

VOTING PATTERN AND NIGERIA'S 2019 GENERAL ELECTIONS

Oluwashina Moruf Adebiyi

University of Ilorin, Nigeria

ABSTRACT

Corresponding author:
Oluwashina Moruf Adebiyi
adebiyi.om@unilorin.edu.ng

Received: 17 January 2020
Revised: 27 October 2020
Accepted: 18 November 2020
Published: 3 May 2021

Citation:
Adebiyi, O. M. (2021). Voting pattern in Nigeria's 2019 general election. *Humanities, Arts and Social Sciences Studies* 21(2): 209-223.

Since Nigeria returned to democratic governance in 1999, elections have been held regularly. The outcome of the 2019 general elections, however, brought about unexpected victories and losses for both candidates and political parties. Thus, the question is: what informed the pattern of voting in the 2019 general elections in Nigeria? It is on this basis that this article examined the voting pattern of the 2019 general elections in Nigeria. Through a descriptive-statistical analysis of official election results released by the Independent National Electoral Commission and a critical review and analysis of extant secondary data which includes relevant journal articles, books, reports of Civil Society Organisations and Election Observer Missions on the general elections, it is found that voting pattern in the 2019 general elections in Nigeria was largely determined by psychological factors such as ethnic considerations and party affiliation rather than by personal qualities of candidates and performance of the party in government. The paper concluded that though voting based on ethnicity or party affiliation is not necessarily irrational or harmful at least from the perception of an informed voter, there is the need to sensitise the electorate on the need to encourage voting based on accomplishments of candidates and performance of the party in government.

Keywords: Democracy; elections; political parties; voting; voters' choice

1. INTRODUCTION

Towards the end of the 20th Century, many nations, especially African countries, transited from authoritarianism characterised by military dictatorship and one-party rule to competitive democratic politics. By the end of the 1990s to early 2000, African ruling and political elites realised that the legitimate right to acquire political power ultimately resides with the electorate and can only be secured through popular votes in free, fair and credible elections (Bratton, 2013). Mindful of their adherence to the international standards for measuring the extent to which they are democratic, elections have indeed become a regular democratic practice in Africa in general and Nigeria in particular. Since the attainment of independence till date, Nigeria has organised and conducted ten general elections of which three - 1979, 1993, and 1999 general elections were conducted by various military regimes to pave way for the transition from military authoritarian regimes to competitive electoral democracy (Nkwachukwu, 2015). Before 1999 when Nigeria returned to multi-party democracy, the country had experienced prolonged military dictatorship. The country's journey to a stable democratic system of governance has been rough. Aside from the Fourth Republic which is the longest democratic dispensation in Nigeria's electoral history, the First, Second and Third Republics were cut-short by military coups and counter-coups.

Since the beginning of the Fourth Republic elections have been conducted regularly. These elections possessed varying characteristics. While it is commendable that elections have been conducted on regular basis, it is also important to admit that each of these elections has its peculiar challenges and low points. Some of these drawbacks include: electoral violence, vote buying and all sorts of electoral malfeasance such as ballot box snatching and manipulation of election results (Centre for Democracy and Development, 2019a; European Union Election Observation Mission (EUEOM), 2007; Human Rights Watch, 2011). One noticeable trend in the Nigerian electoral process is that elections conducted by civilian governments have been more problematic than those conducted by the military. Elections conducted by democratic regimes have been more problematic in terms of credibility. Such problems are derivable from faulty electoral processes and election-related violence (Agbaje and Adejumobi, 2006). Apart from the founding elections of 1999, 2011, as well as the 2015 general elections, other elections held in the Fourth Republic were tainted by grievous electoral malfeasance mainly perpetrated by the ruling party in order to sway electoral outcomes in favour of governing political party (Ibeanu, 2007). This according to Ibeanu (2007) was responsible for the overwhelming victory of the People's Democratic Party in the 2003 and the 2007 general elections in Nigeria. According to international election monitors and observers, the conduct of the 2011 and the 2015 general elections were seen as better than the previous elections, while the 2019 general elections were remarkably described as an improvement on what obtained in 2015 particularly as it relates to competitiveness. The elections, with 91 registered political parties and a large number of candidates jostling for various posts, were competitive. Political parties were able to campaign while civil society organisations fostered accountability (EUEOM, 2019).

Prior to the 2019 general elections, several attempts were made by political stakeholders and analysts to forecast and predict the outcome of the elections. While some predictions came to pass, the outcome of the polls proved other predictions and forecast wrong. Thus, the outcome of the 2019 general elections in Nigeria brought about unexpected victories and losses for both candidates and political parties. The big question then is: what informed the pattern of voting in Nigeria's 2019 general elections? To identify specific trends of voting pattern, the study used the descriptive-statistical analysis of official election results released by the country's electoral body i.e. the Independent National Electoral Commission (INEC) to derive contextual and thematic inferences. The study further derived data from secondary sources which include relevant journal articles, books and reports on Nigeria's 2019 general elections. The next section focuses on a conceptual and theoretical exposition of voting behaviour and voting pattern. This is followed by an analysis of results and voting pattern in Nigeria's 2019 general elections on the basis of geo-political zones. The following section centred on explaining the pattern of voting in Nigeria's elections in Nigeria. The last section gives the concluding remark.

2. VOTING PATTERN AND VOTING BEHAVIOUR: A LITERATURE REVIEW

Voting pattern and voting behaviour are prominent themes in the literature on political behaviour and their study has long remained one of the pivotal concerns of political scientists. The emergence and foundation of political behaviour are premised on the study of factors which determine individual and group electoral choices (Guardado and Wantchekon, 2017; Heywood, 2013; Diener, 2000). Voting pattern and voting behaviour are forms of electoral behaviour in which studying and understanding them explains and leads to the understanding of the factors which influence decisions made by the electorate during elections (Goldman, 1966). The quest to study and to understand how electorates make political choices and decisions led to the interdisciplinary synthesis between political science and psychology, hence the development of the area of study of political psychology. One of the main concerns of political psychologists is the study of what prompts voters to make more informed electoral choices (Diener, 2000). Therefore, the most important issues about an election may not necessarily be who won but maybe to investigate why people voted the way they did or what the implications of the results will be. Such posers cannot be easily answered but explanations to these can be acquired through a rigorous study and a broad understanding of voting pattern and behaviour of voters in particular elections (Alvarez, 1998).

As a concept, the voting pattern is the study of partisan preferences or choices of selected voter groups or individuals (Merrill and Grofman, 1999). The pattern of voting of such voting groups or individual is not static but is largely dynamic due to realignment. While several factors are crucial in explaining voting patterns, shared cultural attitudes towards a government, group or the society at large remain one of the conspicuous factors (Merrill and Grofman, 1999). Voting behaviour is an electoral activity. It is a combination of personal and electoral action, which manifests during an electoral process. Such include voting during elections,

involvement in electoral campaigns and participation in electoral rallies as well as support for a candidate or a political party (Bratton et al., 2012). In essence, it connotes the participation and non-participation of the electorate in an electoral process.

Studies on political and voting behaviour focus on the determinants of voter choice (Guardado and Wantchekon, 2017; Agomor and Adams, 2014; Bratton et al., 2012; Heywood, 2013; Prysby and Scavo, 1993). These studies demonstrate that electoral decisions are not just taken overnight but are influenced by certain factors which according to Heywood (2013) are conditioned by short and long term effects. The short-term effects are peculiar to specific elections and can change from one election to the other. Such effects may include the government or regime performance, the charisma of candidates and the condition of the state's economy. Instances of long-term effects may include loyalty to the party which may be stable over a long period (Heywood, 2013). It is important to note that loyalty to the party in some instances can be an element of the short-term effects. This is because in some democracies particularly the new and developing democracies of Africa, party loyalty can be withdrawn in a short time. In such democracies, personal interest rather than party loyalty comes first.

