

Poverty and Electoral Challenges in Nigeria

Aluko Opeyemi Idowu

Ogunseye Inioluwa I.

Adeyemi Hannah. E

Abstract

Poverty is a global problem. The United Nations over the years had been embarking on several developmental goals so as to override the effects of poverty among the comity of nations. For a country to excel in political, economic and social development, poverty must be reduced and eradicated. This study focuses on the prevalence of poverty as a challenge to the electoral success in Nigeria. There is a connection between poverty and the prevalence of challenges especially in elections in Nigeria. Therefore, how had poverty affected election credibility in Nigeria? What are the connections and the effects of poverty on credible elections in Nigeria? This work adopts qualitative research method. The theoretical framework of utilitarian principles-ensuring the greatest happiness of the greatest number of the people is used across the study to explain the need to eradicate poverty in Nigeria. Nigeria as the most populous black nation in the world needs to eradicate poverty as a matter of urgency so as to have credible elections, sustainable peace and rapid development.

Introduction

The overall development of a country and its citizenry hinges primarily upon the tripod of poverty reduction, 'upright electioneering', and sustainable democracy. This is not to say that foreign direct investment, internal and external security and other issues are not to be considered. The utilitarian philosophers (Bentham and Mill among others) argued that economy determines politics. In that line of thought, there exists a direct relationship between poverty and sustainable democracy or the typology of governmental structure of a country. This truism is such that the preponderance of poverty in a commonwealth has a level of impact on the electorates, and

Aluko Opeyemi Idowu, Ogunseye Inioluwa I., & Adeyemi Hannah. E., Political Science Department, Ajayi Crowther University.

Electoral College framework or codes. It can be manipulated or hijacked by whichever institution of government, politicians or even the electorates-structural violence.

In the same vein, Galtung (1990), posited that social conditions such as poverty, exclusion, intimidation, oppression, want, fear, and many types of psychological pressure was categorized as another form of violence not immediately perceived. (Galtung, 1990 in Best, 2007:4). On the other hand, the political system of a country and its implementation has a significant bearing on the prevalence of poverty in that commonwealth. This is inversely related to the level of uprightness and function ability of the electoral commission.

One could argue further that if there is anarchy or no legitimate government in power, that is legitimate, there may be structural violence or uprising. As a result there will not be foreign direct investment. As such poverty becomes intense. The socio-political milieu of most African Countries and particularly Nigeria is bewildered by other forms of violence as Galtung(1990) puts it. Therefore, poverty in the opinion of Jensen and Justesen (2014) include the exclusion or marginalization, intimidation, want, fear, vote buying, and electoral fraud that had long characterized the political annals of such countries.

Besides, in Nigeria and in most African commonwealths, 'votings' are an outgrowth of the barbarous free-for-all over right to the assets guided by the regime, that are the important possessions in Nigerian guild. Nwankwo (2018), emphasized that as a result the lush universe of Nigerian electoral places, voting are very rivalries, and schemers therefore distribute different ways to triumph considering violence, aggression, influence and rigging.

One of the fundamental causal factors of vote buying derivable in the literature is poverty. Although, there are a host of other reasons, why vote purchasing prospers and flourish in any environment is centred and connected to distributed poverty. Another perspective to this is from the view of political parties. Notable scholars in their various researches explained that, votes at the lowermost of the financial gain distribution are cheaper to purchase (Dixit and Londregan, 1996; Blaydes, 2006; Stokes, 2007b: 119).

Lehoucq (2007), alluded to the reality when he revealed in his study that in instances where schemes are not persuasive enough to triumph, they distribute 'carrots'—voter purchasing. It is important to note that vote buying is usually conceptualized as seeking blessings particularly monetary system in return for vote decision making (e.g., Lehoucq 2007; Ojo, 2008; Kramon, 2016) just that it is a times wrongly conceived for turnout buying

which refers to donations inducement for masses to troop out on voting day (Nichter, 2008).

According to Bratton (2008), poor people are most likely to be targeted by vote buying in Africa, because of their poor level of income. This is evidenced by past elections. For instance in 2007, vote-buying dealings in his study on Nigeria revealed that, electors are normally given money (68 percent of all reportable efforts), goods (like food or clothing, 26 percent) or occupation (6 percent). Also, in the current and early Nigerian voting, the average inducement was 500 naira, or about US\$4. The normal price of a vote cost rose between 2003 and 2007, from 1750 naira to 2250 naira, mostly because the proportion of large commerce (10,000 naira or more per vote) accrued over time (Bratton, 2008: Pp3-4). This is to ascertain the level influence of poverty in the electoral system of Nigeria and it has become worse off in the recent times.

