



ELECTORAL INTEGRITY AND VOTERS' CONFIDENCE IN NIGERIA: A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF 2015 AND 2019 PRESIDENTIAL ELECTIONS

Abdulrazaq Idowu. AMAO, PhD

Department of Politics & Governance,

Faculty of Humanities, Management and Social Sciences

KWARA STATE UNIVERSITY, MALETE, NIGERIA

EMAIL: amaoabdulrazaq@hotmail.com or amao.abdulrazaq.idowu@gmail.com

and

Professor Abdul Rauf Ambali

Director Academic Research and Institution Research

Department of Politics & Governance,

Faculty of Humanities, Management and Social Sciences

KWARA STATE UNIVERSITY, MALETE, NIGERIA

EMAIL: abdulrauf.ambali@kwasu.edu.ng

Abstract

Countries around the world share major challenges in meeting international standards of electoral integrity. Nigeria's return to democratic rule dates back to May 29th, 1999. In its wakes, Independent National Electoral Commission (INEC) has conducted six Presidential Elections namely: 1999, 2003, 2007, 2011, 2015 and 2019 respectively. Since the adoption of card reader machine by the INEC, it is often expected and believed that electoral anomalies will have been resolved. However, malfunctioning of the card readers at several polling units, rejection of Permanent Voters' Card, inability to capture voters biometrics from the finger tips, irregular capturing and battery damage which arises because of erratic power to the device are major challenges. This study set out to examine the relationship between electoral integrity, and voters' confidence in Nigeria. The study used (mixed method) both primary and secondary sources of data collection. The study uses Liberal democratic theory. The study finds out that there is significant positive relationship between electoral integrity and voters' confidence in Nigeria. The study concluded that there is significant positive relationship between electoral integrity and voters' confidence in Nigeria. And the study have also made it clear that for any

nation to achieve positive development it has to improve on the electoral integrity of her electoral process as well as voters' confidence in the electoral process of the country.

Keywords: *Elections, Electoral Integrity, Voters Confidence, Legitimacy*

Democracy

INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background to the Study.

Elections in a democracy are considered by scholars as the means to engender mass participation of the people in taking decision about how they are governed in a given political system. From independence to the present Fourth Republic, Nigeria has witnessed nine different presidential/general elections. However, since 1999 elections have been stable and are conducted on regular basis. From 1999 till date the country's electoral body has organised and conducted six different general elections. These are 1999, 2003, 2007, 2011, 2015, and the 2019 general elections.

The standard of these elections is, however, a source of worry to political actors and observers both local and international. For instance, the 2003 general elections were characterised by discontent from political contestants, voters, and observers. The 2007 general elections were described by some analysts, election observers, and political actors as the worst in the country's electoral history. This was reflected in the series of litigations that trailed the announcement of results and declaration of winners, nullification of results, and ultimately election-related violence which occurred at all the stages of the electoral process (Nwolize, 2007p.163). The 2007 general elections apart from being characterised by all sorts of electoral vices (Nwolize,

2007p.168) were accompanied by a high degree of electoral violence.

The 2011 elections were described by some international and local observers as well as analysts as the most credible in the series of elections conducted since the country's return to multi-party democracy (EUEOM, 2011; Bekoe, 2011; Human Rights Watch, 2011). The credibility of the elections was reflected in the few cases of litigations that trailed the announcement of the election results. It is, however, important to note that these elections were characterised by various degrees of electoral violence. The 2011 general elections though described as credible were also described as the bloodiest and the most violent general elections held in the nation's political history (Human Rights Watch, 2011; International Crisis Group, 2011, Bekoe 2011). This was because electoral violence occurred at all the stages of the elections. Post-election

violence occurred in some parts of the country immediately after the winner of the presidential election was announced. In the Northern part of the country where post-election violence was more pronounced, violent and irate protesters killed several people including some members of the NYSC, burned houses, properties, religious places, and business outfits. The post-election violence many people killed, maimed, and rendered homeless. This was in spite of the electoral laws that abhor violence act.

The integrity in electoral process is considered as the fundamental principle that runs throughout the electoral cycle right from the nomination of candidates by the political parties, the campaign exercise, the conduct of elections proper and the declaration of election results up till litigations on the election if any there were i.e. electoral dispute. When these procedures

is followed fairly, firmly, and transparently by the EMB and all other participants in the process it would result into an election that would be seen as credible and upholding international standard of democratic practice. These situations would necessarily elicit the confidence of the voters in the political system and imbue legitimacy of the government which is the fundamental attribute of good governance.

The objectives of the study **include;** To examine the nexus between electoral integrity and voters' confidence in Nigeria; and to comparatively analyse 2015 and 2019 presidential elections in Nigeria. The research questions include; What is the nexus between electoral integrity and voters' confidence in Nigeria? What similarities or differences existed between the 2015 & 2019 presidential election in Nigeria? The scope of the study examine electoral integrity, and voters' confidence, in Nigeria. (2015-2019). The research hypotheses are;

H₀₂:- Electoral Integrity has no relationship with Voters' confidence in Nigeria. H₂:- Electoral Integrity has a relationship with Voters' confidence in Nigeria.

