



# COST OF POLITICS IN NIGERIA

BACKGROUND PAPER

Adebowale Olorunmola



WESTMINSTER  
FOUNDATION FOR  
DEMOCRACY



# CONTENTS



Introduction	1
Methodology	3
I. Historical context	4
II. Current drivers of the cost of parliamentary politics	8
III. Factors influencing cost of election campaigns	11
IV. Formal and Informal Demands on Elected MPs	15
V. Outlook: General trend in cost of politics	17
Summary	19
Recommendations	20

# INTRODUCTION

Money is crucial for political parties to implement activities during elections and between elections. In addition to other factors, candidates require adequate funds for effective campaigning, which contributes to possible electoral victory. In *The Audacity of Hope*, United States President Barack Obama (2006) captured the power of money when he wrote that incumbent “Peter Fitzgerald had spent \$19 million of his personal wealth to unseat his predecessor, Carol Mosley Braun”. John C. Green (2006) also emphasized the importance of money to party politics when he stated that money is an especially valuable resource among several other resources which parties marshal in the process of seeking control of the personnel of government. However, whether in established or new democracies, unregulated use of money, private or public, for politics is capable of reversing the ethics, practices and spirit of democracy. It confers undue advantages and improperly alters available choice to electorates.

In Nigeria, the 1999 constitution (as amended) of the Federal Republic of Nigeria specified in section 225 (1-6) conditions and scrutiny of the sources of funds and expenses of political parties. Section 225 (3)(a) and (b) as well as 225 (4) forbid political parties from foreign funding of any kind. Section 226 (1-3) demands annual reports of account from political parties. By extension, the Electoral Act (2010) stipulates the ceiling of expenses by candidates and political parties for specific elective positions. The maximum limits are pegged at: N1,000,000,000 (naira) for presidential candidates, N200,000,000 for governorship candidates, and N40,000,000 and N20,000,000 respectively for Senate and House of Representatives candidates.

These provisions are necessary to make certain that political parties and candidates are properly guided with regards to the scope of party and election funding and expenses. Additionally, putting a cap on expenses makes certain that the cost of politics remains reasonable and affordable so as to ensure qualitative and quantitative citizen participation. Available evidence which will be discussed subsequently, however, shows that despite these provisions, parties and candidates have continued to infringe on these regulations. Fundraising conducted ahead of the 2015 elections were done without regards to legal provisions. Campaign expenses, particularly of the two main presidential candidates, overshot the N1 billion limit. Money was illegally used to buy votes and permanent voters cards. State administrative resources were used by incumbent officials to facilitate party activities. Political party primaries became a cash affair to lead to the possible emergence of the highest bidders. Yet, the Independent National Electoral Commission (INEC), the regulatory body, is yet to investigate, prosecute and sanction erring parties and candidates for infringements. This has been the case since the transition to democratic governance in 1999.

<b>Elective Office</b>	<b>Limit on Election Expenses</b>
President	N1, 000, 000, 000
Governorship	N200, 000, 000
Senate	N40, 000, 000
House of Representatives	N20, 0000, 000
State Assembly	N10, 000, 000
Local Government Chairman	N10, 000, 000
Councilors	N1, 000, 000

*Table 1: Election Expenses Limit. (Source: Electoral Act (2010))*

A major implication of this abuse of money at elections and the apparent inability to enforce regulations is the skyrocketing cost of politics, at all levels, including the parliament which is the focus of this study. Expression of interest and nomination forms are priced beyond the reach of many. Politicians resort to desperate measures to mobilize funds, including sales of private estates and borrowing from commercial banks and private lending institutions. A former President of the Senate, Adolphus Wabara, noted that contesting to be an MP is an investment which requires most candidates to sell personal property to meet election expenses, with the intention of “recouping” if elected. For those who borrowed from political investors, they are pressured to repay the loans before the end of their tenure, making them susceptible to corruption. The struggle to gain positions as chairs of important senate and house committees is the commencement of efforts by MPs at ensuring regular personal financial gratification. Describing the Nigerian situation, a serving MP noted, that “access to public offices ought to be determined by people’s votes; but because of the high financial costs involved, only those who can afford to pay continue to have access”. Public funds are often diverted to finance party and election activities. The ongoing probe into the Office of the National Security Adviser (ONSA) to former President Goodluck Jonathan has revealed that public funds of US\$2.1 billion meant for equipping the Nigeria military were diverted to finance party activities for the 2015 general elections (Falodi, 2016). Similarly, Governor Joshua Dariye of Plateau state diverted state ecological funds to campaign activities of his party, the People’s Democratic Party (PDP). The use of public funds for party activities is said to cut across all political parties; however, the practice is associated more with parties in power (Falodi, 2016).

The post 2015 election period consequently provides an opportunity for a critical examination of cost of politics in Nigeria, and for parliament in particular. The Westminster

Foundation for Democracy (WFD) therefore commissioned this background paper to conduct primary research on the cost of parliamentary politics. This research sampled current and former MPs as well as unsuccessful candidates for their thoughts on the financial implications of running for office in the recent parliamentary elections. Information from this exercise will facilitate wider research on the topic, the objective of which is to enable the WFD to create a data set that can deepen the donor community’s understanding of electoral incentives. Additionally, the outcome will inform future programming aimed at improving democratic outcomes around the world, particularly in advancing democracies.

# METHODOLOGY

This paper relied mostly on semi-structured interviews with serving and former members of Parliament, as well as, civil society practitioners who are knowledgeable in this issue area. In order to elicit objective responses from respondents, they were assured that no comments would be directly attributed to them. Desk-based research was also conducted on the drivers of the cost of politics in Nigeria.

Researching political finance in Nigeria is very demanding because funds are spent mostly in cash and informally. This makes it difficult to trace or scientifically establish patterns of income or trends of expenses. Records of the amount expended on campaigns, for instance, are hardly kept or made public by candidates. There is therefore no data on major contributors to parties, authoritative reports on campaign spending, categories of spending, and candidate funding strategies which researchers can rely on (Adeyi, 2014).

Major questions designed to elicit valuable information from respondents were discussed in the course of one-on-one interviews. Those who were not available to be interviewed in person chose to respond to the questions through emails. The questions explored the historical context of campaign finance in Nigeria and how it shaped previous parliamentary elections. Key drivers of electoral costs for parliamentary elections were identified. Despite the lack of documented evidence on the actual cost of contesting parliamentary elections and apparent unwillingness to declare the exact amount spent in contesting elections, interviewees volunteered rough estimates. The research attempted also to identify the sources of funding of parliamentary campaigns, specifically as to whether they were individual or provided by the political parties. The impact of the cost of parliamentary politics on citizen participation, particularly of women, was discussed. Finally, the questions examined the possibility of a future expansion or reduction in the cost of parliamentary politics.