Furthermore, the 2018 election in Ekiti State, was characterized by illicit transactions of votes for cash which began days before election when people multitude into assigned houses to collect 4000 naira to support various political party. Notably, civil servants and pensioners had their stalled salaries paid as they were supposedly credited to mobilise them for the election. Also, on the Election Day, it was reported that both the leading political parties the Peoples' Democratic Party (PDP) and All Progressives Congress (APC), through several accounts distributed as much as 10,000 naira who could prove to the party agents that they voted for the party. (Vanguard, 21 July, 2018).

This study focuses on the prevalence of poverty as a challenge to the electoral success in Nigeria. There is a connection between poverty and the prevalence of challenges especially in elections in Nigeria. Therefore, how had poverty affected election credibility in Nigeria? What are the connections and the effects of poverty on credible elections in Nigeria? The reality a times is surreptitiously denied for some might argue that whatever any party does before Election Day, say in terms of voters swaying in any form is part of the electioneering process. Though the apparent is manifest-poverty in the state and the gain will be to a few individuals. This will not ensure the greatest happiness of the greatest number of the people in the country.

Conceptual Clarification—Poverty

Poverty is many things to many people, throughout the universe. Consequently, it has been a hugely contested concept among politicians, policy analysts, practitioners, students of politics, and the academic scholars.

Nonetheless, the study shall attempt some perspectives to poverty to enhance our understanding of this subject matter in lieu of the discussion of research paper. It is suggested that one can operationally distinguish different dimensions of poverty, namely economic, social, political and legal poverty; and that one might in addition be able to characterize three further aspects, namely psychological, ideological and conceptual poverty. However, other areas of poverty which include; Economic, Widespread or “collective”, Political and Geographical Poverty will be considered.

Poverty is not a personal choice, but a reflection of a society. Poverty refers to the consequences of the rule of money. Poverty is seen as “moneylessness and powerlessness” (Yakubu and Aderonmu 2010: 192) ; deprivation, insecurity, voicelessness, lack of power, and all other human right conditions that are produced and reinforced by poverty (Khan, 2009:9). Poverty is a social problem that leads to other social, economic and political disturbances. Poverty is a global phenomenon but it is more common among developing countries, Nigeria inclusive.

As contended by Mukhtar, Mukhtar & Mukhtar (2015: 3), apart from being oil rich, “the country also has large landmark and a lot of mineral resources which if used wisely, the country will achieve rapid political and socio-economic development”. But the reverse is the case in the country because large scale corruption, poor economic policies and bad governance have rendered majority of the country’s population poor. The Vice president in his interview in 2015 in the Vanguard expressed concern that over 110 million Nigerians lived below poverty line.

Economic Poverty is a form of poverty with regards to households and not the singular man, and is centred on the amount of individuals in a family unit. It oftentimes desire to determine the households whose economic position (characterized as command over resources) falls beneath some minimally acceptable level (Smelser, and Baltes, 2001). Likewise, the United Nations global standard of intense impoverishment is fixed to the ownership of little than 1\$ a day (World Bank, 2019). Furthermore, oftentimes, poverty is described in either comparative or relative terms. Relative poverty standardizes poverty in connection to the sum of money needed to meet primary needs like food, clothing, and shelter. Ajakaiye & Adeleye (2001), argue that the idea of poverty is just the need of education, health, child mortality.

The thought of implicit financial condition is not taken up with broad-brimmed degree of life issues. One can still be referred to as being poor, even if he holds a large sum of money in the bank, if he is not able to cater for the basic needs of his or her life- food, clothing, and shelter. It is then

logical to think that the distribution of food, clothing and a little cash by the politicians during elections is like capitalizing on the inability of the people to survive on the primary need implicitly first before thinking of 'other secondary needs'- buying a car, gold chain among others.

Poverty has been connected, with poor health, low levels of education or ability, inability or no disposition to work, high rates of tumultuous or unruly demeanour, and short-sightedness. From the sociological point of view, though these dimensions have oftentimes been established to live with poverty, their involvement in a explanation of poverty maybe given to make unclear the connection between them and the inability to cater for one's underlying needs (Augustyn, 2018).