Studying American voting behaviour in Presidential elections from 1972 to 1992, Prysby and Scavo (1993) identified several attitudinal and social factors that may determine or shape the decision of voters in an election. On the one hand, they posited that individual attributes, assessment of government performance, knowledge of particular policy concerns, and party affiliation are the primary attitudinal factors that may determine the choice of the voter during elections. On the other hand, they identified ethnic group, faith, constituency and gender as the social factors that influence the voting decision. The influence these factors have on voter choices during specific elections assists in predicting electoral outcomes and enhances the comprehension of electoral dynamics (Prysby and Scavo, 1993).

In another study, which investigated the determinants of voters' behaviour in Ghana, Agomor and Adams (2014) sought to explain what makes voters in Ghana decide on the choice of candidates or party between evaluative rationales such as characteristics and accomplishments of candidates, the performance of government, and policy platforms of parties or non-evaluative factors such as political affiliation, ethnic or family ties which are largely psychological factors. Findings from the study showed that evaluative rationales such as issue-based campaign, the charisma of candidate as well as the extent to which the ruling party fulfils its campaign promises are factors which influence voters' choice in Ghanaian elections. They argued that this finding supports Nordin's (2014) claim that issue-based political campaigns afford the electorate the opportunity of knowing the better candidate among several others because such campaigns help to define issues about a state's economy and explain to the electorate which candidate is in a better position to offer implementable policies to solve the challenges facing citizens' welfare in particular and the economy in general.

One limitation of the study is that the researchers did not take into consideration the notion that the evaluative rationales which they observed to condition voters' choice and pattern in Ghanaian elections are short term effects which are peculiar to specific elections. Thus, the evaluative rationales may not account for voters' choice and pattern in subsequent elections in Ghana. In another study carried out in Bangladesh, Hossain et al. (2017) examined the voting behaviour of the people of Annadanagar Union, Pirgacha, Rangpur in local elections in Bangladesh. They investigated the factors that determine voters' decision either to vote or not to vote. Findings indicate that political ideology, interest in politics, candidate's qualification, locality, religious factor and citizen's obligation are all factors which determine the choice of voters in Annadanagar Union, Pirgacha, Rangpur local elections. Two out of the five determinants were the major determinants of the choice of voters. These are political ideology and candidate's qualification. While these factors may have long-term effects on voters' choice, the authors failed to note that such factors may not explain voters' choice or pattern in subsequent local elections in Bangladesh in the sense that other factors such as those with long term-effects may account for voters' choice in future local elections in the nation.

Scholars have also dealt with the determinants of voting pattern and behaviour in multi-ethnic and developing as well as developed democracies (Hoffman and Long, 2013; Oliver and Mendelberg, 2000; Snyder, 2000). Hoffman and Long (2013) in their study employed two broad approaches to study voting pattern and behaviour. They observed that a chunk of literature on democracy admits that ethnic affiliation is the most powerful determinant of voting pattern and choice in multi-ethnic and new democracies. They suggest that ethnicity conditions voters' choice in such democracies. For them, two approaches can suffice for this. The first approach offers that: "bonds of identity are strong enough to cause anxiety of out-group members and positive evaluations of in-group members, regardless of what those members do in office". The second approach states that "the distribution of goods, including patronage and services, in poor, multiethnic democracies primarily follows ethnic lines" (Hoffman and Long, 2013, p. 128).

From the above, Horowitz (1985), cited in Hoffman and Long (2013), noted that voters may vote for candidates from their ethnic group based on common positive evaluations of members from the same ethnic

group, thus votes are cast to show electoral support which is a derivative of a social group or ethnic affinity. Similarly, Dickinson and Scheve (2006) opined that voters may tend to vote for candidates from their ethnic group in order to secure themselves against unfavourable consequences of governance spearheaded by another ethnic group. Again, it has been observed that the choice of voters during an election can be conditioned by voters' expectation of patronage and social goods from candidates from their ethnic group (Dickinson and Scheve, 2006). This notion of ethnic voting pattern and behaviour has been found to be the basis of patronage and clientelism in African politics. Patronage and clientelism, according to scholars, are strategies employed by African politicians to distribute social and public goods and services in favour of members who share the same ethnic group with them (Hoglund, 2009; Horowitz, 2001; Bratton and van de Walle, 1994). This situation in their perception is underscored by a patron-client relationship which is otherwise called patrimonialism.

Hoglund (2009) has noted that patrimonialism and neo-patrimonialism are prevalent phenomena in the politics of many post conflict societies. Bratton and van de Walle (1994) further opined that neo-patrimonialism has turned into an important institutional character of African political systems. The patron-client relationship has been described as a phenomenon in which the patron (godfather) provides protection, services or rewards to the client (usually individuals of lower status) who become the patron's political beneficiaries and who are in most cases of the same ethnic extraction (Horowitz, 2001). While ethnicity has been seen as a chief determinant of voting pattern and voters' choice in multi-ethnic and developing democracies, attributes of and identification with political parties has been discovered as the principal conditioning factor for the choice of voters and voting pattern in developed democracies (Lachat, 2015; McClurg and Holbrook, 2009; Johnston, 2006). These studies perceive party identification as the main determinant of voters' choice in industrialised societies.

Lachat (2015) analysed the role of party identification in models of voting choice that combine 'spatial' and 'behavioural' factors. He observed that most models of party identification make the tacit hypothesis that the effects of party identification and spatial utilities are additive, that is, voters irrespective of their identification with a political party are expected to respond in the same manner to changes in the relative issue of party decisions. He suggested an alternative assumption that: "party identifiers respond less strongly to issue factors than non-identifiers" (Lachat, 2015, p. 12). This hypothesis is found to be in tandem with the notion that party identification plays a heuristic role in that it gives way to voters who identify with a political party to make choices among alternatives during voting at "cognitive cost" and "without treating all information in a systematic way" (Lachat, 2015, p. 12).

Similarly, Johnston (2006) in his study of the American case finds that party identification is a strong determinant of voting pattern and voters' choice. Findings from his study show that there is a strong correlation between partisan tendency and the choice of voters. He further argues that partisan tendency has a direct impact on values and views of voters as well as their perception of the candidate's performance in governance. In their own study, McClurg and Holbrook (2009) investigated the relationship between the intensity of Presidential campaigns and voter behaviour. Findings from their study reveal that the behaviour of voters is more predictable in states where presidential election campaigns are more intense than in states with less intense Presidential election campaigns. This, according to them, is a strong indication that the decisions made at campaigns go a long way to influence election result through how votes are configured (McClurg and Holbrook, 2009).

3. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Theoretically, the aforementioned factors which condition voting pattern and behaviour can be located within three contending and intersecting paradigms (Antwi, 2018). These are the sociological theory, the psychological theory, and the rational-choice theory of voting. The sociological theory, on the one hand, focuses on the nature of the relationship between the individual and the context of the social structure within which he or she exists (Lazarsfeld et al., 1944; Zuckerman et al., 1994). On the other hand, psychological theory places emphasis on the psychological susceptibility of an individual to explain voter choice and decision. Issues such as partisan tendencies and psychological disposition towards individuals are some of the dominant issues considered by this theoretical approach (Campbell et al., 1960). The Rational-choice theory of voting behaviour and pattern sees the individual as a rational human being who is able to make a cost-benefit analysis of his voting action (Bakalova, 2013; Downs, 1957).

