

Does the Use of IREV Guarantee an Acceptable Election's Outcome? Evidence from Nigerian 2023 Presidential Election

¹Cinjel, Nandes Dickson **A b s t r a c t**

& ²Bur, Andeline

Doosuur

^{1&2}Department of Public
Administration,
Faculty of Management
Sciences, Federal University
Wukari

Article DOI:

10.48028/iiprds/ijsrhlir.v8.i1.07

Keywords:

IREV Portal, INEC,
Outcome,
Acceptance & 2023
Presidential Election

IREV is an acronym for INEC Result Viewing Portal and it is a digitalized technology that was introduced by INEC to help in the collation, storage and displaying of results uploaded from polling units. The primary goal for launching the technology is to promote transparency in the electoral process in the country. The basis for the introduction of the technology, its usage and legitimacy were defined in the Nigerian Electoral Act of 2022. The study seeks to examine IREV Portal and its impact on the outcome of the Presidential Election of 2023. Mixed method research design was used. *Krejcie* and *Morgan* table was used to determine the sample size of the study. *Bourley Proportional Formula* was used to distribute the sample to their cluster. Data of the study were sourced from both primary and secondary source. Questionnaire and interview were the major instruments utilized for the study. The study found that the application of IREV Portal in the Presidential Election of 2023 was not effective. The study also uncovers that the use of IREV does not guarantee an acceptable election's outcome in the 2023 National presidential election in Nigeria. The study recommends that the technology should be used at the required time (during), the need to reconcile the “must” in the Electoral Ac and judicial pronouncement, among others.

Corresponding Author:

Cinjel, Nandes Dickson

Background to the Study

Nigeria is the largest democratic society in Africa; at the moment, it has witnessed 25 years of democratic governance without any military interruption. There were several reforms to strengthen the electoral process in the country. One of the notable reforms was the amendment of the Electoral Act of 2022 which give room for the usage of IREV portal and other digitalized technologies (Cinjel & Danjuma, 2018). IREV is an acronym for INEC Result view portal; it was developed to provide real time access to election results directly from the polling units. The IREV presents images of election from each polling unit including the number of votes cast for each candidate, the overall vote and the percentages (Oni, 2014). The Chief goal for the introduction of IREV was to ensure that results that were collated from the polling units (PUs) are transmitted to the INEC portal before the actual arrival of the prints from the PUs. Apart from this, it will ensure that there is transparency in the electoral process (Sunday, 2014).

The released election guideline of 2023 in paragraph 18 and 38 states that:

There shall be mandatory use of the Bimodal Voter Accreditation system (BVAS) and the election transmission of results and upload of results to the IREV portal which is expected to aid in lowering the prevalence of electoral fraud.

Also, section 60 (3& 5) of the Electoral Act of 2022 states that the presiding officer shall transfer the results including total number of accredited voters and the results of the ballot in a manner as prescribed by the commission. The introduction of IREV portal in 2023 election was to enhance the legitimacy of the election and further improve the shortcomings of preceding digital tools that were used in the previous elections. There was so much expectation from the public that the results obtained from PUs would be transmitted in the IREV Portal but during the collation at the National Centre of Collation, it was only the papers work that were considered. This made a lot of persons to toehold the perception that the results were tampered. There were several skirmish by several parties, questioning why the handwritten results were not compared with the one in the IREV as it was stated in the Act. Some of the political party's walkout of the scene and it was used as a point for litigation by severed parties at the court (Okeye, 2024).

The pronouncement of section 38 that provides which results must be transmitted from PUs to IREV Portal gave the public the assurance that the 2023 election will be transparent. Sumptuous of funds were expended to ensure that the IREV portal were functional during the election. When it should be used and its place on the validity of the outcome of the election was statutorily define. This justified why some parties boycotted the collation process and some uses it as a point for litigation (Oladeji & Chidiebere, 2023).

This study intends to find out whether the usage of IREV portal has guaranteed acceptable election result in the 2023 election. It is in line with this conjecture, the following questions were posited to guide the study.