Widespread or "collective" poverty concerns a comparatively lasting insufficiency of way to guarantee fundamental needs—a precondition that may be as unspecific as to depict the ordinary level of life in a social group or that may be amassed in comparatively large groups in an otherwise rich society. Collective poverty is comparatively pandemic and abiding in parts of Asia, the Middle East, most of Africa, and parts of South America and Central America. Life for the majority of the people in these locations is at a minimal level. Nutritional lack cause seldom illness seen by doctors in the highly industrial commonwealths. Collective poverty is usually concomitant to economic underdevelopment (Augustyn, 2018).

Political Poverty can be described as a situation in which the poor are losers when it comes to the political process. They are demoralized and sometimes precluded from voting, and they have *petite* real chance of expressing their thoughts in manners that will be heard by the mighty because their "representatives" tend not to listen to people who have neither money nor advantage (Alston,2017). It follows that as a result of denial of rights to express their choices at polling centres due to their poor income level or poor economic state, they are promised "political goods" by those who wield enormous influence, and possess the goody bags; with the promise that in return on the election day, they will cast their votes for the 'mighty man' with the 'promised blessings'.

Geographical Poverty implies the setting out to help the poorest of the poor depends on where they live. It is the categorization of poverty according to the locations of the people. The urban poor and the rural poor are most popular geographical poverty categorization by geographical areas. It suffices to say that politicians mostly target the ghettos, wretched of the earth, rurals of the urban sub hubs- poorest of the poor in the land, with unattainable political manifestoes to delivering to them 'opportunistic blessings' once they have resolved to offer their votes for a certain political

party on election day. As such, what results is usually monetary inducement in such campaign districts/ constituencies.

Global Manifestation of Poverty

A Global Phenomenon

Poverty is a global phenomenon. It is globally accepted that the global standard of measurement of intense impoverishment is living below 1\$ a day (World Bank, 2019). Poverty is described in either comparative or relative terms. Relative poverty regulates poverty in connection to the sum of money needed to meet primary needs like food, clothing, and shelter. It then follows that poverty level differs from one region to another and certain areas within a region are very much poorer than others. Deaton (2018), in his study on extreme poverty and human rights globally, revealed through World Bank report that, “769 million people lived on less than \$1.90 a day in 2013; they are the world’s very poorest. Of these, 3.2 million live in the United States, and 3.3 million in other high-income countries.” (most in Italy, Japan and Spain) while the host of others are from the developing countries.

In the same vein, Robert Allen(2018), opined that approximated needs-based infinite impoverishment lines for rich countries that are planned to vie more rightly the \$1.90 line for poor countries, and \$4 a day is roughly the midway of his approximates. He stressed that a comparison of relative impoverishment in the United States with relative financial condition in India, or other poor countries, should be utilizing \$4 in the United States and \$1.90 in India. Thus, there are 5.3 million Americans who are relatively poor by global regulations. This is a small number compared with the one for India, for example, but it is more than that in Sierra Leone (3.2 million) or Nepal (2.5 million), about the same as in Senegal (5.3 million) and only one-third less than in Angola (7.4 million). Pakistan (12.7 million) has twice as many poor people as the United States, and Ethiopia about four times as many (Deaton, 2018). In so far as there are humans, and their needs, and wants abound across countries, and the resources to meet this needs vary there will always be poverty variation.

Poverty: An African Problem—Nigeria

There have been worrisome developmental feelings that trickle down the minds of policy analysts, politicians, state actors, students, and the academia. It had led to several hot debates about poverty being peculiar to a particular continent- Africa in this regard. It is common knowledge that Nigeria as a developing economic system had been witnessing poverty before

1960. It is somewhat taken that people exchange what they manufactured for what they needed by trade by barter. Invariably, you can only get what you want when you exchange or offer what you have made. This indicates no expansion in income derivable. But, multiplication of potential wants. The information in Nigeria reveals that the figures of the poor has proceeded to ascend in geometrical ways. An example is, the figures of those impoverished augmented from 27% in 1980 to 46% in 1985, it decreased slightly to 42% in 1992 and inflated slimy again to 67% and 70% in 1996 and 2000 severally before falling significantly to 54.4% in 2004 and above 65% in 2013 (Ogunleye, 2006; Global Economic Prospect (2015a). Poverty is a prevalent pandemic in most African countries.