# I. Historical Context

## Political system

Nigeria is a federation with three tiers of government: federal, 36 state governments and 774 local government areas. Each tier has three arms of government: the executive, parliament and the judiciary. At the federal level, a democratically elected president forms a cabinet to administer the country. The federal parliament is made up of the Senate, which is the upper house, and the House of Representatives, the lower house. The Senate, headed by the Senate President, is composed of 109 senators; based on equal representation of three senators from each of the 36 states and one representing the Federal Capital Territory (FCT). The lower house is made up of 360 elected members from the 360 constituencies into which the country is divided. The numbers of representatives per state is based on proportional representation of the population of each of the 36 states, including the FCT.

Though a federation, Nigeria practices administrative federalism and not fiscal federalism. The federal government largely controls the resources of the country and therefore wields huge political influence. The 36 states depend on monthly budgetary allocations from the federal government. The PDP, voted out in the 2015 general elections, controlled the centre from transition in 1999. It took a coalition of three major opposition political parties (the Congress for Progressive Change (CPC), the Action Congress of Nigeria (ACN), the All Nigeria Peoples Party (ANPP)), as well as a faction of the All Progressives Grand Alliance (APGA) which merged together to become the All Progressives Congress (APC) to vote the PDP out of power.

Politics at the centre is more lucrative and very competitive due to the concentration of and access to resources. Members of the ruling party at the centre are usually appointed to positions such as heads of ministries,

departments and agencies of government. Due to a high level of corruption and impunity, appointed and elected public officials have almost limitless access to public resources. By implication and historically, the ruling party at the centre has more funds to run party activities, including elections. As one of the three arms of government at the centre, the federal parliament is also well funded and has its budget drawn as “first-line charge” from the federation budget as a measure of its independence.

Members of the federal parliament enjoy very lucrative salaries and allowances which rank as one of the highest in the world. Nonetheless, corruption scandals pervade the National Assembly, suggesting underhand dealings by MPs in the course of oversight functions. For instance, in 2012, Honourable Farouk Lawal, Chairman of the House of Representatives Ad Hoc Committee on Petroleum and Subsidy, allegedly requested and accepted \$620,000 as a bribe from a businessman allegedly involved in an oil subsidy scam. Also, former Senate President Adolphus Wabara was impeached over a N54 million bribe from the Ministry of Education (Vanguard, 2012). As a result, elective positions at the centre provoke intense competition among political parties and candidates, as well as intense use of resources. The current trend at the Senate of the National Assembly is the increasing numbers of former state governors being elected as senators. A civil society practitioner interviewed in the course of this study held that “having been governors for constitutional two terms, of four years each, ex-governors have enough funds to facilitate elections into the senate, even with their dwindled political profiles”. This is evident in the fact that 26 ex-governors are currently members of the senate. This contributes to the turnover rate in parliament, an issue which needs to be dealt with.

### Party system

With the exception of the failed transition programme of General Babangida's regime of 1985 to 1993 which imposed a two-party system, Nigeria has always practiced a multi-party system. Three political parties (the Alliance for Democracy (AD), the PDP and the All People's Party (APP) which became the ANPP) were registered to contest the transition elections in 1999. The constitution provided for the parties to be funded through government subventions, leading to the escalation of the numbers of registered parties, at one point reaching 63. Subventions to parties were stopped in 2010 to curb the increasing numbers, with the consequent deregistration of a host of inactive parties in 2012. Over the years, the parties were reduced to functioning only as platforms for contesting elections, failing to realize the highest potential of recruiting and mobilizing citizens (Momoh, 2014). Politicians decamped from one party to the other with ease to fulfil electoral ambitions. The lack of strict ideological adherence was very pronounced before and after the 2015 general elections. When it became apparent that the PDP was losing the presidency, several long-time members of the party decamped to the APC. Party membership has not strictly been about an ideological stand, but more about being on the platform that provides the best opportunity to win elections and give access to the national cake.

Nigeria uses the first-past-the-post system which gives all the advantages to the winner elected by a simple majority. This winner-takes-all practice has turned politics to a do-or-die affair. Parties and candidates employ divisive, identity-based rhetoric to secure votes and political control, often with little regard for national unity (USAID, 2014). A consequence of this system is the emergence of one or two parties as the most competitive to win elections. For the period of 16 years during which the PDP was in power at the federal level, it was the magical platform on which every politician could easily win elections. Getting the party's ticket was as

good as winning the election itself. Intra-party competition for the party's ticket was very intense, often leading to violence and intimidation of opposition candidates. Personal security arrangements were made by candidates, which required generous amounts of money to hire and equip thugs and body guards. According to a serving MP, "individuals in Nigeria are a municipality unto themselves as they provide their own infrastructures by: generating electricity using personal generating sets; getting water by individually digging boreholes or wells; and employing personal security guards to ensure safety of life and properties. So politicians also have to make personal provisions for security because the formal security forces sometimes prove inadequate".

### Ethnic division

Nigeria is made up of about 374 culturally diverse ethnic groups with distinct languages and dialects (Hassan, 2011). Major among these ethnic groups are the mostly Muslim Hausa/Fulanis of the North-West, the Yorubas of the South-West who are an admixture of Muslims, Christians and traditional worshippers, as well as, the Igbos of the South-East who are mainly Christians. Since the civil war of 1967-70, Nigeria has continued to strive to find strength in this diversity by ingraining in the minds of the citizens the slogan "unity in diversity". Various legal provisions exist to ensure inclusive governance and equitable allocation of resources. The 1999 constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria (as amended) opens with the "people of the Federal Republic of Nigeria firmly resolving to live together in unity and harmony as one indivisible and indissoluble sovereign nation". Chapter 4 of the constitution defines the fundamental human rights of citizens, irrespective of ethnic and religious affiliation. Provision was made in the constitution for the composition of a federal house of representatives in such a way to ensure representation of every section of the federation. The formation of the state house of assembly of each of the 36 states was also designed to make certain that ethnic

divisions within the states are represented. In terms of resource sharing, appointments and employment by the federal civil service is based on provisions of the Federal Character Act which guarantee equity among Nigerians. The constitution requires that political parties be formed to reflect the country's national outlook to stem the emergence of ethnic-based parties (constitution, section 222).

Political parties usually fulfil these conditions for registration, but are not totally exempted from ethnic colorations. The APGA, for instance, was built around the personality of former Biafran warlord Chief Odumegwu Ojukwu and has more influence and members from South-East Nigeria. Also, the ACN had more following in South-West Nigeria than in other parts of the country because it was led by Chief Bola Tinubu, a Yoruba man. The CPC, commanded great following in Northern Nigeria as its founder General Muhammadu Buhari also had ethnic support. The PDP, however, has maintained a national outlook since its formation in 1999, winning elections across the six geo-political zones of the country. The APC has also taken the appearance of a national party, since its formation in 2013, with its leadership drawn from the six zones of the country. As a result, the party was able to emerge as the ruling party at the federal level.