Conceptual clarification and theoretical framework

i. Elections

Election all over the world is regarded as the foremost and the most peaceful means of changing governments in a democratic setting. It provides the citizens the opportunity to determine who governs them as at when and how. Election in the twenty-first century has been seen as the most veritable way of selecting leaders and the most veritable means of participating in the governance process in any country. In recent times, the election has become a tool for legitimating government leadership even when the government has not adopted democracy in principle and practice.

Whenever there are controversies in election politics, judiciary mediation is inevitable. Election is a deeply rooted conditionality in a democratic society that is enshrined in the constitution of the country. Usually an electoral body or commission that would oversee it is also stated. In Nigeria, the 1999 constitution stated that elections must be organised by INEC. In modern states elections are held periodically and it ranges from one country to another. (Ejue & Ekanen, 2011 p. 4; Birch & Muchlinski, 2017 p. 6). In Ghana, Nigeria, USA it is a cycle of four years. It is seven years in China and in the UK, India which practices the parliamentary system, it takes place as soon as the ruling party loses its majority in the parliament. The age of participation is prescribed and it 18 in many cases, the political parties field candidates and the electorates shall have the freedom to vote anybody of their choice. In some countries like the USA, independent candidacy is

allowed in which any citizen can contest without the platform of a political party. In some countries only one party exists and in some there are two dominant parties while in others many parties contest the elections. (Hamalai, Egwu and Omotola, 2017 p. 9). The critical requirement for an election in the best global practice is that it should be free, credible and fair. When these values are upheld the government will enjoy the confidence of the people who shall be assured that the mandate which they gave them freely can be withdrawn during another round of elections to another party or another candidate. (Dahl, 1971 p. 6; Oni, Chidozie and Agbude, 2013 p. 8; Ojo, 2008 p. 6; Cohen, 1983, p. 55; Hughes & May, 1988 p. 20).

ii. The Concept of Legitimacy and Electoral Integrity

Legitimacy is considered as a sine qua non to acceptance of a government, a strong

belief that the will of the electorates sustain and it results in stability of the society. (Rothstein 2009 p. 313). Scholars agreed that when a government is considered legitimate, schism will be low and resort to repression by the government shall not ensue (Scharpf, 1999 p. 9)

Scholars on this issue concentrated more on what integrity is not, rather than what it is. On the one hand, Schedler, (2002 p.12) and Birch (2011 p. 6) believe that the behaviour of incumbent government on the seat in trying to manipulate the choice of electorates by setting legal framework and influencing electoral umpires to design a slanted system which compromise the principle of fair play and puts a stain on electoral integrity. On another hand, the Inter Parliamentary Council (1994) asserts that organising a free and fair election where the electoral procedure is followed amounts to what electoral credibility connotes. This includes an up to date register of voters, free

expression of franchise by all citizens that have attained the prescribed age of adulthood, vote sorting and counting without hindrance and announcement of results fairly.

Norris (2014 p.21), Elklit & Svenson, (1997 p. 32) Bishop & Hoeffler, (2014 p.8) were in alliance that when elections were held and concluded without intimidation and violence and the citizens were convinced that their votes translated into the results that were announced then it would be said to have credibility. They opined that when elections conform to the prescription of the UN and it is acclaimed by the political actors, the electorates, journalists and scholars, it would be said to uphold integrity. They insisted that conformity to the process of the elections is what constitutes integrity. Some scholars including Alvarez, Atkeson & Hall, (2012 p. 7); Munck, (2009 p. 6; O'Donnell, (2001 p. 5) contend that the legal

framework and domestic regulations that guide the election procedure as well as the general conduct and administration of the elections constitute the yardstick to measure integrity.

This research considers electoral integrity as a holistic or comprehensive observance of the electoral laws guiding electoral conduct of a country throughout the electoral cycle through which a collective will of the people can be achieved and upon which the election can meet international standard. What is most significant is these definitions are that it encompasses the nomination process and election cycle leading to good governance. In the acceptance of the necessity to uphold integrity, academics designed a methodological and theoretical basis to assess it through the Electoral Integrity Project (EIP), at the Harvard University and the University of Sydney in Australia that was coordinated by Pippa Norris. It is

notable that their academic exercise had continued to gain international recognition and followership in the global arena including the US, Nigeria, Mexico etc. Their measures are being used by domestic and international observers to assess elections and the electoral procedure. It gives them the exactitude to describe the electoral process as fair, credible, free or tainted by manipulation, malpractices or fraud. (Bjornlund, 2004 p.6; Reynolds, 2005 p. 4; Young, 2009 p. 4; Vickery & Shein, 2012 p. 4). They emphasised that these yardsticks would assist the security agencies and the judiciary to track and exert sanctions on offenders of the electoral procedure. And the press would continue to spread the message of malfeasance in the electoral procedure.