This explains varied levels of human wants in social groups. Poverty is a knotty question because there are lots of human needs in social groups, which might either be in-adequately met or unmet; completely owing to magnitude of reasons: Financing public infrastructure, enhanced agriculture production, buoyant works, etc., which were the fundamental thrust of development. Infrastructure investment across the region, for example, in sea, land or air ports, electricity capacity, and transportation, assisted to sustain development (Patrick, 1987; Balogun 1999) across geographical boundaries is very much relative.

In other words, the level of impoverishment experienced is different from country to country. However, some people hold the belief that poverty is reported as 'really' associated with the Dark Continent (Adichie 2009) of which Nigeria is one. Kazeem (2018), 'opined the United Nations' Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) to end extreme poverty by 2030 is unlikely to be met in large part of Nigeria. Furthermore, he noted that a new written report by The World Poverty Clock revealed that Nigeria has taken over India as the country with the most extreme poor people in the world. The struggle to lift more citizens out of extreme poverty is an indictment on successive Nigerian governments which have mismanaged the country's vast oil riches through incompetence and corruption (Kazeem, 2018). Recent studies reveal that over 91 million Nigerians are now living in extreme poverty.(Vanguard, 16 Feb, 2019). Corruption has been the hill top for poverty exposure in Nigeria which has for a long time been a theme of discussion by many experts (Aluko, 2002; Dike, 2005; Hope Sr, 2017; Ogbeyidi, 2012; Ogundiya, 2009; Okoosi-Simbine, 2011; Osoba, 1996; Salisu, 2000; Tignor, 1993). Funds meant for improvement are carried off and misappropriated by dishonest regime officials. Ewhrudjakpor (2008) accounts that Nigeria is socioeconomically reversed even with her plentiful oil wealth and 70 percent of her people is still under the curse of impoverishment.

How Poverty Affects Electoral Process

Nigeria has been a democratic government for 20 years since the inception of the fourth republic in 1999. Election is a part of the system and majority of those who vote fall into the category of the 110 million that live under extreme poverty in Nigeria. In this type of situation, it is not expected that the best of democracy can be achieved, as the masses that are meant to come out and vote are affected by social, basic educational, psychological poverty to make the right decisions. Schechter (2002) quoting Eldar Shafir, opined that “When you’re poor you’re surrounded by bad decisions of people around you,” he says.

You’re so concerned about the present that you can’t begin thinking about the future, and that’s the big irony: People with the greatest need to think about the future don’t have the leisure or emotional capacity to do so. The very essence of poverty complicates decisions and makes immediate needs so urgent that you start making wrong choices. These mistakes aren’t any different from anyone else’s, but they occur more frequently due to the element of stress, and their implications are much greater.

In Nigeria, a country where the poor work so hard before they can get little to eat, and where the middle class have to hustle hard to keep barely afloat. They contend with no water, no electricity on a daily basis. Nigeria, a country where parents struggle to send their children to school, and provide basic amenities that government fail to provide, yet after school the learner gets a job that’s below the money you had to pay for just a session’s school fees, making decision about who to vote into power and the right person too, as very difficult, because there is already frustration.

We can look at how poverty might affect the decisions of the masses during election from two perspectives but have the same conclusion. These are those that feel they have nothing to lose—*the wretched of the earth*. Those that are really struggling to make ends meet—*the poor but reserved*. Those that feel they have **nothing to lose**: these are people whose case are hopeless. They are so poor, not just financially, but also mentally and psychologically. These set of people believe that whether they sell their votes or not, these set of politicians cannot bring them out of their poverty, so they would just sell their votes to every party or candidate that comes their way, hence thumbprint (vote) for the highest bidder. They are not thinking beyond their present predicament or beyond their stomach. All they want is an immediate satisfaction because obviously, they have been failed by the government.

Those that are really struggling to **make ends meet**: The main concern of these set of people is to make ends meet. This is due to the fact that they also have been failed by the government. It doesn't matter who is in government, they would rather not vote and everything that is happening in the nation is almost not their concern as long as they have food on their table and little money to spend. They are not really politically apathetic but a semi participant. They give more credence to their daily existence.

