




ISSN: 2617-6548

URL: www.ijirss.com



Election administration in Nigeria: A factor leading to declining voter turnout

Temitope Olukunmi Akanmu¹,  Eyitayo Francis Adanlawo^{2*}

¹*Independent National Electoral Commission (INEC) Ondo State, Nigeria.*

²*Social Transformation Research Entity, North-West University, South Africa.*

Corresponding author: Eyitayo Francis Adanlawo (Email: eyitayofadan@gmail.com)

Abstract

This paper discusses the complex relationship between election administration and voter turnout in Nigeria. By identifying and analysing the election administrative factors contributing to low voter turnout, this study delves into the areas where the administration of election processes and procedures serves as a significant causal factor. The analysis draws on relevant scholarly and policy literature to map out emerging trends, structural challenges related to election administration and voter turnout. The analysis reveals that the causes of low voter turnout in Nigeria are not limited to electoral violence, but it also includes maladministration or administrative failures of the electoral processes and procedures by INEC. The paper proposed several recommendations for administering elections to enhance voter turnout as a strategy for future elections in Nigeria. This paper offers a comprehensive understanding of the electoral administrative procedures that pose challenges to the electoral process and deter Nigerian voters from participating in elections.

Keywords: Election administration, Independent national electoral commission (INEC), People living with disabilities (PWDs).

Polling units, Voter turnout.

DOI: 10.53894/ijirss.v8i10.10777

Funding: This study received no specific financial support.

History: Received: 27 August 2025 / Revised: 15 October 2025 / Accepted: 17 October 2025 / Published: 30 October 2025

Copyright: © 2025 by the authors. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

Competing Interests: The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

Authors' Contributions: All authors contributed equally to the conception and design of the study. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Transparency: The authors confirm that the manuscript is an honest, accurate, and transparent account of the study; that no vital features of the study have been omitted; and that any discrepancies from the study as planned have been explained. This study followed all ethical practices during writing.

Publisher: Innovative Research Publishing

1. Introduction

Elections in Nigeria, similar to those in other democratic countries, have been witnessing a decline in voter turnout with each successive election. Voting remains the primary form of political participation, whereby citizens exercise their right to vote for their choice of representatives [1, 2]. From 1999 to the present, Nigeria has experienced over twenty-six (26) years of uninterrupted democratic national and sub-national elections. This makes the Fourth Republic the longest period of democratic rule in Nigeria's history, with seven (7) national elections and numerous sub-national elections. Despite this achievement in democratic commitment, Nigeria's electoral process has been hindered by a decline in voter

turnout, even as the number of registered voters continues to rise each year. Voter turnout has declined significantly, dropping from 52.6% in 1999 to just 26.7% in the 2023 national elections [3, 4].

However, many reasons have been identified as the causes of this declining voter turnout, ranging from what Nwangbo, et al. [5] described as the effects of colonialism and the nature of politics in Nigeria, which focuses on the electoral process and procedures through which the country's leadership emerges. Gbighidje and Kaizar [6] identify the sit-tight syndrome of the incumbent government or the intolerance of the incumbent as a factor that discourages voters from participating in an election. Several studies also identified the impact of electoral violence in Nigeria as a significant factor affecting voter turnout in elections. Several studies have pointed to election administration (challenges confronting INEC in conducting free, fair, and acceptable elections) as a contributing factor to persistent low voter turnout in Nigerian elections, but the impact of election administrative disenfranchisement has been overlooked [7, 8].

This paper aims to examine how the administration of election procedures and processes by the Independent National Electoral Commission (INEC), the body responsible for overseeing general elections in Nigeria, contributes to the issue of low voter turnout. This study explores how specific rules, guidelines, and operational procedures implemented by INEC have inadvertently disenfranchised certain groups of voters. This disenfranchisement, resulting from the complexity and restrictive nature of these procedures, has significantly reduced voter participation in Nigerian elections.

2. Problem Context and Objective

A probe into the nuance of low voter turnout in elections reveals a lot of causes, but for this paper, attention is given to those causes instigated by the administrative actions or inactions of INEC. Though several factors have been adjudged to be the administrative cause of low voter turnout, for this paper, attention is limited to the following:

1. The failure of INEC to create polling units that will take care of the voting needs of the electorate.
2. Failure of INEC to make provision for election officials, security agents, domestic election observers, journalists, and essential workers who are registered voters to be able to vote.
3. The failure of the polling unit set up by INEC to take care of the PWDs.

