State College of Education (Technical), Kabba, Kogi State,

E-mail : ojuolusegun2017@gmail.com¹; margaretakomolafe@yahoo.com²;

³Steveolley4k@yahoo.com

Abstract

Incentives in the form of money have been used in Nigerian elections in recent years, but in the 2019 General Election and the recently concluded general elections in 2023, the prevalence of vote buying was so obvious that it damaged the credibility of the democratic process. This paper explores the topic of vote buying and how it affects Nigeria's chances for fair elections. It used primary and secondary data to investigate the origins, occurrences, and effects of vote buying on Nigeria's democratization process. The General Incentive Model was also adopted by the study and used as its analytical framework. It was found that Nigeria has consistently faced threats in its efforts to institutionalize the best democratic principles and ensure the purity and integrity of the process. To prevent vote buying in Nigeria, the paper suggests lowering poverty levels as well as making sure the Electoral Act of 2022 is followed to the letter.

Keywords: Democracy, elections, financial inducements, voters, and vote buying

Introduction

One of the primary pillars sustaining and assessing the effectiveness of democracy is the electoral process. It is hardly surprising that modern States consider repeated elections to be a necessary element of democracy. They also assert that election is a fundamental principle that guarantees the right of the populace to select their leaders and act as a yardstick for the effectiveness of democratic institutions. As a result, elections take place under conditions that preserve regional and global standards of credibility. The way elections have been held in Nigeria since it resumed its democratisation process in 1999 has left a lot to be desired. This is because elections have been tainted by electoral fraud, such as vote buying, as well as other transgressions like electoral violence, which cast doubt on the integrity of the procedure and the authority of the government. Even with the recently enacted naira redesign strategy and the

recently signed electoral act of 2022, the incidence of vote buying, and financial inducements became so clear in the 2019 General Election (Adigun, 2019; Dauda, et al., 2019). The 2023 General Elections also follow a similar trajectory. It is sufficient to mention that Peter Obi of the Labour Party (LP), Atiku Abubakar of the People's Democratic Party (PDP), and Asiwaju Bola Ahmed Tinubu of the All-Progressives Congress (APC) all faced off in a difficult and fiercely competitive race during the 2023 General Election. 91 recognised political parties took part in the election, which had 18 presidential contenders on the ballot. The Independent National Electoral Commission (INEC) reported that there were 93.46 million total registered voters. As politicians and political parties sought to outdo one another and impact the election results, vote buying grew. What impact does vote buying have on Nigeria's electoral and democratic system, then? This paper examines the practice of vote buying and how it affects Nigeria's chances for transparent elections and democratic stability.

Clarification of Concepts

- Election

Vote buying is a practise that affects Nigeria's chances for transparent elections and democratic stability. Elections are democratic processes that give citizens the power to choose their representatives and decide on governmental matters. Under any democratic system, those who are eligible to vote could choose political options and to make choices that reflect their views. The act of electing a leader and participating in governance is a formal act of collective decision-making that involves the participation of the populace. The primary relevance of elections is that our current democratic system depends on an effective electoral system.

- Vote- buying

The idea of "vote buying" has received a substantial explanation from several specialists as an emerging issue in political and electoral language. On the other hand, corrupted elections can never produce acceptable and genuine leaders. According to Etzioni-Halevy (1989), the exchange of personal material rewards for political support is one way to define vote buying. Voters receiving private material incentives in exchange for their political support is the focus of this definition. Additionally, it entails giving voters rewards or gifts in exchange for their support of the candidate or giver(s). In light of this, this viewpoint sees vote buying as a commerce in which supporters of such candidates are compensated with presents. It is important that Bryan's definition specifically includes money, since the previous definition did not directly focus on the usage of money, and that Baidoo, Dankwa, and Eshun's (2018) description of the notion is similarly phrased as "the use of money and direct rewards to sway voters." His proposal encompasses the buying of votes for other things other just money, such as food, clothing, motorcycles, and other tangible commodities. Voters are given cash and other material rewards in this scenario to influence their voting preferences. Voters may also be requested to abstain, vote a particular way, or decline to cast a ballot in addition to receiving these direct benefits. Vote buying can therefore be defined as any reward given to a person for casting a particular ballot or for opting not to. Vote buying refers to any kind of monetary, material, or promissory incentive or reward offered by a candidate, political party, agent, or supporter to influence a voter's choice to cast a ballot or even to abstain to increase the

likelihood that a specific candidate will win an election. Vote buying is an electoral fraud that takes place in many nations, including Nigeria, and it is important to state this.

