

**MONEY POLITICS AND COMMERCIALIZATION OF VOTES IN NIGERIA:  
ANALYSIS OF THE 2024 GOVERNORSHIP ELECTION IN EDO STATE.**

**BY**

**IZE-OSAIGBOVO OSAMWONYI**

**PG/SSC1307111**

**DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE,  
FACULTY OF SOCIAL SCIENCES  
UNIVERSITY OF BENIN  
BENIN CITY**

**MARCH, 2026**

**MONEY POLITICS AND COMMERCIALIZATION OF VOTES IN NIGERIA:  
ANALYSIS OF THE 2024 GOVERNORSHIP ELECTION IN EDO STATE.**

**BY**

**IZE-OSAIGBOVO OSAMWONYI**

**PG/SSC1307111**

**BEING A THESIS SUBMITTED TO THE DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL  
SCIENCE, FACULTY OF SOCIAL SCIENCES, UNIVERSITY OF BENIN,  
BENIN CITY IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT FOR THE REQUIREMENT FOR  
THE AWARD OF MASTER OF SCIENCE (M.Sc) DEGREE IN  
COMPARATIVE POLITICS AND DEVELOPMENT STUDY.**

**MARCH, 2026**

## **CERTIFICATION**

This is to certify that this research work was carried out and approved in fulfillment for the award of Masters of Science degree in Comparative Politics and Development Studies, in the Department of Political Science, Faculty of Social Sciences, and University of Benin, Benin City.

\_\_\_\_\_  
**DR. FRANCIS OSAYI**  
Project Supervisor

\_\_\_\_\_  
**DATE**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Dr. G.O IGIEBOR**  
Ag. Head of Department

\_\_\_\_\_  
**DATE**

## **DEDICATION**

This work is humbly dedicated to the blessed memory of His Royal Majesty, Omo N’Oba N’Edo, Uku Akpolokpolo, Oba Erediauwa, CFR, Oba of Benin, and Sergeant Osamwonyi Izevbigie, his beloved Police Orderly, upon whose enduring legacies I stand.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Who would have thought I would come this far in my academic journey after the untimely death of my indefatigable father at my tender age? Although it was my utmost desire, the future once seemed bleak.

I am most grateful to the God of my forefathers, whose omnipresent face I seek through Holy Aruosa Cathedral, for His infinite mercies, strength, courage, good health, and financial provisions toward the completion of this laudable venture. *UYIOGHOSA.*

My immeasurable gratitude goes to His Royal Majesty, Omo N'Oba N'Edo Uku Akpolokpolo, Oba Ewure 11, CFR for upholding the legacy of fatherly care his own father extended to my life. More so, I appreciate our beloved Iyoba N'Uselu, Omo N'Ikuoyemwen through whose I was conferred the chieftaincy title of Akenuwa of Benin in the course of this Journey.

I am indebted to my academic mentors and tutors. To my amiable supervisor, Dr Francis Osayi, who was polite, understanding and patient throughout the duration of this thesis. I am profoundly grateful. To my academic advisers and guidance, Dr. Ambrose Iyase, my beloved course mate and lecturer Mr Ehimen. U Uduehi and Dr. Charles F. Omigie of the Department of Sociology and Anthropology. *WA'RUESE.*

I also wish to express my appreciation to my Head of Department, Dr. Igiebor for ensuring a serene environment for learning. To my course lectures Dr Ebomonyi, Dr Idahosa, Prof Aiye, Prof M.I Abutudu, Prof A. Otoghile, and the entire department, I

will be forever grateful for the knowledge you imparted to me. To my course mate, and friends who came to stay.

To my sweet mother, Madam Florence U. Otasowie, who never stopped praying and wishing best in life. Thank You.

My deep and heartfelt gratitude also goes to my siblings, my children and my friends who believed in my dreams and aspiration.

Above all, I acknowledge my humble self for the zeal and unrelenting spirit that propelled me to attain this height. *UYIOGHOSA*.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Title Page	i
Certification	ii
Dedication	iii
Acknowledgements	iv
List of Tables	viii
Abstract	ix
<b>CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION</b>	
1.1 Background of the Study	1
1.2 Statement of the Problem	5
1.3 Significance of the Study	6
1.4 Research Questions	6
1.5 Objectives of Study	7
1.6 Scope of the Study	8
1.7 Limitation of the Study	8
1.8 Conceptual Clarification	8
<b>CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK</b>	
2.1 Introduction	10
2.2 Evolution of Elections in Nigeria	12
2.3 Elections in the Fourth Republic	16
2.4 Theoretical Framework	25
2.4.1 Basic Elements of Game Theory	27

2.4.2	Basic Assumptions of Game Theory	29
2.4.3	Types Of Games Theory	30
2.4.4	The Political Economy Approach	31
<b>CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY</b>		
3.1	Introduction	33
3.2	Research Design	33
3.3	Population of Study	33
3.4	Sources of Data	34
3.5	Instrument of Data Collection	34
3.6	Method of Data Collection	35
3.7	Sampling Technique/Sample Size	35
3.8	Method of Data Analysis	35
<b>CHAPTER FOUR: DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION</b>		
4.1	Independent Variables	36
4.2	Analyzing in Percentage each Items in Section B of the Questionnaire in Relation to Respondents' Perception of the Subject Matter	41
4.3	Discussion of Findings	55
<b>CHAPTER FIVE: SUMMARY CONCLUSION AND POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS</b>		
5.1	Summary	60
5.2	Conclusion	61
5.3	Policy Recommendation	61
	REFERENCES	64
	APPENDIX	70

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 1:	Sex Distribution of Respondents (n = 135)	36
Table 2:	Age Distribution of Respondents (n = 135)	37
Table 3:	Marital Distribution of Respondents (n = 135)	38
Table 4:	Occupational Distribution of Respondents (n = 135)	39
Table 5:	Local Government Distribution of Respondents (n = 135)	40
Table 6		41
Table 7		41
Table 8		42
Table 9		43
Table 10		44
Table 11		45
Table 12		46
Table 13		46
Table 14		47
Table 15		48
Table 16		49
Table 17		50
Table 18		51
Table 19		52
Table 20		53
Table 21		54

## ABSTRACT

*This project work portrays the theoretical framework applicable and assesses the impact of the several mentioned irregularities, especially if they were of sufficient magnitude or scope to curb money politics and commercialization of votes in Nigeria: analysis of the 2024 governorship election in Edo state. Controversies and uncertainties over allegations of irregularities reflect the problematic role of the State bureaucracy, serious inadequacy and lack of transparency in the election administration process in Nigeria. Therefore, election, voting, violence, and vote buying issues examined in this research work include- the theoretical framework applicable; electoral malpractices as restrictive registration of potential voters; the training of citizens on minimum concepts of civic responsibility; voter intimidation and other sources of suppression or distortion of voter will and recommendation on the mechanisms to increase popular participation, transparency, credibility and integrity of the electoral process in Nigeria. It was discovered that the impact of vote buying was difficult to demonstrate with empirical evidence. Our analysis indicates that the incumbent may have benefited marginally from vote buying, but his benefits were nowhere nearly as salient as some observers have perceived. We also find that the stability, legitimacy and effectiveness of the government may be undermined if it fails to develop mechanisms to ensure free, fair and transparent elections.*

# CHAPTER ONE

## INTRODUCTION

### 1.1 Background of the Study

In traditional and contemporary societies as of now, election have been seen or defined as the holistic and generally agreed method, by which people are selected as representatives of a community or organization in a massive government or institution. No society can be said to have democracy if elections are not conducted and judged to be free and fair. Nevertheless, the problem is that in most democratic nations including Nigeria, it is difficult to talk about the freeness and fairness of elections. Among the notable rationale is the peril of commercialized voting and money politics. Surely in Nigeria, this political disorder is prevalent and many other countries (Adetula, 2006). In comparative and historical perspectives, voting commercialization as an occurrence is not space destined or system particular. In every system, whether developing or developed, modern or old, commercialization of votes happens in every region and territory but what however differentiate them is the manifestations and intensity. Countries or states wherein periodic election involving giving of gifts or favours is prevalent comprise Slums of Metro Minica, Taipei, Tokyo, and Northern Portugal (Ojo, 2006).

Research conducted by Nugent in 2005 revealed certain occurrences in Accra. In the findings, he revealed that election in Ghana is a very expensive venture for everyone involved. In the process to secure the presidential ticket of the party, aspirants will

have to spend heavily. Then, as a prelude to the elections, when visits are made to constituencies, donations are made voluntarily for several other causes, during the period of campaign, candidates will have to go to the length and breadth, followed by a large group of people that sheltered and moved around. However, just as it is with other countries, the electoral process in Nigeria is also characterized by money politics, vote commercialization or vote buying are not just at the national level, but also at the federating units and local government elections. Financial inducement and vote buying is a standard practice in Nigeria, not just during campaign rallies but even beyond. Put differently, using money for vote commerce doesn't mean it ends at elections and campaign rallies but extends even beyond the elections. An average Nigerian sees the election period as a blatant opportunity to grasp his share of the national cake. Politicians often give out money, bags of rice and other gifts to the electorates. This has taken a worrisome dimension as it contract the space politically and equally becomes the yardstick to determine who take part and the manner to participate (Gabriel, 2015).

Researches on commercialization of votes and financial politics have been conducted by many scholars in the political system of Nigeria due to the devastating impact on the nation's politics (Davies, 2006; Ojo, 2006; Schedler, 2005; Walecki, 2006, Saliu, 2008). Hence money or financial politics is described as a situation in the process of election in which competitors for elective post deploys finance as incentive to sway in voters' support in order to cast their votes in defiance of their convictions, conscience and wishes (Ovwasa, 2013). On the other hand, Vote buying literally means

“exchange”. It is defined as any type of conviction wherein monetary profit is proposed by an individual to others with the purpose to influence the votes of other people (Sha, 2006). The uncontrolled deployment of finance in the politics of Nigeria is not a recent phenomenon. In the contemporary history of Nigeria, there several instances starting in the 1950s with nationalism politics which became notable later in Nigeria post-independent era (Adetula, 2006). Even at that, they had just minimum control. During the first republic between 1960-1966, tribal idols and political leaders used religious and ethnic persuasion as the most significant tools in ensuring victories in every election. As (Dudley, 1982:68) factually stated,

*In the election, contestants were not much important because political parties took the lead by playing politics of alliance, appealing to ethnicity and deployed improved emotional concepts which often lured individuals to brutality. During this period, almost all the expenses for the elections were handled by the parties through the monies they could attract and save. This is despite the fact that politicians during political rallies were habitual distributors of Caps, T-Shirts and some food-stuffs to the electorates.*

There was lack of high expenditure by individual contestants to emerge victorious in the polls as it is in contemporary Nigeria. During the second republic (1979-1983), commercialized voting and politics of increased rapidly. This was inspired by a number of Nigerians who were rich and had had become successful as a result of the Civil War (1967-1960) by supplying arms and ammunition in the war, people that were contractors to government, projects remodeling following the calamitous crisis. Immediately the military gave the signal for competitive elections to commence, these

rich individuals migrated into the political arena or financed interested participants for elective positions (Ovwasa, 2014). This was summarized thus;

*There were too much wealth and deployment of money by wealthy contractors and business class that those who came out successful in some of the political party primaries and conventions particularly the unity party of Nigeria (UPN), national party of Nigeria (NPN) and Nigeria peoples' party (NPP) were part of the business mercantile groups (Davies, 2006).*

This condition worsened and took a very firm root in electoral process in Nigeria during the 1993 annulled election. Despite being carried out under the influence of the military, the election exhibited unrestrained deployment of cash in the course of the primaries and election into the office of the president. Cash were given to officials of political parties that were asking and transacting on the total cash that they should be given as payment for them to get to office and the manner that aspirants will be allocated votes (Nwosu, 1996). Furthermore, from May 29, 1999 which ushered in the current democratic dispensation (Fourth republic), commercialized voting and politics of money got to a dangerous level with the body politics witnessing unprecedented influence of Money. It has also played out in the transition to civil as well as successive elections in 2003, 2007, 2011, 2015 and 2019. This is problematic because the process of the election is mostly jeopardized with election outcome devoid of freeness, fairness and acceptability (Ovwasa, 2014). Thus within this context, the study seeks to examine the position that politics of money and commercialization of voting has assumed in the nation's polity and the resultant influence and crisis it has

engendered with respect to the form of governance and leadership it has thrown into the polity.