- (i) How effective is IREV in the transmission of 2023 Presidential Election in Nigeria

- (ii) To what degree has the IREV portal guaranteed an acceptable election in the 2023 Presidential Election

The core objective of the study is to assess whether the use of IREV portal has guaranteed an acceptance election outcome in the 2023 President Election. Specifically, the study intends to:

- (a) Examine how effective was IREV portal in the transmission of 2023 Presidential Election
(b) Determine how IREV portal has guarantee an acceptance election in the 2023 Presidential Election

Hypothetically, the study states that:

H₀₁: The use of IREV portal was not effective in the transmission of 2023 Presidential Election in Nigeria

H₀₂: The use of IREV portal has not guaranteed an acceptable outcome in the 2023 Presidential Election in Nigeria

IREV and National Presidential Election of 2023 in Nigeria

The introduction of IREV portal in Nigerian Election was seen as a good development that would have helped to manage situation were electoral results are being tampered. Many scholars and spectators see it as an answered prayer; a transition that would help to usher transparency in electoral process (Adeyemo, 2023). It was the Electoral Act of 2022 that made provision for the usage of the IREV Portal. Section 60 and paragraph 18 and 38 of the Electoral Act of 2022 and guideline of the 2023 election provide that it must be used (Mandatory); but how and when it should be used were not statutorily defined. These were some of the things that brought argument at the Nation Collation Centre; and several parties led by the PDP challenges why the IREV Portal was not use as it was stated in the Act.

It was a bond of contention; a lot of parties uses it as a point for litigation. It was what LP, PDP, among others uses to challenge the credibility of the election at the Supreme Court. During the legal tussle at the Supreme Court, the seven judges and the lead judge in person of justice Okoro discredit the place of IREV. He categorically stated that the use of IREV was to strengthen the process and the failure to use it does not in any way means that the process is faulty and should be invalidated.

Chukwumah (2023) opined that the public and many of the political parties in the country felt betrayed. He went further to say that:

Most of us thought that this IREV will promote transparency and reduce electoral fraud that were done in the past. We were carried by section 60 of the Electoral Act and guideline of 2023 which clearly state that it is mandatory. The BVAS in most of the PUs were effective; what we do not understand is why it was transmitted at the IREV portal as it was stated in the Act.

In the same direction Yusuf (2023) states that the non-usage and display of the electoral result has created a lot of suspicion in the mind of the public. He went further to state that no any reason was given by INEC on why results were not transmitted on IREV Portal. Bello and Ajai (2023) stressed that many voters and observes have lost confidence in the electoral process in Nigeria. They enthused:

In the Act, it was clearly stipulated that it is a “must” for the electoral results to be displayed in the IREV and the Supreme Court on the other hand level a counter by stating that the goal of the technology was to strength the process and on its own, cannot invalidate the outcome of the result.

Ahmed (2023) in his work *electoral process and voters' participation* in Nigeria states that voters can only be motivated to participate if only the process are transparent and fair. He states that participation of the citizens can only be encouraged when the right thing is done. He went further to say that technical issues that were encountered from the usage of some of the digitalized technologies should never be used as an excuse for not using the IREV portal. IREV is used in other mature democratic societies and it is used during and not after the electoral process. In the 2023 election, IREV was used after the results were declared and pronounced by INEC. The question that many people have been asking and his begging for answer is that, why was the results not displayed during the election as it is practiced in other countries. INEC has not come out with a solid excuse on why it was not used during the electoral exercise. *Dino Malaye*, one of the agents of PDP at the National Collation Centre questioned why IREV portal has not been used. He unequivocally state:

The INEC chairman has said it 57 times in several occasion that IREV will be used. The chairman of voters' Education who is also my brother has said it 13 times. We do not know why it was not use and that is why we demand that it must be used. In an attempt to respond, Prof Yakubu Mahmud, the INEC chairman did not argue but pleaded that the exercise should go on and parties not satisfied should seek redress at the court.

Conceptual Clarification

(a) Election

The word election originates from the old English word *elect* and this is also traced from the Latin word *eligere* and it denote to choose somebody to hold a public position by voting.

According to Stephenson (2022), it is a procedure where by a person is selected.