To achieve the study's objectives, analysis draws on relevant scholarly and policy literature to map out emerging trends, structural challenges, and institutional responses related to election administration and voter turnout. By highlighting successful case studies and innovative practices, the research seeks to provide actionable recommendations for policymakers.

3. Conceptual Background

3.1. Election

Elections have generally been acknowledged as a cardinal pillar of a democratic political system, which is the core of democracy and the core institution of representative democracy in Africa, including Nigeria [9]. In a similar vein, Ojieh [10] described it as "the heart of representative democracy" and a requirement to confer legitimacy on government. From the above descriptions, it is well established that election is one of the features that distinguish the democratic system from other forms of government by attaching the consent of the majority as a condition for governance. Conceptually, election principally revolves around the established institutional processes and procedures that allow citizens of a particular polity to select among contestants for political positions [11, 12]. Elections are widely recognized as a critical mechanism for the long-term viability of democratic processes.

This study conceptualizes election as a vital part of the democratic process, which serves as an affirmation of democratic rights, inclusion, and transparency. In other words, elections help to institutionalize the process of democratic succession and mobilization of popular support for the government. Beyond the promotion of political participation, a credible election is characterized by inclusive participation. Inclusive elections entail that the voters must be large enough to accommodate a large proportion of the adult population. Heywood and Chin [13] aver that any government chosen by a small, exclusive group is not a democracy, even if the internal workings of such a group appear to be democratic. An election can be defined as a complicated series of democratic activities aiming at selecting the rightful choice of leadership for a group of people in a certain polity.

3.2. Election Administration

The competitive nature of elections has been central to the political life of almost all African countries, including Nigeria, since the start of what Huntington [14] called the "third wave of democratization" in the early 1990s. According to Holloway and Manwaring [15] creating a credible and inclusive electoral regime is essential for all democracies, whether they are transitional or consolidated. This has led to the emergence of Electoral Management Bodies (EMBs), which are responsible for election administration. These bodies are crucial to the success of any democratic system. Nshindano [16] avers that the quality of the electoral institution that administers elections significantly impacts the credibility of the electoral process, which is foundational to the legitimacy of democratic governance. The authors also highlighted that a well-functioning electoral institution promotes both an inclusive and transparent electoral process. Consequently, EMBs have become the cornerstone of democratization in Nigeria and other African countries that experienced the third wave of democracy.

According to Harris [17] elections are complex events that require an administrative apparatus to manage a variety of activities before, during, and after the election. Agbaje [18] views election administration as the managing of a series of public affairs and events, collectively known as electoral processes. Nwangbo, et al. [5] describe it as electoral governance, emphasizing that good elections are impossible without effective governance. Lundstedt and Edgell [19] believe that

Electoral Management Bodies (EMBs) significantly impact the quality and integrity of democratic elections. Madueke and Enyiazu [7] also add that election administration involves tasks related to lawmaking, law implementation, and some elements of law adjudication. This includes designing procedures and regulations for the electoral process and implementing these rules. Overall, election administration encompasses managing all aspects of the electoral process throughout its entire cycle.

3.3. Voter Turnout

Adanlawo and Reddy [20] argue that voter turnout can be used to assess the democratic quality of elections. Voter turnout is a key indicator, measured by the percentage of registered voters who cast ballots. Higher voter turnout suggests greater participation and higher democratic quality [21, 22]. Voter turnout is the most common form of political participation, according to Stockemer [23] it is crucial in assessing how citizens engage in governance. Daoust and Nadeau [24] describe it as a simple measure reflecting outcomes, constituent satisfaction, political attitudes, and other indicators of democratic effectiveness. Franklin [25] explains that voter turnout can be measured in two ways: as the percentage of registered voters who vote (RV turnout) and as the percentage of the voting-age population who vote (VAP turnout). Low voter turnout poses a significant risk to democracy, indicating a lack of engagement Motolinia [11]. Nwankwo and Okafor [26] emphasize the relationship between voter turnout, elections, and democracy, stating that turnout is crucial for measuring democratic performance. Stockemer [23] asserts that high electoral participation is essential for the electoral process and system. This study defines voter turnout as the percentage of registered voters who cast their vote in an election.

4. Voter Turnout in Nigeria General Elections

The electoral process in Nigeria always commences with the registration of voters. This exercise kick-starts the competitive nature of the election as it remains mandatory to prepare the voter list. The Independent National Electoral Commission (INEC) is empowered by the 1999 constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria to compile the voter list, which must be done 90 days before the general election in the country, as it provides the voters with the eligibility to vote during the election. Therefore, the exercise is considered as part of the election's pre-election stage, alongside the election and post-election stages.