Theoretical Foundation

The General Incentive Model, developed by Clark and Wilson in 1961, serves as the study's theoretical underpinning. They argue that if we are aware of the kinds of incentives that an organisation may offer to encourage members' increasing collaboration, we can learn something about the incentive structure a political party uses to retain members' engagement in its operations. According to Clark and Wilson (1961), understanding an organization's incentive systems can aid in the explanation of both internal and external events. They asserted that all organisations in good standing must provide "physical or intangible incentives" to encourage the best contribution from their members. When attempting to buy voters' support, politicians frequently use both monetary and non-monetary incentives to influence voter behaviour. This practice is known as "negative vote buying," "swing voters, and a party's core supporters to turn out and vote, which is often referred to in this paradigm as "turnout buying," and is typically directed towards the impoverished or less educated class of opposition supporters (Cox & McCubbins, 1986). Turnout purchasing boosts votes for the party buying votes while negative vote buying decreases votes for the opposing party. Vote-buying incentives deliver goods that are private, immediate, and highly certain (Desposato, 2007). The distribution of these vote-buying incentives is meant to accomplish two main goals: first, to assure positive or participative vote buying, and second, to achieve low turnout. When vote-buying incentives are distributed, the electorate's poorer and less educated members are frequently the target. This is explained by the fact that gifts have a stronger impact on the underprivileged. As a result, parties will attempt to buy the votes of the impoverished before the wealthy (Stokes, 2005). For instance, a naira note found on the street will make a poor person happy than a wealthy person. The declining marginal utility of income is to blame for this. For instance, according to Bratton (2008), the dollar was the most popular form of payment during the 2007 elections in Nigeria. Due to these economic factors, political parties that seek to increase their prospects of (re)election are likely to focus their efforts on buying the votes of poor voters. Hence, the party will be able to secure more votes from people in the lower income bracket with the same investment of resources. In other words, because the poor are frequently left out of the allocation of public goods, vote-buying may be a more effective way to persuade them to cast a ballot. Poor voters "should, on average, have a higher value for immediate private goods than for delayed public goods," according to Desposato (2007). Furthermore, it is unlikely that poor voters will be able to reject vote-buying incentives unless they have a backup source of revenue or simply did not need the inducement.

Methodology

When gathering data for the study, the mixed method approach—a blend of qualitative and quantitative research methodological approaches—was used. The research methodology of a single study using mixed methods incorporates both quantitative and qualitative methodologies. The two research methodologies function well together and offer advantages