Notwithstanding, the constitutional provisions designed to foster greater unity, ethnic consciousness and identity is deeply entrenched. National concerns are viewed from ethnic perspectives and interests, resulting in suspicion of other ethnic groups and often leading to conflicts. The appointments made by President Muhammadu Buhari after the 2015 elections were viewed through ethnic lenses by various groups. Due to these divisions and resultant suspicion, political parties and candidates have had to reach out to ethnic groups, through their leaders, to negotiate or buy supports with money or promises of certain appointments. Leading up to the 2015 general elections, traditional rulers across Nigeria were allegedly

bribed by political parties to elicit support for presidential candidates. Element of this practice was observed in the first republic, when the National Council of Nigeria and the Cameroons (NCNC) allegedly failed to canvass for individual voters but allegedly bribed the leadership of minority groups for support. Also in its effort to form the federal government, the Action Group campaigned extensively in northern Nigeria, allegedly using monies which came as gifts from its members who were government contractors.

### [Previous work on campaign finance in Nigeria](#)

Local and international election observer groups have always included campaign finance concerns in the scope of their observations. Reports of such groups as the European Union Election Observer Mission (EUEOM), the Commonwealth Observer Group (COG), the National Democratic Institute (NDI) and many others reported on-the-spot observation of infringements by political parties and candidates. In its final report on the 2003 National Assembly and presidential elections in Nigeria, the COG noted: "It is clear that in Nigeria, as in many other countries, there is a strong 'money culture' which affects the political landscape at all levels. Politicians went as far as acquiring local newspapers and broadcasting stations to advance access to the media." In its observation report of the 2007 Elections, the EUEOM cited several instances of illegal use of money during campaigns and elections proper. In one instance, an incumbent governor was videotaped using government vehicles to campaign, from which he threw bundles of money into the crowds (EUEOM, 2007). Regarding the 2011 elections, the NDI noted that "better financed candidates held large rallies; advertised on the radio, television and newspapers; and gave supporters money, food, garments and other gifts. While the latter type of campaigning violates electoral law, there was no serious discussion about prosecuting vote-buying". The report emphasised INEC's lack of capacity, beyond the audit of political party accounts, to prosecute parties and candidates for breaches

of campaign finance rules.

In 2003, the Centre for Law and Social Action (CLASA) implemented a research and advocacy project to address the issues of political finance. The initiative was supported by the Heinrich Boll Foundation and culminated in a policy agenda for reform. Proceedings of the workshop and policy agenda were published in a book in 2004 with the title "Political finance and democracy in Nigeria: prospects and strategies for reform." Notable studies and capacity building have also been conducted by the International Foundation for Electoral Systems (IFES), USAID, UKaid and Friedrich Ebert Stiftung, working closely with local civil society organizations, particularly the Centre for Social Justice (CSJ). Currently, CSJ is running a robust Political Finance Reform Programme (PFRP) which is focused on: capacity building for political parties and civil society organizations, reducing the influence of money in electioneering, reporting of expenses by political parties and candidates and monitoring of same by INEC. The programme monitors the use of state administrative resources for political purposes. Detailed reports of the monitoring of political finance and the use of state and administrative resources during general elections and stand-alone gubernatorial elections were published by the organization. The focus of the reports was, however, limited to candidates vying for executive positions at the federal (presidential) and state (gubernatorial) level; the parliament was excluded from this exercise. Additionally, monitoring was focused on the top two or three political parties. This made it possible for low-profile candidates and parties to escape compliance monitoring.

## II. Current drivers of the cost of parliamentary politics

The 1999 constitution of Nigeria guarantees citizens' fundamental rights, including the right to peaceful assembly and association. Citizens are free to be members of legally registered and recognized political parties, conferring on them the rights to contest for public offices so long as they attain specified age, educational qualifications and other relevant criteria. However, certain formal and informal barriers in terms of costs hinders the free participation of citizens in politics. According to a civil society practitioner, "most drivers of cost of politics are illegal because the dishonest use of both private and public funds is often involved". Many of the MPs interviewed corroborated this assertion and even gave examples of having to part with money for delegates and key members of their parties who demanded gratification, which had to be paid in most cases, up front.

### Expression of interest and nomination forms

Over the years, political parties capitalized on election periods to make money from candidates through the sales of expression of interest and nomination forms. Though the costs of these forms are excluded from what

constitute the limit of election spending, they are sold at exorbitant fees that makes it tough for anyone but the very rich to obtain them. While it is reasonable that funds be charged to ascertain that only serious candidates obtain them, in reality the enormity of the cost is a barrier to participation in politics. President Muhammadu Buhari reportedly obtained a loan facility from his bank to purchase the forms. For the APC, which was formed less than two years before the elections, candidates had to pay N27.5 million for the forms. Insinuation by political analysts was that the high price tag was intended to stop Buhari's candidature (Oladimeji, 2014). All interviewed MPs were unanimous that the high cost associated with politics, as reflected by the nomination form, has the implication of hindering the participation of credible and patriotic Nigerians with genuine intentions to serve the country, but with limited financial means. Though some political parties exempt women from paying nomination fees, as a measure to encourage female participation, yet down the line the costs of participation makes it tough for some of them to continue the race effectively to the very end.

Party	Office in view	Expression of Interest	of Nomination Fee	Total
APC	Presidency	N2, 5000, 000	N25, 000, 000	N27, 500, 000
	Governorship	N500, 000	N5, 000, 000	N5, 500, 500
	Senate	N300, 0000	N3, 000, 000	N3, 300, 000
	House of Rep	N200, 000	N2, 000, 000	N2, 200, 000
PDP	President	N2, 000, 000	N20, 000, 000	N22, 000, 000
	Governorship	N1, 000, 000	N10, 000, 000	N11, 000, 000
	Senate	N500, 000	N4, 000, 000	N4, 500, 000
	House of Rep	N400, 000	N2, 000, 000	N2, 400, 000
APGA <sup>1</sup>	President			
	Governorship	N2,000,000	N10,000,000	N12,000,000
	Senate	N5,000,000	N3,000,000	N3,500,000
	House of Rep	N500,000	N2,000,000	N2,500,000

### Support of the godfathers or oracles

Candidates curry the support of “godfathers”, also known as “oracles”, to further improve their chances at the polls. Godfathers are mostly instrumental to the emergence of virtually every successful candidate from whichever state they control. Alhaji Olusola Saraki, father of current Senate President Bukola Saraki, reigned as godfather in Kwara state and almost always single-handedly determined who emerged for federal and state elections, from the state. In Oyo state, late Chief Lamidi Adedibu once openly boasted to have sponsored every successful politician, including the governor and federal and state legislators (HRW, 2007). Getting the support of godfathers does not come cheap, whether in monetary terms, which have to be paid in advance, or through a commitment to regular returns of a percentage of certain budget lines of state resources, usually the vote for security. The godfathers are typically above the law and able to mobilize support, money and violence for candidates. In 2003, Governor Chris Ngige of Anambra state attracted the anger of his godfather Chris Uba when he reneged on terms of agreements after emerging victorious at the polls. Again, the impeachment of Governor Rashidi Ladoja of Oyo state in 2006 was facilitated by his godfather, Alhaji Lamidi Adedibu, as punishment for not paying him N15 million monthly from the state security budget.