Determinants of Electoral Integrity

The casual factors of electoral integrity are both comprehensive and holistic to what occurred within the entire circuit. Although, some observers focus essentially on

election-day activities. This is however erroneous because what take place ahead of election, during and after the election is crucial to determine the confidence that both the citizens, scholars and the observers devolve on it (Stegmaier & Linek, 2014 p 5; Norris,, 2015 p. 6; Bishop & Hoeffler, 2014 p. 6; Birch 2011, p. 8). If the EMB is autonomous and work conscientiously, if the government and the ruling party does not interfere, the electorates are mobilized by the political actors, media and NGOs , the security agencies and judicial officers conduct themselves in a fair manner, then the electoral process could be described as upholding integrity (Simpser, 2012 p. 3; Kelley & Kirill 2010p. 3; Hyde & Mariniv, 2012 p. 2; Hyde, 2007 p. 8; Ansolabehere, & Persil, 2008 p. 5; Levitsky & Way, 2010 p. 3). To me, electoral integrity is not a one off occurrence, but a consistent good conduct in the cycle. This is what would engender

confidence in the procedure and reduce the tendency to engage in violence.

(i.) Election Laws.

The laws that govern the electoral process are strong factor that determines the confidence that the people have in the procedure. When the laws are allowed to be subjected to the scrutiny of the legislature especially in a multiparty democracy, it could stand the test of being fair when encumbrances were not placed for voters, observers, judiciary e.t.c (Personal communication).

(ii.) Media coverage.

A fair access to the media by all the actors in the political field is important to enhance the integrity of the electoral process. Contestants in an election and political parties should have access to be heard and to sell their manifesto to the public in the media outfits available through the orbit,

broadcast and audio visual outlets (Personal communication).

(iii.) Electoral Violence.

Violence or and the threat of it, is a strong factor that signpost the integrity of an election. When the electorates are threatened, many eligible voters will not register. If they fear for their lives in being maimed or killed, many will equally not vote in an election. This is what often resulted in low voter turnout. Equally, if the government or opposition parties have demonstrated the capacity to inflict violence, then the process will not have high credibility rating (Personal communication).

(iv.) Election Administration.

The entire gamut of an election in a democratic society is usually placed on an EMB. The body might be independent, dependent wholly on the government or an admixture of the two. In either of the three cases enunciated, when the EMB display

fairness, firmness, consistency and non bias, this would go a long way to establish the integrity of the elections. Beyond the provisions of the law, whatever the EMB does in practical terms is the strongest determinant of what level of confidence the electoral process would enjoy and it would be a strong factor to stem or instigate pre or and post election violence (Personal communication).

(iv.) The Concept of Voters' Confidence.

Voter's confidence in the electoral system is interchangeably used to denote the level of trust that the electorates have in the electoral process. (Coleman & Manna 2000 p.7; Bowler & Karp 2004 p.7; Price & Romantum, 2004 p.7 Hansen, 2002 p.8). Confidence in the electoral process is very important because, it is the determinant of the perception of the citizens and how much support and assistance they lend to the

governance process. And ahead of governance, the trust that they build on the process that determines to a large extent the peace, harmony and concord that would exist within the society. On the other hand, the catastrophe and pandemonium that they inflict on the process before, during and after elections, It is also a function of their confidence in the process. (Miller, 1974 p. 6 Easton 1965 p. 7; Nye et al, 1997 p. 4; Hetherington, 2005 p. 9). Scholars contend that what constitutes voters' confidence are varied but it is a function of how well and effectively that the electoral body charged with that responsibility performed on their assignments and how well the government supports and distances itself from actions that undermine the voting pattern and change its outcome.

While events from the developed democracies have shown a steady rise in the confidence of voters in the process of

elections, the developing world including Nigeria, Belarus, Uganda, Afghanistan have shown acts that does not make the votes of the electorates to count. The consequence of these is that violence erupted at different stages of the electoral process pre, during, and post-elections. It's also lamentable that the governance system is negatively affected. Delivery of the dividends of democracy for which a government is voted for is reduced and insecurity of lives and property which is the primary duty of the government is heightened. (Dalton 1999 p. 3; American National Election Studies, 2007 p. 2; Hill 1981 p. 5; Rahn, Brehm & Carlsin 1999 p. 4 Price and Romantan 2004 p. 3.) In essence, the trust that citizens effect on the electoral system translates to the level of support that they give to the government and governance process. (Koehler, 2009 p. 4; Bratton et al 2005 p. 3). Further, scholars believe that voters' confidence can aggregate from either support for the system of

government that is emplaced, the political leaders and contestants. Similarly, the familiarity of the voters with the procedures of elections, the trust in the efficacy and efficiency of the technology adopted and promptitude and exactitude of voting scores that was announced affect their confidence in the electoral process.