## **1.2 Statement of the Problem**

In contemporary Nigeria, the issue of voting commercialization and politics of money remains a key challenge facing the electoral process. Those who have honour including individuals that desire to be of service to citizens but lack the necessary finance to acquire votes might lose out the election while candidates with propensity for corruption of huge financial war chest are mostly elected (Milbrath, 1965), Politics of money and commercialization of votes in the politics of Nigeria has created a leeway for the domination of political bourgeoisie and occupy sensitive positions in the country (Adamu et al, 2016). progressively, politics has become too costly to the effect that most authentic politicians have been shut out from taking part due to lack of funds thus opening the way for those with much money to commandeer the process of the election (Ojo, 2006). As a result, some of the exceptional democratic qualities in Nigeria have been corrupted. The devastating strength of politics of money and vote buying has over the years undermined genuine rule and administration.

The trouble with purchase of votes and politics of money has its dire consequences on democratic governance and thus makes it difficult to fairly and freely choose leaders. It suggests the fact of one buying elective positions thereby making it doubtful to legitimize the incumbent. More so, voters who engage in vote selling cannot demand

for transparent and accountable leadership as politicians who equally engage in vote buying are under no obligation to be accountable to the electorates. Thus the essentiality of clearness and accountability cannot be exaggerated in all system of democracy. It has equally impacted growth in Nigeria as resources deployed in the electoral process are frequently recuperated, in as many folds as possible even before anything else is done. In view of this, the study seeks to examine the challenges of vote commercialization and politics of money.

### **1.3 Significance of the Study**

It is imperative to note that this research work will contribute to existing literature on the subject matter, by providing a critical assessment of vote commercialization and politics of money in the country using 2024 Edo state gubernatorial elections as a case study. It will provide Political Science students the required platform for handling the phenomenon of money politics and vote commercialization in Nigeria's potential elections. It will also be useful to the electorates as it will educate or enlighten them on the dividends of portraying a positive behavioral pattern during elections.

### **1.4 Research Questions**

The research seeks to give response to some inquiries such as;

1. What are the factors responsible for money politics and commercialization of voting in Edo State?

2. What are the forms which politics of money and votes commercialization takes in Edo State?
3. What are the impacts of money politics and commercialization of voting in Edo State?
4. What are the possible ways of addressing the challenges of voting commercialization and politics of money in Edo State?

### **1.5 Objectives of Study**

The broad objectives of the research is to critically assess the issue of politics of money and commercialization of votes in Nigeria, using the 2024 Edo state gubernatorial elections as reference point. The specific study objectives are stated as;

1. To ascertain the factors responsible for politics of money and commercialization of votes in Edo State.
2. To examine the forms which politics of money and commercialization of votes takes in Edo State.
3. To identify the impacts of politics of money and commercialization of votes in Edo State.
4. Suggest policy recommendation to address the problem.

## **1.6 Scope of the Study**

Basically, this study will conduct a critical assessment of the issue of politics of money and voting commercialization which characterize elections and electoral process in the 2024 governorship polls in Edo state.

## **1.7 Limitation of the Study**

There are limitations associated with this study which includes;

### **Time constraint**

Due to constraint of time for this study, the researcher will not be able to capture what happened across every local government in Edo state. Similarly and in a simultaneous manner, the researcher consulted other research work in the study as this will ultimately reduce the period assigned to the study.

## **1.8 Conceptual Clarification**

**Election:** Election is the method of alternative which a group agreed on that allows them to choose a single or number of persons in positions of authority. In the words of Ezeani (2015), election means the legitimate process of decision making through which the citizens' elects people to handle political offices.

**Vote Commercialization:** This implies any kind of influences wherein monetary profits are suggested by an individual to others for the purpose of persuading the vote of others (Sha, 2006).

**Money Politics:** This is described as an occurrence in the process of election wherein political contestants' for position of authority deploy resources through their agents as a way of inducing and swaying the electoral outcome in their favour (Ovwasa , 2013)

**Electoral Process:** Electoral process is the method adopted in the selection of persons for political offices which must have some basic structures such as statutory provisions establishing the electoral body, delineation of wards/constituencies, registration of political parties, registration of eligible voters, recruitment and training of ad-hoc staff (Eya, 2003).

**Voter:** A voter is a person who votes or has the right to vote in an election (INEC, 2016).

**Politics:** Politics has been seen as the authoritative allocation of values. (Easton, 1965).

## CHAPTER TWO

### LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

#### 2.1 Introduction

In a liberal democracy, elections are necessary to ensure popular participation in government, they are considered as cardinal and indispensable in the practice of modern democracy. Elections are therefore crucial and seen as a pillar in the democratic process (Okoye, 2011). According to Nnoli (1990), it is closely tied to the growth and development of democratic political order that is generally held to be the single most important indicator of the presence or absence of democratic government.

In the words of Larry Diamond,

*Elections are the litmus test of a democratic political system. This is because in a democracy, the authority of the government derives solely from the consent of the people or the governed. And the principle mechanism for obtaining and translating that consent into governmental authority is the holding of periodic and genuinely democratic elections (2002: 352).*

Election as the formal process of selecting a person for public office (Gwinn and Norton, 1992). Election as the process of selecting persons for office by ballot and making a choice between alternatives. (Eya, 2003). It has been argued that election is considered to be a critical element of modern representative government (Odofin, 2005). Elections remain a way of realizing some of the core values of democracy, especially participation of the citizenry, which helps to ensure quality of governance and accountability on the part of elected officials (Alemika, 2007),. Elections are the

only acceptable institutionalized process enabling some or all of the recognized members of a democratic society to choose office holders. As a defining characteristic of democracy, therefore, elections enable citizens to choose a government empowered by them to make and enforce laws in a given political community and within a defined territory (Olaitan, (2005). Through elections, people choose the programmes the government will follow, as well as settle problems which divide the government and the political parties (Ofoegbu, 1976). According to Elekwa, (2008), elections have the potential to confer legitimacy, moderate dissent, engender compliance and heighten citizen efficacy. Elections are especially crucial for eliciting consent from those citizens who would prefer alternative rules and policies within the political process.

Elections therefore remain the basic platform upon which liberal democracy is built. The conduct of elections is the cause of liberal democracy and liberal democracy is the effect of real elections. Election lies at the heart of representative governance, giving meaning to the modern conception of democracy (Joseph, 1987). The centrality of elections in a democratic polity therefore cannot be over emphasized. Momoh and Adejumobi , (1999) posits that election occupy a central place in the democratic process with the animating force they provide for representative government, on the other hand, they serve as an instrument of legitimization for the state power, while on the other hand, they ensure political accountability to the people. Obi and Abutudu (1999) share the same view when they posited that elections offer

the electorate the freedom of choice, the power to hold elected leaders accountable and provide protection against perpetuation of arbitrary rules.

## **2.2 Evolution of Elections in Nigeria**

Elections were first organized in Nigeria in 1922 by the British colonial government in response to the pressure of the nationalists who were agitating for greater participation in the colonial administration Enojo, (2010). The first election in Nigeria was held for the four elective seats in the Nigerian legislative council under the 1922 Clifford's constitution. Elections to the council continued until the 1946 Richard's constitution. The elections were restricted to Lagos (3seats) and Calabar (1seat). Franchise was limited to specified income levels and residency in Lagos and Calabar. This was on account of the higher population of educated elites in both towns. Political parties such as the Nigerian National Democratic Party (NNDP) and the Nigerian Youth movement (NYM) contested the elections. The first nationwide indirect elections were held in 1951 under the Macpherson's constitution. The election was indirect with the exception of Lagos. The native authorities elected members to the provincial level through a secret ballot system, which met and selected members to the regional houses of assembly. The regional assemblies in turn, chose members to the federal House of Representatives. The Action Group (A.G), Northern People's Congress (NPC), National Council of Nigerian and Cameroons (NCNC), and Northern Elements Progressive Union (NEPU) were the main parties that contested the elections. The NPC won a decisive majority in the Northern region and NCNC in the Eastern house of assembly respectively. However, neither A.G nor

NCNC in the election had majority in the Western house but through cross carpeting, the A. G had majority Dudley, (1982).

The first extensive direct election was the 1954 federal elections. The only exception was the Northern region where the election was indirect. The NPC won majority of seats in the Northern region and had the highest seats among the parties 79 out of 184 in the federal House of Representatives. The A.G and NCNC won majorities in the Western and Eastern regions respectively. The NPC's parliamentary leader, Tafawa Balewa became the leader of the executive council and later in 1957 was appointed Prime Minister Ikelegbe, (2013). In 1959 the first nationwide direct elections were held following the announcement of October 1, 1960 as the date of Nigeria's independence. According to Osumah and Aghemelo, (2010), the significance of the election was that it constituted the basis of the post-independence government. The electoral process was active, the political parties campaigned actively and extensively with some of the major political parties aligning with the minority parties. The A.G aligned with NEPU, several other political associations, independent candidates apart from the major political parties contested the elections. According to Amadu, (1983). The voter turnout was impressive. But because no single party could win a single majority, the NPC and NCNC formed a coalition government. This saw Alhaji Tafawa Balewa of NPC as the prime minister and Dr. Nnamdi Azikiwe of NCNC as the governor-general and the senate president in Nwafor Orizor. The A.G led by Obafemi Awolowo therefore became the opposition party at the federal level in the first republic Ogbeidi, (2010)

In 1964 however, there was the first general election in the country. The election was unique in several ways; first, it was the first federal elections in an independent Nigeria. Secondly, many political parties, politicians and Nigerians were quite frustrated with the state of affairs in the country and wanted a change. The NCNC and AG reached out by way of a coalition to NEPU, UMBC, SWAFP (Nigerian Socialist workers and Farmers Party). This led to the formation of the united progressive grand alliance (UPGA). In response to that alliance, The NPC aligned with the NNDP, DP (Dynamic Party), Mid-western democratic party to form the Nigerian national alliance (NNA) Ikelegbe, (2013). According to Ikelegbe, (1997), there was so much irregularities, violence, fraud, thuggery, molestation, resignation of electoral officials and fraudulently returned unopposed candidate that UPGA decided to boycott the elections. President Nnamdi Azikiwe therefore refused to appoint Balewa of the NNA as prime minister on account of the violence and irregularities which marred the 1964 elections. This sparked off a constitutional crisis which took the intervention of the court for a peace to be brokered. Although through the intervention of the court, peace was brokered and a broad based government was formed and headed by Alhaji Tafawa Balewa Ofeimun, (2011).