### Party primary

Political parties have the responsibility to conduct primaries to elect their standard bearers. This intra-party activity has become an expense for candidates on one hand and a money spinner for delegates and party officials on the other. Because the political fortune of a candidate is determined by the votes of delegates, the candidates and their sponsors go all out to bribe and buy those votes. There have been instances of delegates being camped in secret locations to make it difficult for other candidates to access them. Most delegates vote for the candidates that offer the highest amount of cash. For instance, the over 8,000 delegates who participated in the APC

presidential primary in Lagos state before the 2015 elections allegedly made US\$5,000 each from the candidates, just for the three days of the primaries. Delegates were supposed to have received US\$2,000 each from the Atiku Abubakar group and also US\$3,000 each from the Buhari group (Onyekpere, 2015). In addition to bribing delegates with money, their hotel accommodations for the duration of the primaries and other logistics are taken care of by the candidates. Party primaries and conventions are sometimes fraught with fraudulent practices that tilt the outcome in favour of predetermined candidates. One MP said: “In the case of primaries, settling the delegates translates to major financial cost to candidates because you have to pay in cash for their votes even when you have contributed to their rise to party executive positions. Otherwise, they will do magic, while you are not looking.”

### Implications for the political system

Having spent fortunes to win elections, the MP is already badly bruised, morally and financially. Individual MPs – and the legislature by consequence – lack the moral pedestal to oppose unpopular actions and policies of government. It becomes a legislature that is less focused on thorough legislative oversight and more disposed to recouping huge election expenses. In the process MPs become vulnerable to corrupt practices and are easily manipulated. Some of the MPs sold their properties and investments, while others dipped into their savings or borrowed to raise funds.

The political terrain is also a major determinant of the amount to be spent by candidates. For instance, candidates contesting in the Niger Delta area, particularly the riverine areas, have to factor in the cost of water transport, as well as adequate security arrangements to forestall attacks by militants. The majority of interviewees were of the opinion that candidates aspiring to be federal MPs will have to expend as much as N200 million on election campaigning, N160 million above the legal limit set by the Electoral Act

(2010). An MP claimed that an estimate could not be given regarding the amount he spent in the course of the election. To quote him: “It got to a point during the campaign that I decided not to keep records any longer so that I do not get discouraged.” A civil society respondent held that “as a result of the huge personal costs of the elections, many MPs are disillusioned about serving a society that milked them so heavily. As such, the passion and input in their responsibilities as MPs are already eroded by personal interests. In reality, recouping for most of the MPs could mean taking steps to look for gratification where they ought to look for the interest of the country.”

Having invested huge funds, candidates and their supporters have only one mindset: to win the election, and win at all costs. The candidates and sponsors are not prepared to lose the huge sum invested in the process. Therefore, elections become prone to violence, fraudulent practices and all forms of irregularity. They explore every available means, including violence, intimidation and vote buying, as well as rigging to ensure victory. Most electors stay away from voting to keep safe. In such a scenario, the outcome of elections hardly reflects the wishes of the electorates. Election credibility becomes a difficult objective to attain no matter the professional competence of the EMB.

The high cost and potential for the outbreak of violence contributes to the low participation of women in politics. Political

entrepreneurs do not believe women could win elections and will not want to invest money in them. An MP averred that “women do not go too far in the electoral process as they usually opt out due to the lack of financial means necessary for mobilizing supporters”. Though they constitute almost 50 per cent of Nigeria’s population, the percentage of women elected to parliament and other elective positions in the country have never reflected this numerical strength. In the same vein, the country is deprived of the potential of the youth as they are disconnected from a process through which they could be prepared for leadership. Except those with personal wealth or from a rich family, it is tough for the youth to participate in politics. As reflected in table 3, the representation of women in the house of representatives dropped steeply to 3.9 per cent, which is just above the 1999 figure of 3.33 per cent. A drop in female representation to a period when the country was new to democratic governance gives reason for all stakeholders to be concerned. The number of women represented in the senate improved to eight, just above the 2011 figure of seven, but dropping below the marked gain made in 2007 when nine women were elected. These do not reflect efforts made by stakeholders to advance female political participation and representation ahead of the 2015 elections. This unimpressive representation of women is not a co-incidence because at no other time since transition in 1999 was there such open and massive use of money at elections as during the 2015 general elections.

		Year of Election								
		1979	1985	1993	1999	2003	2007	2011 <sup>2</sup>	2015 <sup>3</sup>	
<b>House Representatives</b>	Numbers of Elected Women	11	14	20	12	21	27	26	14	
	Numbers of Elected Members	445	589	360	360	360	360	360	346	
	% of women	<b>2.47</b>	<b>2.38</b>	<b>5.56</b>	<b>3.33</b>	<b>5.83</b>	<b>7.5</b>	<b>7.2</b>	<b>3.9</b>	
<b>Senate</b>	Numbers of Elected Women	1	1	9	3	3	9	7	8	
	Numbers of Elected Members	57	91	109	109	109	109	109	101	
	% of women	<b>1.75</b>	<b>1.10</b>	<b>8.25</b>	<b>2.75</b>	<b>2.75</b>	<b>8.25</b>	<b>6.5</b>	<b>7.33</b>	

**Table 3: Gender representation at the Federal Parliament (Source: INEC Gender Policy**

### III. Factors influencing cost of election campaigns

#### Mediatization of campaigns

A major factor which influences the cost of elections is the mediatization of election campaigns. Political parties and candidates use private and public electronic media to reach as many members of the public as possible. At election periods, radio and television stations' prime time are usually in high demand and therefore attract increased prices. Funds are budgeted for live coverage of rallies and other political activities with partisan jingles, documentaries and advertisements struggling to dominate the airwaves. Expensive billboards are strategically positioned around town to capture public attention. The print media is filled with paid adverts of candidates and party messages and activities. A study of the 2015 presidential elections indicates that huge amounts of money, far beyond total legal limits, were spent by the APC and PDP candidates on media campaigns. A breakdown of expenses incurred on the media by the top two presidential candidates in the 2015 elections in Table 4, gives an idea of the enormity of funds dedicated to media campaigns by candidates. The PDP and APC expended on the media alone eight times and three times respectively the amount legally allowed for running the entire presidential campaign!