The below table showcases the number of registered voters and valid votes cast in the Nigerian election between 1999 and 2023.

Table 1.
Voter Turnout in Nigeria 1999 – 2023.

Year of election	Number of registered voters	Valid votes / votes cast	Turnout percentage
1999	57,938,945	30,280,052.00	52
2003	60,823,022	39,480,489.00	65
2007	61,567,036	35,397,517.00	57
2011	73,528,040	38,209,978.00	52
2015	67,422,005	28,567,564.00	42
2019	84,004,084	28,614,190	36
2023	93,469,008	24.9	26.7

Source: Independent National Electoral Commission [27].

Table 1 reveals that the number of registered voters increases year by year, while valid votes decrease. For instance, in 2019, 84 million people registered, while only 28.6 million people (36%) cast their votes. The number of registered voters increased in 2023 to 93.5 million, with only 24.9 million (26.7%) votes. The table reveals that voter turnout decreases year by year. Lower voter turnout indicates that fewer citizens consider elections as the principal means for legitimizing elected political leaders and their control over political decision-making. Kostelka and Blais [28] state that declining voter turnout is an indicator that there are profound problems confronting democracies in these present days.

In Lilleker and Koc-Michalska [29] view, lower voter turnout does not necessarily mean that citizens are becoming less active in politics. The authors state that an increase in alternative forms of citizen activism, which include large-scale protests, occupation movements, and the growing use of social media as a fresh avenue for political involvement, contribute to lower voter turnout. Citizens who could not participate in elections due to administrative issues are actively using other channels of participation and political engagement. This speaks volumes to the course of this paper, as it tries to move away from looking at low voter turnout as mostly a display of dissatisfaction with government by citizens, or voter apathy, as much literature had indicated. However, this paper delves into the plights of many citizens who could not vote, not because of their circumstances but due to the administrative procedures and processes of election in their country.

4.1. Failure of INEC to Create Adequate Polling Units in Nigeria

One of the major challenges making the electoral process lose its integrity, credibility, and acceptability in Nigeria over the years is described as the lack of access to the polling units by the voters [30]. Section 40 (2) of the Electoral Act 2022 of Nigeria empowered INEC to establish an adequate number of polling units in the country and assign voters to

them. The Section stipulates that “*The Commission shall establish a sufficient number of Polling Units in each Registration Area and allot voters to such Polling Units.*” Polling units are recognized as locations where voters cast their ballots. These units play a crucial role in the electoral process. They serve as the fundamental platform through which citizens exercise their right to vote and freely make electoral choices. In other words, voter access to the polling units goes a long way in determining voter turnout. This is because well-organized and efficiently managed polling units are referred to as the symbol and quality of the entire election environment [27].

Due to population growth and the establishment of new settlements and residential areas, the existing polling centres are significantly inadequate to provide voters with sufficient access to voting or polling locations [31, 32]. Despite the increasing number of registered voters, anticipated at around 50 million in 1996 and rising to 60.82 million in 2003, 61.56 million in 2007, 68.83 million in 2015, and 84 million in 2019, the number of polling units has remained unchanged at 119,974, except in the 2023 election, when INEC expanded the polling units from 119,974 to 176,846. Despite this expansion, the 2023 general election still witnessed congestion, and voters still face the challenges of overcrowding. The distance of residence to some polling units is still far, and this enhanced low voter turnout in the election. The discrepancy between the rising number of registered voters and the available number of polling units has resulted in congested polling units on election day [17]. Consequently, this has contributed to low voter turnout. The overcrowding of polling centres during elections affects the voting behaviour of the voters and thereby causes low turnout during elections. Also, the locations of certain polling centers are inaccessible, while others are situated in the residences of individuals with political inclinations or in areas of communal conflict [33].

Voters, election personnel, and election materials are susceptible to the effects of weather due to the fact that numerous units are situated in the open field with minimal cover. The overall conduct of elections is adversely affected by this situation. For example, when the Bi-Modal Voter Accreditation System (BVAS), as it is now, is exposed to glaring sunshine during the accreditation of voters, it invariably affects their performance. Voters also face the hurdle of getting to their polling units because of the distance. The voters in this condition in most cases must trek a long distance to participate in the electoral process because of the restriction of vehicular movement on the election day. The situation places a heavy burden on voters. The congestion of polling centres, the distance, and the location of polling units or centres in unconducive locations constitute challenges to voter access to the polling centres. This identified problem has far-reaching implications on voter turnout, which in the long run has grievous implications on the quality of democracy and the electoral process in Nigeria. Akanmu [4] supports that the inability of voters to travel the distances to their polling units because of restrictions on movement on election day contributes to low voter turnout.