The theoretical assumptions of the sociological theory of voting pattern and behaviour have their foundation in 'The People's Choice'. It is a study carried out by Lazarsfeld et al. in 1944. The initial assumption which drove the study was that the act of voting is personal and is influenced by the disposition of the voter

and how conversant he is with the sources of relevant political information including the media, peer groups and other social groups. Findings from the study proved that the influence of social groups which individuals belong to largely determined voters' choice and not the media (Antunes, 2010). In other words, findings from the study showed that social and cultural environments are the deciding factors which influence voting pattern and behaviour of a group of people. Thus, this indicates that there exists a strong correlation between an individual's social group and his electoral behaviour. This was evident in the research when close to 80 per cent of first-time voters voted in line with their parents (Lazarsfeld et al., 1944). The main thesis of the sociological theory of voting pattern and behaviour, therefore, is that an individual's electoral choice is largely conditioned by the individual's membership of a particular social group and the social position of the group within the larger society (Andersen and Yaish, 2003).

The origin of the psychological theory of voting pattern and behaviour can be traced to the research conducted by Campbell, Converse, Miller and Stokes on the United States of America's Presidential elections of 1948, 1952, and 1956. Comprehensive findings of the studies were published in the book titled 'The American Voter' (Campbell et al., 1960). The psychological theory was developed in antagonism to the sociological theory. The protagonists of the psychological theory, (i.e. Campbell, Converse, Miller and Stokes) argued that membership of a social group has a minimal direct influence on an individual or group's electoral choice. They argued that the advocates of the sociological theory only discovered the social variables which link social attributes to voters' choice but were not able to give explanations of what transpires in-between the process. In essence, the psychological theory places emphasis on "the psychological variables which intervene between the external events of the voter's world and his ultimate behaviour" (Campbell et al., 1960, pp. 85-86).

The main thesis of the psychological theory of voting pattern and behaviour is underscored by the concept of partisanship (Antunes, 2010). Partisanship is seen as a psychological identification with a political party. In other words, it is a constant and perpetual identification with a political party which is not defined in terms of registration or constant casting of votes for such political parties during elections (Antunes, 2010). It is described in terms of the sense of belonging to a political party. Sarlamanov and Jovanoski (2014) argued that political parties through their political ideology can secure members and loyalists through which citizens are given a meaningful sense of living. In essence, partisanship connotes adherence to the principles and ideology of a political party embedded in a sense of responsibility to such party which goes beyond the casting of votes for the party when the need arises (Sarlamanov and Jovanoski, 2014).

The idea of the psychological theory of voting pattern and behaviour can be explained through a metaphorical phrase known as the funnel of causality. This is referred to as the explanatory forms of correlation between factors that are used in investigating electoral behaviour (Antunes, 2010). It connotes the process by which a voter arrives at his or her choice of candidates amidst remote and immediate variables that are capable of influencing a voter's choice during an election. On the one hand, remote variables include socio-economic and historical factors as well as values, attitudes and membership of social groups. On the other hand, immediate factors include societal or public issues, the charisma of candidates, election campaign, the political and economic situation, the government actions and policies and the influence of peers (Antunes, 2010).

The analogy of the metaphor of causality shows that at the atrium of the funnel are the sociological variable which stimulates the psychological variable of partisanship or party identification which is the next elements in the process. Partisanship serves as the framework through which the potential voter assesses the electoral alternatives on offer, deliberate on issues of public concern, examine the events which occurred during election campaigns as well as discussions which emanate from interactions among voters, peers and family (Antunes, 2010). Antwi (2018) noted that partisanship or party affinity is not the only determining factor in explaining voting pattern or behaviour under this theory. He observed that issue orientation and candidate position are also significant factors which determine voters' choice. According to him, issue orientation means individuals' opinions or views on societal or public issues. It also involves voters' embrace or abhorrence for particular public policies. Candidate position refers to voters' affection for the charisma of political candidates (Antwi, 2018).

The rational choice theory of voting otherwise known as the economic theory of voting was developed by Anthony Downs in his work *An Economic Theory of Democracy* which was published in 1957. The rational choice theory of voting sees an average voter as not being influenced by partisan preferences or identification with a particular social or ethnic group in making his or her choice during an election. However, a rather rational choice theory views a voter as being a rational being who is capable of making rational thoughts and decisions as regards who to vote for and who not to vote for (Sarlamanov and Jovanoski, 2014). In this regard, it can be said that a voter is driven and motivated by his or her interest when making an electoral choice. Thus, the voter views his vote as an investment in which he or she expects a return. Within this context, the voter tries as much as possible to maximise his or her electoral gains by voting for the political party which he or she

believes will cater and provide for his or her general welfare (Sarlamonov and Jovanoski, 2014). This behaviour was explained further by Antunes (2010) when he likened the behaviour of a voter in making an electoral choice to that of a consumer who makes an economic choice in the economic market. Therefore, the rational choice theory of voting sees an average voter as a rational economic actor who behaves like a rational consumer in the economic market (Antunes, 2010). As the economic consumer aims at maximising the utility of goods even when he or she is paying less, the political voter tries as much as possible to invest his vote in a candidate who he or she believes can provide for his or her needs.

In essence, the basic assumption of the rational choice theory of voting is premised on three cardinal assumptions: first, "that all decisions related to voting made by voters and political parties are rational; second, that the democratic political system implies a level of consistency that supports predictions about the consequences of decisions made by voters and political parties and third, that the democratic system assumes a level of uncertainty, sufficiently important to allow different options" (Antunes, 2010 p. 158). Based on these assumptions it is believed that voters will vote for the political party or candidate with valuable policies and programmes that they feel will best suit their interest (Bakalova, 2013; Downs, 1957). Since their emergence as theoretical bases, the sociological, psychological and the rational choice theories have been very useful and pivotal to explaining voting pattern and behaviour. Despite their strengths, these theories have not gone without criticisms.

For instance, the sociological theory has been criticised based on the notion that it places too much emphasis on social groups as the determinant of voters' choice thereby, undermining the interest of individual voter and influence of political parties in determining voting pattern and choices. The psychological theory has been criticised based on the role of partisanship which forms the crux of the theory (Antunes, 2010). It has been argued that applying the role of partisanship to electoral systems that are not bi-partisan is almost impossible because there is the notion that the link between individuals and political parties is becoming weaker (Dalton, 2000). The rational choice theory of voting has also been described as having difficulty in explaining individual participation in collective actions of which voting at elections is a vivid example in the sense that during elections a multitude of voters is involved in the voting process (Uhlán, 1989 cited in Antunes, 2010).