#### Weak legal mechanisms

In the first republic which spanned 1960-66, there was no definite campaign finance regulation. Political parties and candidates

were responsible for funding election activities. Conduct bordering on corruption and sharp practices were recorded. For instance, the Action Group and NCNC were alleged to have used state resources and investments to fund their campaigns. Also, in the second republic which spanned the period between 1979 and 1983, legal provisions were provided in the 1979 constitution to regulate campaign finance. These included: the prohibition of any associations, other than political parties, from campaigning on behalf of a candidate or contributing funds to parties and election expenses of candidates; the provision of annual grants to political parties; and enabling political parties to receive donations from individual and corporate bodies, except from abroad. However, the limit of funds parties and candidates could receive from individuals and corporate bodies was not specified. This was a loophole which parties and candidates abused. Private individuals lavished funds on parties and consequently on election campaigns. This led to the emergence of the money-bag phenomenon in Nigerian politics and subsequently the overthrow of the second republic. (Adeyi, 2014). The narrative was not different with the 1993 elections that would have ushered the country back to democratic governance. Despite the well-orchestrated transition programme, there was no guideline to regulate campaign finance, a trap which saw an end to the transition process.

S/no	Description of media expenses	PDP/Goodluck Jonathan	APC/Muhammadu Buhari
	Campaigns and Rallies	N1,280,374,879.00	N671,062,200.00
	Expenses on Billboard	N473,160,000.00	N190,380,000.00
	Electronic Media Campaign	N532,100,000.00	N410,050,000.00
	Electronic Media Adverts	N3,988,822,125.00	N1,064,706,850.00
	Print Media Campaign	N2,475,228,301.00	N579,647,687.00
<b>Total</b>		<b>N8,789,685,296.00</b>	<b>N2,915,846,737.00</b>

**Table 4: PDP and APC media expenses for the 2015 elections** (source: Centre for Social Justice)

However, political finance regulation has been repeatedly defined and redefined since the 1999 transition to civil rule, such that country now has the Electoral Act 2002, 2006 and 2010. Nevertheless, loopholes still exist. For instance, while section 91(9) states that “no individual or other entity shall donate more than one million naira (N1,000,000.00) to any candidate”, section 93(2)(b) in contradiction gives political parties leverage to receive unlimited amounts above the threshold, while requiring the party to record and keep “the name and address of any person or entity that contributes any money or assets which exceeds N1,000,000.00”. Therefore, it becomes possible for candidates to technically overshoot the limit by transferring the extra cash to their party. Secondly, donors took advantage of the provision to donate funds in billions on behalf of several unnamed friends. This occurred repeatedly during the PDP fundraiser for the re-election bid of President Goodluck Jonathan, during which about N21 billion was recorded in donations (Vanguard, 2014). The APC for its part attempted involving ordinary Nigerians in raising funds for its presidential candidate through five platforms, including: donation via dedicated bank accounts; an electronic donation platform, targeted at young people who are computer savvy; donation of a maximum of N100 per time by means of text messages to dedicated numbers; purchase of the party ringtone for which N100 was deducted per time; and the use of scratch cards through which supporters could donate between N100 and N1,500 each (Times, 2015). By these direct donations, the APC planned to make N10 billion. On the other hand, the party expected N40 billion in donations from its elected members at the federal and state levels, hoping to pool a total of N50 billion in donations. This is several billion naira above the ceiling of one billion naira per presidential candidate, which contravenes regulatory provisions and also calls into question the donation and expenses limits as provided for in the Electoral Act 2010.

### Lack of enforcement capacity

While Nigeria’s current political finance regulations are stronger than previous ones, the capacity and willingness of INEC to enforce them is lacking. INEC is saddled with the responsibility to, among other functions, register and regulate political parties and monitor their activities, including finances, expenditures, primaries and campaigns. The tasks of tracking political parties’ finances, as well as election expenses of candidates seem to be overwhelming for the commission.

It has been more than a year after the 2015 elections, but there has been no investigation, arrest or prosecution of individuals for breaching campaign finance regulations, despite apparent occurrences. The PDP had donations running into several billions from serving governors, elected officials and party members. Corporate organisations donated funds to the party in breach of the law, but INEC failed to raise the red flag. Allegations that the APC’s presidential campaign was largely funded by outgoing governors, including those of Lagos and Rivers, are yet to be disproved. Obvious were the activities of the Transition Ambassadors of Nigeria (TAN), which contravened section 221 of the constitution prohibiting any association from canvassing for votes for any candidate or contributing to the funds and election expenses of political parties. TAN widely and openly displayed President Goodluck Jonathan’s pictures and posters to canvass support for him. TAN practically ran a parallel presidential campaign for President Jonathan without restraint.

The infringement of funding regulations was not particular to the presidential elections, but was associated also with other levels of elections. For instance, Alhaji Muhammed Umaru Jubrilla, governor of Adamawa state, publicly acknowledged receiving a donation of N500 million from Vice-President Atiku Abubakar which facilitated his emergence as governor and convinced him to shift allegiance from his former boss, Murtala Nyako. The governor’s public acknowledgement of the illegal donation has not met with prosecution

and possible sanctions, as would have been expected. The lack of deterrent as apparent by the failure of INEC to prosecute anyone for infringing on political finance regulations since the transition elections in 1999 is a major influencing factor for the rising cost of elections in Nigeria.

### Corruption and impunity

A factor closely related to lack of enforcement capacity is the general laxity of the rule of law in the country. It is noteworthy that various studies, including the Index on African Governance for 2015 which was done by the Mo Ibrahim Foundation, scored Nigeria low (50.8/100) with regards to enforcement of the rule of law. In the study which was conducted between 2000 and 2014, Nigeria was rated very low in rule of law between 2011 and 2014 (Foundation, 2015). During this period, corruption, impunity and lawlessness rose to a phenomenal proportion. Highly connected individuals in the society got away with all forms of crimes and infringements of the law with little or no consequences. The culture of impunity and recklessness on the part of political parties and candidates was therefore encouraged, with the consequent abuse of party finance provisions. In situations where offenders belonged to the ruling party, prosecution was virtually impossible. As a result, elected government officials did not see problems in converting government funds to personal uses or to fund party and campaign activities. The ongoing revelations emanating from the probe of the office of ONSA would not, in all probability, have been possible but for the change of government. With the culture of corruption and lawlessness which pervades the Nigerian polity, cost of politics can only soar beyond the reach of citizens.

### Winner takes all syndrome

Because candidates and political parties invest unimaginable amounts of money in the process, elections can only be a do-or-die affair. Contestants and supporters alike become desperate and resort to illegal means to manipulate or subvert the process. The first-past-the-post system gives winners all

the advantages, as against such other systems which enable proportional representation. Calls have been made at several meetings for the Nigerian system to be replaced to ensure opposition political parties and candidates do not totally lose out at elections. This is for the reason that they will be less inclined to go beyond legal limits when certain that, regardless of the outcome of the elections, their efforts will yield some electoral dividends.