over each other for the subject. As a result, the study's sequential mixed method design was used. Interviews were used to further the triangulation of survey data. The intended audience for this study was all eligible voters in local governments in the Yoruba-speaking region of Kogi State who were at least 18 years old. The local government areas include the following: Yagba East, Yagba- West. Mopa-Muro, Kabba-Bunnu, and Ijumu LGAS were chosen for the study. The Taro Yamene's formula was used to determine a sample size of 193 people. Ten others were purposefully picked for the qualitative (interviews conducted) portion of the study, while these were chosen for the quantitative (questionnaires administered) portion. To support the data, two respondents from each of the Area Councils (a total of 10 respondents) were chosen for the oral interview. Results indicate that only 193 (96.8%) of the 200 copies of the disseminated questionnaire were retrieved. This was acknowledged and deemed appropriate, and it served as the foundation for this study's analysis. The frequency distribution table utilizing straightforward percentages served as the quantitative data analysis tool used in this investigation. A description of the practice of vote buying from the early 1970s, democratic elections have been more widespread around the world. Vote buying and other forms of electoral fraud have also increased. Vicente (2008) confirms that vote buying occurs often in many regions of the world as support. Vote buying has continuously increased in scope and brazenness in African nations such as Sao Tome and Principe, Nigeria (Athanasius, 2019; Onuoha & Ojo, 2018); (Bratton, 2008; Vicente, 2008), Kenya, and Ghana (Kramon & Posner, 2013). As stated further by Baidoo, Dankwa, and Eshun (2018), campaigns work to make sure that supporters of their candidate can easily link the gift to them. For instance, a flyer for the candidate might be stapled to the meal that voters are given, or a flier might have money connected to it. Every society has varied manifestations of vote buying. Direct payments to voters could be one option. According to Schaffer & Schedler (2005), literal vote buying is just a straightforward commercial transaction. They claim that similar to how people buy and sell apples, shoes, or televisions, candidates "buy" votes and individuals "sell" them. This demonstrates that vote buying is an act in which voters sell their votes to the highest bidder according to a contract or even an auction. Following the concept of market exchange, parties and candidates that provide tangible benefits to voters may generally seek to buy political support at the polls. Providing social infrastructure to communities at the "last minute," the offering of employment prior to elections, the gifting of gifts, and the conditional pledges made to individuals upon the election of a candidate are examples of forms of vote buying (Baidoo, Dankwa, and Eshun) (2018). Similar to this, Kramon (2009) believes that political parties use certain tactics to buy electorates' votes. The techniques can be centered on either mobilizing inactive supporters or demobilizing active opponents. While the latter could be referred to as "participation buying," the former is frequently referred to as "negative" vote buying or "abstention buying." These tactics may be used to encourage voters to vote or to ensure a high turnout, but it is yet unclear how the parties would select between them when providing electoral incentives or purchasing votes. Again, Baidoo, Dankwa & Eshun (2018) suggest that during the distribution of these "goodies" or "freebies," political parties and politicians target or examine two key topics. They contend that one aspect political parties take into account when attempting to buy votes is the voter's demographic. Therefore, Cox and McCubbins (1986) distinguished three categories of voters: core supporters, swing voters, and supporters of the opposition. These three main voter groupings may therefore be identified in every

electoral system, and they constitute the target demographic for vote purchasing. Asserting that vote-trading propositions may target either electoral choices or electoral participation, Schaffer & Schedler (2005) identify the second factor. They may be made to influence people's decisions on how to vote, whether to vote at all or how to vote. In addition, three key theories have emerged from existing literature and theoretical viewpoints to explain the roots of vote buying in elections. First, it is asserted that socio-economic variables, particularly deprivation, unemployment, and illiteracy, significantly contribute to the market for votes. Second, it is asserted that a certain electoral system's voting procedures may also ensure that vote buying will be prevalent when elections are held. The third theory is based on the idea that vote buying is a by-product of the partisanship and party structure in a specific state (Onapajo, Francis & Okeke - Uzodike, 2015). Every democracy frowns upon the purchase of votes. It calls into doubt the effectiveness of democracy. Because of this, some defences of the practice are frequently offered. Secondly, they contend that vote buying breaches the equality principle because it unfairly favours wealthy people. The second worry is that vote buying can encourage inefficiency. This is because certain voters' interests have been purchased by parties prior to the election, and as a result, their demands or interests can be disregarded by political representatives after the election. In many economies, buying votes is likewise discouraged. This is because a country loses favour with international multinational corporations looking to invest in emerging nations once it becomes user-friendly to vote buying and vote selling (Baidoo, Dankwa & Eshun, 2018). Significantly, Nigeria forbids the purchase of votes. According to the Electoral Act of 2010 and that of 2022, as amended, anyone who — (a) corruptly gives, provides or pays money to, or on behalf of, any person at any time after the date of an election has been announced to corruptly influence that person or any other person to vote or refrain from voting at such election, or on account of such person or any other person having voted or refrained from voting a Section VIII (e) of the 2018 Revised Code of Conduct for Political Parties states that: "...all political parties and their agents shall not engage in the following practice: buying votes or offer any bribe, gift, reward, gratification, or any other monetary or material considerations or allurement to voters and electoral officials." This is in accordance with the Electoral Act (2010). Vote buying has persisted in Nigerian elections in recent years despite these legal frameworks outlawing it. In fact, because of Nigeria's open practice of purchasing votes, the country's electoral system has been referred to as a "cash-and-carry democracy" (Onuoha & Ojo, 2018). Vote-buying, which is defined as providing rewards or presents to voters ahead of elections in exchange for their votes, is without a doubt a corrupt electoral practice. Nevertheless, prevalent in many developing democracies, the phenomena appear to hamper democratic processes. Vote buying puts the integrity of elections at risk. The validity of the electoral process is allegedly called into question by electoral fraud, corruption, and unfair tactics, according to Akwetey (2016). It has an impact on the elected leaders' legitimacy. According to him, the practice frequently causes mistrust, violence, and conflicts while depriving citizens of the peace and advancement they deserve. This cankerworm has grown widely in Africa, where many elections have not been centred on issues, policies, or accountability. Since it's typically done by providing incentives to voters, this has an impact on economic development. Election campaigns are meant to be a civil, free-flowing exchange of ideas in a democracy. Candidates should compete for the public's vote by making persuasive cases for why they are the best deserving of the position. They take opposing stands on public