According to Ibeanu, (2007), the attendant crisis, disillusionment, disenchantment and loss of confidence by majority of the population in the government, significantly motivated the military to usurp political power on January 15, 1966. After thirteen years of military rule, the nation was returned to civil rule vide the nationwide elections held in 1979 which was contested by five political parties; National party of

Nigeria(NPN), the Great Nigeria people's party(GNPP), the People's redemption party(PRP) and the Unity party of Nigeria (UPN). The political parties campaigned intensively for the election, they mobilized religion and ethnic sentiments to gain support Dudley, (1982:68). FEDECO based on available result, announced the NPN candidate Alhaji Shehu Shagari as the winner of the presidential election.

More so, four years later, in 1983, another general election was held that was contested by six political parties. Nigerian advanced party was registered by FEDECO in addition to the earlier five which contested the 1979 elections Adamu and Ogunsanwo, (1983:13). The result was a victory for the ruling party –The National Party of Nigeria (NPN) which used its control of state power and institutions to manipulate the outcome of the elections and obtained majority seats in the national assembly and 13 states Ademolekun, (1983). According to Nwolise, (1988) the 1983 elections was the worst national elections in Nigeria's history as he noted that the preparation and management of the elections by FEDECO was shoddy, the voters list was riddled with irregularities and over-inflation and fraudulent practices. The opposition parties on account of irregularities rejected the outcome of the election. Thus, at the federal and state levels there were several agitations. Tension, uncertainty and insecurity therefore characterized the period. As the nation was on the edge of a precipice, the military on December 31, 1983 quickly intervened to salvage the situation.

On August 27, 1985 when Ibrahim Babangida took over political power in a counter coup, he declared that he would be brief in restoring civil rule. On August 12, 1987

the Babangida administration held elections into local government council on a zero party basis, in 1989, the administration lifted ban on partisan politics and imposed two political parties, the Social Democratic Party (SDP) and the National Republican Convention (NRC) on the nation. In December 1990, local government council elections were held which the SDP won marginally. In December 1991 SDP won 14 governorship seats while the NRC won 16. On July 4, 1992 the National election was held, the SDP won convenient majority seats both the senate and House of Representatives. On June 12, 1993 came the presidential election Nwosu, (2008). To many observers, the election was the freest and fairest elections in the annals of Nigeria political history. However, as part of the results had been released, Babangida on June 23, 1993 annulled the election for reasons that were not too clear Osumah and Aghemelo, (2010)

### **2.3 Elections in the Fourth Republic**

Six general elections have been conducted since the 1999 elections that heralded the fourth republic; the 2003, 2007, 2011, 2015, 2019, 2023 elections. The 18<sup>th</sup> (governorship) and 27<sup>th</sup> February, 1999 presidential elections was contested by three major political parties; the People's Democratic party (PDP), Alliance for Democracy (AD) and the All People's Party (APP) Abimbola and Adesote, (2012). The AD won six governorship seats, the APP won nine and PDP twenty-one. The PDP won the presidency under Olusegun Obasanjo and majority seats in both the Senate and House of Representatives Osumah and Ikelegbe, (2009). The elections were characterized by widespread electoral abuses such as falsification of votes, undisguised financial

inducement of voters, falsification of votes, stuffing of ballot boxes with pre-marked ballot papers, snatching of ballot boxes and violence”. The opposition party, APP in the presidential election rejected the result of the election on account of brazen electoral fraud and went to court to contest the outcome. Although the court threw out the lawsuit, it took much pressure and appeal from Nigerians and the international community for the APP to accept the election results just to avert the bitter experience of another annulment Olarenwaju, (1999:33)

In 2003, another democratic election was held in the months of April 12, 19 and May 3, for the National Assembly, Presidential, Governorship and State Houses of Assembly respectively. The election was contested by about 20 political parties and the result was a victory for the incumbent president Olusegun Obasanjo of the People’s Democratic Party (PDP). According to Lewis, (2003) “there was abundant evidence of large scale rigging, fraud and intimidation in many parts of the country”. The transition monitoring group (TMG) that monitored the 2003 election reported the irregularities that besmeared the election when it stated that;

*Twenty-nine of the registered political parties that contested or did not contest the elections have variously rejected the results as announced by INEC declaring the results as fraudulent. Both domestic and international observers documented massive irregularities that characterized the elections and refused to endorse the election as free and fair. Some political parties and their candidates decided to challenge some of the results before the various election petition tribunals and have gone ahead to do so while others declared “massive action” to pressurize a government without popular mandate to abdicate power (Iyayi, 2005:11).*

The third general election under the fourth republic was held on the 14<sup>th</sup> and 21<sup>st</sup> of April, 2007. The Governorship and State House of Assembly elections were held on the 14<sup>th</sup> of April, while the presidential and National assembly elections were held on the 21<sup>st</sup> of April. The election was contested by 26 political parties Ikelegbe, (2013). Umaru Musa Yar'adua won the election, the highly controversial election for the ruling People's Democratic Party (PDP). The 2007 general election has been regarded as being controversial, disastrous as it was defined by rigging, ballot box stuffing, vote buying, snatching of electoral materials and false declaration of losers as winners Ibrahim and Ibeanu, (2009). In 2011, general elections were held in Nigeria. National assembly elections were held on April 9<sup>th</sup>, 2011 while the presidential elections were held on April 26<sup>th</sup>, 2011 and state assembly and gubernatorial elections held on April 26<sup>th</sup> 2011. Oluwatobi, (2011). The election was contested by twenty candidates and won by President Goodluck Jonathan of the People's Democratic Party (PDP). The elections were adjudged by foreign and domestic observers as partially fair and better when compared with the 2003 and 2007 general elections.

Another democratic election was held in Nigeria on the 28<sup>th</sup> of March 2015 and was contested by 14 candidates and was won by General Muhammadu Buhari of the All Progressive Congress (APC). The 2015 general elections in Nigeria was seen as a major improvement over the 2011 elections in the country as even local and international observers rates the election as the freest and fairest since the return to democracy in 1999 (Eze and Agena, 2016).

On February 23, 2019, another round of elections was held to usher in new administration. The election was contested by 74 political parties with President Muhammadu Buhari of the APC coming out victorious with about 15, 191, 847 votes. There were accusation and counter-accusation of vote commerce, voter intimidation and other forms of electoral malfeasance. The last election was conducted on February 25, 2023 and was contested by 14 political parties. Ahmed Bola Tinubu of the APC was declared winner. The election was keenly contested in court due to allegation of widespread rigging, vote buying, voter intimidation and shooting.

However, the governorship election in Edo state does not fall within the general electoral circle due to the appeal court ruling of March 26, 2008 which nullified the 2007 election that brought Professor Oseriemen Osunbor of the PDP to power. In view of the ruling, Adams Oshomhole of the Action Congress of Nigeria (ACN) now APC was consequently sworn in as the duly elected governor. Since then, four rounds of governorship elections (2012, 2016 and 2020 and 2024) have been held consecutively in the state. In 2012, Adams Oshomhole of the APC was re-elected, he was succeeded by Godwin Obaseki of the APC in 2016 who was re-elected under the platform of the PDP in 2020 while in 2024, Senator Monday Okpebholo of the APC was elected.

Following the declaration of the result by the Independent National Electoral Commission (INEC) which announced Senator Monday Okpebholo of the APC as the winner, the PDP and some other observers and civil society groups kicked against the result alleging that it was rigged in favour of the supposed winner. Another issue at

the front burner was financial inducement of vote which was prevalent in the election across the state. The key question to ask and which this study seeks to find answer to is; what are the drivers of vote commercialization particularly in the 2024 governorship election in Edo state?

The electoral process in Nigeria has been confronted with daunting and enormous challenges which distort the conduct of free, fair and acceptable elections both in the country and in the external world. This is one of the fundamental problems of the democratization process in Nigeria, as virtually all the elections conducted in the history of Nigerian politics have been characterized by one form of irregularity or another Danjibo and Oladeji , (2007). Ajani, (2003) expressed his views on the irregularities that confront Nigeria elections thus; “Between the admirable success and distasteful failure, the vortex of Nigeria’s election is below standard of democracy because from all intents and purposes, it remains a largely loose entity ring-fenced by mere aspirations of political parties whose sole concern is the lucre of office”

Elections in Nigeria continues to elicit more than casual interest by Nigerian scholars due to the fact that despite the appreciation that only credible election can consolidate and sustain the country’s nascent democracy, over the years, Nigeria continues to witness with growing disappointments and apprehension, the inability to conduct peaceful, free, fair and credible elections whose result are widely accepted and respected across the country Igbuzor, 2010). In his own contribution, (Olu, 2007)

defined the notion of free and fair election as “The election experience whose processes, procedure and outcome are transparent, credible and acceptable”

Heywood, (2002) also observed that a free and fair elections is the very heart of democracy. The universal declaration of Human rights, which today is the right of passage for all nations when they become members of the United Nations, provide that “the will of the people shall be the basis of the authority of government” as expressed in periodic and genuine elections. Thus, free, fair and credible elections have become an increasingly critical prerequisite for government to have legitimacy in the eyes of the international community and their own citizens. (Nwabueze,1993) noted that a democratic election would characteristically be competitive, periodic, inclusive, definitive, free and fair, and to achieve this will demand an independent electoral process and a cardinal requirement of such a process is that those charged with the responsibility of conducting and supervising the process must be independent of the players in the system. Again, Mackenzie (1958: 14) listed conditions for the holding of free and fair elections. These include;

1. An honest, non-partisan, competent administration to run the elections.
2. An independent judiciary free from political influence or control to interpret the electoral laws fairly and impartially.
3. A developed system of political parties, traditions and teams of candidates before the electorates as alternatives between which to choose, since if this is

not so, the vote may not be clear to which policies a candidate stands for or which government he would support if elected.

4. There must be general acceptance, both by the politicians and by the public of what might vacuously be described as the “rules of the game”. Candidates must play fair, they must not try to evade legal districts upon their electoral activities, such as bribery or misrepresentative, either in the spirit of the law nor must they refuse to admit defeat if the verdict or the ballot box goes against them.
5. Provision of electoral register which must contain all the names of the registered voters.

The snag however, is that in Nigeria, elections are far from being free and fair because of the twin problem of money politics and vote buying (Olajide, 2003). (Bello-Imam, 2007) sees vote buying as thus, a form of bribery consisting of the use of money or other rewards to influence candidates into voting as directed. According to Sobel, (1974: 1) “money has always been a major weapon in the politicians’ arsenal, money drives politics and without it politics cannot survive”. Also, Ojo (2006) observed that money has become a dominant factor, money seems to have taken the centre stage in the political process in most countries and in Nigeria politics and further noted that it is now sadly playing an increasingly critical role. It even appears to such an extent that the word money politics with a prerogative connotation has crept into the country’s political lexicon. Again, Gabriel (2015) noted that in Nigeria,

money is what makes politics go round. Money buy votes, buy bags of rice as gifts for voters, and buy the support of local leaders. Ojo, (2008) is of the opinion that money politics is synonymous to vote buying and selling, it is viewed beyond monetary exchange and transaction, distribution of items such as food stuffs, t-shirts, face caps is another form of vote buying and selling.