### Political culture

Corruption and the embezzlement of public funds by the political class were the usual excuses by the military for the coups which truncated democratic governance in Nigeria at various times. This categorization of politicians as very corrupt was reinforced over time by the reckless lifestyles of elected and appointed public officers. Since the return to democratic governance in 1999, the financial profiles of politicians became very high. Elected officials, including governors, senate presidents, speakers of the house of representatives, speakers of state houses of assemblies, among others, approved handsome service and retirement or severance packages for themselves. The country's MPs are believed to earn one of the highest remuneration levels among their peers around the world. The popular saying about politics in Nigeria is that it is the best vocation where money can easily be made. As such, electorates perceive politicians to be very corrupt and very rich. Because of the several years of the non-fulfilment of political promises, Nigerians have come to believe that politicians seek to be elected only to steal money and not to serve the people. By extension, election periods are viewed by electorates as periods to get as much money as possible from the politicians. Given this scenario, politicians who are willing buyers of votes meet electorates who are likewise willing to sell their votes. With this situation, campaigns have become very capital-intensive. Elections are completely made a cash issue as voters want to grab as much money as they can from politicians; little or no attention is paid to campaign promises and

manifestoes as a result.

### Crowd for rent

A consequence of the above point is the emergence of rented crowds for parties' activities. For a candidate, the larger the crowds at their rallies, the more the public is impressed and the more seriously their candidature is perceived. Attractive amounts are budgeted for the crowds to be rented, ranging from N3,000 to N8,000 per head. Political parties and candidates try to outdo each other with the sizes of the crowds at their rallies. The higher the amounts the candidates can afford to pay, as well as the gifts to be given per head, the larger the crowds that will be in attendance at each rally. On the contrary, candidates who are unwilling to rent crowds or give gifts at rallies attract very little following. Public opinion and perception is immediately turned against such candidates.

In addition to monetary compensation, it is common to see the crowd at rallies with t-shirts, wrappers, bags of rice, salt, groundnut oil, sugar, etc. As expressed by an MP, "the process of logistics for campaign is very capital-intensive. Good numbers of cars have to be lined up and the crowd at the campaign grounds has to be huge, though some of them are not even committed members of the party or supporters of the candidate in question. The sheer numbers of people that attend the rallies gives an impression of seriousness of the candidate. So people hire crowds, including students." In fact, civil society organizations that were focused on promoting issue-based politics launched an anti-vote-buying campaign with the slogan "collect their money but vote your conscience". However, this is not to say that there have not been instances of candidates who successfully conducted issue-based campaigns without throwing money around or renting crowds.

### Culture of free money

The culture of "free money" built over time by political leaders is a major driver of electoral cost. Free money is made available to youths, particularly during election periods,

for doing nothing other than being political followers, praise singers and thugs. Outside election periods, the youths maintain access to free money by demanding "settlement" from companies and individuals implementing projects. These demands are usually granted to placate the youths and ensure work was not disrupted. Most of the youths have lived on free money for years without any form of education or skills that could provide alternative sources of income. For this class of youths, election periods are a good time to access free money. Wherever political parties and candidates go to campaign, provisions are made to settle the area "boys", as they are called, for hitch-free campaigns and party activities.

### Lack of volunteerism

The volunteer culture is still not very popular in Nigeria, at least not with political parties. Party and candidate campaign team members are regularly fully compensated. Individuals and groups lobby to be part of campaign teams of high-profile parties and candidates for ancillary benefits and not as uncompensated volunteers. The higher the position candidates are vying for, the higher the cost involved in mobilizing local campaign teams from one region, state, local government, and ward, to the other. Compensated campaign team members constitute a major cost of entry into politics as they have to be paid, accommodated, fed and transported throughout the duration of the campaign and beyond. An MP noted that "politicians pay students' transportation fees, as well as, feeding allowances, for participating at rallies".

## V. Formal and Informal Demands on Elected MPs

Demands from constituents are regular occurrences which the MPs have to deal with. Constituents recognise MPs as their representatives at the federal parliament and believe their responsibilities, direct or indirect, include dealing with their concerns, including personal ones. Officially, the MPs are expected to maintain constituency offices for which provisions are made by federal government. Also, they are expected to go on know-your-constituency meetings and to stimulate input of constituents on bills as well as to identify pressing needs to be considered for constituency projects which are funded by the federal government through direct implementation. However, demands are regularly made on MPs by constituents to support and contribute to community development efforts. To meet these demands, MPs have to draw from their personal incomes.

Regardless of the input of the MPs into constituency development, in terms of the provision of infrastructure, the personal needs of their constituents as well as those of the elders are usually required to be met. The MP has to “settle” in order to continue to be in the good books of the constituents whose demands include, but are not limited to: school fees, medical bills, employment opportunities and holy pilgrimage trips, among many others. The situation is compounded by privileged constituents who also demand to be serviced financially. Such leaders can easily withdraw their supports if not “treated well”. According to some of the MPs, “only very few of the phone calls received on a daily basis are not personal-demand-driven. The demands are always there and will continue to be there, because Nigerians sees politicians as very rich people with lots of money to spare. Moreover, emphasis has been shifting from physical infrastructural development to a new concept of stomach infrastructure.” As such the MPs are also motivated to make as much money as possible to take care of the demands from the constituents. The

situation puts undue pressure on the MPs and encourages corruption. The inability of serving MPs to “settle” godfathers and VIPs in the constituency as much as expected usually leads to counter votes from the constituents during re-election bids, and possible replacement by a fresh and more ambitious candidate who is more willing to meet the demands of the constituents. This has caused a rapid turnover in parliament, which is a concern to most stakeholders. As reflected in the current eighth assembly, of the 360 members of the federal house of representatives, only 85 (23.61 per cent) were returned, while out of 109 senators, only 33 (30.28 per cent) retained their seats (Guardian, 2015). A respondent held that “right now the rate of turnover is becoming a concern because it is not just about non-performance in terms of bills or motions but more about how much money parliamentarians are able to give the leaders per time”.

MPs are also often required to make donations to political parties for various reasons, including elections. Ahead of the 2015 elections, while the APC requested donations from elected party members, including MPs, for the election of President Muhammadu Buhari, the PDP made the same requests for the re-election bid of former President Goodluck Jonathan. Although the amounts donated by MPs were not reported, 21 governors of the PDP were reported to have donated N50 million each (Vanguard, 2014). For its part, the APC expected its elected officials, including governors, members of federal parliament, and state parliaments to contribute N40 billion. According to Professor Moses Aluaigba, the “inclusion of APC state governors, federal and state MPs as donors to the parties’ campaign funds questions the compliance of the party with the Electoral Act 2010, as well as, the 1999 constitution that forbids elected public office holders from making donations to political parties”. (Aluaigba, 2015)

These notwithstanding, PMs have devised ingenious means of dealing with incessant demands from constituents, particularly the youths. Skill acquisition schemes, for both male and female constituents, are organised to equip them with skills and capacity to engage in productive, profitable and income-generating vocations. Two MPs from the Niger Delta region where the phenomenon of free money is prevalent recently organized solar electronics installation and repairs, hair dressing and smart phone repair training for the youths. The underlying principle is that the youths will become less dependent on free money, thereby reducing dependency on the MPs. Ultimately, this will contribute to a reduction of the cost of politics, particularly at parliament.