goods programs while also being pushed in the direction of the median voter in the middle of the political spectrum (Downs, 1957). The candidate whose positions on issues most closely align with voters' own preferences is then chosen by voters. Since Nigeria's return to democracy in 1999, the nation has organized and held six general elections, including those for the National Assembly, Governorship, State Assembly, and Council. In addition, there have been bye-elections. Allegations of the distribution of electoral incentives intended to buy voters' votes have dogged all these elections. At both the national and internal party elections, vote buying appears to have established itself as the standard practice. The issue is a result of the high rates of poverty and ignorance among the electorate. The Civil Society Situation Room (2019) claims that it is a deceitful strategy intended to profit from the widespread need and poverty by persuading individuals to sell their votes to the highest bidder. The Situation Room documents egregious instances of vote buying involving major political parties in Nigeria, where Party officials stationed themselves at polling places and paid voters amounts ranging from N500 to N5,000 to support their candidates. The appearance of vote buying in Nigeria suggests that it will damage political legitimacy and discredit the country's democratic system. As a result, there will be a fundamental issue with irresponsibility and lack of accountability, and the elections' legitimacy would suffer since voters won't have the moral authority to demand decent governance from candidates. Vote buying increases election expenses for parties and candidates and may discourage trustworthy candidates from running for government (Matenga, 2016). Voters become disgruntled and feel alienated from a system that has been tarnished and has turned its back on democratic norms.

3. Findings and Discussions

The findings of this research work are discussed in this section.

Table 1: The reality of vote buying in Nigeria.

	Frequency	Per cent	Cumulative Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	110	57.2	51.2
AGREE	64	33.3	90.5
UNDECIDED	5	2.3	92.8
DISAGREE	8	4.1	96.1
STRONGLY DISAGREE	6	3.1	100
	193	100	

Source: Field Survey, 2023

One hundred and ten respondents to the survey—representing 57.2% of the sample as a whole—strongly agreed that vote buying occurs in Nigeria. 64 respondents, or 33.3% of the sample, confirmed this. The total percentage indicates that more than 90% of respondents agreed that vote-buying is a reality in Nigeria. Nevertheless, five (5) respondents, or 2.3%, were unsure. A total of fourteen (14) respondents, or 7.2%, disagreed with or strongly disagreed with the statement that vote buying occurs in Nigeria. These outcomes made it very evident that vote buying is a serious and concerning practice in Nigeria.

Table 2: Money/Gift items were distributed by politicians during the 2023 General Elections

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	99	51.2	51.2
AGREE	72	37.5	88.7
UNDECIDED	0	0	88.7
DISAGREE	16	8	96.7
STRONGLY DISAGREE	6	3.3	100
	193	100	

Source: Field Survey, 2023

During the general elections in 2023, incentives for vote buying in the form of cash and gifts were given out. Many respondents had either directly received a gift or reward from a political party or knew some people who had. Table 2's findings revealed that 99 respondents, or 51.2%, and 72 respondents, or 37.5%, strongly agreed and agreed, respectively, that politicians utilized gifts and money as incentives during the 2023 General Elections. The distribution of these rewards was done to influence voters' voting decisions, which is the same as purchasing votes. Contrarily, 16 and 6 respondents, or 8.0% and 3.3%, rejected and strongly opposed, respectively, that politicians distributed gifts and money during the general elections of 2023. According to the findings, more than a third of all respondents had experience with vote-buying incentives. Likewise, 10 of the 12 interviewees confirmed that vote buying was a widespread occurrence during the general elections of 2023. Many respondents were either participants or observers of vote buying. The respondents provided a variety of products obtained as gifts from political parties and politicians as incentives for buying votes, including money, rice, beans, and sauces, as well as branded party materials such "T" shirts, wrappers, bangles, and umbrellas.