In the Psychological sense, electorates are poor because politicians are playing on their intelligence. They do not know the mind of the politician who is just trying to get votes for himself at the expense of the electorates. It could be through ethnic or other means. For instance, the 2019 presidential election both candidates are from the same religion and tribe, therefore playing intellectual and psychological politics on Nigerians. This creates division between other tribes on who to support. A similar occurrence in Lagos 2019 gubernatorial election, psychological poverty came to play when political parties begin to ignite ethnic and religious politics to get people's sympathy and amass votes.

From our discourse so far, there is no doubt that the economic (material) and social welfare of the individual and the society is the epicentre of democracy. Aside the socio-economic status of an individual that will define their level of participation, they also weigh the decision for democratic participations on a cost- benefit scale (Ikelegbe 1995, Down 1957, Alapiki 2004).

Meanwhile it is worthy of note that the material condition of an individual's life is the constant determining variable for democratic (political) participation, every other variable or determining factor revolves around it. It is obvious that the substructure determines the superstructure and the dominant culture which includes political is determined by the dominant class in the economy. Nigeria in the hands of those at the helm of affairs have failed in keeping up with its statutory obligation of bettering the life of the citizen. The poor now resort to observing Maslow's psychology of the "Hierarchy of Need", devoting their time to their unmet needs than the "luxury of democratic participation" that would not put food on their table nor give them shelter. The deliberate mechanization and maintenance of poverty now narrows the political space to the selfish advantage of the ruling class.

Money, is an important material condition of life and the cultural and material resource required for effective democratic participation. For instance, money gives an individual the opportunity to have quality education which in-turn sharpens his consciousness and helps in the processing and

interpreting of political information for informed political choices. With no education for the poor or an appalling and dysfunctional educational system, this will produce uncritical minds, majority of Nigerians are left in a state of “false consciousness” of their existence. They lack the capacity to “understand and work with complex, abstract and intangible subject like politics” (Wolfinger and Rosenstone 1980).

It is also imperative to note that psychological and educational poverty work hand in hand. The case can be seen when the APC led government came in 2015 shouting the slogan of change. Subconsciously, everyone wanted change from a government, but nobody really asked the kind of change that the APC were chanting and many followed with the slogan. And it can be seen that there was no imperative changes in the economic, political and social lives of Nigerians to the positive side. A lot of things went wrong, and there were several unexecuted policies, Nigeria's poverty level rouse to a new height, more jobs losses and more failed banks surfaced. Terrorism and ethno-religious killing became prominent in the Northern parts of Nigeria, drug abuse became rampant across the country especially among the youths. Things became generally worse.

The government declared that they were mainly to fight corruption, but it seems that even corrupt leaders were encouraged to join their wagon and were even put at the helm of affairs. The question of will these changes bring about good lives? Will it bring about better education for our children? Will it increase our minimum wage to a better one a better means of livelihood can be achieved? Dollars went high, then recession hit the nation and the damages was too great.

It is a way of life of Nigerians to go with whatever they feel will bring them succour or keep them at advantage, which is psychology of the mind and not to really ask questions, which is getting the proper education on why they should vote for a particular party, and this came to play also in the 2019 election, when major political parties tried to bring in ethnicity as a bait to gather votes, and Nigerians, mainly the Yorubas and the Igbos embraced it, forgetting that this could lead to a full blown war.

The incumbent government, in their campaign brought in another slogan after the “Change” slogan, which is “Next Level” and yet no one is asking again what the next level means. The after effect of a nation that has electorates that are not open to been educated and allows them to be ruled by emotions is always grievous, because in all of these, the electorates are the ones who will suffer the consequences.

Conclusion and Recommendations

It is clear that the case of poverty in Nigeria has been for a long time and tied to the nature and character of the government, political system and its activities of growing impunity among the political and ruling class. It has affected all aspect of the country's political, economic and social spheres of life. For this, it is almost impossible for a transparent and free electoral process to take place in a poverty-stricken nation.

Poverty creates a sense of disorientation, unpatriotic and unconcerned spirit, and passivity that makes the legitimacy of our democratic rule questionable. The state and its elite ruling class have rendered ineffective the development of the class consciousness of the poor through 'religious' and the ethnicity. The poor need to understand that relegating them to the background is a disadvantage for them. The greatest happiness of the greatest number of the poor can be achieve if they utilize their number to cause an over turn because they are more than the elite class, they have the numerical strength to 'snatch back' their destinies. It lies in their hands to break the cycle of poverty and perpetual underdevelopment.