## VI. Outlook: General trend in cost of politics

From available data, the cost of politics shows an upward trend. The impression from interacting with former politicians was that the cost of politics was very low in the first republic because Nigerians were more concerned about the programmes, plans and credibility of political parties and candidates for the good of citizens and the country. This has changed because electorates are rather more concerned with personal benefits than the credibility of politicians. Given this circumstance, money plays a greater role than the message or details of programmes candidates campaign with. The more money a party and its candidate are able to mobilize, the more efficient the campaign and the likelihood of being elected. Unfortunately, political parties hardly keep paper records of all their election expenses as to enable a clear explanation of the increase in the cost of elections.

Officially, the amounts required for candidates to signify their interest in contesting elections has drastically increased. Candidates contesting to be president on the platform of the PDP in the 2007 general elections were each required to pay N10,000 for expression of interest forms and N5 million for nomination forms. The same year, a candidate for the uouse of representatives paid N10,000 for expression of interest form and N500,000 for nomination forms. However, for the 2015 general elections, presidential candidates were required to pay N2 million for expression of interest forms and N20 million for nomination forms. Candidates for the house of representatives

are now required to pay N500,000 for expression of interest forms and N2 million for nomination forms. A comparison of what it costs to obtain the PDP nomination form for the presidential candidate in 2007 and 2015 reflects the trend or rising costs of politics. In 2007, the PDP charged its presidential candidates N5 million for nomination forms, while in 2015 the presidential candidate was required to pay N20 million to obtain the same form, 300% of the amount paid by the presidential candidate in 2007.

Also, between 2011 and 2015, there was a sharp increase in the cost of running presidential campaigns by both the ruling and opposition parties. As reflected in the table below, the 2011 total traceable campaign spending of the PDP and opposition parties was almost doubled in 2015. The total traceable expenses of the PDP were a little over N5 billion and those of three opposition parties (ACN, APGA and CPC) combined was just above N2 billion in same year. However, in 2015, the total traceable amount expended by the PDP increased to almost N9 billion. That was 74.75 per cent above its media expenses in 2011 and 777.4 per cent of the N1 billion total election limit for presidential candidates. The APC expended almost N3 billion naira in the same year; almost a billion naira above what three opposition parties expended for the 2011 elections, meaning that the opposition parties' expenses on the media increased by 42.86 per cent and 191.58 per cent of the election limit for presidential candidates.

Year in View	Opposition	PDP
2011	N2,041,075,906.00 <sup>4</sup>	N5,015,614,851.00
2015	N2,915,846,737.00 <sup>5</sup>	N8,749,685,296.00
<b>% Increase in media expenses in 2015</b>	<b>42.86%</b>	<b>74.45%</b>
<b>Well above N1billion total legal spending for Presidential Candidates by</b>	<b>191.58%</b>	<b>774.97%</b>

Table 5: Total Traceable Spending of APC and PDP Presidential Candidates

This upward trend was acknowledged by INEC when it reviewed the legal limits of election expenses. The amounts specified in the Electoral Act 2006 were doubled in the Electoral Act 2010. For instance, the Electoral Act 2006 put the campaign expenses limit of a presidential candidate at N500 million. This was increased in the Electoral Act 2010 to N1 billion. While this increase might have been justified by the apparent high cost of politics, the current limits are totally unrealistic going by the actual expenses incurred by political parties that contested the 2015 general elections.

### Current options available to restrain role of money in politics and impacts

Stakeholders, including INEC, CSOs, and donor agencies have been working closely to attract public attention to the importance of restraining the use of money in politics. These collaborative efforts yielded fruit and led to a series of reviews and improvements in legal provisions guiding party finance in Nigeria. Ahead of the 2003, 2007 and 2011 general elections, the reviews led to the enactment of the Electoral Act 2002, 2006 and 2010. Legal provisions guiding the use of money in elections are firmer and more solid than before, though there is still room for improvement. Unlike in the past, candidates now have reporting obligations with the design of new rules making it possible for financial reports to be audited and submitted under oath.

Training was conducted to build the knowledge and capacity of INEC and political party officials as well as civil society organisations on issues surrounding party finance. The Centre for Social Justice, through support of donor agencies, trained and equipped partners to monitor the use of money during the 2011 and 2015 general elections, as well as stand-alone gubernatorial elections. This effort successfully generated real data on some election expenses of political parties which will be useful for future work on the topic. Allegations of infringements on legal provisions guiding the use of money for party and election activities were reported by the monitors, thereby providing a basis for INEC to investigate and prosecute offenders.

The availability in the public domain of the reports on monitoring and tracking of the level of compliance by parties and candidates has contributed to improving the body of knowledge on the topic. More awareness is being created and facts established about the real situation with regard to money and politics in Nigeria. This reality creates bases for future robust actions that could encourage critical interventions which may lead to greater compliance.

Unfortunately, these have not led to a reversal in the disposition of political parties and candidates to use money illegally for elections. As noted earlier, both the APC and PDP contravened these legal provisions during the 2015 elections. No single individual has been

<b>Table 6: Review of Legal Limits on Election Expenses</b>		
<b>Elective Office</b>	<b>Electoral Act 2006</b>	<b>Electoral Act 2010</b>
President	N500,000,000.00	N1,000,000,000.00
Governorship	N100,000,000.00	N200,000,000.00
Senate	N20,000,000.00	N40,000,000.00
House of Representatives	N10,000,000.00	N20,000,000.00
State Assembly	N5,000,000.00	N10,000,000.00
Local Government Chairman	N5,000,000.00	N10,000,000.00
Councilors	N500,000.00	N1,000,000.00

*Source: Electoral Act (2006), (2010)*

prosecuted to date. INEC is saddled with the responsibility to sanction offenders; however, the commission has not displayed the political will to take up this responsibility. In addition to the lack of will is the commission's lack of capacity to follow through with monitoring, investigating and prosecuting offenders. Nigeria has 30 registered political parties, which conduct primaries for elective positions at

all levels in 36 states. Though INEC also has a presence in all the states of Nigeria, it is doubtful that the commission has enough human resources to effectively monitor infringements and still be focused on election activities. The current situation is not expected to change until the political will and ability to enforce legal provisions are established.