Furthermore, the INEC has not been able to move all of the polling stations in front of private residences and other inappropriate locations to public buildings or public open spaces where tents can be provided. However, while the number of voters across the nation has grown over the years, the quantity of polling units available to accommodate them remains stagnant. The polling units become congested, with many of them sometimes serving up to 2,000 to 3,000 voters.



Figure 1.
Overcrowded election polling unit.
Source: Independent National Electoral Commission [27].

The picture above was taken during the monitoring of the 2019 general elections by the INEC monitoring team. The picture shows how crowded the polling unit was and the extent of the queue of voters waiting to be attended to by the election officials during 2019 general elections in various parts of Nigeria. According to Abumbe and Owa [34] the insufficient numbers of polling units led to many of the polling units being overcrowded and congested during elections,

which culminated in delays, disruptions, violence, apathy, and low voter turnout. According to the operational principle of INEC, a polling unit is expected not to exceed 500 voters, but some have over 2,000 registered voters. This huge number implies that voting may not be conducive, is rowdy, and is extremely slow, which may serve as a discouragement to voters, hence leading to a decrease in voter turnout. Experts declare that most electorates are unwilling to participate in the elections primarily because of the conventional practice that requires voters to stand in queues for long hours [35]. A good indication is the voter turnout in the last 2023 presidential election in Nigeria, with less than 27% of the registered voters [36]. It can be rightly said that the actions and inactions of INEC have prevented citizens from voting. In other words, the enumerated realities have established that there is a strong indication that the existing number of polling units in Nigeria is grossly inadequate.

4.2. Failure of INEC to Make Provision for Election Officials, Security Agents, Domestic Election Observers, and Essential Workers.

The administration of elections in Nigeria is inherent complex due to its huge voting population [37]. INEC needs almost a million personnel to adequately conduct elections; but, with its 15,000 permanent staff and its inability to accommodate more staff due to its limited budget, the commission relies on the recruitment of ad hoc staff for voter registration and polling station services [27]. These ad hoc staff are disenfranchised because of their official engagement in the administering of the electoral process.

The disenfranchised people include individuals across various spectrums, such as INEC officials focused on conducting the election, security personnel ensuring the process's safety, journalists covering the event, as well as essential workers like medical practitioners and transport officers. These groups of citizens are administratively disenfranchised. These sets of people could not vote because of the unavailability of absentee or early balloting. The burden of traveling to a polling station can be alleviated through absentee voting. There are a lot of ways to vote, such as by mail, in person at a select few polling places, or in person at any polling place [38]. While some nations allow absentee voting for all voters, others only allow a certain group of voters (such as those who are ill or in the military),

INEC disclosed that it would engage over a million ad hoc employees for the 2019 general elections [36]. This number specifically refers to INEC temporary staff and does not account for the significant presence of security agents, party representatives, election observers, and INEC's monitoring staff. Moreover, the lack of absentee voting options means hospitalized individuals or prisoners awaiting trial are unable to participate in the voting process [39]. INEC's inability to come up with rules and administrative procedures that will enable all the mentioned to be able to vote is considered a catalyst for low voter turnout in Nigeria. Pallister [40] avers that poor electoral procedures can serve as barriers to voting.

Table 2.

The number of officials deployed for election.

Officials Deployed for Election	Number
Presiding Officers	120,000
Assistant Presiding Officer 1 (APO 1)	120,000
Assistant Presiding Officer 2 (APO 2)	120,000
Assistant Presiding Officer 3 (APO 3)	120,000
Assistant Presiding Officer Voting Point (APO VP)	57,023
Assistant Presiding Officer 1 Voting Point (APO 1 VP)	57,023
Assistant Presiding Officer 2 Voting Point (APO 2 VP)	57,023
Assistant Presiding Officer 3 Voting Point (APO 3 VP)	57,023
Supervisory Presiding Officers	12,079
R A Collation Officers (Presidential Election)	8,809
R A Collation Officers (Senatorial Election)	8,809
R A Collation Officers (House of Representative)	8,809
L G Collation Officers (Presidential Election)	774
L G Collation Officers (Senatorial Election)	774
L G Collation Officers (House of Representatives)	774
State Collation Officers (Presidential Election) (Including FCT Abuja)	37
Returning Officer (Presidential Election)	1
Returning Officers (Senatorial Election)	109
Returning Officers (House of Representatives)	360
R A Tech	12,079
L G Tech	774
State coordinator Tech	37
Election Management Support Centre (EMSC)	892