Despite these criticisms, the theories serve as valuable and valid theoretical platforms for explaining voting pattern and voters' choice. Studies on sociological theory have been conducted to show a high level of applicability of the assumptions to the electoral process in Africa (Erdmann, 2007; Gyimah-Boadi, 2007; Horowitz, 1993). Horowitz (1993) has contended that there is a significant relationship between ethnicity, party system and voting behaviour, particularly in developing societies. According to him, ethnicity has a strong and direct impact on electoral behaviour most especially in ethnically divided societies. This establishes a long-term psychological belief in party loyalty attaching citizens to parties. Therefore, casting vote becomes an expression of belonging to a particular group. This implies that other social divisions are subordinate to ethnicity. Consequently, elections in this circumstance result in mere census counts (Horowitz, 1993) which indicates the numerical strength of indigenous groups. The 'funnel of causality' which forms the fulcrum of the psychological theory of explaining voting pattern and behaviour has been found worthy in conducting researches to understand how voters' sense of party loyalty becomes the filter through which they evaluate candidates and issues, which ultimately influence their voting pattern. Thus, this model explains why some voters stick to a particular voting pattern in a series of elections (Antwi, 2018).

4. NIGERIA'S 2019 GENERAL ELECTIONS: ANALYSIS OF RESULTS AND VOTING PATTERN

Nigeria's 2019 general elections took place on 23 February and 9 March 2019 for the Presidential and National Assembly elections and the gubernatorial and States Houses of Assembly elections respectively. However, due to the disruption in the use of the Smart Card Readers during voting and the failure to deploy them at the appropriate time, over-voting and widespread disruption in many polling units in 6 states during the governorship election of 9 March 2019, supplementary elections were held on 23 March 2019. The supplementary elections also included election into States Houses of Assembly (Independent National Electoral Commission, 2019a; Olorok, 2019). A candidate contesting the Presidential election must have won twenty-five percent of the total valid votes in at least two-thirds of Nigeria's thirty-six states to emerge the winner.

The elections were highly competitive, with a high number of candidates contesting for various elective offices. While a total of 91 registered political parties contested for various positions in the elections, 73 candidates slugged it out with one another in the Presidential election (European Union Election

Observation Mission, 2019). This notwithstanding, the general elections were principally between the All Progressives Congress (APC) and the People's Democratic Party (PDP). In the Presidential election, the incumbent President, Muhammadu Buhari of the APC contested against a one-time Vice-president of the country, Alhaji Atiku Abubakar of the PDP. Muhammadu Buhari, who contested and came second in Presidential elections of 2003, 2007, and 2011 and who defeated Goodluck Jonathan of the PDP in 2015 to become the first contestant to unseat an incumbent President in Nigeria, is a Fulani man from Daura, Katsina state. The former military head of state like in 2015, had as his Presidential running mate former Lagos state Attorney General and Commissioner for Justice, Professor Yemi Osinbajo. Atiku Abubakar who was his major contender was also born into a Fulani family in Jada village in Adamawa state. The state-by-state results of the Presidential election can be found in Table 1.

Table 1: State-by-State Results of the 2019 Presidential Election in Nigeria

S/N	STATE	VOTES WON BY POLITICAL PARTY		WINNER
		APC	PDP	
1.	ABIA	85,058	219,698	PDP
2.	ADAMAWA	378,076	410,266	PDP
3.	AKWA IBOM	175,429	395,832	PDP
4.	ANAMBRA	33,298	524,738	PDP
5.	BAUCHI	798,428	209,313	APC
6.	BAYELSA	118,821	197,933	PDP
7.	BENUE	347,668	355,255	PDP
8.	BORNO	836,496	71,788	APC
9.	CROSS RIVER	117,302	295,737	PDP
10.	DELTA	221,292	594,068	PDP
11.	EBONYI	90,726	258,573	PDP
12.	EDO	267,842	275,691	PDP
13.	EKITI	219,231	154,032	APC
14.	ENUGU	54,423	355,553	PDP
15.	FCT	152,224	259,997	PDP
16.	GOMBE	402,961	138,484	APC
17.	IMO	140,463	334,923	PDP
18.	JIGAWA	794,738	289,895	APC
19.	KADUNA	993,445	649,612	APC
20.	KANO	1,464,768	391,593	APC
21.	KATSINA	1,232,133	308,056	APC
22.	KEBBI	581,552	154,282	APC
23.	KOGI	285,894	218,207	APC
24.	KWARA	308,984	138,184	APC
25.	LAGOS	580,825	448,015	APC
26.	NASARAWA	289,903	283,847	APC
27.	NIGER	612,371	218,052	APC
28.	OGUN	281,762	194,655	APC
29.	ONDO	241,769	275,901	PDP
30.	OSUN	347,634	337,377	APC
31.	OYO	365,229	366,690	PDP
32.	PLATEAU	468,555	548,665	PDP
33.	RIVERS	150,710	473,971	PDP
34.	SOKOTO	490,333	361,604	APC
35.	TARABA	324,906	374,743	PDP
36.	YOBE	497,914	50,763	APC
37.	ZAMFARA	438,682	125,423	APC
TOTAL		15,191,847	11,262,978	

Source: Independent National Electoral Commission (2019b)

It can be observed from Table 1 that while the PDP won Presidential election in 18 states (including Abuja, the country's capital) the APC won in 19 states. The APC Presidential flag bearer, Muhammadu Buhari garnered 15,191,847 votes (fifteen million, one hundred and ninety-one thousand, eight hundred and forty-seven). His closest challenger, Atiku Abubakar garnered 11,262,978 votes (eleven million, two hundred and sixty-two thousand, nine hundred and seventy-eight). With these figures, the APC Presidential candidate won 55.6% of the total valid votes cast while PDP flag bearer won 41.2% of the valid votes cast. Thus, having secured more votes than his opponents and having won twenty-five per cent of the total valid votes in at least two-thirds of thirty-six states of the country, Muhammadu Buhari of the APC was declared the winner of the

Presidential election and was consequently sworn-in for a second term in office as the President and Commander-in-Chief of the Armed forces of the Federal Republic of Nigeria.

The National Assembly elections comprising the Senate and the House of Representatives elections were held concurrently with the Presidential election. Nigeria operates a bicameral legislature comprising the Senate and House of Representatives. While the Senate consists of 109 members representing the 109 Senatorial districts of the country, the House of Representatives comprises of 360 members representing the 360 Federal Constituencies in the country (Federal Government of Nigeria, 1999). Membership of both houses is based on elections held every four years to elect the 109 members of the Senate and 360 members of the House of Representatives. Table 2 shows the number of seats won by various political parties in the 2019 National Assembly elections.

Table 2: Number of Seats Won by Various Political Parties in the 2019 National Assembly Elections

Party	Senate Number of Seats (109)	House of Representatives Number of Seats (360)
APC	62	212
PDP	42	127
YPP	1	-
APGA	-	10
PRP	-	2
AA	-	2
APM	-	1
SDP	-	1
ADP	-	1
LP	-	1
ADC	-	3
TOTAL	109	360

Source: Independent National Electoral Commission (2019c)

From Table 2, it can be observed that the APC won the highest number of seats both in the Senate and House of Representatives, winning 62 and 212 seats respectively. The PDP won 42 Senate seats and 127 House of Representative seats. The Young Progressives Party (YPP) won 1 Senatorial seat. The All Progressives Grand Alliance (APGA) won 10 House of Representative seats only. The Peoples Redemption Party (PRP) and the Action Alliance (AA) won 2 House of Representative seats each. The African Democratic Congress (ADC) won 3 House of Representative seats while the Allied Peoples Movement (APM), Social Democratic Party (SDP), Action Democratic Party (ADP) and Labour Party (LP) parties won 1 House of Representative seat each. It is important to note that the APC which had earlier won 212 seats in the House of Representatives and won 65 seats in the Senate, lost 3 Senatorial seats and 5 House of Representative seats to the opposition PDP in Zamfara state. This came as fallout of a Supreme Court Judgement delivered on 24 May 2019 in respect of the case relating to the issue of the validity of the All Progressives Congress' primary elections that produced the candidates fielded by the party in the general elections. The judgement declared all APC votes in Zamfara state null and void and ruled that candidates with the second highest number of votes be declared winners.