According to Ogbebor, (2016), elections in Nigeria these days is cash and carry, it is those who have money that win. In the same line, (Matenga, 2016) argued that money has become a dominant, determinant factor in Nigeria's politics, the poor are likely to be victimized by vote buying because, their limited means makes them susceptible to material inducements including offers of basic commodities or modest amount of money. Also, (Adetula, 2011) noted that money and violence exert far reaching influence over electoral process in Nigeria. He further stated that elections in the country have been generally marred by violence and financial machinations of the voters by moneyed elites who are hell bent on preserving their influence over the masses vote. Furthermore, (Ovwasa, 2013) noted that, in Nigeria, the electorates see politics especially election as an opportunity to sell their vote to get their own share of the national cake, since they do not have access to where the national cake is being shared.

On the other, Sohner, 1973 as cited in Schedler, 2005 opines that money has in fact been made to become the mother's milk of politics, which the political gladiators must drink to remain in politics. Similarly, (Frederick and Schedler, 2005) observed that candidates buy and citizens/electorates sell vote as they buy and sell apples, shoes

or television sets. As for Wright, 1985 as cited in Ovwasa 2013. He stated that, the use of money to buy vote does not stop at Election Day. It is a common practice in Nigeria as it is in many other countries. Numerous private interest groups and political action committees which seek policy goals and legislations to serve their narrow private needs continue to use all the means at their disposal including money to solidify or expand their influence on the elected officials and the officials on the electorates. Furthermore, writing on the impact of Money politics, (Dung, 2008) argued that, money politics only places persons with resources, to get access to political offices in Nigeria and will discourage the masses from political leadership due to their financial handicap. Also (Walecki, 2008) asserted that vote buying drives up the cost of elections for candidates and may prevent many qualified and honest candidates from running, at the same time, voters who do not accept bribes may feel that the system is so corrupted, that their votes does not count., thus such a system makes election to become a marketplace.

The ugly trend of money politics in Nigeria's political setting did not start in a vacuum; it is attached to some predisposing factors. The low level of education contributes to low political awareness thus making it easy for the state to manipulate the poor majority and for the greedy and self-seeking politicians to fool the electorates by offering them money in exchange for vote (Ajakaiye, 2002). Again, it was argued that the tragedy of money politics and vote buying is hinged on poverty. For instance, poverty makes people powerless and easily susceptible to political manipulation, people who are poor and whose next meal is not guaranteed can easily

sell their conscience/votes for any amount (cash, kind) offered (Ojo, 2006). On the other hand, there are two conditions that makes the environment conducive for vote buying, and they include; close competition between political factions within the jurisdiction for an important office, poverty, he maintained that poverty makes people to sell their votes and went further to state that; rich people, the privileged among us, do not sell their votes (Donsanto, 2006).

#### **2.4 Theoretical Framework**

Ideally, elections are means of determining the will of the people regarding their choice of political leaders and regime types. In essence, both the process and the outcome of the election should reflect the consent and aspirations of the people as an organized electorate (Olu, 2003). This implies that apart from being a routine democratic exercise, election must be competitive and transparent, it must give the citizens the opportunity to choose their leaders, and it must be free, fair as well as credible to live up to its democratic essence and merit. In Nigeria, election could be likened to a fierce competitive elite game. In other words, there is a competitive struggle for the people's vote, whether by hook or crook means. Against this background, the researcher will make use of the Games theory and Political Economy Approach as the theoretical framework for analyzing the issue of money politics and vote buying in Nigeria. The Games theory is an approach in social and political analysis, which assumes that behavior is rational and uses the common game as a model of politics. The theory was propounded in the 1920's by Emil Borel and further

developed by John Newmann (1944) to explain the behavior of the economic or the rational man.

According to Schelling, (1960), games theory is the “formal study of the rational, consistent expectations that participants can have about each other’s choices. The theory is germane to this study because it helps to analyze competitive situations – a situation where two or more participants compete for values. This could prompt a decision maker to use Games theory to formulate the best strategy in a particular situation. For instance, in the 2016 Edo state elections, political parties/candidates were contending for political positions so as to achieve political superiority over opponents.

According to Wohlstetter (1964: 209-225) in his article titled “ Sin and Games in America” sees Game theory as a mathematical method for the study of some aspects of conscious decision-making in situations involving the possibilities of conflict, competition or cooperation. The theory as Piano and Riggs (1973: 33) sees it deals “with rational decision strategies in situations of conflict and competition, when each participant or player seeks to maximize gains and minimize losses”. The emphasis of the theory was the application of mathematical models to political studies which is characterized by elements of conflict, completion, decision-making and cooperation (Ajayi, 2006)

### 2.4.1 Basic Elements of Game Theory

According to Rapoport, (1974:1), the Games theory has the following elements.

**Players:** These are people engaged in the game properly. They could be regarded as participants. They are usually armed with goals and resources as well as objectives that indicate what they want to get out of the game. This is often to win. For instance, in an election, the political actors, parties contesting elections are the players and their aim is to win. A good example is the 2020 Edo state elections, the nineteen candidates and the political parties which they represent are regarded as the players armed with goals and resources as well as objectives to win the election.

**Strategy:** This refers to the plan that a rational player in games theory develops to guide as well as tell him what to do, given the possible moves of his opponent. In a competitive situation, a player usually has various strategies open to him as a rational man to choose from, but he is however guided by the need to choose the strategy that he can maximize gain and minimize loss.

According to Rapoport, (1974), the best strategy a player can adopt is not the one that brings about the biggest pay-off if successfully completed but the one that offers a good chance for modest gain and a slight chance of loss. Pay-off strategy might have another possible pay-off... The disastrous (loss). For example in the 2020 Edo state gubernatorial elections, all the political parties had strategies to choose from in order to win the election which included the method of campaign and party but in a country like Nigeria where electoral laws are not adhered to, they opted for the strategy which

offered them a good chance for modest gain and a slight chance of loss by financially inducing the voters to vote for them. Some of the strategies have to do with over voting and substantial non-compliance with the electoral law as well as threat.

**Rules:** These are set of conventions, propositions that indicate what the players or participants can do or cannot do in a game situation. In an electoral environment, it includes the legal frameworks governing the electoral process, E.g the electoral act. Electoral act section 131 (1 and 2) of the 1999 constitution of Nigeria specified forms of vote buying as electoral offences under the sub-title “Bribery and Conspiracy” yet candidates don’t adhere to this law as this is abruptly faulted with impunity. Example, was the 2020 Edo state governorship election where there was direct inducement of the electorates with money by the agents of political parties in other to influence votes in favour of a particular party or candidate.

**Outcome:** This refers to the final state of affairs that follows the game. In other words, they are the pay-offs for whatever strategy adopted. It can also be seen in terms of what the players gain in relation to their objectives of participating in the game. It may not necessarily be positive alone even if a player wins, because it could be negative if it generates some controversies. In an election, taking the 2020 election as an example, the outcome of the strategy adopted by the winning party (APC) was to form the government while the losing party (PDP) challenged the outcome in court.

### **2.4.2 Basic Assumptions of Game Theory**

According to (Ajayi, 2006:93) the use of the games theory in political science is based on the following assumptions;

1. There must be at least two players, put differently; participants must be more than one.
2. It also assumes that the players have knowledge of the competitive or conflict situation. For instance, political parties are exposed to the rules and regulations of the conduct of the election, and they can see the possible moves of their opponents; but not entirely knowing their next possible moves. For example, In the 2020 Edo state elections All progressive congress (APC) might see some strategies of People's democratic party (PDP) before and during the election, but cannot predict the exact plan that PDP has in stock on the very day of the election and vice versa.
3. It also assumes that participants are rational decision-makers. It assumes that in a competitive situation such as elections, the players try to maximize gains and minimize their losses, they want to get as much as they can out of the game. Taking the 2020 election as an example, the candidates/political parties were rational, as they deployed all means to get the greatest benefit from the game (maximize gains) and minimize their loss.
4. It also assumes that competition or conflicts are normal aspect of life as such individuals should be concerned in adopting basic measures in resolving them.

Example, in elections, electoral malpractices, fraud such as vote buying as the case may be are conventional part of the electoral process in Nigeria but it is now left for political parties to look for measures to counter or checkmate their opponents if they suspect them of rigging, vote buying e.t.c.

#### **2.4.4 Types Of Games Theory**

There are basically two types of games namely.

1. The Zero-sum game; This is the type that is assumed to involve basically two players. Here, the gain of one is the loss of the other player. This is the nature of politics in Nigeria, that is, the winner takes all. A typical example is the 2020 Edo state governorship elections where the PDP won while the opposition party APC automatically lost. Thus, the gain of PDP is the loss of APC.
2. The Non-zero sum game: This assumes that there can be either two or more players. Here, gains and losses are shared by the players. For Example in an election, when a party wins, the other parties should not really be the losers but should be compensated. Therefore, the gain of one does not necessarily correspond with loss by another. Example, Olusegun Obasanjo giving some ministerial and special adviser slot to the opposition parties.

#### **2.4.4 The Political Economy Approach**

The study also adopted Political Economy Approach. Proponents of this approach are Marx (1848) cited in Chikendu 2002, Ake (1981), Aja (1998) and Chikendu (2002). The political economy approach is pigeonholed on dialectical materialism. The theory of dialectical materialism according to Marx places primary on material or economic directions conditions of society. Apparently, it is premised on the belief that man is dominantly motivated by economic needs. These theorists believed that labor is the essence of material existence hence; economic activity is man's primary concern (Oddih, 2007). For Aja (1998), the thrust of this perspective is on how the understanding of its economic structure as defined by the relations between employers of labor and the working class in the process of production. To Marx, every political system corresponds and reflects its kind of economic structure. He places emphasis and premium on the production base-the substructure, one easily understands the nature of internal relations, one easily organizes, manages and reproduce itself, the causes of tension, conflicts or contradictions in any given society and the bearing or direction of social change. For these theorists, it is believed that the primary cause of tension and other social dislocation in a society is economic factor. To this end, if one understands the economic structure of a society, the relations between the people in production process, it is easier to understand the nature of politics, culture, national security, social-psychological consciousness, and ideological inclinations. Thus it is this economic force that breeds conflicts and contradictions in human societies. *Ipsa facto*, elections is seen as the quickest means

to power and economic survival depending on the creed and perception of the politicians to win elections by all means.

As argued by Ake (1981), the postcolonial states were endowed with highly developed power. But with denial of access to wealth by the colonial masters and poor development of the forces of production to secure economic base for existence, the indigenous middle-class turns to the state to utilize the highly statist economic for its aggrandizement. State power contemporaneously become a high state, and an object of deadly struggles that must be captured through hook or crook means since controlling the state tantamount to controlling political and economic power. For this reason, Chikendu (2002) opined that it is not surprising therefore that political competition which is undertaken in order to gain control of state power should generate great heat and bitterness and promote extra-constitutional behavior in the form of electoral malpractices. All in all, the relevance of this approach to win and control state power and use same for personal economic advantage of the politicians lies at the root of all electoral frauds and vote-buying in Nigeria.