Determinants of Confidence

Trust and confidence in an electoral system is not static. It is contingent on time and some variables they might intervene to direct the view of the voters. The critical issues that determine the confidence that the people express in the electoral system are: One of these issues is when a scandal occurs at any level of the cycle. For instance if the hope and confidence of the people had been kindled during the voters registration, but they realised on election day that under age pupils or non nationals have been stuffed in,

this shall definitely affect their confidence. Also, finance that is devoted to campaigning is a strong factor that imbues confidence in the mind of the voters. It should be regulated and monitored so as not to result in vote buying that shall reduce the confidence of the voters. If the electoral law is followed throughout the electoral cycle, the electoral integrity would be high and vice versa. When the campaign is based on issues and the language of communication is issue based and polite rather than personal attacks, the voters and observers would have confidence in the procedure. Before, during and after elections, political communication should be based on ideas that can further the growth and development of the society. When the electorates lose trust at any point of the electoral cycle, it would ultimately, reduce their confidence. When the EMB is perceived to be independent, it would elicit the confidence of the voters. Once the electoral laws are unbiased and it is applied

accordingly, voters' confidence would be high. Voters' familiarity with the electoral process, the perception of such voters is high and vice versa. A helpful poll worker who offers guide and assistance to the aged and illiterate voters, would be seen as helping to increase the confidence of the voters and even the observers if and when they make a visit to his polling booth. Furthermore, voter familiarity with the electoral process, general opinion about the voting technology, party identification with the winner/or losers' effect, voting method, age and gender.

Effects of Voters' Confidence on the Political System

(1). Voter's confidence improves the legitimacy of the government in the political system.

(2). When the level of support is low i.e. voter's confidence, the survival of the political system is threatened.

(3). When the voter's confidence is low, the system's institution would be constrained.

(4). Unfavourable outcome of public policy or public policy outcome.

(5). When the voter's confidence is low, there would be a higher tendency of deviant behaviour of the citizens. In Nigeria the increase in the activities of Boko Haram, the IPOB and the Fulani herdsmen devastation are classical examples of behaviour arising from loss of confidence in the leadership.

(6). When voter's confidence is high in the electoral process, it helps to improve governance.

(7). When confidence is high, it increases level of political participation of the citizens.

The linkage between Electoral Integrity and Voters' Confidence
Conceptual Framework of Analysis

Figure 1



Source: PLSM / SPSS OUTPUT/Researcher's field survey, 2019.

The study finds out that electoral integrity is positively related to voters' confidence, It shows that electoral integrity and voters' confidence are good determinants of good governance in any social setting. Statistically, our flow chat shows the relationships between these latent variables (Electoral integrity, and voters' confidence,), Electoral integrity contribute 0.777 to the model, out of 0.777, indirectly

contributed 0.3632 to good governance through voters' confidence i.e. the higher the quality of Electoral integrity the more confident the voters has in the system of election or electoral system and the better good governance the system produced. Therefore Electoral Integrity and Voters' Confidence are goes concurrently and positively related to each other in any social setting. (Amao, 2021p.12)

2.1 Measurement of Electoral Integrity

Table1. Comparative Analysis of Electoral Integrity in 2015 & 2019 Presidential Electoral in Nigeria

S/N	DIMENSIONS OF ELECTORAL INTEGRITY	KWARA STATE 2015	STATE 2019	EKITI STATE 2015	STATE 2019	RIVERS STATE 2015	STATE 2019

1.	Application of Electoral Laws.	355	320	371	300	380	355
2.	Electoral Procedures.	900	900	850	800	800	800
3.	Electoral District Boundary.	245	250	352	260	300	300
4.	Voters Registration Procedures (V. Register)	294	300	360	330	355	360
5.	Party Registration & Candidates Selection.	551	608	512	650	560	700
6.	Media Coverage i.e. Political broadcast & Advertisements.	300	230	291	250	300	250
7.	Political Party Campaign Finances.	360	380	328	370	380	360
8.	Voting Process Procedures.	363	230	310	220	363	208
9.	Vote Count (Election Monitors: Domestic and international)	380	300	326	336	900	400
10.	Post-Election (Electoral Outcome & Electoral Dispute Settlement).	504	664	501	638	800	900
11.	Electoral Authority / Election Administration (EMB)	320	250	365	296	350	250
12.	Electoral Security.	327	250	375	250	300	250

Source: Researcher Field Survey, 2019.

Measurement of Voters' Confidence in 2015 & 2019 Presidential Election in Nigeria

Table2. Comparative Analysis of Voters' Confidence in 2015 & 2019 Presidential Election in Nigeria.