## S U M M A R Y

- a. Campaign finance regulations have continued to improve in Nigeria since transition to democratic governance in 1999. However, there has been a lack of political will and capacity on the part of INEC to enforce legal provisions.
- b. CSOs and donor agencies have partnered successfully to advance the campaign to effectively regulate use of money in elections. However, there are wider gaps to be covered and opportunities for greater collaborations.
- c. There is growing capacity by CSOs to monitor and track campaign finance. However, the tracking mechanism may not be cost effective if personnel always have to be deployed to campaign rallies and other party activities while at the same time tracking radio and television for party campaigns.
- d. Moreover, focus has always been on top candidates vying for top executive positions such as the president at the federal and governorship at the state levels, to the exclusion of other elective positions including the federal parliament.
- e. The cost of parliamentary politics has continued to soar due to public and private demands on MPs by constituents, party officials and godfathers. MPs expend several millions above the legal limits of the Electoral Act 2010 which puts most of them under financial pressure to repay loans or recoup funds expended during elections. Unfortunately, stakeholders pay little or no attention to the spiralling cost of parliamentary politics, leaving the institution susceptible to the dangers of high cost of politics, corruption, ineffectiveness and easy manipulation.
- f. The rate of turnover in parliament as a result of unregulated use of money in politics is very high and does not help the building and retention of institutional memories for effective legislation.
- g. The quality of oversight functions is affected due to the strain on the parliamentarians resulting from the cost incurred financially. Moreover citizen participation is hindered by the high cost of parliamentary politics. The very best among the citizens are unable to gain entry to participate, while access is gained only by those who can afford the cost of participation but who may not necessarily be the best candidates.
- h. Gender representation in parliament is very low due to the increasing cost of parliamentary politics.
- i. The cost of politics is going higher and needs to be addressed urgently.
- j. Limits set for campaign expenses in the Electoral Act 2010 are unrealistic and have to be reviewed for objective monitoring and transparent party and campaign finance.

# RECOMMENDATIONS

- a. The following are hereby recommended as possible actions to address the findings listed above:
- b. High-level post-election assessment, advocacy and multi-stakeholder engagement is needed to objectively identify constraints to the enforcement of regulatory provisions by INEC. This will also help identify realistic measures to build the capacity and political will for enforcement.
- c. Capacities of more vibrant CSOs need to be built to multiply the numbers of practitioners knowledgeable in the areas of party and campaign finance. The empowered CSOs can grow to become a vibrant campaign network promoting campaign finance issues and regulation enforcement.
- d. Support is needed for capacity-building and experience-sharing workshops to identify practical cost-effective mechanisms for monitoring and tracking compliance with political finance regulations.
- e. The mediatisation of election campaigning is taking up a huge percentage of campaign budgets. As such, media practitioners and owners must be engaged as stakeholders in the process and sensitized on the importance of political and campaign finance issues and monitoring.
- f. The level of mediatisation of election campaigns demands that the media must also be equipped to take responsibility for monitoring and tracking campaign finance. Mechanisms for partnering with the media to realise this can be developed.
- g. The expansion of campaign finance monitoring and tracking should include members of the federal parliament.

This is necessary to commence the process of addressing the growing cost of parliamentary politics.

- h. Support is needed for the development of more democratic political parties, with living youth and women wings that are truly democratic and structured to build and enhance youth and women participation.
- i. Support is needed for further reviews of political finance regulations to reflect current realities regarding existing loopholes, but including such provisions as setting realistic campaign expenses limits and requiring parties and candidates to submit bank and paper records to back up reports on election expenses.

## References

- Adeyi, V.A. (2014). Money, parties and democracy in Nigeria, in Political parties and democracy in Nigeria. Kuru: National Institute of Policy and Strategic Studies, pp. 289-313.
- Aluaigba, P.M. (2015). Taming a lion: monitoring campaign finances of political parties prior to the 2015 elections in Nigeria, The 2015 General Elections in Nigeria: The Real Issues, Abuja. 27 to 28 July 2015. Abuja: Electoral Institute of Nigeria, p. 23.
- Commonwealth Observer Group. (2003). The national assembly and presidential elections in Nigeria 12 and 19 April 2003. London: Commonwealth Secretariat .
- European Union Election Observation Mission. (2007). Nigeria: Final Report on 2007 General Elections. Brussels: European Union.
- Falodi, F. (2016,). Counting issues from \$2.1bn arms fund diversion. 16 January. Lagos: Lagos State.
- Federal Ministry of Information and Culture. (2016). People and Culture. Available at: <http://fmi.gov.ng/about-nigeria/history-people/>, (Accessed: 26 March 2016).
- Foreign relations of Nigeria (2016). Wikipedia. Available at: [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Foreign\\_relations\\_of\\_Nigeria](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Foreign_relations_of_Nigeria). (Accessed: 27 February).
- Green, J.C. (2006). On the cusp of change: party finance in the United States, in Crotty, R. S. Handbook of Party Politics. London: Sage Publications, pp. 134-145.
- Hassan, B. S. and Hassan A. O. (2011). 'Ethnic politics and its implications for the survival of democracy in Nigeria'. Journal of Public Administration and Policy Research 3(2), pp. 28-33.
- Human Rights Watch. (2007). Criminal politics: violence, "godfathers" and corruption in Nigeria. Abuja: HRW.
- Momoh, A. (2014). Party system and democracy in Nigeria, 1999-2010, in Political parties and democracy in Nigeria. Kuru: Electoral Institute of Nigeria, pp. 78-99.
- Obama, B. (2006). The audacity of hope. New York: Vintage Books.
- Oladimeji, W. (2014). 2015: party nominations and monetisation of elective offices. National Mirror.
- Onyekpere, E. (2015). Still above the ceiling (a report on campaign finance and use of state administrative resources in the 2015 election). Abuja: Centre for Social Justice.
- USAID. (2014). Nigeria cross-sectoral conflict assessment. Abuja: Democracy International .
- Vanguard (2012). Endless corruption scandals: burden of lawmakers, 23 June.
- Vanguard (2012). National assembly and allegations of corruption, 27 March.
- Vanguard. (2014). Naira rain at Jonathan's fundraiser. 21 December 21.
- Vanguard. (2015). Dollars for monarchs, 16 March.

## Endnotes

- 1 These figures are as collated by the FMWASD Zonal Empowerment Offices for women political empowerment when a number of cases involving women were still unresolved at the Elections Petitions Tribunals as at date of this compilation i.e. four months after the elections.
- 2 2015 figure culled from a conference paper titled "Men without women: an analysis of the 2015 general elections in Nigeria", by Nse Etim Akpan, Department of Political Science, Federal Polytechnic Wukari, Wukari, Taraba State, Nigeria.
- 3 This was the combined total expenses of the three main opposition parties in the 2011 elections, namely: ACN, ANPP and CPC.
- 4 Total expenses of the APC, which was the main opposition party, for the 2015 elections