Table 1.

S/N	Concept	Meaning
a.	Elector	A person who has the right to vote in an election
b.	Electioneering	The action of campaigning to be elected to a political position
c.	Electoral College	A group of people chosen to represent the members of a political party in the election of a leader
d.	Electoral Roll	An official list of the people in a district who are entitled to vote in an election

Election can also be defined as the act of choosing candidate to represent the people of a given country is the parliament, the executive and possibly into other arms of government as stipulated in the constitution of that particular country. It is into many types. This can be seen in the table below:

Table 2.

S/N	Types	Meaning
a.	Direct Election:	This involve the electorate casting their votes directly in an election for candidate of their choice that will represent them
b.	Indirect Election:	In this system, the electorate elect someone who in turn vote on their behalf
c.	By Election:	This is an election that takes place to fill a vacant elective post as a result of death, disqualification or resignation
d.	Run-off Election:	This is also known as second Ballot. This is when none or the candidate wins the election by absolute majority in a general election. A final one will be done to the first-two and the one with the highest vote will be declared as the winner
e.	Primary Election:	This involve the political parties presenting the candidate for an election
f.	Referendum:	This is a "Yes" or No vote of the people particularly on law in a given political system. This is a useful check on the power of the legislature
g.	Plebiscite:	A vote by everyone entitled to do so on an important public issue. It is designed by for certain persons or group
h.	Recall:	It is the "calling back" of elected law-makers, executive officers or judges

(b) Free and Fair Election

Some called it credible election and come called it acceptable election. It is an election conducted according to the principles and rules of democracy (Floor, 2023). This simply means that, the people of a given society or country must be free, without coercion, to elect their leaders under a condition that is most favorable and conducive.

© **IREV (INEC Result Viewing Portal)**

This is one of the digitalized technologies that is introduced by INEC so that results from PUs are uploaded, transmitted and published to the public (Cheaseam, 2018). The chief goal for the introduction of this digitalized technology is to control electoral fraud and promote transparency in the electoral process.

The success of IREV lies on how effective are other technologies such as – BVAS, SCR, AFIS, among others.

Table 3.

S/N	Device	Meaning
1.	BVAS	It stands for Bimodal Voter Accreditation System. This tool uses biometric characteristics to identify a person because everyone has a unique digital feature. It is also use to capture images of polling unit result sheet and the uploading of result to IREV portal
2.	SCR	This mean Smart Card Reader. This machine authenticates the validity of a voter’s card.
3.	EVR	This stands for Electronic Voter Register. It is a list that capture all voters that have registered for an election
4.	DDCM	It stands for Direct Data Capturing Machine. It is use for the registration of voters
5.	AFIS	This stands for Automated Fingers Prints Identification System. It is designed to rid the register of multiple registration
6.	PVC	This stands for Permanent Voter Card and it was introduced as an alternative to the TVC. It contains voter’s biometric information in an embedded microchip

Empirical Review

Cinjel and Danjuma (2023) conducted study on court system and the determination of election result in 2019. They used a cross sectional survey and a sample size of 400. Their result shows that the Supreme Court of Nigeria has strong influence on the electoral process in Nigeria. Johnson and Ubag (2023) conducted a study on *digital technology and credible election in Nigeria*. A mixed method research design was employed. The sample size used was 350. The result of the study shows that digitalized technology has significant impact on election in Nigeria. Ayogu (2019) in his study, *credible election in Nigeria, Panacea for stability, Growth and Development* used a mixed research design. 350 sample size was used and his result shows that credible election is a strong determiner of development in Nigeria.

Itodo (2022) conducted a study on – inspiring confidence in BVAS and electronic transmission of result in Nigeria. He employed a survey research design and utilized a sample size of 372; it was determined using Krejcie and Morgan. The result of the study

shows that the use of BVAS will help to promote transparency in the Nigerian electoral process. Akeaya-inne (2023) conducted a study on Technology fail and presidential election in Nigeria. A cross sectioned research survey was employed. Slovin formula was used to determine the sample size which was 470. The result of the study shows that glitch in the use of digitalized technology have significant effect on electoral result in Nigeria.