## **CHAPTER THREE**

### **METHODOLOGY**

#### **3.1 Introduction**

Methodology refers to the methods/techniques that are used by the researcher in conducting research in order to arrive at a solution for a given problem (Kothari, 2004). To this end, the methodology that would be used for this study will cover; the research design, population of the study, sample frame or size, sampling procedure/technique, sources of data, method/instrument of data collection and method of data analysis.

#### **3.2 Research Design**

This study focused on the examination of the issue of money politics and vote buying in Nigeria, using the 2024 Edo state governorship election as a case study, by systematically gathering data which are relevant to the issue under investigation from respondents. Consequently, in this research work, the survey research method would be adopted, this is because the researcher will rely on the information generated from the respondents to ascertain their perception on the subject matter through printed questionnaires which will be subjected to statistical analysis.

#### **3.3 Population of Study**

The population of the study is the totality of objects or elements being studied and to which the conclusion or generalizations of our study will apply (Agbonifoh and

Yomere, 1999). The population of this study will consist of persons who are 18 years and above and therefore eligible to vote as specified by the Nigerian constitution and were present as at the time of the election. They include; Traders, students, civil/public servants, employed and unemployed persons in the three metropolitan areas of Oredo, Egor and Ikpoba-Okha local government areas of the state.

### **3.4 Sources of Data**

As a survey research design, the study utilized the primary source of data, through the administration of questionnaire. This is the research method where the researcher goes to the field to sample people's opinion on the topic under investigation. It also deployed the secondary sources of data such as books, journals, newspapers, magazines, lecture notes, media and websites.

### **3.5 Instrument of Data Collection**

The instrument that would be used for this research work is the written questionnaire. This is a technique of data collection in which the researcher systematically presents well-structured written questions that are to be answered in written form by the respondents. The questionnaire will consist of two sections; the first section (A) will contain the personal data (Bio-data) of the respondents which includes the sex, age, and marital status while the second section (B), will examine issues that address the core subject matter under study. It will comprise mainly closed ended questions where the researcher will simply indicate yes or No.

### **3.6 Method of Data Collection**

There would be a personal contact (face to face) between the respondents and the researcher with the aim of gathering reliable and vital information by the use of questionnaire which would be administered hand to hand from the researcher to the respondents.

### **3.7 Sampling Technique/Sample Size**

According to (Osemwota et al, 1996), sampling is defined as a scientific method of obtaining unbiased and representative data from a given universe or population. Gay, (1987) defined sampling as the process of selecting a number of individuals for a study in such a way that the individual represents the large group from which they were selected. Thus, the sampling technique that would be used in drawing the population for this study is the simple random sampling. The sample will be drawn from 150 persons from three metropolitan areas of the state: They include: Oredo, Ikpoba-Okha and Egor.

### **3.8 Method of Data Analysis**

The research data will be analyzed using descriptive statistics which includes the use of frequency tables, simple percentage. The responses from the respondents will be grouped and arranged in tabular form. The percentage is the frequency of occurrence of a category per 100 cases. To calculate a percentage, we simply multiply any given proportion by 100. The formula is;  $\% = \frac{f}{n} * 100$ , where  $f$ =frequency and  $n$  is total of responses (Ogbeide, 1997).

## CHAPTER FOUR

### DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

#### 4.1 Independent Variables

This chapter deals with the analysis of data collected from respondents and discussion of the findings. In analyzing the data gotten from the field survey, it was discovered that out of the 150 questionnaire distributed by the researcher, only 135 of them were retrieved while 15 were discarded due to lack of proper response to the questions and other irregularities. Thus, the research working sample total is 135 respondents, which showed that about 90% of the respondents responded to the questions. Furthermore, the tables in section A of this study present the socio – economic (bio-data) characteristics of respondents while section B present the responses of the research subjects as regards the questions which border on the subject matter.

**TABLE 1: Sex Distribution of Respondents (n = 135)**

<b>GENDER DISTRIBUTION</b>	<b>RESPONDENT</b>	<b>PERCENTAGE %</b>
MALE	76	56.2
FEMALE	59	43.7
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>135</b>	<b>100</b>

**Source:** Field Survey; 2025.

Table 1 above shows that 76 of the respondents representing 56.2% of the respondents are males while 59 of the respondents representing 43.7% are females. The significance of this is that, from the above analyses more males participated in the study than females.

**TABLE 2: Age Distribution of Respondents (n = 135)**

<b>AGE DISTRIBUTION</b>	<b>RESPONDENTS</b>	<b>PERCENTAGE %</b>
18 – 24	24	17.8
25 – 34	55	40.7
35 and Above	56	41.5
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>135</b>	<b>100</b>

**Source:** Field Survey; 2025.

Also, from the above age distribution of respondents, it was discovered that 17.8% of the respondents were 18 – 24 years of age, 40.7% were 25 – 34 years of age, while 41.5% were 35 and above years of age. That is to say, age 35 and above were more active in this study, followed by participants in the age bracket 25-34. And lastly, respondents in the age bracket 18 – 24.

**TABLE 3: Marital Distribution of Respondents (n = 135)**

<b>MARITAL DISTRIBUTION</b>	<b>RESPONDENTS</b>	<b>PERCENTAGE %</b>
SINGLE	70	51.9
MARRIED	52	38.5
DIVORCED/SEPERATED	13	9.6
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>135</b>	<b>100</b>

**Source:** Field Survey; 2025.

Table 3 above shows that 51.9% of the respondents are single, 38.5% of the respondents are married while 9.6 of the respondents are either divorced or separated. Therefore, the analyses indicate that more single respondents took part in the study.

**TABLE 4: Occupational Distribution of Respondents (n = 135)**

<b>EDUCATIONAL DISTRIBUTION</b>	<b>RESPONDENT</b>	<b>PERCENTAGE %</b>
STUDENT	14	10.3
CIVIL SERVANT	34	25.1
PUBLIC SERVANT	18	13.3
EMPLOYED	15	11.1
UNEMPLOYED	17	12.5
TRADERS	23	17.0
OTHERS	14	10.3
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>135</b>	<b>100</b>

**Source:** Field Survey; 2025.

Also, analyses from table 4 shows that 10.3% of the respondents are students, 25.1% of the respondents are civil servants, 13.3% are public servants, 11.1% are employed private workers, 12.5% are unemployed, 17.0% are traders while 10.3% of the sampled respondents are into “other” occupations. Therefore, the above analyses indicate that majority of the respondents are civil servants.

**TABLE 5: Local Government Distribution of Respondents (n = 135)**

<b>LOCAL GOVERNMENT</b>	<b>RESPONDENTS</b>	<b>PERCENTAGE %</b>
EGOR	46	34.0
IKPOBA – OKHA	43	31.8
OREDO	46	34.0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>135</b>	<b>100</b>

**Source:** Field Survey; 2025.

Table 5 above shows that 34.0% of the respondents are from Egor local government area, 31.8 % are from Ikpoba – Okha local government area. While 34.0% of the respondents are from Oredo local government area. Therefore, the analyses indicate that respondents from Egor and Ikpoba- okha local government area took part more in this research study.

#### 4.2 Analyzing in Percentage each Items in Section B of the Questionnaire in Relation to Respondents' Perception of the Subject Matter

**QUESTION 6:** Did you vote in the 2020 Edo state election?

**Table 6**

<b>Response</b>	<b>Respondents</b>	<b>PERCENTAGE %</b>
Yes	107	78.5
No	28	21.4
<b>Total</b>	<b>135</b>	<b>100</b>

**Source:** Field Survey; 2025.

It can be seen from table 6 that 107 respondents representing 78.5% of the research sampled respondents voted in the 2019 Edo state gubernatorial election. While the remaining 28 respondents covering 21.4% were of the view that they did not participate in the 2020 Edo state gubernatorial election.

**QUESTION 7:** If “NO” why?

**Table 7**

<b>Response</b>	<b>Respondents</b>	<b>PERCENTAGE %</b>
Under age	NIL	NIL
Not in the country	5	17.9
Not interested	23	82.1
<b>Total</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>100</b>

**Source:** Field Survey; 2025

In relation with table 5, it was observed from table 7 that; 5 respondents representing 17.9% of the research sampled respondents of none voters of the 2019 Edo state gubernatorial election argued that their reasons for not voting was because they were not in the country. Also, 23 respondents covering 82.1% of none voter in the 2020 gubernatorial election in Edo state were of the view that, they were not interested in the electioneering process. While none of the respondents gave “under age” as a reason for not participating in the election.

**QUESTION 8:** If “YES” which party did you vote for?

**Table 8**

<b>Response</b>	<b>Respondents</b>	<b>PERCENTAGE %</b>
PDP	61	45.1
APC	31	22.9
Others	15	11.1
<b>Total</b>	<b>135</b>	<b>100</b>

**Source:** Field Survey; 2025

As seen in table 8; 61 respondents representing 45.1% of the research sampled respondents argued that they voted for the People’s Democratic Party (PDP), 31 respondents representing 22.9% of the total respondents voted for the All Progressive Congress (APC). While 15 respondents representing 11.1% respondents were of the view that they voted for “other” political parties.

**QUESTION 9:** Did you receive gifts from any political party or candidates during the elections?

**Table 9**

<b>Response</b>	<b>Respondents</b>	<b>PERCENTAGE %</b>
Yes	71	52.5
No	64	47.4
<b>Total</b>	<b>135</b>	<b>100</b>

**Source:** Field Survey; 2025.

As observed in table 9, 71 respondents representing 52.5% of the research sampled respondents were of the view that, they received gift items from political parties or from their representatives during the election. While 64 respondents representing 47.4% respondents were of the view that, they did not receive gifts from any political party or their representatives. The implication of this is that, money politics and vote buying played out in the 2024 Edo state election.

**QUESTION 10:** If “YES” as regard item 10, what kind of gift did you receive?

**Table 10**

<b>Response</b>	<b>Respondents</b>	<b>PERCENTAGE %</b>
Cash	56	79.0
Food items	5	7.0
Other materials	4	5.6
Cash/food items	2	2.8
Cash/other materials	4	5.6
<b>Total</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>100</b>

**Source:** Field Survey; 2025

Drawing reference from Question 10, table 9 shows that, 56 respondents representing 79% of the research sampled respondents of gift collectors were of the view that, they received cash or money from political parties or their agents for their vote, 5 respondents also representing 7% of the total respondents of gift collectors were of the view that, they received food items during the 2020 Edo state gubernatorial election, 4 respondents representing 5.6% of gift collectors in the 2020 gubernatorial election were of the view that, they received “other materials”. Also, 2 respondents covering 2.8% of the total sampled respondents of gift collectors were of the opinion that, they were given both cash and food items. While remaining 4 respondents

representing 5.6% respondents of gift collectors were of the view that they received both cash and other materials.

**QUESTION 11:** Can ignorance and illiteracy be seen as factors responsible for money politics and vote purchase in Edo state?

**Table 11**

<b>Response</b>	<b>Respondents</b>	<b>PERCENTAGE %</b>
Yes	115	85.0
NO	20	15.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>135</b>	<b>100</b>

**Source:** Field Survey; 2025.

The above table 11 shows that, 115 respondents representing 85% of the research sampled respondents were of the view that, ignorance and illiteracy are factors responsible for money politics and vote buying in Edo state. While 20 respondents also representing 15% of the total respondents do not agree to the fact that, ignorance and illiteracy are factors responsible for money politics and vote buying in Edo state.