400,000 members of the National Youth Service Corps (NYSC) were disenfranchised during the 2023 election. In addition to it, 15,000 INEC permanent staff were disenfranchised. There are other sets of ad hoc workers who served as collation officers, supervisory presiding officers, and technical support staff who were deployed into all registration areas and wards throughout the country. There were also the collation officers for all the registration areas/wards, and the local

government collation officers who were deployed in all 774 local governments of the country. The below table shows the number of officials deployed for election:

In addition to the above, a total of about 500,000 security personnel were required to ensure a secure environment for the electoral process of general elections. INEC also recruited over 1800 Nigerian journalists from over 150 media organisations to cover the election [41]. As a result, the sum of the numerous categories listed above is undoubtedly a considerable number that, if permitted to exercise their franchise, may influence the results of the election in either direction.

4.3. The Failure of the Polling Unit Set Up by INEC To Take Care of the People Living with Disabilities (PWDs).

Nigeria is a highly populous country in Africa with a population of about 215 million [42]. Out of this population, about 25 million are living with a disability [43]. According to Article 1 of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD), persons with disabilities are those people who have long-term physical, mental, intellectual, or sensory impairments that cause various barriers and may hinder them. There are growing concerns about the plights of people living with disabilities, especially concerning their inability to have equitable and inclusive rights of political participation, especially unhindered access to the ballot, to be able to vote on election day [35]. Despite the rights of people with disabilities, which have been defined and protected by a variety of international, regional, and national organizations. Yet PWDs are still facing significant challenges to be able to vote during elections despite the existence of various agreements, charters, conventions, and many other instrumentalities that protect their voting rights.

Many of these PWDs experience extreme difficulties while exercising their political rights. They face challenges that make it difficult or impossible to participate in elections. Those challenges include the location or setting of polling units and voting cubicles in a way that they are not always physically accessible to those who are unable to walk or have impaired walking. Election materials such as ballots are not produced in Braille or tactile for visually impaired voters. Similarly, polling units do not have officials who can communicate in sign language to voters with impairments. Written instructions on election day procedures are also not always available for this category of voters. Various voter education programmes of INEC give limited attention to the PWDs, as information and educational materials do not consider the plights of the PWDs. So, in most cases the PWDs are not always abreast of the process and procedures [44].

The above-mentioned are sources of discouragement to the electorates in this category, and INEC is doing little or nothing about it. Another difficulty is that election officials are unable to help PWDs with voting on election day. PWDs in Nigeria face a lot of challenges in the pursuit of their political and socio-economic rights, as these challenges have over time left them marginalized, underrepresented, and excluded from political and electoral processes. It should be noted that there were systematic failures by INEC to actively involve and include PWDs in the electoral process [45]. However, the right to vote creates an exceptional privilege for citizens to impact the various policies that affect their lives. However, the rights have eluded the PWDs in Nigeria as far as elections and electoral activities are concerned. This is basically because of what International Foundation for Electoral Systems (IFES) [46] described as accessibility barriers that the PWDs face in the electoral process.

5. Pathways for Improvement: Strategies for Nigeria

Based on the causal factors contributing to low voter turnout, as identified through insights derived from the reviewed literature, the following recommendations are proposed: It is incumbent upon INEC to strengthen the electoral procedures and guidelines to facilitate early voting for INEC staff, recruited ad hoc staff, all security agents, accredited domestic election observers, and all essential workers engaged in electoral activities. These groups of voters should have the opportunity to exercise their franchise, and their ballots must be securely stored and should not be sorted or counted until the designated time for sorting and counting on election day. The votes from these ballots, once sorted and counted, should be integrated with those from other polling units as part of the overall results declared nationwide. This measure will significantly contribute to increasing the declining voter turnout.

There is a necessity to establish additional polling centres and units to take care of the residents in newly developed areas and settlements where no polling units currently exist. Also, registered voters in overcrowded polling units might be transferred to newly formed polling units that are relatively close to their residence. INEC should collaborate with pertinent parties to expedite the establishment of easily accessible voting facilities and infrastructures in various voting centres. In pursuance of the above, it is expected that all electoral infrastructures of INEC, such as registration centres, registration equipment, voting centres and voting materials, must be disability-friendly by taking care of the plights of the PWDs to be able to register as voters and vote on the election days at the designated centres without difficulties that may discourage them from turning out to vote. INEC is hereby advised to site registration and voting centres at locations with level ground floor access, as this will help older people and pregnant women in addition to voters with any form of mobility disability.