S/N	DIMENSIONS OF VOTERS' CONFIDENCE	KWARA 2015	STATE 2019	EKITI 2015	STATE 2019	RIVERS 2015	STATE 2019
1.	Vote Count	350	327	393	271	360	200
2.	Confident with the	300	250	270	200	380	250

	Electoral Authority or (E.M.B)						
3.	Confident with the Electoral Officials	360	218	269	250	350	208
4.	Confident with the Electoral Outcome	338	324	371	291	363	200
5.	Reflection of the popular will of the Voters'	355	200	379	108	355	200
6.	Electoral Manipulation	186	340	125	284	150	350
7.	Free, Fair, and Credible Election	332	180	359	170	390	180

SOURCE: Researcher's field survey, 2019.

A Comparative Analysis of the 2015 and 2019 Presidential Election in Nigeria

The 2015 Presidential Election was initially scheduled to hold on February, 14th 2015 and was postponed till March, 28th 2015 and it was well administered. The reasons for the postponement were due to security challenges in the country then following a meeting of the council of the state where it was reported that the security chiefs could not assure of security if the election were to be held on an earlier date. While the 2019 Presidential Election which was scheduled

for February 16th, 2019 was however postponed to the 23rd of February, 2019 by the INEC around 03:00 am on the original polling day, giving logistical inadequacies in getting election materials to polling destinations.

The number of registered political parties in the 2015 General Election was fourteen (14) and the number of political parties that contested the 2015 presidential election was fourteen (14). While the number of registered political parties for the 2019 general election was ninety-one (91) and the

number of political parties that contested for the 2019 presidential election was seventy-three (73). The interpretation of this was that, there was an increased political participation in Nigeria than that in the 2015 Presidential Election.

The number of registered voters for the 2015 (General Election) Presidential Election in Nigeria, was 67, 422, 005. While, the total number of voters registered for 2019 Presidential Election was 84,004,084. The total number of voters turn-out of the 2015 Presidential Election was put at 29,432,083 with 43.65%. While the total number of voters turn-out of the 2019 Presidential Election was put at twenty-nine million three hundred and sixty-four thousand, two hundred and nine (29,364,209) with thirty-five-point-fifty-six-percent(35.56%). The 2015 Presidential Election was transitional, while the 2019 Presidential Election was a consolidatory election.

The 2015 Presidential Election was well administered and meets the international standard for electoral integrity as it was adjudged credible by the reports of both domestic and international election observers. On the other hand, another group of respondents with a frequency or response rate of six-hundred and ten (610) with seventy-six-point-three percent (76.3%) declared that they were confident that the outcome of the 2015 Presidential election reflects the true will of the voters in Nigeria. While the 2019 Presidential Election was not well administered and failed to meet the international standard for electoral integrity. The electoral outcome of the 2015 Presidential Election reflects the true wills of the Nigerian masses or voters' from the result of voters' confidence measurement. On the other hand, another group of respondents with a frequency or response rate of six-hundred and ten (610) with seventy-six-point-three percent (76.3%)

declared that they were confident that the outcome of the 2015 Presidential election reflects the true will of the voters in Nigeria. While the outcome of the 2019 Presidential Election does not reflect the true will of the Nigerian masses or voters' from the result of voters' confidence measurement in 2019. An absolute or overwhelming majority of our respondents with a frequency of six-hundred and ten (610) with seventy-six-point-two-percent (76.2%) declared that they were not confident that the outcome of the 2019 Presidential election reflected the true will of the masses of voters in Nigeria.

The 2015 Presidential Election was relatively peaceful considering the reports of both domestic and international election observers in Nigeria. Whereas the 2019 Presidential Election was rancorous and largely un-peaceful considering the voting day report by all domestic election observers reports. As well as international election observers report on the 2019 General

Election in Nigeria. Moreover, the gravity of electoral violence reported occurring at pre-election, during the election, and after. The comment in the election observers' reports both domestic and international was positive for the 2015 Presidential Election. While the comment in the election observers reports both domestic and international was negative for the 2019 Presidential Election in Nigeria.

The ballot papers used for 2015 Presidential Election was moderate and easy for voters to understand it was sizable, this can be supported by the opinion pool that declared that five hundred and seventy-three respondent (573) with seventy-one-point-six-percent (71.6%) unanimously agreed that the ballot paper used for 2015 Presidential Election was easy for the voters to understand. Finally, this can also be supported by the number of invalid votes in 2015 in which the figure was put at eight hundred and forty-four thousand five

hundred and nineteen (844519). While the ballot papers used for the 2019 Presidential Election were too cumbersome or too long and confusing to the voters especially the illiterate voters in Nigeria. However, this also can be supported by the opinion pool that four hundred and fifty-five respondents (455) with fifty-six-point-nine-percent (56.9%) agreed that the ballot paper used for the 2019 Presidential Election was too cumbersome for voters to understand. Finally, this can be supported by the number of invalid votes in the 2019 Presidential Election in which the figure was put at one million two hundred and eighty-nine thousand-six hundred and seven (1,289,607). However, this figure was considered higher when compared with the 2015 figure.