On 9 March 2019, elections were held to fill governorship positions and States Houses of Assembly seats. Elections for governorship positions were held in 29 of the 36 states which make up the Federation. The remaining seven states of Anambra, Bayelsa, Edo, Ekiti, Kogi, Ondo and Osun conduct off-cycle gubernatorial elections. Results of the elections show that the APC won governorship seats in 13 states while PDP won in 9 states. Governorship elections were declared inconclusive in 6 states while governorship election was suspended in Rivers state (European Union Election Observation Mission, 2019). The states won by the two major political parties can be seen in Table 3.

Table 3: States Won by the Two Major Political Parties in the 2019 Gubernatorial Election

S/N	Political Parties	Number of States Won	States Won
1.	APC	13	Borno, Gombe, Jigawa, Kaduna, Katsina, Kebbi, Kwara, Lagos, Nassarawa, Niger, Ogun, Yobe, Zamfara
2.	PDP	9	Akwa Ibom, Cross River, Ebonyi, Enugu, Taraba, Delta, Imo, Abia, Oyo

Source: Author's compilation from Independent National Electoral Commission (2019d)

With the conduct of off-cycle gubernatorial elections in 7 earlier mentioned states and the eventual conclusion of gubernatorial elections in states where elections were initially declared inconclusive, the number

of states controlled by the APC and the PDP increased. It is important to note that, although, the APC was initially declared winner in Bayelsa state, a Supreme Court judgement of 14 February 2020 returned the state to the PDP due to the inconsistencies in the name of the APC's gubernatorial running mate. While Kogi state remains under the control of the APC, gubernatorial elections are yet to be conducted in the other states of Edo, Ekiti, Ondo and Osun. The party also won 2 out of the states where elections were declared inconclusive: Kano and Plateau states. Rivers state is controlled by the PDP while Anambra State where the gubernatorial election held in 2017 is controlled by the All Progressives Grand Alliance (APGA). The party won 4 states out of the states with the inconclusive election. These are: Sokoto, Bauchi, Benue and Adamawa. Thus, the number of states controlled by the APC is 19, that of the PDP is 16 and APGA controls 1 state.

A critical analysis of the results of the general elections reveals the trend of the voting pattern in each of the elections. In the Presidential election, the results show a voting pattern of bloc votes for each of the leading candidates in specific geo-political zones of the country. While the APC Presidential candidate, Muhammadu Buhari got the bulk of his votes from the North-West and North-East geopolitical zones, the PDP candidate secured most of his votes from the South-East and South-South geo-political zones. This is not to say that both candidates did not get considerable votes in various states of the remaining geo-political zones. The APC Presidential candidate got landslide victories in all the states in the North-West geo-political zone of the country. These states comprise Sokoto, Zamfara, Kebbi, Katsina, Kano, Jigawa and Kaduna. He also got landslide victories in four states of the North-East geo-political zone. These states are Bauchi, Gombe, Borno and Yobe states. The APC lost in Adamawa and Taraba with slim margins.

In the South-East geo-political zone there was a voting pattern of bloc vote for the PDP Presidential candidate, Alhaji Atiku Abubakar. The PDP Presidential candidate won all the states in the South-East geo-political zone. These states are Abia, Anambra, Ebonyi, Enugu and Imo. It is important to note that while the PDP candidate won all the states in the South-East zone, the APC candidate got considerable votes in the zone particularly in Imo and Ebonyi states as compared to the number of votes polled by the PDP in the North-west region where the APC candidate also won all the states. Results of the Presidential election in the North-Central, South-West and South-South geo-political zones indicate that the states in these geo-political zones were more or less battleground states. Battleground states in this regard connote states where neither the APC candidate nor the PDP candidate can lay claim to total or landslide victory. The pattern of voting in the geo-political zones reveals that the two leading political parties slugged it out in the zones. Even though the APC got landslide victories in few states it did not get total control of the states in the zones. While the APC won with wide margins in Kwara and Niger in the North-Central Zone, the PDP won the presidential election with slim margin in Plateau and Benue states. The APC also won with a slim margin in Kogi and Nassarawa states.

In the South-West geo-political zone, the APC won in Lagos, Osun, and Ogun states though with slim margins, while the PDP won the Presidential election in Oyo and Ondo states with a margin of less than 1000 and 30 000 votes respectively. In the South-South region the PDP won all the states. This is not to say that the APC did not get considerable votes in some states. For instance, the PDP could only boast of landslide victories in Rivers and Delta states where the APC could only manage to win approximately 30% of the total valid votes cast. In the Presidential election in Bayelsa, Edo and Cross River states the APC slugged it out with the PDP winning more than 40% of the total valid votes cast. The voting pattern obtained in the National Assembly elections followed the trend of the voting pattern in the Presidential election particularly in the North-West, North-East, North-Central and South-West geo-political zones. The APC claimed overwhelming victories in the Senatorial election in North-West and North-East zones. Out of the available 21 senatorial seats in the North-West zone, the APC won 20 seats leaving the PDP with just 1 seat. Following the Supreme Court judgment nullifying all APC votes in the Gubernatorial, National Assembly and State House of Assembly elections in Zamfara State, the APC lost all National Assembly seats to the PDP. The nullification of the APC votes affected only Zamfara state and not the entire North West. Based on this, the number of seats won by the APC in the Senatorial election was reduced to 17 while that of PDP increased to 4. In the North-East zone, while the APC won 14 Senatorial seats out of the available 18 seats the PDP won 4 seats. The APC also won more than 80% of the House of Representatives seats in the two geo-political zones.

Just like in the North-West and North-East geo-political zones, the APC also claimed overwhelming victories in the Senatorial and House of Assembly elections in the North-Central and South-West geo-political zones. In the North-Central zone, while the APC won 11 out of the available 16 Senatorial seats the PDP won 5. In the South-West zone, out of the 18 available Senatorial seats, the APC won 14 while the PDP won 4. The APC also won more than 70% of the House of Representatives seats in the two geo-political zones. Like in the Presidential election, the PDP had landslide victories in the Senatorial and House of Representatives election in the South-East and South-South geo-political zones. In the South-East zone, the PDP won 11 out of the 15 Senatorial seats in the zone leaving the APC and YPD (Young Democratic Party) with 3 seats and 1 seat respectively. The party also held sway in the House of Representatives election winning more than 80% of the

available seats in the zone. In the South-South zone, the PDP won 15 out of the 18 available Senatorial seats leaving the APC with 3 seats. The PDP also clinched more than 80% of the available House of Representatives seats in the geo-political zone.

The pattern of voting in the gubernatorial elections shows a similar trend to that of the Presidential and National Assembly elections, except for some few isolated cases. In the North-West where the APC held sway in the Presidential and National Assembly elections, the APC won all the gubernatorial seats in the zone. The party lost Zamfara state to the PDP through the Supreme Court judgment. In the North-East geo-political zone, the APC won gubernatorial elections in all states in which it won Presidential election. This is with the exception of Bauchi state where it lost in the gubernatorial election. The PDP also maintained its superiority in Adamawa and Taraba states winning the two states in the gubernatorial and presidential elections.