6. Conclusion

Conclusively, this paper underscores the significance of a comprehensive and inclusive approach to strengthen democratic processes in Nigeria. As the country strives for more transparent, inclusive, and participatory elections, it is essential to consider the nuanced interactions between election administration and voter turnout to foster a vibrant and engaged electorate. The literature on election administration and voter turnout established that the causes of low voter turnout in Nigeria are not limited to electoral violence, electoral fraud, and the sit-tight attitude of the incumbency [47, 48] but it also includes maladministration or administrative failures of the electoral processes and procedures by INEC, which

have served as barriers preventing a lot of registered voters from voting during the election [17, 49]. However, this study extensively looks into one of the causal factors of low voter turnout in Nigerian context. The paper was able to establish the gap and, to an extent, fill the identified gap noticed in the extant literature on the perceived causes of low voter turnout in Nigeria.

Over the years, INEC has faced several challenges that are polling unit-oriented, which are regarded as one of the causal factors of low voter turnout. First is the problem of insufficient numbers of polling units at the voter's disposal. This is due to population expansion, demographic changes, and the creation of new communities and residential areas, which make the existing polling units grossly insufficient and inadequate for the teeming electorate in Nigeria to exercise their electoral franchise. Thus, decongesting voting units and distributing voters as evenly as feasible across all polling units are key difficulties. There is a need for the creation of additional polling units to cater for the splitting of large polling units as well as for new settlements not serviced by any existing polling unit. These obstacles are made more severe by the practice of restriction of movement on election day. Since INEC has not successfully been able to solve this identified problem, this makes INEC defective by administratively encouraging low voter turnout in Nigeria. In as much as democracy heavily relies on the participation and representation of all citizens in a particular polity, this makes political inclusion an underpinning to democracy, which implies equal access and rights for every citizen regardless of class, age, gender, sex, ability, culture, or religious or ethnic background to various democratic institutions and processes.