Finally, destiny of the poor lies squarely in their hands and not the state. Governance and election needs to be people centred so as to liberate the masses from poverty. Liberation lies in the rising above stomach politics, ethnic- mosaic and primordial sentiments, prebendalism to asking decisive question about the real cause of their poverty. Attaining sophistication consciousness is vital. With it, the people can build up a bottom-top organizational structure (perhaps a worker's party) with great organizational strength, "vote with their feet" (Fukuyama, 2012:4) for a people- driven and inclusive political and economic reforms, empower the excluded and open the political and economic space. The state can criminalise corruption and money politics and making them capital offences as the case in China, Japan, Malaysia and India among other countries. Option A4 can be effected for all elections and under the peoples' security. When this is achieved, the electoral system in Nigeria will be developed and in the words of Gilbert and Barigbon (2015) "the man on the street will matter".

References

- Adichie, C (2009) The Danger of a Single Story. [accessed online 20.09.15.] https://www.ted.com/talks/chimamanda_adichie_the_danger_of_a_single_story/transcript?language=en
- Ajakaiye D Olu and V.A Adeyeye (2001) The Nature of Poverty in Nigeria. *Technical Report*, NISER, Ibadan.

- Anderson, M. (2015). What is the Millennium Development Goal on Poverty and Hunger All about. <https://www.theguardian.com/global-development/2015/feb/19/millennium-development-goal-one-poverty-hunger> . [Accessed on 9 March, 2019].
- Alapiki, H. E. (2004) *Politics and Governance in Nigeria*. (2nd Ed). Port Harcourt: Amethyst and Colleagues Publishers.
- Alston, P. (2017) Poverty Is Political. These 3 Things Will Help Us Eliminate It. https://www.huffingtonpost.com/entry/poverty-eradication-is-possible-united-nations-economics_us_59e5d3b9e4b0a2324d1d64ab [Accessed on 6 March, 2019].
- Aluko, M. (2002). The institutionalization of corruption and its impact on political culture and behaviour in Nigeria. *Nordic Journal of African Studies*, 11(3), 393-402.
- Augustyn, A. (2018). Poverty Sociology. <https://www.britannica.com/topic/poverty> [Accessed on 6 March, 2019].
- Balogun, E. D. (1999). Analyzing poverty: Concepts and methods. *Central Bank of Nigeria Bullion* 23(4), 11-16.
- Blaydes, L., (2006). Who votes in authoritarian elections and why? Determinants of voter turnout in contemporary Egypt. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, 2006, Philadelphia, PA.
- Bratton, Michael. (2008). Vote Buying and Violence in Nigeria Election Campaigns. *Electoral Studies*. 27. 621-632. 10.1016/j.electstud.2008.04.013.
- Deaton, A. (2018). The U.S. Can No Longer Hide From Its Deep Poverty Problem <https://www.nytimes.com/2018/01/24/opinion/poverty-united-states.html> Accessed on 6 March, 2019.
- Dike, V. E. (2005). Corruption in Nigeria: A new paradigm for effective control. *Africa Economic Analysis*, 24(08), 1-22.
- Dixit, A., & Londregan, J. (1996). The Determinants of Success of Special Interests in Redistributive Politics. *The Journal of Politics*, 58(4), 1132-1155. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2960152>
- Downs, A. (1957) *An Economic Theory of Political Action in a Democracy*. In Ferguson, T. and Rogers, J. (1984) *Political Economy: Readings in the Politics and Economics of America* Public Policy: New York. M. E. Sharpe.
- Ewurdjakpor, C. (2008). Poverty and its alleviation: The Nigerian experience.
- Fukuyama, F. (2012) *The Origin of New Political Order*. London: Profile Books Ltd.
- Galtung, J. (1990) 'Cultural Violence', *Journal of Peace Research*, 27:3
- Global Economic Prospect (2015a). Sub-Saharan Africa. January, 2015. World Bank, Washington, DC.
- Hope Sr, K. R. (2017). Corruption in Nigeria Corruption and Governance in Africa (pp. 125-162). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-50191-8_4