Abodunin & Abdulhamed (2018) conducted a study on Technological device and electoral process in Nigeria. Cross sectional survey was employed. Taro Yamane formula was used to determine the sample size which was 382. It was distributed to the cluster using Bourley formula. The result of the study shows that technical glitch and the usage of a technological device has significant influence on electoral outcome.

Olonite, Chidiebere & Agbailu (2023) conducted a study on *BVAS, Electoral integrity and public opinion in Nigeria*. A cross sectional survey research design was employed. Cochran sampling formula was used to determine the sample size. Neyman formula was used to distribute the sample to the cluster. The study conclude that may voters in Nigeria believes that the use of BVAS and other digitalized technologies would help to strengthen electoral process in the country.

Theoretical Underpinning

Instrumentalism theory of technology is adopted as the theoretical framework of the study. The theory was propounded by *John Dewey* in 1952 and was adopted into technology by R L Bloom in 1958. It was further developed by *Brian Martin* in 2020. According to this theory, technology is a neutral tool or instrument and its purpose is to fulfill users' specific tasks and users' intentions; you make it good or bad. Chair doesn't dictate what you have to do with it, you choose. It depends on moral intentions of human agents. Guns don't kill people, people kill people. The theory state that technology can be understood as an evolutionary process and its rationale is to improve productivity/efficiency. The theory assert that technology designed in a tool or device and their success lies in three (3) things - environment, use and the system of the device. The tenets of the theory are as follows:

- (a) The environment in which a technology is employed can enhance or mar it success
- (b) The person using the tool; poor usage, knowledge and how he or she intent to use it. The functionality of device depend on how the human element uses it
- (c) The health of the device; the success of a device lies on how sound it is

In the case of Nigeria, IREV portal was built and design to upload result obtained from PUs in Nigeria. The success of the IREV portal lies on how other digitalized technology like BVAS, DDCM, AFIS were used. In the case of the 2023 presidential election, the challenges of environment (Network) and fault associated with the devices were not what affected the use of IREV portal. The strong constraint was from the use of the IREV portal; the results were uploaded and transmitted but they were not displayed in the IREV as it was stated in the electoral Act. The Act provides that it must be used and it is during the election but it was put to use by INEC after the results were declared. The failure to use the

IREV as stated by the Act does not show that it was faulty; the fault was from the electoral empire. The device was not use as when it should be used as the Act stated and the court did not see the non-usage as a strong justification to invalidate the outcome of the result. The reaction at the National Collation Centre, protestation activities and litigation show that the public were not satisfied with how the device was used.

Methodology

The study adopts *cross sectional survey design*. The population size of the study is 29,839,937 and can be seen in the table below. Based on the population sized utilized, Krejcie & Morgan table was used to determine the sample size of the study. The sample size we arrived at was 420. According to Hair & Black (2003), a sample size of 30 and above is worthwhile. Proportional and multi-stage sampling technique was adopted; we started from the geopolitical zone, to state and down to the local Government Areas:

Table 4: Population Size of the Study Area

S/N	State	Zone	Population
1.	Plateau	North-Central	4,717,200
2.	Taraba	North-East	13,609,800
3.	Enugu	South-East	3,267,832
4.	Osun	South-West	4,433,800
5.	Kaduna	North-West	9,032,200
6.	Edo	South-South	4,777,000
Total			29,839,937

Source: BOS projection in 2023

Questionnaire was the major instrument utilized and it comprises of four (4) sections. Bio-data of the respondent, effectiveness of IREV in the Election and its acceptability with respect to the outcome of the election. The total number of items were 10. We used Bourdley proportional formula to distribute the samples to the designated cluster. This can be seen in the table below.

Table 5: Sample Size Distribution

S/N	State	Population Size	Proportioned Size
1.	Plateau	4,717,300	63
2.	Taraba	13,609,800	49
3.	Enugu	3,267,837	44
4.	Osun	4,435,800	59
5.	Kaduna	9,032,200	121
6.	Edo	4,777,000	64
Total			400

Results

In the study, 410 questionnaires were administered and 400 were retrieved. This thus shows that we have 98% rate of return.