**QUESTION 12:** Can poverty be seen as responsible for money politics and vote commerce in Edo state?

**Table 12**

<b>Response</b>	<b>Respondents</b>	<b>PERCENTAGE %</b>
Yes	94	69.6
No	41	30.4
<b>Total</b>	<b>135</b>	<b>100</b>

**Source:** Field Survey; 2025

As seen from the above table 12, 94 respondents representing 69.6% of the sampled respondents were of the view that poverty can be seen as responsible for money politics and vote buying in Edo state. While 41 respondents also representing 30.4% of the total respondents do not agree to the fact that poverty is responsible for money politics and vote buying in Edo state.

**QUESTION 13:** Can deceit by the politicians and focusing on the personalities rather than issues be seen as responsible for money politics and vote commerce in Edo state?

**Table 13**

<b>Response</b>	<b>Respondents</b>	<b>PERCENTAGE %</b>
Yes	124	91.8
No	11	8.1
<b>Total</b>	<b>135</b>	<b>100</b>

**Source:** Field Survey; 2025.

The above table 13 shows that, 124 respondents representing 91.8% of the total sampled respondents were of the view that, deceit by politicians and focusing on the personalities rather than issues can be seen as responsible for money politics and vote buying in Edo state, While on the contrary, 11 respondents also representing 8.1% of the total respondents do not agree to the fact that, deceit by politicians and focusing on the personalities rather than issues be seen as responsible for money politics and vote buying in Edo state.

**QUESTION 14:** Do you think that money politics and vote buying can lead to political instability?

**Table 14**

<b>Response</b>	<b>Respondents</b>	<b>PERCENTAGE %</b>
Yes	126	93.3
No	9	6.7
<b>Total</b>	<b>135</b>	<b>100</b>

**Source:** Field Survey; 2025.

As seen in table 14, 126 respondents representing 93.3% of the total sampled respondents were of the view that, money politics and vote buying can lead to political instability in Edo state and Nigeria at large. While 9 respondents representing 6.7% respondents were of the view that, money politics and vote buying cannot lead to political instability in Edo state and Nigeria at large.

**QUESTION 15:** Do you think that money politics and vote buying can lead to corruption in Edo state?

**Table 15**

<b>Response</b>	<b>Respondents</b>	<b>PERCENTAGE %</b>
Yes	121	89.6
No	14	10.4
<b>Total</b>	<b>135</b>	<b>100</b>

**Source:** Field Survey; 2025.

It was observed in table 15 that, 121 respondents representing 89.6% of the total sampled respondents were of the view that, money politics and vote buying can lead to corruption in Edo state. While 14 respondents also representing 10.4% of the total respondents strongly disagreed to the fact that, money politics and vote buying can lead to corruption in Edo state.

**QUESTION 16:** Do you think money politics and vote buying in Edo state denies voters of accountable and transparent government?

**Table 16**

<b>Response</b>	<b>Respondents</b>	<b>PERCENTAGE %</b>
Yes	126	93.3
No	9	6.7
<b>Total</b>	<b>135</b>	<b>100</b>

**Source:** Field Survey; 2025.

As seen in table 16, it was discovered that 126 respondents representing 93.3% of the total sampled respondents were of the view that, money politics and vote buying in Edo state denies voters of accountable and transparent government. While 9 respondents also representing 6.7% of the total respondents seriously disagreed to the fact that, money politics and vote buying in Edo state denies voters of accountable and transparent government.

**QUESTION 17:** Do you think that money politics and vote buying in Edo state makes it impossible to elect leaders freely and fairly?

**Table 17**

<b>Response</b>	<b>Respondents</b>	<b>PERCENTAGE %</b>
Yes	128	94.8
No	7	5.2
<b>Total</b>	<b>135</b>	<b>100</b>

**Source:** Field Survey; 2025.

Table 17 above according to our research finding shows that, 128 respondents representing 94.8% of the total sampled respondents were of the view that, money politics and vote buying in Edo state makes it impossible to elect leaders freely and fairly. While 7 respondents also representing 5.2% of the total respondents utterly disagreed to the fact that, money politics and vote buying in Edo state can make it impossible to elect leaders freely and fairly.

**QUESTION 18:** Do you think that money politics and vote buying took the form of direct payment of money to electorates to influence votes in favour of a particular party or candidate?

**Table 18**

<b>Response</b>	<b>Respondents</b>	<b>PERCENTAGE %</b>
Yes	125	92.6
No	10	7.4
<b>Total</b>	<b>135</b>	<b>100</b>

**Source:** Field Survey; 2025

Table 18 above according to our research finding shows that, 125 respondents representing 92.6% of the total sampled respondents were of the view that, money politics and vote buying took the form of direct payment of money to electorates to influence votes in favour of a particular party or candidate. While 10 respondents representing 7.4% respondents were in direct opposite in view that money politics and vote buying took the form of direct payment of money to electorates to influence votes in favour of a particular party or candidate.

**QUESTION 19:** Do you think that money politics and vote buying took the form of paying political thugs to snatch ballot boxes in the 2020 Edo state governorship election?

**Table 19**

<b>Response</b>	<b>Respondents</b>	<b>PERCENTAGE %</b>
Yes	94	69.6
No	41	30.4
<b>Total</b>	<b>135</b>	<b>100</b>

**Source:** Field Survey; 2025

Table 19 above shows that, 94 respondents representing 69.6% of the total sampled respondents were of the view that, money politics and vote buying took the form of paying political thugs to snatch ballot boxes in the 2020 Edo state governorship election. While 41 respondents representing 30.4% respondents were in conflict view that money politics and vote buying took the form of paying political thugs to snatch ballot boxes in the 2020 Edo state governorship election.

**QUESTION 20:** Do you think money politics and vote buying in the 2020 Edo state governorship election took the form of financial inducement of political elites and other materials in order to get the bulk vote of a particular constituency?

**Table 20**

<b>Response</b>	<b>Respondents</b>	<b>PERCENTAGE %</b>
Yes	115	85.2
No	20	14.8
<b>Total</b>	<b>135</b>	<b>100</b>

**Source:** Field Survey; 2025

As seen in table 20, 115 respondents representing 85.2% of the total sampled respondents were of the view that, money politics and vote buying in the 2020 Edo state governorship election took the form of financial inducement of political elites and other materials in order to get the bulk vote of a particular constituency. While 20 respondents representing 14.8% respondents were of the view contrary view that, money politics and vote buying in the 2020 Edo state governorship election took the form of financial inducement of political elites and other materials in order to get the bulk vote of a particular constituency.

**QUESTION 21:** Do you think money politics and vote buying in the 2020 Edo state governorship election took the form of limiting access of opposition party to funding?

**Table 21**

<b>Response</b>	<b>Respondents</b>	<b>PERCENTAGE %</b>
Yes	88	65.2
No	47	34.8
<b>Total</b>	<b>135</b>	<b>100</b>

**Source:** Field Survey; 2025.

As seen in table 21, it was discovered that 88 respondents representing 65.2% of the total sampled respondents were of the view that, money politics and vote buying in the 2020 Edo state governorship election took the form of limiting access of opposition party to funding. While 47 respondents also representing 34.8% of the total respondents seriously disagreed to the fact that, money politics and vote buying in the 2020 Edo state governorship election took the form of limiting access of opposition party to funding.

### **4.3 Discussion of Findings**

Election have been seen or described as a widely and universally accepted means, through which individuals are chosen to represent a body or community in a larger entity or government. No polity can be adjudged democratic if elections are not conducted and judged to be free and fair. The problem however, is that in Nigeria and several other democratic nations, elections are far from being free and fair. One of the palpable factors is the menace of money politics and vote buying. This political malady is indeed pervasive in Nigeria and other countries (Adetula, 2006).

The study found that there are strong links between financial inducement and election outcome in Edo State 2020 gubernatorial election. Therefore, in analyzing our findings from this research work, it was discovered that, majority of the sampled respondents voted in the 2020 Edo state gubernatorial election. And this was seen by the percentage difference (78.5% of “yes” respondents to the above assertion under review as opposed to 21.4% of “no” respondents), see table 1.5. It was also observed that, 82.1% of non-voters in the 2020 Edo state gubernatorial election were not interested in the electoral process while 17.9% of the aforementioned category of respondents was not in the country (see, table. 6; Question 7)

Furthermore, the discovered that, majority of the sampled respondents voted for the People’s Democratic Party (PDP) and this represented 45.1% of the total sampled population. And the study further noticed that 22.9% voted for the All Progressive

Congress (APC), while the remaining 11.1% sampled respondents voted for “other” political parties (see table 7).

As regard receiving of gifts, the study observed that, majority of the sampled respondents were involved in collecting of gifts from political parties and their agents in the 2020 Edo state gubernatorial elections. From table 1.8, the study revealed that, the Edo state 2020 gubernatorial election was marred with numerous cases of gift giving and collections for the main purpose of manipulating electoral outcome. And this assertion was supported by both adult males and females in the research study area. Another part of the findings of this study was that, 79% of gift collectors in the gubernatorial election of Edo state in 2020 collected cash, 7% collected food items, 5.6% collected “other materials”, 2.8% collected both cash/food items while 5.6% collected both cash and other materials (see, table 9, Question 11).

Again, the study observed that, ignorance and illiteracy can be seen as factors responsible for money politics and vote buying in Edo state. The above assertion was supported by the large percentage number of respondents (male and female) in the form of 85% agreement who gave their full voice to validating the above assertion to 15% disagreement (see table 10; Question 12). This goes to say that, majority of the people that participated in the 2024 Edo state gubernatorial elections were either ignorant or lacked the basic political education as regard election and the democratic process in Nigeria.

It was also discovered in this study that; poverty is a major factor responsible for money politics and vote buying in the 2020 governorship election in Edo state. This position was substantially supported by a large percentage respondent of both adult males and females in the research sampled area (see table 11; question 13). According to the research finding, a lot of politicians and party agents especially those of the “big” political parties took advantage of the hardship and poverty situation in the country especially in Edo state to induce the timid/gullible electorate thereby causing a shift in their electoral stands or choice of candidates in terms of voting.

It was also discovered by reason of this research study that; money politics and vote buying can lead to political instability. This assertion was strongly supported by both adult males and females of the research case study area, giving the differences in percentage respondent in the agreed and disagreed as shown in table 13; question 15. In addition to this point, the country can be faced with uncertainty or instability economically, politically and socially based on the fundamental reason of voting the wrong person into leadership position just for the mere reason of instant gain and self-aggrandizement.

The researcher also found out that, money politics and vote buying can lead to corruption in Edo state. This is seen according to table 14; question 16, where both males and females gave their support that, vote buying and money politics is a major factor for corruption in Edo state and in Nigeria at large. And this can be seen in the form of receipt collection by patrons from clients which have been placed in office by

various god-fathers in the system thereby leading to various fraudulent practices by the clients.

The study also observed that, money politics and vote buying in Edo state makes it impossible to elect leaders freely and fairly. This view was supported by a larger percentage of the respondents totaling 94.8% while the others with opposing totaled 5.2% (see, table 16; question 18). And as being the major trend in various elections in Nigeria where leaders are not elected freely and fairly, the 2020 Edo state gubernatorial election according to majority sampled respondents was not an exception due primarily to financial inducement and vote buying which characterized the election.