- Ikelegbe, A.O. (1995) *Politics and Government in Nigeria: An Introductory and Comparative Perspective*. Benin: Uri Publishing Co.
- Jensen, P. S., & Justesen, M. K. (2014). Poverty and Vote Buying: Survey-based Evidence from Africa. *Electoral Studies*, 33, 220-232. DOI: 10.1016/j.electstud.2013.07.020.
- Kazeem, Y. (2018). Nigeria has become the poverty capital of the world. <https://qz.com/africa/1313380/nigerias-has-the-highest-rate-of-extreme-poverty-globally/> [Accessed on 7 March, 2019].
- Kramon, E. (2016). Electoral handouts as information: Explaining unmonitored vote buying. *World Politics*, 68(3), 454-498.
- Khan, I. (2009) *The Unheard Truth: Poverty and Human Right*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company.
- Lehoucq, F. (2007). "When Does a Market for Votes Emerge?" in Schaffer (ed.). 2007. *Elections for Sale: The Causes and Consequences of Vote Buying* (Boulder, Colorado: Lynne Rienner Publishers): 33-45.
- Mukhtar, U., Mukhtar, J. I., & Mukhtar, H. Y. (2015). Unemployment among Youth in Nigeria: A Challenge for Millennium Development Goals. *Researchjournal's Journal of Economics*.
- Nichter, S. 2008. "Vote-buying or turnout buying? Machine politics and the secret ballot." *American Political Science Review* 102 (01): 19-31.
- Nwankwo, C. F. (2018). Vote Buying in the 2018 Governorship Election in Ekiti State, Nigeria. *Open Political Science*, 1(1), 93-97.
- Ogbeidi, M. M. (2012). Political leadership and corruption in Nigeria since 1960: A socio-economic analysis. *Journal of Nigeria Studies*, 1(2).
- Oguh, C., (2015). The Representation of Africa in Western Media: still a 21st century problem. 10.13140/RG.2.1.3984.2326.
- Ogundiya, I. S. (2009). Political corruption in Nigeria: Theoretical perspectives and some explanations. *Anthropologist*, 11(4), 281-292. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09720073.2009.11891117>
- Ogunleye, O. S. (2006). Challenges of Poverty Alleviation in Nigeria. *The Social Sciences* 1 (3), 194-197
- Ojo, E. (2008). *Vote buying in Nigeria* Victor, A. (Eds). Abuja: Money and Politics in Nigeria IFES Publisher.
- Okoosi-Simbine, A. T. (2011). Corruption in Nigeria State, Economy, and Society in Post-Military Nigeria (pp. 157-180). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230117594_7
- Patrick, J. (1987). Rural Poverty, Social Development and their Implications for Field Practice. *Journal of Social Development in Africa*, 1(2), 75-85.
- Robert, A. (2018). Opinion | The U.S. Can No Longer Hide From Its Deep <https://www.nytimes.com/2018/01/24/opinion/poverty-united-states.html>. [Accessed on 6 March, 2019].
- Schechter A., (2012) *The Psychological Poverty Trap*
- Smelser, N. J. and Baltes, P. B. (eds.) (2001). *International Encyclopaedia of the Social and Behavioural Sciences*. Elsevier. Oxford Science Ltd.

- Stokes, S.C., 2007b. Is vote buying undemocratic? In: Schaffer, F.C., (Ed.), *Elections for Sale: The Causes and Consequences of Vote Buying*. Lynne Rienner Publishers, Boulder, pp. 81-99.
- The geography of Poverty <https://www.economist.com/finance-and-economics/2012/09/01/the-geography-of-poverty> [Accessed on 6 March, 2019]
- UNDP Human Development Report, 1997. <https://www.nytimes.com/2018/01/24/opinion/poverty-united-states.html>. [Accessed on 6 March, 2019]
- Vanguard (August 20, 2015). Over 100m Nigerians living below poverty line-Osinbajo. Retrieved www.vanguardngr.com/2015/08/over-1-million-nigerians-living-below-poverty-line-osinbajo/
- Wolfinger, R. & Rosenstone, J. (1980) *Who Votes?* New York: Yale University Press.
- World Bank (2019) *Poverty Overview* <https://www.worldbank.org/en/topic/poverty/overview> assessed on 16/4/2019
- World Poverty Clock (2019) 91 million Nigerians now live in extreme poverty – <https://www.vanguardngr.com/.../91-million-nigerians-now-live-in-extreme-poverty-> [Accessed on 11 March, 2019]
- Yakubo, O.D. & Aderonmu J.A. (2010) “Rural Poverty Alleviation and Democracy in Nigeria Fourth Republic (1999-2009). *Current Research Journal of Social Sciences* Vol. 2 (3).