References

- [1] S. M. Sakah, "The 2015 general elections: Voter the 2015 general elections: voter turnout, voting behaviors and democratic consolidation in nigeria. in Nigeria," presented at the Post-Election Conference. Abuja: The Electoral Institute, 2016.
- [2] H. Marcos-Marne, C. Plaza-Colodro, and T. Freyburg, "Who votes for new parties? Economic voting, political ideology and populist attitudes," *West European Politics*, vol. 43, no. 1, pp. 1-21, 2020. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01402382.2019.1608752>
- [3] D. Amata, "Nigeria records only 26.72% voter turnout in 2023 election," Dataphyte, 2023. <https://elections.dataphyte.com/insights/nigeria-records-only-2672-voter-turnout-in-2023-election>
- [4] O. T. Akanmu, "An examination of election administration and voter turnout in Nigeria (2011–2019)," Doctoral Dissertation, University of Zululand University of Zululand Institutional Repository, 2023. <https://uzspace.unizulu.ac.za/items/16241edb-cb10-4183-9485-9edc6667fb31>
- [5] S. O. Nwangbo *et al.*, "Transforming voter behaviour in nigeria's south-east region: Analysing the impact of socio-economic conditions, electoral irregularities and sustainable voters' education," *Journal of African American Studies*, vol. 28, no. 4, pp. 359-379, 2024. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12111-024-09677-2>
- [6] L. D. Gbighidje and V. O. Kaizar, "Political parties, electoral violence, and possible consequences on democratic consolidation in Nigeria, 1999-2022," *Insights and Explorations in Democracy, Political Unrest, and Propaganda in Elections*, pp. 114-128, 2023.
- [7] O. Madueke and C. Enyiazu, "Electoral integrity and election management in nigeria: The case of the 2023 general election," *World Affairs*, vol. 188, no. 1, 2025. <https://doi.org/10.1002/waf2.12055>
- [8] U. C. Obiagu, P. O. Mbah, C. Nwangwu, I. M. Ibekwe, C. O. Odey, and F. O. Eteng, "Political interference in election administration and electoral irregularities in Nigeria," *Modern Africa: Politics, History and Society*, vol. 13, no. 1, pp. 67-101, 2025. <https://doi.org/10.26806/modafr.v13i1.249>
- [9] E. F. Adanlawo and H. Rugbeer, "Media and democracy: Is conventional media performing the role of the fourth estate of the realm?," *Journal of African Films and Diaspora Studies*, vol. 4, no. 2, p. 23, 2021.
- [10] C. O. Ojeh, "The phenomenon of representative democracy with election as an indispensable component: A case study of nigeria's fourth republic elections up to 2007," *The International Journal of Interdisciplinary Civic and Political Studies*, vol. 16, no. 2, p. 37, 2021. <https://doi.org/10.18848/2327-0071/CGP/v16i02/37-50>
- [11] L. Motolinia, "Party considerations for renomination in pre-electoral coalitions," *Legislative Studies Quarterly*, 2025. <https://doi.org/10.1111/lsq.70017>
- [12] F. Xaba, E. F. Adanlawo, and M. Chaka, "Exploring higher education policies regulating breastfeeding on university campuses: Implications for the wellbeing of women academics," *International Journal of Research in Business & Social Science*, vol. 14, no. 2, pp. 325-331, 2025. <https://doi.org/10.20525/ijrbs.v14i2.3897>
- [13] A. Heywood and C. Chin, *Political theory: An introduction*. London & New York: Bloomsbury Publishing, 2023.
- [14] S. P. Huntington, "Democracy's third wave," *Journal of Democracy*, vol. 2, no. 2, pp. 12-34, 1991.
- [15] J. Holloway and R. Manwaring, "How well does 'resilience' apply to democracy? A systematic review," *Contemporary Politics*, vol. 29, no. 1, pp. 68-92, 2023. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13569775.2022.2069312>
- [16] K. P. Nshindano, "Comparative insights on electoral management bodies' independence: A deep dive into South Africa, Zambia and Zimbabwe board appointment processes," *African Quarterly Social Science Review*, vol. 2, no. 3, pp. 44-56, 2025. <https://doi.org/10.51867/AQSSR.2.3.4>
- [17] J. A. Harris, "Election administration, resource allocation, and turnout: Evidence from Kenya," *Comparative Political Studies*, vol. 54, no. 3-4, pp. 623-651, 2021. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0010414020938083>
- [18] C. C. Agbaje, "The involvement of women in the banking industry in Nigeria, 1944-2005 ", Doctoral Dissertation, University of Lagos Nigeria, 2017.
- [19] M. Lundstedt and A. B. Edgell, "Institutions of electoral integrity and clientelism: The role of electoral management bodies," V-Dem Working Paper, No. 108, 2020. <http://hdl.handle.net/2077/66575>
- [20] E. F. Adanlawo and M. M. Reddy, "The role and effect of the mass media during electioneering," *Journal of African Films and Diaspora Studies*, vol. 3, no. 2, p. 61, 2020.
- [21] S. I. Lindberg, *Democratization by elections*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2009.
- [22] M. M. Reddy and E. F. Adanlawo, "Communication's module: Inclusion within all undergraduate qualification at higher education institutions," *Gender and Behaviour*, vol. 16, no. 2, pp. 11359-11376, 2018.
- [23] D. Stockemer, "Electoral participation: How to measure voter turnout?," *Social Indicators Research*, vol. 133, no. 3, pp. 943-962, 2017. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-016-1410-6>