The field research findings also discovered that a huge number of respondents (male and female) agreed to the assertion that, money politics and vote buying took the form of direct payment of money to electorates to influence votes in favour of a particular party or candidate. Thus, according to the study respondents who were in a strong support as regarding the state of the electoral system in Edo state, it was discovered that, a high level of financial inducement was at play in the 2020 governorship election and this was in the form of direct payment of money by politicians and their agents to electorates in order to influence their vote to their favour.

It was also discovered from the research that, money politics and vote buying took the form of paying political thugs to snatch ballot boxes in the 2020 Edo state governorship election. This was seen in the level of response by the respondents

(male and female) with 69.6% support and 30.4% disagreement (see table 20; question 18). And according to the study respondents, most pulling units in the 2019 governorship election was marred with political thugs causing trouble in election centers and even going to the extent of snatching ballot boxes.

Also, it was discovered that, money politics and vote buying in the 2020 Edo state governorship election took the form of financial inducement from political elites and other materials in order to get the bulk vote of a particular constituency. And majority sampled respondents of both adult males and females strongly supported the aforementioned statement. And this is seen in (table 19; question 21) where a total of 85.2% respondents (male and female) agreed to the question under review, while a total of 14.8% remaining respondents disagreed with the assertion. And lastly, the study also discovered that, money politics and vote buying in the 2020 Edo state governorship election took the form of limiting access of opposition party to funding. And in response to the above, 65.2% sampled respondents supported the notion, while 34.8% of the sampled respondents disagreed on the subject matter under review.

## CHAPTER FIVE

### SUMMARY CONCLUSION AND POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

#### 5.1 Summary

The study sought to examine “Money politics and Vote buying in Nigeria: A case study of the 2020 Edo state governorship election”. The objectives were to identify the factors responsible for money politics and vote buying in Edo state; to identify the impacts of money politics and vote buying in Edo state as well as to suggest policy recommendation to address the problem. The research design that was employed in this study is survey research design. The population of this study consisted of persons who are 18 years and above and therefore eligible to vote as specified by the Nigerian constitution and were present as at the time of the election. The study used both primary and secondary data. Primary data was collected using structured questionnaires. Collected raw data was cleaned and edited for completeness and consistency. Data was analyzed by the use of the simple percentage.

The study found amongst others that there are strong relationship between financial inducement and election outcome in Edo State 2020 gubernatorial election. It was discovered that majority of the sampled respondents voted in the 2020 Edo state gubernatorial election. Again, the study discovered that majority voted for the People’s Democratic Party (PDP). Another part of the findings of this study was that, majority of the sampled respondents were involved in collecting of gifts from political parties and their agents in the 2020 Edo state gubernatorial elections. Again,

ignorance and illiteracy can be seen as factors responsible for money politics and vote buying in Edo state. It was also discovered in this study that, poverty is a major factor responsible for money politics and vote buying in the 2020 governorship election in Edo state. The study also found out that the, money politics and vote buying can lead to corruption in Edo state.

## **5.2 Conclusion**

The study concludes that money politics and vote buying leads to political instability in Edo state. The study further concludes that, poverty is a major factor responsible for money politics and vote buying in the 2020 governorship election in Edo state. More so, by reason of conclusion, the study further concludes that, money politics and vote buying took the form of direct payment of money to electorates to influence votes in favour of a particular party or candidate. Again, the study concludes that, ignorance and illiteracy can be seen as factors responsible for money politics and vote buying in Edo state. And also, the study concludes that, money politics and vote buying can lead to corruption in Edo state. Furthermore, the study concludes that, money politics and vote buying took the form of paying political thugs to snatch ballot boxes in the 2020 Edo state governorship election.

## **5.3 Policy Recommendation**

In terms of recommendations, the study thus recommends the following;

Firstly, in order to reduce the increasing trend of money politics, vote-buying and negative voting behaviour on the part of the electorate, governmental and non-

governmental organisations needs to expand the scope of their responsibilities to carry out elaborate sensitization, mobilization and political education of the masses about selling their conscience and the implications of selling their votes in elections, through this nobody will claim ignorance of the offence of money politics and vote buying, even the illiterates can be made to understand the implication of selling their votes.

Also, election finance is another area that deserves proper regulation. Anti-corruption agencies need to collaborate with banks and other financial institutions to monitor the movement of cash during elections. Importantly, politicians, electorates and stakeholders in the Nigerian project need attitudinal change because official and legal sanction alone does not prevent the trend. Ovie-Whiskey cited in Alabi, (2008. 105) said;

*If the individuals can have self-examination and determine to be honest at elections, come what may, there will be free and fair elections. What we need is a deep sense of patriotism and a devoted sense of selfless to the acquisition of wealth by unjust means and refuse to be bought at election time or to commit any electoral offence or other kind of evil during elections and if we refuse to make ourselves marketable commodities, the elections will be free and fair. Further, if we behave like decent persons and law abiding in the absence of the uniformed police officers or soldiers, elections will be free and fair.*

Also, the issue of poverty must be tackled seriously. People turn out in their numbers during elections just to partake in the sharing of the national cake, as according to the electorates that is their only means of getting their share; this is as a result of the abject poverty with which they are faced with. The government should eradicate

poverty by introducing poverty alleviation programmes such as creating employment for the citizenry. Finally, the use of cash and other materials such as food stuffs and emotional appeals on the electorates at campaign rallies and even beyond by our modern politicians without workable legal prohibitions has greatly affected the psychological stability of the voters. Adequate and definite means of preventing such acts should be put in place by relevant authorities to help check-mate the excess of politicians in the way and manner they abuse peoples' rights.

## REFERENCES

### Books

- Abimbola, J.O. and Adesote, S.A (2012). Political Parties and the Quest for Good Governance in Nigeria. In: Edo, V.O and Salami, F.F.K. (eds), *Issues and Trends in Nigeria's Development*. Ibadan: John Asher Publishers.
- Adamu, H. and Ogunsanwo, A. (1983). Nigeria: The Making of the Presidential System 1979 General Election. Kano: Triumph Publishing Company.
- Ademolekun, L. (1983). The Fall of the Second Republic. Ibadan: Spectrum Books.
- Adetula, A.O. (2011). Measuring Democracy and Good Governance in Africa. A Critique of Assumptions and Methods in Africa. In: Kondlo, A. and Chinenyen G.E, *Focus Governance in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century*. Johannesburg: Human Science Research Council (HSRC), P. 10-25.
- Agbonifoh, B.A. and Yomere, G.O. (1999). Research Methodology in Management and Social Sciences. Benin: Uniben press.
- Ajakaiye, D.O. (2002). Role of Civil Society. In: F.O.N. Roberts and Ajakaiye D.O. (eds), *Meeting the Challenges of Sustainable Democracy in Nigeria*. Ibadan: NISER.
- Alabi, M.O (2008). The Election Act 2006 and the Conduct of 2007 Elections in Nigeria. In: Salu, H.A (eds), *Nigeria Beyond 2007: Issues, Perspective and Challenges*. Faculty of Business and Social Sciences, University of Illorin. Illorin.
- Amadu, K. (1983). The Nigerian General Elections, 1959 and 1979 and the Aftermath. Lagos. Macmillan.
- Davies, A.E. (2006). Money and Politics in Nigeria Electoral Process. Memo, Department of Political Science, University of Ilorin. Ilorin; Nigeria.
- Diamond, L. (2002). Free and fair? The Administration and Conduct of the 1983 Nigerian Election. In: Akinsanya, A.A and Idang, G.J. (eds), *Nigerian Government and Politics 1979-1983*. Calabar. Wusen Publishers.
- Dudley, B. (1982). An Introduction to Nigerian Government and Politics. Bloomington. Indiana university press.
- Dung, P.S. (2008). Vote Buying in Nigeria. in: Victor A. (eds), *Money and Politics in Nigeria*. Abuja. IFES.

- Easton, D. (1965) *A Framework for Political Analysis*. Englewood, cliffs N.J: prentice-hall.
- Elekwa, N.N . (2008). *The State, 2007 Elections and the Future of Nigeria*. Nsukka: Great AP Express.
- Enojo, E.K. (2010). *Elections in Nigeria from 1999-2009: Issues and Challenges*. In: Egwemi, V.(ed), *A Decade of Democracy in Nigeria 1999-2009: Issues, Challenges and Prospect of Consolidation*. Makurdi: Aboki Publishers.
- Eya, N. (2003). *Electoral Process, Electoral Malpractice and Electoral Violence*. Enugu: Sages.
- Ezeani, O.E. (2005). *Electoral Malpractices in Nigeria; The Case of the 2003 General Elections*: in G. Onu and A. Momoh (eds). *Elections and Democratic Consolidation*. Lagos: NPSA.
- Gay, L.R (1987). *Educational Research, Competencies for Analysis and Application*. Columbus: Merrill Publishing Company.
- Gwinn, R. and Norton, P. (1992). *The New Encyclopedia*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Heywood, A. (2002). *Politics*. New York: Palgrave.
- Ibeanu, O. (2007). *Elections and the Paroxysmal Future of Democracy in Nigeria*. In: A. Jega and O. Ibeanu (eds), *Elections and the Future of Democracy in Nigeria*. Lagos: NPSA.
- Ibrahim, J. and Ibeanu, O. (eds). (2009). *Direct Capture: The 2007 Nigerian Elections and Subversion of Popular Sovereignty*. Abuja: Centre for Democracy and Development.
- Ikelegbe, A. O. (2013). *Politics and Governance in Nigeria: Perspectives, Issues and Cases*. Benin: CPED.
- Ikelegbe, A. O. (1997). *Political Parties, Elections and Interest Groups*. In: R.F Ola (eds), *Nigeria Political System, Inputs, Outputs and Environment*. Benin. Ambik press.
- Joseph, R.A. (1987). *Democracy and Prependal Politics in Nigeria. The Rise and Fall of the Second Republic*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kothari, C.R (2004). *Research Methodology: An Introduction*. New Delhi: New Age international l.td.

- Mackenzie, W. J. M. (1958). *Free Elections*. London: Rinehart & co.
- Milbrath, L.W. (1965). *Political Participation*. Chicago; Rand McNally College Publishing Company.
- Momoh, A. and Adejumobi, S. (1998). *The Nigerian Military and the Crisis of Democratic Transition*. Lagos Civil Liberties Organization.
- Nnoli, O. (1990). The 1987 Local Government Elections in the Eastern Zone of Nigeria; Imo, Anambra. In: Jinadu, A. and Edoh, T (eds), *The 1987-1988 Local Government Elections in Nigeria, Vol 1 Case Studies*. Lagos: National Electoral Commission.
- Nwabueze, B. (1993). *Democratization*. Ibadan: Spectrum Law Publishing.
- Nwosu, H.N. (2008). *Laying the Foundation for Nigeria's Democracy. My Account of June 12, 1993 Presidential Election and its Annulment*. Lagos: Macmillan Nigeria.
- Obi, C. and Abutudu, M. (1999). Election Observers. In: Oyediran and A Agbaje (eds), *Nigeria: Politics of Transition and Governance*. Brasford: CODESRIA and Russell press.
- Odofin, A.P. (2005) Electoral Politics, Elite Conspiracy and the Future of Nigeria. In: G. Onu and A. Momoh (eds), *Elections and Democratic Consolidation in Nigeria*. Lagos: Educational Publishers and Printers.
- Ogbeide, .U. (1997). *Statistical Techniques for Social and Management Sciences*. Lagos: Amfitop book.
- Ogbeidi, M. (2010). *A Culture of Failed Elections: Revisiting Democratic Elections in Nigeria, 1959-2003*. Ghana: University of Cape Coast.
- Ojo, E. (2008). Vote Buying in Nigeria. In: Adetula, A. (eds), *Money and Politics in Nigeria*. Abuja: IFES.
- Ojo, E. (2006). Vote Buying in Nigeria. In: *Money Politics and Corruption in Nigeria*. Abuja: IFES.
- Okoye, G. N. (2011). *Electoral Administration in Nigeria's Fourth Republic. A Guide for Election Managers and Students*. Nsukka: University of Nigeria press.