In the North-Central geo-political zone, the APC won gubernatorial elections in states where it won Presidential election. These include Kwara, Niger, Kogi and Nasarawa states. It also won the gubernatorial election in Plateau state which it lost in the Presidential election. The voting pattern in the South-West geo-political zone reflects that of the Presidential election. It is important to note that governorship elections were held in 3 states only, namely: Lagos, Oyo and Ogun. The APC won gubernatorial elections in Lagos and Ogun while the PDP won in Oyo state just as each party did in the Presidential election. In the South-East and South-South geo-political zone, the PDP maintained its superiority over the APC winning all gubernatorial elections in all the states with the exception of Anambra which is controlled by APGA and Imo state controlled by the APC. In Imo state where the APC had been the ruling party since the 2015 General elections, the PDP had initially won the 2019 governorship elections. However, on 14 January 2020, a Supreme Court Judgement returned the state to the APC. The judgement was sustained by the Supreme Court on 3 March, 2020 when its review panel sustained the earlier decision on a vote of 6:1 affirming that the APC truly won the state's gubernatorial election. Edo state which is an off-cycle state is also controlled by the APC.

5. EXPLAINING THE VOTING PATTERN IN NIGERIA'S 2019 GENERAL ELECTIONS

The voting pattern in Nigeria's 2019 general elections shows bloc vote for each party in specific geo-political zones of the country, particularly the North-West and South-East zones for the APC and the PDP respectively. Though the APC recorded strong dominance in the North-East, North-West, North-Central and South-West geo-political zones in the Presidential, gubernatorial and National Assembly elections, the PDP in these zones could not be described as an underdog. The dominance of each candidate and political party in specific geo-political zones and they are not too impressive performances in the other zones can be explained within the context of: the ethnic identity of the candidates, the personality of contestants, political party affiliation, accomplishments of candidates, performance of government and ability of party in government to formulate and implement effective public policies.

Ethnic tie as a determinant of voting pattern and voters' choice has been well developed by the proponents of the sociological theory of the voting pattern and behaviour (Lazarsfeld et al., 1944). Voting pattern in this perspective is largely determined by identity to social and cultural groups. Social and cultural groups within this context are defined as natural membership of a particular group whose members share a common ancestral origin and ways of life. Such sense of belonging to the social group conditions individuals of the same ethnic group to vote for candidates from their ethnic zone in national elections. In relation to the 2019 Presidential election, the two main contestants drew support from their ethnic bases. The APC Presidential candidate, Muhammadu Buhari is of the Fulani ethnic extraction in the Northern part of Nigeria. He hails from Daura, Katsina State in the North-West geo-political zone of the country. The PDP Presidential candidate, Atiku Abubakar like Muhammadu Buhari is also of the Fulani ethnic extraction but unlike Buhari hails from Jada Village in Adamawa State in the North-East geo-political zone.

Belonging to the dominant ethnic group in the Northern part of the country, Muhammadu Buhari's popularity coupled with his public perception as being honest and straightforward gave him the nickname – "Mai Gaskiya" (one who always speaks the truth) among the Northerners (Hassan, 2018). He enjoyed genuine and spontaneous grassroots support in the Northern parts of the country particularly among the northern people of the Fulani ethnic origin. Having taken part in three previous Presidential contests (2003, 2007 and 2011) and lost before he won in 2015, Muhammadu Buhari has never lost a presidential contest in the North-West geo-political zone of the country. Even though he lost the nation-wide Presidential election of 2011, his

defunct political party, the Congress for Progressive Change (CPC) managed to win the gubernatorial election in Nasarawa state. Since the country's return to electoral democracy in 1999, the North-West geo-political zone which is the most populous zone in the country has remained a stronghold for Muhammadu Buhari (Hassan, 2018).

With the dominance of Buhari in his ethnic base in the North-West geo-political zone, it would ordinarily be expected that his closest opponent in the Presidential contest, Atiku Abubakar would excel in the Presidential election and his party, the PDP will dominate the gubernatorial and National Assembly elections in North-East zone of the country. This was not the case. Atiku and PDP's inability to dominate the general elections in the North-East zone just as Buhari did in the North-West may not be unconnected with the notion that Atiku Abubakar is not well-liked in his base in the North East. In essence, he does not enjoy the kind of adoration and grassroots support which Buhari enjoys in his base. In addition to this, Atiku and the PDP hinged their campaign promises on restructuring the country, a phenomenon which was not acceptable to the Northern elite. Above all, even in his base in the North-East zone, Atiku was seen as a person whose track record in governance is soiled by a litany of allegations of corruption (Premium Times, 2018). Therefore, the people of the North-East zone were left with two personalities to choose from in the Presidential election. They were interested in voting a perceived incorruptible charismatic leader whose track record in governance was based on transparency and honesty, these they saw in Muhammadu Buhari.

Voting pattern based on ethnicity and social cleavage is not peculiar to Nigeria. South Africa, like Nigeria is an ethnically segmented country (Horowitz, 1991) and thus, provides a valuable example of a state characterised by ethnic cleavage voting pattern (Machaya, 2017; Maloka, 2001). This claim was evident in the 1994 elections in which the African National Congress (ANC) claimed overwhelming victory simply due to the support it got from black South Africans (McLaughlin, 2007). This scenario revealed the nature of elections in South Africa as a process in which voters during elections take decisions as a group rather than as individuals. Thus, voting pattern in South Africa, especially among the blacks is construed as a product of group decisions rather than an individual rational decision (Eldridge and Seeking, 1996). Ethnic identity influences electoral decisions in South Africa in contemporary times (Lapegna, 2020). While it is undeniable that other factors do account for electoral choice, ethnic and cleavage identity plays a prominent role in South Africa's electoral process (Piombo, 2005).

Evidence of ethnic cleavage as a potent influence of voters' choice was further exemplified in the failed attempt to remove former President of South Africa, Jacob Zuma through a vote of no confidence. Jacob Zuma from the ANC and who is of the Zulu ethnic origin (the largest ethnic group in South Africa) had all odds stacked against him. He was accused of bad governance and sacking of his Minister of Finance who was judgmental of corruption in government. With these critical issues, it was almost certain that Zuma would be relieved of his Presidency through a vote of no confidence more so when his party members opted for a secret ballot - a request which indicated their dislike for Zuma's leadership style (Machaya, 2017). However, the ANC having adequate knowledge of the numerical strength of the Zulu tribe feared losing support from the ethnic group and thus had to pass a vote of confidence on Jacob Zuma despite the allegations against him (Lapegna, 2020).

The relative success recorded by the APC and President Buhari in the Presidential, gubernatorial and National Assembly elections in the North-Central and the South-West geo-political zones can be attributed to the personality and charisma of Muhammadu Buhari. Personality and charisma of candidates have been found to be a potent determinant of voting pattern and behaviour. Proponents of the psychological theory of voting pattern and behaviour view charisma and personality of contestants in an election as immediate factors that can influence the decision of voters during an election (Antunes, 2010). Pertaining to the 2019 general elections in the North-Central and the South-West geo-political zones, Muhammadu Buhari was perceived as a charismatic leader who is religious and incorruptible while Atiku Abubakar was seen as a corrupt and elite-oriented individual who does not have the interest of the masses at heart. Atiku confirmed this shortly before the Presidential election when he affirmed his commitment to selling Nigeria's main economic asset, the Nigerian National Petroleum Cooperation (NNPC) and enrich his friends when he becomes the President of Nigeria (P.M. Express, 2019).