The 2015 Presidential Election was better secured by the security agents that were involved in the election then. While the 2019 Presidential Election was not better

secured considering the electoral violence that trailed the conduct of the 2019 Presidential Election in Nigeria. The 2015 Presidential Election in Nigeria did not witness or the result was never challenged in the court of law for the first time in the history of election in Nigeria where the opposition party will defeat the incumbent political party and the candidate, as well as the party, will accept defeat without post-electoral violence in Nigeria was never anticipated. While the 2019 Presidential Election result was challenged by both the candidate and the political party in Nigeria was a negative index of electoral integrity measurement worldwide and coupled with the various election observers reports on the 2019 General Election in Nigeria that gave a submission that it failed to meet international standard and lack credibility.

In submission, another criterion for comparison was the opinion pool that argued that four hundred and sixty respondents

(460) with fifty-seven-point-five percent (57.5%) declared that fraud does not likely affect the electoral outcome of the 2015 Presidential Election in Nigeria. While four hundred and ninety-four respondents (494) with sixty-one-point-seven percent (61.7%) declared that fraud likely affected the electoral outcome of the 2019 Presidential Election in Nigeria.

Test of Hypothesis

Test of Hypothesis on Research Question

Two

H₀: Electoral integrity has no relationship with voters' confidence in Nigeria.

H₁: Electoral integrity has relationships with voters' confidence in Nigeria.

TABLE 3 Chi-Square for Kwara State E.I. & V.C.

	Value	Df	Asymptotic Significant (2sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	13691.270 ^a	110.88	.000
Likelihood Ratio	2128.069	110.88	1.000
Linear- by-Linear Association	20.697	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	400		

(a)11300 cells (100.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is '00'

Source: SPSS OUTPUT/ Researcher's Field Survey, 2019

In the table Chi-Square Test result, SPSS also tells us that "11300" cells have an expected count less than 5 and the minimum expected count is 0.0

We can see here that Chi-square (2) =13691.270, $p < 0.05$. This tells us that there is a statistically significant association or

relationship between Electoral Integrity and Voters' Confidence in Kwara State, Nigeria.

The probability of the Chi-square test statistic (chi-square =13,69.270,) was $p = 0.000$, less than the alpha level of significance of 0.05

Decision and Interpretation: If the probability of the test statistic is less than or equal to the probability of the alpha error rate, we reject the null hypothesis and adopt the alternative hypothesis and we conclude that our data support the research hypothesis, and we also conclude that there is a relationship between the two variables

under consideration i.e Electoral Integrity and Voters' Confidence.

The research hypothesis that says: Electoral Integrity has no relationship with Voters' Confidence. is rejected. We, therefore, adopt the alternative hypothesis that says that: Electoral Integrity has relationships with Voters' Confidence in Kwara State, Nigeria.

TABLE 4. Chi-square for Ekiti State E. I. & V. C.

	Value	Df	Asymptotic Significant (2sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	1912.854 ^a	1221	.000
Likelihood Ratio	786.385	1221	1.000
Linear- by-Linear Association	58.768	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	400		

(a)1292 cells (100.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is '00'

Source: SPSS OUTPUT/ Researcher's Field Survey, 2019

In the table Chi-Square Test result, SPSS also tells us that "1292" cells have an expected count less than 5 and the minimum expected count is '00'

We can see here that Chi-square (2) =1912.854, $p < 0.05$. This tells us that there is a statistically significant association or relationship between Electoral Integrity and

Voters' Confidence in Kwara State, Nigeria.

The probability of the Chi-square test statistic (chi-square =1912.854,) was $p = 0.000$, less than the alpha level of significance of 0.05

Decision and Interpretation: If the probability of the test statistic is less than or

equal to the probability of the alpha error rate, we reject the null hypothesis and adopt the alternative hypothesis and we conclude that our data support the research hypothesis, and we also conclude that there is a relationship between the two variables under consideration i.e Electoral Integrity and Voters' Confidence.

The research hypothesis that says: Electoral Integrity has no relationship with Voters' Confidence is rejected. We, therefore, adopt the alternative hypothesis that says that: Electoral Integrity has relationships with Voters' Confidence in Ekiti State, Nigeria.

TABLE 5. Chi-Square for Rivers State E.I. & V.C.

	Value	Df	Asymptotic Significant (2sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	12791.380 ^a	122.88	.000
Likelihood Ratio	1215.089	122.88	1.000
Linear- by-Linear Association	30.769	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	400		

(a)11200 cells (100.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is '00'

Source: SPSS OUTPUT/ Researcher's Field Survey, 2019

In the table Chi-Square Test result, SPSS also tells us that "11200" cells have an expected count less than 5 and the minimum expected count is 0.0

We can see here that Chi-square (2) =12791.380^a, p<0.05. This tells us that

there is a statistically significant association or relationship between Electoral Integrity and Voters' Confidence in Rivers State, Nigeria.