Table 3: Some Communities benefitted from developmental projects before 2023 general elections.

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	34	17.3	17.3
AGREE	49	25.6	42.9
UNDECIDED	8	4.4	47.3
DISAGREE	57	29.5	76.8
STRONGLY DISAGREE	45	23.2	100
	193	100	

Source: Field Survey, 2023

Table 4: Conditions Attached to Vote Buying Incentives by Politicians or their Allies.

No.	ITEMS	SA%	A%	U%	D%	SD%	TOTAL
1.	I was told to snap my ballot paper as proof	21 (11.1)	28 (14.5)	6 (3.1)	86 (46)	49 (25.3)	193 (100)
2.	I was given an object to swear with	17 (8.8)	30 (15.8)	5 (2.3)	95 (49)	18 (10.1)	193 (100)
3.	Somebody was watching me while voting	85 (43.7)	49 (25.3)	11 (5.9)	29 (44)	29 (15)	193 (100)
4.	The party agent sent to assist me in voting	83 (50.4)	34 (17.3)	2.5 (1.3)	43 22.2	17 (8.3)	193 (100)
5.	I was threatened should in case I changed my mind	16 (8.3)	22 (11.1)	7 (3.6)	84 23.1	65 (33.9)	193 (100)
6.	There was no condition attached to the incentives	32 (16.8)	36 (18.9)	43 (22.2)	86 44.4	35 (18.1)	193 (100)
7.	I rejected the gifts because of the conditions attached	40 (20.7)	55 (28.4)	3.5 (1.8)	43 22.2	56 (26.6)	193 (100)
8.	I accepted the gifts but voted the way I so desired	84 (43.1)	34 (17.3)	2.5 (1.3)	43 22.2	31 16.1	193 (100)

Source: Field Survey, 2023

(SA. - Strongly Agree, A. - Agree, U. - Undecided, D. - Disagree, SD. – Strongly Disagree. Figures in bracket are in percentages).

Also, the study investigated whether the communities in the local governments in the Okun region of Kogi State benefited from construction initiatives before or just after the general elections in 2023. The objective was to determine whether these initiatives were intended to act as incentives to influence people' voting decisions, which is equivalent to purchasing votes.

Table 3 reveals that 49 (25.6%) and 34 (17.3%) strongly agreed with the claim that communities benefited from development initiatives before the general elections. 8 people (4.4%) were found to be unsure. Nonetheless, 57 (29.5%) and 45 (23.2%) disagreed and strongly disagreed with the claim, respectively. In other words, individuals who responded affirmatively saw projects in their neighbourhoods or knew of similar ones in other communities. Again, those who gave a negative response had not heard of or seen any such initiatives until the Nigerian general elections in 2023. Participants in the interviews mentioned the construction of community clinics, tarring of roads, drilling of boreholes, installation of transformers, and provision of public electricity supply as some of the developmental initiatives.

This study also investigated the limitations imposed on the incentives provided during vote buying. It also questioned respondents on the nature of the limitations imposed on their incentives. Table 4 makes it very clear that there were certain restrictions placed on the incentives offered with the intention of buying votes. Many of the people who were interviewed admitted that the incentives had requirements. However, some insisted that there was no constraint attached to the incentives, even though they were offered to influence voters'

behaviour, and this supports the opinion of a senior party member of the kabba-bunu council. The council leader said that they do not put limits on the incentives unless they are concerned about the recipient's party affiliation or believe the recipient is only collecting the incentive and not casting a ballot. The survey also showed that despite voting their consciences, many electorates were prepared to accept rewards from politicians. In other words, even if political leaders-imposed restrictions, voters expected to collect rewards.