While Atiku and PDP's electoral exploits in the Northern and South-West zones were not so promising, the pattern of voting in the South-East and South-South geo-political zones shows the dominance of the PDP in the two zones. The dominance and huge success recorded by the party in the general elections can be related to the affiliation and identification of the two zones with the PDP. In other words, there is partisan identification

with the PDP in South-East and South-South geo-political zones. Partisanship as a determinant of voters' choice underscores the psychological theory of voting pattern and behaviour. Partisanship explains the long-lasting affiliation and identification with a political party which is not only explainable in terms of casting of votes or being a registered member of a party but also defined in terms of a strong sense of individual partisanship (Sarlamonov and Jovanoski, 2014; Antunes, 2010). Since 1999 the PDP has been a dominant party in the South-East and South-South geo-political zones. Hence during elections, the two regions have always remained strongholds of the PDP.

The historical antecedents of Muhammadu Buhari and Atiku Abubakar in governance were also determining factors in the general elections. In the South-South and South-East geo-political zones it was believed, arguably though, that Buhari has a track record of human rights abuses when he was the military Head of State between 1983 and 1985. Therefore, Atiku was perceived as a better option to Buhari. To the other zones, it was believed that during the military regime of General Buhari there was a restoration of public accountability and the fight against corruption. To many, his "War Against Indiscipline" restored public order and discipline among public officers (Global Security Organisation, 2017). The performance of Muhammadu Buhari from 2015 to 2019 was also a point of intense debate. While some believe that he has not done enough to deserve re-election others are of the opinion that he has fulfilled most of his campaign promises. While the people of the Northern zones are of the opinion that Buhari has been able to record considerable success in the fight against the deadly Boko Haram sects and the scourge of corruption the people of the South-South and the South-East zones believed that the Buhari administration has not done much in terms of the security situation of the country and that his fight against corruption is selective and is politically motivated (Centre for Democracy and Development, 2019b).

6. CONCLUSION

The 2019 general elections were the sixth set of elections to be conducted since Nigeria returned to democratic governance in 1999. While these elections have their peculiar challenges and low points, that Nigeria has undergone 20 years of uninterrupted democratic rule with sustained periodic elections is commendable. The 2019 general elections were not perfect in all ramifications as there were operational shortcomings, electoral security challenges and low turnout. On the positive side, the elections were competitive, parties were able to campaign and civil society enhanced accountability (European Union Election Observation Mission, 2019). The analysis of results of the 2019 general elections indicate a voting pattern of bloc votes for each of the two leading candidates and political parties in particular geo-political zones. Rather than being driven by factors such as accomplishments of candidates, the performance of government and the ability of the party in government to formulate and implement effective public policies, voting pattern in Nigeria, as revealed by the results of the 2019 general elections, is largely influenced by psychological factors which mainly include ethnic and political party affiliation. Even though voting on the basis of ethnicity or party affiliation is not necessarily irrational or harmful, at least from the perception of an informed voter, there is the need to sensitise the electorate on the need to encourage voting based on accomplishments of candidates and performance of the party in government. While ethnic voting may promote ethnic politics, it may not be injurious to national politics at all times as it may aim to secure representation for specific groups. On the other hand, however, voting patterns based on ethnic considerations may be detrimental to the nation's democracy and harmonious co-existence. The case of South Africa in which Jacob Zuma, the former President, in the face of bad leadership and corruption allegations, escaped being removed through a vote of no confidence because he belongs to the largest ethnic group in South Africa shows how dangerous such could be. To stem this, there is the need for rigorous sensitisation of the electorate on the ills of voting for candidates in elections based on psychological factors.

REFERENCES

- Agbaje, A. and Adejumobi, S. (2006). Do votes count? the travails of electoral politics in Nigeria. *Africa Development* 31(3): 25-44.
- Agomor, K. and Adams, S. (2014). Determinants of voting behaviour in Ghana. Paper presented at *Global Awareness Society International - 23rd Annual Conference*. Montego Bay, Jamaica. May 23-27. [Online URL: http://orgs.bloomu.edu/GASI/2014_Proceedings_pdfs/AgomoGASI%2012%20Conference%20%20paper%2029.pdf] accessed on November 14, 2019.
- Alvarez, R. M. (1998). *Information and Elections*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

- Andersen, R. and Yaish, M. (2003). Social cleavages, electoral reform and party choice: Israel's natural experiment. *Electoral Studies* 22(3): 399-423.
- Antunes, R. J. (2010). Theoretical models of voting behaviour. *Exedra* 4: 145-170.
- Antwi, R. B. (2018). *How do voters decide? A study of the determinants of voting behaviour in Ghana* (Master's Thesis). Wright State University, United States of America.
- Bakalova, M. (2013). An inquiry into the rationale behind violent ethnic conflicts: A rational choice perspective. *Economic Alternatives* 26(4): 103-115.
- Bratton, M. and van de Walle, N. (1994). Neopatrimonial regimes and political transitions in Africa. *World Politics* 46(4): 453-489.
- Bratton, M. (2013). Voting and democratic citizenship in Africa: An overview. In *Voting and Democratic Citizenship in Africa*, edited by M. Bratton, pp. 1-16. Boulder: Lynne Rienner Publishers.
- Bratton, M., Bhavnani, R. and Chen, T. H. (2012). Voting intentions in Africa: Ethnic, Economic or partisan? *Commonwealth & Comparative Politics* 50(1): 27-52.
- Campbell, A., Converse, P. E., Miller, W. E. and Stokes, D. (1960). *The American Voter*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Centre for Democracy and Development. (2019a). *Nigeria Electoral Trends*. [Online URL: <https://www.cddwestafrica.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/02/Nigeria-Elrctoral-Trends.pdf>] accessed on April 1, 2020.
- Centre for Democracy and Development. (2019b). *Buharimeter 2019 Survey Report*. [<https://www.cddwestafrica.org/buharimeter-2019-survey-report/>] accessed on April 1, 2020.
- Dalton, R. J. (2000). The decline of party identifications. In *Parties Without Partisans: Political Change in Advanced Industrial Democracies*, edited by R. J. Dalton and M. P. Wattenberg, pp. 19-36. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Dickinson, E. and Scheve, K. (2006). Social identity, political speech, and electoral competition. *Journal of Theoretical Politics* 18(1): 5-39.
- Diener, E. (2000). Subjective well-being: The science of happiness and a proposal for a national index. *American Psychologist* 55(1): 34-43.
- Downs, A. (1957). An economic theory of political action in a democracy. *Journal of Political Economy* 65(2): 135-150.
- Eldridge, M. and Seeking, J. (1996). Mandela's lost province: The African National Congress and the Western Cape electorate in the 1994 South African elections. *Journal of South African Studies* 22(4): 517-540.
- Erdmann, G. (2007). Ethnicity, voter alignment and political party affiliation - An African case: Zambia. *GIGA Working Paper No. 45*. Hamburg: German Institute of Global and Area Studies.
- European Union Election Observation Mission. (2007). *Nigeria Final Report Gubernatorial and State Houses of Assembly Elections 14 April 2007 and Presidential and National Assembly Elections*. [Online URL: http://www.eods.eu/library/FR%20NIGERIA%202007_en.pdf] accessed on April 1, 2020.
- European Union Election Observation Mission. (2015). *More efficient polling although increased incidents of violence and interference*. [Online URL: http://www.eods.eu/library/130415-nigeria-ps2_en.pdf] accessed June 15, 2015.
- European Union Election Observation Mission. (2019). *Nigeria 2019 Final Report: General elections 23 February, 9 and 23 March 2019*. [Online URL: https://www.ecoi.net/en/file/local/2020744/nigeria_2019_eu_eom_final_report-web.pdf] accessed on November 3, 2019.
- Federal Government of Nigeria. (1999). *Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria 1999*. Abuja: Federal Government Press.
- Global Security Organisation. (2017). *Muhammadu Buhari*. [Online URL: <https://www.globalsecurity.org/military/world/nigeria/muhammadu-buhari.htm>] assessed December 22, 2019.
- Goldman, S. (1966). Voting behaviour on the United States Courts of Appeals, 1961-1964. *American Political Science Review* 60(2): 374-383.
- Guardado, J. and Wantchekon, L. (2017). Do electoral handouts affect voting behaviour? [Online URL: https://afrobarometer.org/sites/default/files/publications/Working%20papers/afropaperno171_elctoral_handouts_and_voting_behavior.pdf] accessed on April 1, 2020.
- Gyimah-Boadi, E. (2007). Political parties, elections and patronage: Random thoughts on neo-patrimonialism and African democratization. In *Votes, Money and Violence Political Parties and Elections in Sub-Saharan Africa*, edited by M. Basedau, G. Erdmann and A. Mehler, pp. 21-33. South Africa: University of KwaZulu-Natal press.