Table 6: Bio-Data of Respondents

S/N	Class	Category	Responses	%
1.	Sex	a. Male	250	76
		b. Female	150	30
2.	Religion	a. Christianity	180	45
		b. Islam	180	45
		c. Other	40	10
3.	Age bracket	a. 18-30	150	38
		b. 31-40	150	38
		c. 40 & above	100	34
4.	Qualification	a. FSLC	100	25
		b. SSCE/NECO	100	25
		c. Diploma/NCE	80	20
		d. First Degree/HND	90	23
		e. Post graduate	30	8

Source: Researchers' Field Survey, 2024

The table above shows that 70 of the respondents were male while 30 were female. The table shows that 45% of the respondents professed Christianity, another 45% Islam and 10% professed other religions (ATR). The table shows that 38% of the respondents falls within the age bracket 18-30, another 38% falls within the age bracket 31-40 and 34% falls within the age bracket 40 and above. The table also shows that 25% of the respondents were holder of FSLC, another 25% hold SSCE/NECO, 20 possesses Diploma & HND, 23%, were holders of first Degree/HND and 8% were holders of Post Graduate Qualifications (PGD, Masters and PhDs).

Table 7: Effectiveness of IREV Portal in the 2023 National Presidential Election

S/N	Items	Responses				
1.	Was IREV used as expected (During Election)	SA%	A%	U%	D%	SD%
2.	Was IREV actually introduced by INEC	20(5)	50(12.5)	10(2.5)	20(5)	300(75)
3.	The usage of IREV after election is in order	300(75)	50(12.5)	10(2.5)	20(5)	20(5)
4.	There was sufficiency of other Digitalized Technologies (BVAS, AFIS) that to aid IREV were available	20(5)	50(12.5)	10(2.5)	20(5)	300(75)
5.	IREV has controlled Electoral fraud	20(5)	50(12.5)	10(2.5)	20(5)	300(75)

The table above shows that IREV portal was actually introduced by INEC. 300 respondents attested to it, 50 respondents representing 12.5% supported it, 2.5% were not sure, 5% disagreed and another 5% strongly disagreed. On the mode of usage, 20% of the respondents strongly supported the view that IREV was not used at the expected time,

50% subscribed to the view, 10 % were indifferent, 5% disagreed and 75% strongly refuted the notion.

On the usage of the IREV portal after election, 25% of the respondents strongly supported it, 12.5% concurred, 10% of the respondents were indifferent, 50% were not in agreement with the view and 75% strongly opposed the view. On whether there were sufficient digitalized technologies (BVAS, AFIS, etc.) to support IREV, 75% strongly attested that the digitalized technologies were available, 12.5% supported the view, 2.5% were not sure of their stands, 5% disputed the view and another 5% strongly rejected the notion. On whether the usage of IREV was able to manage fraud, 5% of the respondents strongly agreed with the view, 12.5% supported the view, 2.5% were not certain, 5% rejected the view and 75% strongly opposed the view. This thus shows that how IREV portal was used does not guarantee an acceptable outcome of the 2023 presidential election.

Table 8: The Usage of IREV Portal and the Legitimacy of 2023 Election

S/N	Items	Responses				
		SA%	A%	U%	D%	SD%
1.	There was tussle at National Collation Centre for nothing IREV	300(75)	50(12.5)	10(2.5)	20(5)	30(7.5)
2.	At the NCC, some parties left because IREV was not use	300(75)	50(12.5)	10(2.5)	20(5)	20(5)
3.	The non-usage of IREV during Election was a litigation point	300(75)	50(12.5)	10(2.5)	20(5)	20(5)
4.	The non-usage of IREV during the eating affects voter's participation in the subsequent ones	300(75)	50(12.5)	10(2.5)	20(5)	20(5)
5.	The definition of IREV by Supreme Court as a device that cannot affect the validity of result	20(5)	50(12.5)	10(2.5)	20(5)	20(5)