- [24] J. F. Daoust and R. Nadeau, *Elections and satisfaction with democracy: Citizens, processes and outcomes*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2023.
- [25] M. N. Franklin, *Consequences of lowering the voting age to 16: Lessons from comparative research*. In *Lowering the voting age to 16: Learning from real experiences worldwide*. Cham: Springer International Publishing, 2019.
- [26] C. F. Nwankwo and U. P. Okafor, "Voting in Nigeria: Determinants of turnout in the 2015 Presidential Election," *Statistics, Politics and Policy*, vol. 8, no. 2, pp. 249-260, 2017. <https://doi.org/10.1515/spp-2017-0010>
- [27] Independent National Electoral Commission, "The state of voter access to polling Units in Nigeria," Discussion Paper No. 1/2021, 2021. https://www.inecnigeria.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/02/The-State-of-Voter-Access-to-PUs-in-Nigeria_mini.pdf
- [28] F. Kostelka and A. Blais, "The generational and institutional sources of the global decline in voter turnout," *World Politics*, vol. 73, no. 4, pp. 629-667, 2021. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0043887121000149>
- [29] D. G. Lilleker and K. Koc-Michalska, "What drives political participation? Motivations and mobilization in a digital age," *Political Communication*, vol. 34, no. 1, pp. 21-43, 2017. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10584609.2016.1225235>
- [30] S. O. Nmor and A. U. Onochie, "Electoral integrity in Nigeria: Challenges, strategies and pathways to reform," *LASJURE*, vol. 5, p. 76, 2024.
- [31] M. Chaka and E. F. Adanlawo, "The impact of ethnicity on South Africa's national unity," *African Renaissance*, vol. 20, no. 2, p. 315, 2023.
- [32] Z. Chen *et al.*, "Ntire 2024 challenge on image super-resolution (x4): Methods and results," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2024, pp. 6108-6132.
- [33] A. Budi, "Estimating crowd: Electoral adjustment and spatial effects of turnout during covid-19 pandemic," *Statistics, Politics and Policy*, vol. 16, no. 2, pp. 147-177, 2025. <https://doi.org/10.1515/spp-2024-0061>
- [34] G. T. Abumbe and O. E. Owa, "Democracy and electoral integrity in the Nigerian 2023 general elections: An assessment," *Global Journal of Social Sciences*, vol. 23, no. 1, pp. 117-141, 2024. <https://doi.org/10.4314/gjss.v23i1.10>
- [35] T. S. Ezeudu, "Democracy in diverse landscapes: Exploring the nexus of free and fair elections, voter apathy, and civic engagement in Nigeria's geo-political zones," *ESP International Journal of Science, Humanities and Management Studies*, vol. 1, no. 3, pp. 32-48, 2023.
- [36] A. Elechi, U. Nwodom, and K. Ohazuruike, "Politicization of the security agencies and its implication on the electoral processes: 2019 general elections in perspective," *African Journal of Politics and Administrative Studies*, vol. 16, no. 2, pp. 469-493, 2023. <https://doi.org/10.4314/ajpas.v16i2.25>
- [37] C. E. Chukwudi, G. U. Osimen, P. C. Ezebuilo, and I. Adi, "The electorates and electioneering process: A global view of democratic system," *Pakistan Journal of Life & Social Sciences*, vol. 22, no. 2, pp. 1974-1986, 2024. <https://doi.org/10.57239/PJLSS-2024-22.2.00139>
- [38] S. I. Mncwango and E. F. Adanlawo, "Reducing youth unemployment through entrepreneurship education interventions: The case of South Africa," *Educational Process: International Journal*, vol. 16, p. e2025261, 2025. <https://doi.org/10.22521/edupij.2025.16.261>
- [39] Policy and Legal Advocate Centre, "Report on inclusivity in Nigeria's election PLAC annual report -2022," Policy and Legal Advocate Centre, 2022. <https://placng.org/i/documents/report-on-inclusivity-in-nigerias-elections/>
- [40] K. Pallister, *Election administration and the politics of voter access*. New York: Routledge, 2017.
- [41] O. Adu, "Exploring the influence of online political discourse on electoral violence and information operations in Nigeria's democratic landscape: A case study of nigeria's 2023 general elections," 2024.
- [42] N. Y. Nkomo and E. F. Adanlawo, "The relationship between smoking and household expenditure: A quantile regressions analysis," *E-Journal of Humanities Arts and Social Sciences*, vol. 6, no. 2, pp. 136-146, 2025. <https://doi.org/10.38159/ehass.2025628>
- [43] Election Access, "Election access: A global database on the political participation of persons with disabilities," International Foundation for Electoral Systems (IFES), 2015. <https://www.electionaccess.org/>
- [44] P. J. Ukpong and A. Mfon, "Voting system and electoral malpractices in nigeria: A case study of the fourth republic of nigeria," *Public Policy and Administration Research*. ISSN, pp. 2224-5731, 2023.
- [45] A. K. Shittu, T. I. Odeyemi, and K. A. Asiyambi, "Do disabled people also vote? Electoral frameworks and voting participation in Nigeria's 2019 elections," *Disability & Society*, vol. 39, no. 4, pp. 872-891, 2024. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09687599.2022.2090900>
- [46] International Foundation for Electoral Systems (IFES), *Inclusive Electoral Processes: A guide for electoral management bodies on promoting the participation of persons with disabilities*. Washington, D.C: IFES, 2016.
- [47] D. Mac-Ikemenjima, *Violence and youth voter turnout in Sub-Saharan Africa*. In C. Tsekeris & L. Stylianoudi (Eds.), *Youths in challenging situations: International and interdisciplinary perspectives*. Abingdon, UK: Routledge, 2018.
- [48] O. W. Adigun, "The factors determining voter turnouts in presidential elections in Nigeria: Multivariate correlation analysis of the 2019 presidential election," *Open Political Science*, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 11-33, 2020. <https://doi.org/10.1515/openps-2020-0002>
- [49] B. Sule and U. Sambo, *Presidential elections in Nigeria's fourth republic*. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan, 2024.