- Hassan, I. (2018). *Nigeria 2019: The Issues and Electoral Maths that will Decide the Race*. [Online URL: <https://africanarguments.org/2018/11/01/nigeria-2019-elections-issues-electoral-maths/>] accessed on November 23, 2018.
- Heywood, A. (2013). *Politics*. 4th ed. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Hoffman, B. D. and Long, J. D. (2013). Parties, ethnicity, and voting in African elections. *Comparative Politics* 45(2): 127-146.
- Höglund, K., Jarstad, A. K. and Kovacs, M. S. (2009). The predicament of elections in war-torn societies. *Democratization* 16(3): 530-557.
- Horowitz, D. L. (1991). *A Democratic South Africa?: Constitutional Engineering in a Divided Society*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Horowitz, D. L. (1993). The challenge of ethnic conflict: Democracy in divided societies. *Journal of Democracy* 4(4): 18-38.
- Horowitz, D. L. (2001). *The Deadly Ethnic Riot*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Hossain, K. R., Aktar M. and Islam, S. (2017). People's voting behavior in local election: A study of Annadanagar Union Parishad, Pirgachha, Rangpur. *IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Science* 22(3): 1-14.
- Human Rights Watch. (2011). *Nigeria: Post-Election Violence Killed 800*. [Online URL: <https://www.hrw.org/news/2011/05/16/nigeria-post-election-violence-killed-800>] accessed on April 1, 2020.
- Ibeanu, O. (2007). Simulating landslides: Primitive accumulation of votes and the popular mandate in Nigeria. In *Perspectives on the 2003 Elections in Nigeria*, edited by I. O. Albert, D. Marco and V. Adetula, pp. 49-63. Abuja: IDASA-Nigeria.
- Independent National Electoral Commission. (2019a). *2019 Signed Time Table*. [Online URL: <https://www.inecnigeria.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/02/2019-signed-Timetable.-09.01.20180001.pdf>] accessed April 24, 2019.
- Independent National Electoral Commission. (2019b). *2019 Presidential Election Results*. [Online URL: <https://www.inecnigeria.org/2019-presidential-election-results/>] accessed November 11, 2019.
- Independent National Electoral Commission. (2019c). *2019 Senatorial District Election Results*. [Online URL: <https://www.inecnigeria.org/2019-senatorial-district-elections-result/>] accessed November 1, 2019.
- Independent National Electoral Commission. (2019d). *2019 Governorship Election Results*. [Online URL: <https://www.inecnigeria.org/2019-governorship-election-results/>] accessed November 12, 2019.
- Johnston R. (2006). Party identification: Unmoved mover or sum of preferences? *Annual Review of Political Science* 9: 329-351.
- Lachat, R. (2015). The role of party identification in spatial models of voting choice. *Political Science Research and Methods* 3(3): 641-658.
- Lapegna, A. (2020). *Taking Stock of South Africa's Deep Social and Political Cleavages*. [Online URL: <https://aspeniaonline.it/taking-stock-of-south-africas-deep-social-and-political-cleavages/>] accessed on March 25, 2020.
- Lazarsfeld, P. F., Berelson, B. and Gaudet, H. (1944). *The People's Choice: How the Voter Makes Up His Mind in a Presidential Campaign*. New York: Duell, Sloan and Pearce.
- Machaya, S. (2017). *The Reality of Ethnic Cleavages in South African Politics*. [Online URL: <https://www.africanpoliticsandpolicy.com/?p=7980>] accessed on March 25, 2020.
- Maloka, E. (2001). "White" political parties and democratic consolidation in South Africa. *Democratization* 8(1): 227-236.
- McClurg, S. D. and Holbrook, T. M. (2009). Living in a battleground: Presidential campaigns and fundamental predictors of vote choice. *Political Research Quarterly* 62(3): 495-506.
- McLaughlin, E. S. (2007). Beyond the racial censuses: the political salience of ethnolinguistic cleavages in South Africa. *Comparative Political Studies* 40(5): 435-456.
- Merrill, S. and Grofman, B. (1999). *A Unified Theory of Voting: Directional and Proximity Spatial Models*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Nkwachukwu, O. (2015). The 2015 Nigerian general elections. *Africa Spectrum* 50(2): 73-85.
- Nordin, M. (2014). Do voters vote in line with their policy preferences?—The role of information. *CESifo Economic Studies* 60(4): 687-721.
- Oliver, J. E. and Mendelberg, T. (2000). Reconsidering the environmental determinants of white racial attitudes. *American Journal of Political Science* 44(3): 574-589.

- Olorok, F. (2019). *Supplementary Elections to Hold in Six States on March 23—INEC*. [Online URL: <https://punchng.com/supplementary-elections-to-hold-in-six-states-on-march-23-inec/>] accessed on November 3, 2019.
- P.M. Express. (2019). *As President, I'll Sell NNPC, Enrich My Friends –Atiku*. [Online URL: <http://pmexpressng.com/president-ill-sell-nnpc-enrich-friends-atiku/>] accessed November 15, 2019.
- Piombo, J. (2005). Political parties, social demographics and the decline of ethnic mobilization in South Africa, 1994-99. *Party Politics* 11(4): 447-470.
- Premium Times. (2018). *The 2019 Presidential Election: Predicting the Outcome, by Jibrin Ibrahim*. [Online URL: <https://opinion.premiumtimesng.com/2018/12/31/the-2019-presidential-election-predicting-the-outcome-by-jibrin-ibrahim/>] accessed on November 11, 2019.
- Prysby, C. and Scavo, C. (1993). *SETUPS: Voting Behavior: The 1992 Election*. Ann Arbor, MI: Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research.
- Sarlamano, K. and Jovanoski, A. (2014). Models of voting. *Journal of Arts, Science & Commerce* 5(1): 16-24.
- Snyder, J. L. (2000). *From Voting to Violence: Democratization and Nationalist Conflict*. New York: W.W Norton & Company.
- Zuckerman, A. S., Valentino, N. A. and Zuckerman, E. W. (1994). A structural theory of vote choice: Social and political networks and electoral flows in Britain and the United States. *Journal of Politics* 56(4): 1008-1033.