- Olaitan, W.A. (2005). Elections and the Making of Democracy in Nigeria. In: G. Onu and A. Momoh (eds), *Elections and Democratic Consolidation in Nigeria*. Lagos: NPSA.
- Olu, A. (2003). Political Orientation. Gashua, Yoke: Lamp Printing Press.
- Osemwota, O. et al (1996). Research and Statistical Methods. Lagos: Amfitop book.
- Schelling, T. (1960). The Strategy of Conflict. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Sha, D.P. (2006). Vote Buying and the Quality of Democracy under the 2002 Electoral Act. Abuja: IFES.
- Sobel, L.A (ed). (1974). Money and Politics: Contributions, Campaign, Abuse and the Law. New York: Facts on file, Inc.
- Sohner, C.P. (1973). The Peoples Power: American Government and Politics Today. Illinois: Scott Foresman and Company.
- Walecki, M. (2006). Political Money and Corruption; Money Politics and Corruption in Nigeria, Uk Department (DFLD) under IFES Nigeria Election Support Programmes.
- Walecki, P.S. (2008). Political Money and Corruption: Limiting Corruption in Political Finance. In: Victor A. (eds), *Money and Politics in Nigeria*. Abuja. IFES.
- Wohlstetter, A. (1964). Sin and Games in America. In: Martin, S. (eds), Games Theory and Related Approaches to Social Behavior. New York. John wiley.
- Wright, J.R. (1985). Pace Contribution and Roll Calls. An Organizational Perspective. *The American Political Science Review* 29(2):5

## **JOURNAL**

- Adamu, A. et al (2016). Money Politics and Analysis of Voting Behaviour in Nigeria; Challenges and Prospects for Free and Fair Elections. *IJP AMR*, 3(3):89-99.
- Adetula Victor, A.O. (2006a). Money Politics and Vote Buying in Nigeria: An Overview. A Seminar Paper Presented by IFES at the University of Jos and Ibadan in May 2006.
- Ajayi, M.O. (2006). Reflections on Democratic Succession in Nigeria. Covenant university. *Journal of Business and Social sciences*. 1(1) pp. 6.

- Alemika, E.E. (2007). Quality of Elections, Satisfaction within Democracy and Political Parties in Africa. Afro Barometer Paper. No 84.
- Bello-imam, I.B. (2007) Critical Areas Begging for Electoral Reforms in Nigeria. Discussion Paper Presented at NISER's Workshop on Electoral Reforms in Nigeria, Ibadan, 24 October.
- Danjibo, N.D and Oladeji, A. (2007). Vote Buying in Nigeria. An Assessment of the 2007 General Elections in Nigeria. *A Journal of African Elections*. 6(2) Pp. 180.
- Donsanto, C. (2006). The Experience of the United States and Mexico in Combating Electoral Crimes. An Interview Published in IFES-Nigeria Political Finance Newsletter. 4(4-6,33).
- Eze, R.C. and Akena, J.E. (2016). Independent National Electoral Commission (INEC) Electronic Card Readers and the 2015 General Elections in Nigeria. *Scholars Journal of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences*, 4(7A),PP. 802.
- Frederick, C.S and Andreas, S. (2005). What is Vote Buying: The Limit of Market Model. A Text Delivered at the Conference of: Poverty, Democracy and Clientelism; The Political Economy of Vote Buying. Department of Political Science, Stanford University. Bellagio Center, Rockefeller Foundation.
- Iyayi, F. (2005). Elections and Electoral Process in Nigeria: Dynamics and Implication. *The Constitution: Journal of Constitutional Development*, 5(2) Pp. 11.
- Lewis, P.M. (2003). Nigeria: Elections in a Fragile Regime. *Journal of Democracy*. 14(3): 131-144
- Nwosu, H.N. (1996). The Nigerian Presidential Election of 1993. *Indian Journal of Politics*. 30(1-2), P. 12.
- Ojo, J. (2008). The Challenge of Electoral Reform through Enhanced Political Party Management and Internal Democracy. A Paper Presented at the Society for Peace Studies and Practice. First National Conference and General Assembly, Abuja, 17 June.
- Olajide, E. (2003). Governance and Legitimacy Crisis in Nigeria: Research for Development. *The Journal of the Nigeria Institute of Social and Economic Research*, 18(1-2) Pp 103.
- Osumah, O. and Ikelegbe, A. (2009). The People's Democratic Party and Governance in Nigeria, 1999-2007. *Journal of Social sciences*, 19 (3).

Osumah, O. and Aghemelo, A.T. (2010). Elections in Nigeria since the End of Military Rule. *A Journal of Ideas on Africa and the African Diaspora*, 4(2): Pp. 11.

Ovwasa, O.L. (2013). Money Politics and Vote Buying in Nigeria: The Bane of Good Governance. *Afro Asian journal of Social sciences*, 4(4.3): 1-19

Ovwasa, O.L. (2014). Money Politics and Vote Buying in Nigeria. The Bane of Good Governance: An Overview of Money Politics and Vote Buying in Post-colonial Nigeria. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 5(7), Pp. 101.

Piano, J.C. and Riggs, R.E. (1973) cited in; Ajayi, M. O. The Soccer Pitch and the Arena of Politics in Nigeria. A Public Lecture Series of Department of Political Science. Covenant University, Ota, Ogun State. 1(10): Pp. 5.

#### **ONLINE**

Gabriel, C. (2015). Democracy: It's not always about Money. Available at: [www.vanguardngr.com/2015/24/democracy-its-not-always-about-money](http://www.vanguardngr.com/2015/24/democracy-its-not-always-about-money), accessed. December 9, 2021.

Matenga, G. (2016). Cash for Votes: Political Legitimacy in Nigeria. Available at: <https://www.opendemocracy.net/gram-matenga/cash-for-votes-political-legitimacy-in-Nigeria>, accessed December 9, 2021.

Ogbebor, P. (2016). How can Nigeria Curb Buying of Votes during Elections? Available at: [Punchng.com/Can-Nigeria-curb -buying-votes-elections](http://Punchng.com/Can-Nigeria-curb-buying-votes-elections), accessed December 9, 2021.

#### **NEWSPAPER**

Ajani, J. (2003). Fourth Republic Politics. *The vanguard*, April 21, Pp. 36.

Nwolise, O.B.C. (1988). Political Parties and the Electoral Process. In: V. Ayeni and K. Sore-Mekun (eds), *Nigeria's Second Republic: Presidentialism, Politics and Administration in a Developing State*. Lagos: Daily Times Publication.

Ofeimun, O. (2011). Elections and Electioneering in Nigeria. How did we get to Where We Are Today? *The Guardian*, October 10, Pp. 79-83

Olarenwaju, O. (1999). The West Stoops Down for Fraud. *The Guardian*, March 19. Pp. 13.

Oluwatobi, D. (2011). An Appraisal of 2011 General Elections in Nigeria. *The Vanguard*, June 04, Pp. 10.

## APPENDIX

### DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE UNIVERSITY OF BENIN, BENIN CITY.

#### QUESTIONNAIRE

Dear Respondent,

I am a post graduate student of the above named institution, carrying out a research titled “Money Politics and Votes Commercialization in Nigeria”. My study area is the 2020 Edo state governorship election.

Kindly assist me in completing the attached questionnaire. I will be grateful if the questionnaire is responded to as sincerely as possible. You can be rest assured that your views will be treated confidentially.

Yours faithfully,

**Ize-Osaigbovo Osamwonyi**

Researcher

**PART ONE; BIO DATA.**

Instruction: Please mark [] as appropriate.

1. Sex: Male [] Female [].
2. Age: 18-24[  ] 25-34 [  ] 35 and above [  ].
3. Marital status: Married [  ] single [  ] divorced/separated [  ].
4. Occupation: Student [  ] civil servant [  ] public servant [  ] Employed [  ]  
Unemployed [  ] Trader [  ] others [  ].
5. Local government: Egor [  ] Ikpoba- Okha [  ] Oredo [  ]

**PART TWO:**

Instruction; Please mark [] as appropriate.

6. Did you vote in the 2020 Edo state election? Yes [  ] No [  ].
7. If No why? (A) Under age. Yes [  ] No [  ]. (B) Not in the country.  
Yes [  ]  
No [  ]. (C) Not interested. Yes [  ] No [  ].
8. If yes which party did you vote for?  
PDP. Yes [  ] No [  ].  
APC. Yes [  ] No [  ].  
Others. Yes [  ] No. [  ].
9. Did you receive gifts from any political party or candidates during the elections?  
Yes [  ] No [  ].

10. If yes what type of gift?

(A) Cash (money) Yes [ ] No [ ].

(B) Food items (Akara, Rice) Yes [ ] No [ ].

(C) Other materials. Yes [ ] No [ ].

Factors responsible for money politics and vote purchase in Edo state

11. Can ignorance and illiteracy be seen as factors responsible for money politics and vote commerce in Edo state Yes [ ] No [ ].

12. Can poverty be seen as responsible for money politics and vote buying in Edo state? Yes [ ] No [ ].

13. Can deceit by the politicians and focusing on the personalities rather than issues be seen as responsible for money politics and vote commerce in Edo state? Yes [ ] No [ ].

The impact of money politics and vote purchase on Edo state

14. Do you think that money politics and vote buying can lead to political instability? Yes [ ] No [ ]

15. Do you think that money politics and vote buying can lead to corruption in Edo state? Yes [ ] No [ ].

16. Do you think money politics and vote buying in Edo state denies voters of accountable and transparent government? Yes [ ] No [ ]

17. Do you think that money politics and vote buying in Edo state makes it impossible to elect leaders freely and fairly? Yes [  ] No [  ].

Forms which money politics and vote buying takes in Edo state

18. Do you think that money politics and vote buying took the form of direct payment of money to electorates to influence votes in favour of a particular party or candidate?

Yes [  ] No [  ].

19. Do you think that money politics and vote buying took the form of paying political thugs to snatch ballot boxes in the 2020 Edo state governorship election? Yes [  ]

No [  ]

20. Do you think money politics and vote buying in the 2020 Edo state governorship election took the form of financial inducement of political elites and other materials in order to get the bulk vote of a particular constituency? Yes [  ]

No [  ].

21. Do you think money politics and vote buying in the 2020 Edo state governorship election took the form of limiting access of opposition party to funding. Yes [  ] No

[  ].