Vote buying's effects on Nigerian elections and democracy

Vote buying has a lot of bad consequences, especially for a democracy in transition like Nigeria. It is critical to keep in mind that vote buying artificially raises election expenses, excludes candidates with low funding, and promotes political corruption. Naturally, state takeover happens when victory is bought rather than legitimately obtained. The best course of action is to envision what happens after State capture. This implies that politicians might turn corrupt once they are in office. This is because they want to get back the money they spent on the campaign. Public funds might be used improperly as a result of this. The validity, credibility, and integrity of elections are all compromised by vote buying. Election integrity is compromised because winning candidates are typically picked based on their large bids rather than their popularity or trustworthiness (Adamu, Ocheni, & Ibrahim, 2016). Vote buying hurts politics and the electoral process that is serious. Because of this, it discourages moral people from participating in electoral politics, undermines public trust in government institutions, and encourages political and voter apathy. Additionally, vote dealing tends to maintain ineffective governments. It puts in peril not just the health of those who purchased votes to obtain an advantage in the near term, but also the future of those who did not purchase votes but are ultimately subjected to the terrible governance that results from such a dishonest method. Many people will experience the unintended repercussions of each vote swapped if the traded votes decide the election's outcome. To put it another way, vote buying jeopardises the "elected" government's adherence to the ideals of good governance, such as accountability, inclusivity, and responsiveness. Vote buying jeopardises elections' legitimacy, credibility, and integrity. Additionally, using rewards to purchase votes can have a terrible effect on Nigeria's elections. As a result, election quality (freedom and fairness) can decline. Vote buying can aid in the election of the wrong political parties, opening leadership positions to the highest bidder. Once voters are paid to cast their ballot, they are effectively made slaves by their political masters because they no longer have the freedom to reject those who buy their votes. Vote buying is so widespread that it calls into question how democratic institutions are evolving and how future elections can help create more efficient and responsible governments. Vote buying was once again found to be one of the biggest threats to the general elections in 2023, despite the use of technology. In Freetown, as they say, there is no such thing as a free lunch. Therefore, according to Ojo (2018), the opportunity cost of vote buying is the underdevelopment of the country. According to international standards, a democracy ensures that everyone has the same rights. Every citizen of a State, for instance, has the right to vote and be elected in every genuine democracy worldwide, assuming there are no restrictions that are both reasonable and legal. Vote buying, on the other hand, can make it impossible to meet these requirements since it discourages candidates from seeking office, especially when these people are at a disadvantage economically, i.e., when they lack the funds to buy votes and win elections (Athanasius, 2019)

4. Conclusion and Recommendations

Over time, vote buying has become more common in Nigeria's political system. Political parties routinely target the poor for vote buying because of Nigeria's shockingly high and frighteningly prevalent rate of poverty. The impoverished and helpless are now more successful at buying votes as a result. It is a prevalent misconception that the success of vote buying among low-income voters is due to the fact that their marginal utility of little material possessions is higher. Money, branded and unbranded clothing, rice, cooking supplies, motorbikes, and even development projects undertaken during electioneering were discovered to be some of the most popular items used as inducements to buy votes. According to the investigation, money was primarily distributed at the voting stations throughout election week and on election day. Incentives have frequently been given away unconditionally unless the person giving them believed the receiver may violate or renege on the seller-buyer agreement. In essence, it was evident that voters would approve of the incentives even if they came with restrictions. Because they perceived it as an opportunity to retrieve some money that the politicians had unlawfully taken, many people believed it was acceptable to accept money from politicians in exchange for their votes. Despite the circumstances, the effects of vote buying have already been discussed. Consequently, it is advised that:

- i Reducing poverty is one approach to dissuade people from buying votes. The results showed a relationship between income (economic status) and voters' decisions; therefore, governments should prioritise reducing poverty by fostering wealth growth and redistribution. It is feasible to achieve this, especially for people residing in rural areas, by creating or providing sustainable work.
- ii. More voter education, awareness-building campaigns, and citizen education are required to combat the fraud of vote buying. By aggressively educating the electorate that accepting cash or other benefits in exchange for their vote is the same as selling their conscience and constitutional rights, voters, civil society organisations (CSOs), the media, and other non-state actors should collaborate with the government and political parties to advance and strengthen democracy.
- iii. The amended election Act should let citizens utilise social media tools to reveal election fraud, such as vote buying, and should make it illegal for anybody to record ballots.
- iv. The Independent National Electoral Commission (INEC) and the Economic and Financial Crimes Commission (EFCC) should establish a strategic framework for cooperation to effectively monitor political parties' campaign funding to successfully combat electoral fraud, including vote buying.
- v. To increase the privacy of the ballot, the INEC should construct a foldable voting cubicle that would make it challenging for party agents to view a voter's thumbprint on the ballot paper.
- vi. The police and other law enforcement should be held accountable for their actions by apprehending, properly investigating, and prosecuting anyone who engages in vote trading, as demanded by civil society organisations.