The probability of the Chi-square test statistic (chi-square =12,791.380^a,) was p=

0.000, less than the alpha level of significance of 0.05

Decision and Interpretation: If the probability of the test statistic is less than or equal to the probability of the alpha error rate, we reject the null hypothesis and adopt the alternative hypothesis and we conclude that our data support the research hypothesis, and we also conclude that there is a relationship between the two variables under consideration i.e Electoral Integrity and Voters' Confidence.

The research hypothesis that says: Electoral Integrity has no relationship with Voters' Confidence. is rejected. We, therefore, adopt the alternative hypothesis that says that: Electoral Integrity has relationships with Voters' Confidence in Rivers State, Nigeria.

Finding

1. There is a significant relationship between electoral integrity and voters' confidence in Nigeria.

2. The 2015 presidential election met international standard of electoral integrity while 2019 presidential election was not or less transparent.

Recommendation and Conclusion

To achieve voters' confidence at elections the quality of electoral integrity should be improved considerably. The study has examined the interrelationship between electoral integrity, and voters' confidence, in Nigeria between the years 2015-to-2019. There is a significant relationship between electoral integrity and voters' confidence in Nigeria. For Nigeria to achieve improved electoral integrity the election must be peaceful free from manipulations and all forms of electoral malpractices must be discouraged. This will in turn improve the confidence voters' have in the electoral system.

References

- Alvarez, R., Hall, Thad E., Hyde, Susan (Eds.)(2012), *Election Fraud: Detecting and Deterring Electoral Manipulation*. Brookings Institute, Washington, DC.
- ANES (2007): *American National Elections Studies*: McGrawHill Publisher.
- Ansolabehere & Persil (2008) *Election Turning constitutional system*, Michigan, Michigan University Press.
- Bekoe, D.A. (2011). *Nigeria's 2011 Elections: Best Run, But Most Violent*. Peace Brief 103
- Birch, & Muchlinsk. (2017). *Getting away with foul play? The importance of formal and informal oversight institutions for electoral integrity*. In *European journal of political Research*.56:487-511
- Bishop & Hoeffler (2014) "Free, Fair Elections: A New Data Base" in *Journal of Peace and Research*, Vol.5No.2 pp21-22
- Bowler & Karp (2004) *Citizen, Scandals and Trust in Government* in *journal of Political Behaviour*, Vol.26,No.3pp271-287.
- Bjornlund, E.C.(2004). *Beyond Free and Fair: Monitoring Elections and Building Democracy*.
- Bratton, M. (2005). *Some Comment on Elections in Africa: Africa Journal of Democracy* Vol. 8.No.1
- Coleman, J.J. & Manna, P.F. (2000) *Congressional Campaign Spending and The Quality of democracy* *Journal of politics*, - Wiley Online Library
- Cohen, D.L. (1983). *Elections and Election Studies in Africa*, in Barongo, Y. (Eds), *Political Science in ' Africa*; London: Zed Press Ltd.
- Dahl, R. (1971). *Polyarchy*; New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Dalton, R. (1999) *Critical Citizens*, In *journal of American Political Science Review* .Vol.10, No.6, pp. 57-77,
- Donno, D.(2010). *Who is Punished? Regional Intergovernmental Organisations and the*
- Downs, A. (1957) *An Economic Theory of Democracy*. New York: Harper & Row.

- Enforcement of Democratic Norms. International Organisation. 64(4).593-625.
- Easton, D . (1965) *The Civic Culture*, Princeton: Princeton University Press,
- Ejue B.J. and Ekanem S.A. (2011) Voter rights and credible election in Nigeria: the imperative of rethinking the content of citizenship education International Journal of Humanities and Social Science Vol. 1 No. 19.
- Elklit, Jørgen, and Palle Svensson (1997). "What Makes Elections Free and Fair?" *Journal of Democracy*, vol. 8, no. 3 (July 1997): 32–46.
- Emerging Democracies. A New Research Agenda. Paper Delivered at the 2000 Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association. Marriot Wardman Park, Washington DC. 31st August -3rd September.
- European Union Election Observation Mission (2011) *Nigeria: General Elections April 2011*
- FinalReport.Availableat:http://eeas.europa.eu/eucom/missions/2011_of_uganda/index_en.html. Assessed 21st October, 2013.
- Federal Republic of Nigeria, 1999 Constitution of The Federal Republic of Nigeria, With Amendments, 2011.Nigeria Security Printing and Minting Press, Abuja.
- Federal Republic of Nigeria, Electoral Act, 2010, Federal Government Printer, Abuja, Nigeria.
- Freedom House (2010). *Electoral Democracies: Freedom in the World*'' Availableatwww.freedomhouse.org/uploads/fiw10/ElectoralDemocraciesFIW2010.pdf .Assessed 4th January, 2017.
- FRCN, (2019) Federal Radio Corporation of Nigeria, NNMC publisher.
- Hamalai,L. Egwu,S. & Omotola J.S (2016).Continuity and Change, Nigeria's Electoral Democracy Since 1999. Abuja, National Institute for Legislative Studies.
- Hasen, R.L (2012) *The Voting Ways From Florida 2000 To The Next Election Meltdown* .Yale
- Hetherington, M, J.(2005.) *Changing the Coverage of Canadian federal Politics and Government* forever. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press,
- Hyde, S. D & Marinov, N. (2012) *Political Analysis*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hills (1989) *Election and Its Effective Management* NY: Cornell University Press.
- Hughes, A. and May, R. (1988). *The Politics of Succession in Black Africa's Third Word; Quarterly*, Vol.10, No.1.
- Human Rights Watch (2011) *Nigeria: Post – Election Violence killed 800*. Available at:

- www.wwor.org/need
2011/05/16/nigeria-post-election-violence-killed-800-assessed-30th-august, 2015.
- International Crisis Group (2011). Lessons From Nigeria's 2011 Elections. Africa Briefing No.81. Available at: www.crisisgroup.org. Assessed 23rd October, 2013.
- International Crisis Group, (2015). Nigeria's Dangerous 2015 Elections: Limiting the Violence. Brussels: ICG.
- International Peace Institute (2011) Elections in Africa: Challenges and Opportunities. Meeting Note, September, 2011.
- Milner, H.V. (1974) The Political Economy of US Foreign Aid: American Legislators and the Domestic Politics of Aid
- Norris, P. (2014). Why Electoral Integrity Matters; New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Norris, P (2013). The New Research Agenda Studying Electoral Integrity, Electoral Studies, 32 (4), pp. 563-575.
- Norris, P. et-als. (2014): Measuring Electoral Integrity around the World. A New Dataset. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Nye et'al. (1997) Economic Outcomes, Quality of Governance, and Satisfaction with Democracy. Great Britain, Ashford Publisher.
- Nwolise, O.B.C. (2007)..Electoral Violence and the Nigeria's 2007 Elections. Journal of African Elections, Vol.6, No 2. Pp 155-179
- Ojo E.O (2008) Money and Politics in Nigeria. Abuja: IFES-Nigeria,
- Simpser, A& D.Donno (2012) Can International Election Monitoring Improve Governance? The Journal of Politics. University of Chicago. chicago.edu.
- Reynolds, A. (2005) Representation, Judging Elections and Election Management Quality by process .UK, Taylor & Francis.
- Stegmaier, M. J.& Linck (2014) Economic Voting under Coalition Governments: Evidence from Germany Political Science Research and cambridge.org.
- O'Donnell, GA (2001) Democracy, Law, and Comparative Politics. Studies in Comparative International Development, Springer Publisher.

- Scharpf, F. W (1999) Political Legitimacy in a Non-Optimal Currency Area Democratic Politics in a European Union. under, books.google.com
- Price, V.and A. Romantan.(2004)."Confidence in Situations Before, During and After Indecision 2000." Journal of Politics, 66(3): 939-56.
- Schedler, A. (2002) "The Menu of Manipulation" Journal of Democracy 13(2), 36–50.
- Schedler, A. (2002). 'The Nested Game of Democratisation by Elections', International Political Science Review, 23(1), pp. 103–122.
- Simpser, A. (2012) Why Government and Parties Manipulate Election: Theory,Practise, And Implications. New York: Cambridge Univerity Press.
- Vickery, C., Shein, E.,(2012).Assessing Electoral Fraud in New Democracies. IFES, Washington DC.http://www.ifes.org/w/media/Files/Publications/White%20PaperReport/2012/Assesing_Electoral_Fraud_Series_Vickery_Shein.pdf.
- Yamane, T. (1967). Statistics, An Introductory Analysis, 2nd Ed., New York: Harper and Row.
- Young, J.H.(Ed.) (2009) International Election Principles: Democracy and the Rule of Law. American Bar Association, Chicago. University of Chicago Press.
- NEWSPAPERS
- The Nation 12th April, 2012.
- The Punch, Newspaper 25th February, 2019.
- Premium Times 7th October, 2018.
- Vanguard Newspaper 7th October, 2018.
- Daily Trust Newspaper New York Times January, 2015.
- Thisday Newspaper, 2015.
- Thisday Newspaper, 2019.
- Vanguard Newspaper, February, 8th 2015
- Vanguard Newspaper, March, 14th 2015.
- The Herald Newspaper, May, 12th 2007.
- The Herald Newspaper, May, 19th 2008.
- Sahara Reporter ,2019.
- BBC, 2019.