References

Adamu, A. Ocheni, D. and Ibrahim, S. (2016). Money Politics and Analysis of Voting Behaviour in Nigeria: Challenges and Prospects for Free and Fair Elections.

- International Journal of Public Administration and Management Research, 3(3), 89– 99. Retrieved from <http://www.rcmss.com/2016/ijpamr/>
- Adigun, O. W. (2019). Vote Buying: Examining the Manifestations, Motivations, and Effects of an Emerging Dimension of Election Rigging in Nigeria (2015- 2019). *Canadian Social Science*, 15(11), 20-28. DOI: [http:// dx.doi.org/10.3968/11392](http://dx.doi.org/10.3968/11392).
- Akwetey, E. (2016). Vote buying could collapse Ghana's democratic systems. Retrieved from <http://www.myjoyonline.com/politics>.
- Athanasius, J. (2019, March 4). Effect of vote buying in Nigeria. Retrieved from <https://infoguidenigeria.com/effect-vote-buying-nigeria/>.
- Baidoo, F.L; Dankwa, S. and Eshun, I. (2018). Culture of Vote Buying and its implications: Range of Incentives and Conditions Politicians Offer to Electorates. *International Journal of Developing and Emerging Economies*, 6(2), 1-20. Retrieved from www.eujournals.org/
- Bratton, M. (2008). Vote buying and violence in Nigerian election campaigns. *Electoral Studies*, 27(4), 621-632. DOI: 10.1016/j.electstud.2008.04.013
- Clark, P., & Wilson, J. (1961). Incentive systems: A theory of organizations. Retrieved from [www.research gate.net/publications/](http://www.researchgate.net/publications/).
- Cox, G., & McCubbins, M. D. (1986). Electoral politics as a redistributive game. *Journal of Politics*, 48, 370-389. DOI: 10.2307/2131098.
- Dauda, M.; Adamu, A. and Ahmodu-Tijani, L. (2019). Vote Trading in Nigeria Politics. *Asian People Journal*, 2(2), 42-51. Retrieved from <https://journal.uniswa.edu.my/apj/index.php/apj/article/view/111/101>
- Desposato, S. W. (2007). How does vote buying shape the legislative arena? In Schaffer, F.C. (Ed.). *Elections for sale: The causes and consequences of vote buying*, This rerefere London: Lynne Rienner, pp. 144-179.
- Downs, A. (1957). *An Economic Theory of Democracy*. New York.
- Etzioni-Halevy, E. (1989). Exchange material benefits for political support: A comparative analysis. In Heidenheimer, A.;
- Kramon, E. (2009). Vote-buying and political behaviour: Estimating and explaining vote buying's effect on turnout in Kenya. Working Paper Number 114, Afro Barometer.
- Kramon, E., & Posner, D. N. (2013). Who benefits from distributive politics? How the outcomes one studies affect the answers one gets. *Perspectives on Politics*, 11(2), 461-474.
- Matenga, G. (2016). Cash for Votes: political legitimacy in Nigeria. Democracy. Retrieved from <https://www.opendemocracy.net/grammatenga/cash-for-votes-political-legitimacy-in-nigeria/>.
- Nigerian Civil Society Situation Room (2019). Report of Nigeria's 2019 General Election, Abuja: Nigerian Civil Society Situation Room. Retrieved from https://www.placng.org/situation_room/
- Ojo, J. (2018, August 22). Electoral Violence, Vote Buying and Nigeria's Future Elections. Retrieved from [https://punchng.com/electoral-violence-vote buying-and-nigerias-future- elections/](https://punchng.com/electoral-violence-vote-buying-and-nigerias-future-elections/).
- Onapajo, H.; Francis, S. & Okeke-Uzodike, U. (2015). Oil corrupts elections: The political economy of vote buying in Nigeria. Florida: Centre for African Studies, University of Florida.
- Onuoha, F. & Ojo, J. (2018, December 13).
- Schaffer, F. C. and Schedler, A. (2005). What is vote buying? The limits of the market model. A Paper presented at the Conference of Poverty, Democracy and Clientelism: The Political Economy of Vote Buying, Stanford University.
- Vicente, P. C. and Wantchekon, L. (2009). Clientelism and Vote Buying: Lessons from Field Experiments in African Elections. *Oxford Review of Economic Policy*, 25(2), 292–305