The table above shows that 75% of the respondents attested to the notion that there was tussle at the National Collation Centre for the non-usage of IREV, 12% supported the view, 25 were not sure, 5% refuted it and 5% strongly rejected it. On whether some parties boycott the counting process at the NCC for the non-usage of IREV, 75% attested that it transpired, 12.5% also supported the view, 2.5 were not sure, 5% opposed it and another 5% strongly opposed it. On the usage of IREV and voter's participation in the subsequent election, 75% strongly supported the view that it affected it, 12.5% subscribed to it, 2.5% were indifferent, 5% opposed it and another 5% strongly rejected it. On the Supreme Court pronouncement that non-usage of IREV is not a sufficient base to invalidate the result, 20 of the respondents strongly subscribed to the view, 12.5% supported the view, 2.5% were not sure of their stands, 5% opposed the view and 75% of the total respondents strongly rejected the view.

Test of Hypothesis

We used inferential statistical tools (both parametric & non-parametric tools) to test the formulated hypotheses of the study. Chi-square was used to test the first hypothesis while ANOVA was used to test the second hypothesis.

Table 9: Chi-Square Test of Hypothesis one (1)

	F-value	Df	Asymp. (Siz 2 sided)
Pearson Chi-square	52.10	8	0.0000
Like hood Ratio	210.20	8	0.0000
Linear by Linear Association	41		0.0000
N of valid cases	200		0.0000

Source: Field work, 2023; SPSS V23

Research Result: From the computation above, the Pearson calculated value is 52.10 and the PV is not more than 0.5000 @ 8 degree of freedom. With this, we accept the Ho and conclude that IREV was not effective in the conduct of 2023 National Presidential Election in Nigeria.

Table 10: ANOVA summary of Hypothesis two

S/N	Source of Variation	SS	MS	DF	F Cal	Fr
1.	Between Group	3340	835	4	6.776	
2.	Within Group	620	124	5		
	Total	3960	959	9		3.326

Research Result: From the computation above, the Fcal is 6.772 and is greater than the Fr which is 3.376. With this, we accept Ho and conclude that the non-usage of IREV does not affects the outcome of the National Presidential Election in Nigeria.

Results and Discussions

- (a) **Effectiveness of IREV:** In the course of the study it was uncover that there were several definitions on what constitutes the usage of IREV portal. The Electoral Act of 2022 and INEC guideline of 2023 stipulate that IREV must be used but the pronouncement by the Supreme Court shows that the non-usage of the device in itself cannot invalidate the result. The lead judge at the court state that IREV is introduced to strength the process and its non-usage is not a strong excuse to discredit the poll. IREV was used but when it was used, was not when it should be used. The introduction of the technology was for it to be used during the electoral process and not after the election. The good intentions of IREV portal can be seen in the table below:

Table 11

S/N	Benefits	Application
1.	Comparison	Results obtained from the PUs are compared with what is on paper
2.	Quicken release of result	It collates results as they are uploaded
3.	Fraud control	Results cannot be tempered
4.	Transparency	Results from PUs are presented the way they are
5.	Storage	Safety of results from PUs

The effectiveness of the technology would be said to be effective if it measures and perform the above task as it is expected. It is a technology and its functionality lie on how it is being used. In the case of the 2023 presidential Election, INEC did not use the technology as it is supposed.

- (b) **IREV and Acceptance of the Outcome of the Result:** The impression from the start was that the usage of the technology would help to strengthen and improve the electoral process in the country. So many people and parties have hope in it and they thought that this application would guarantee an acceptance result as it is done in other nations. This justify why several parties challenged INEC during the collation and some even uses it as a point for litigation at the court. In the course of our study we found that majority of the respondents do not believe that how IREV portal was used in the 2023 election shows that the outcome of the election is acceptable. The study also found that the non-usage affects the participation of voters in the subsequent election.

Conclusion and Recommendations

IREV is a digitalized technology that was introduced in Nigeria by the INEC to strengthened and as well improve the election of 2023. The introduction of the technology was supported by the Electoral Act of 2022 and the Electoral Guideline of 2023. Funds were released for this purpose and other technologies. The impression that must parties and the public have been that the usage of IREV portal would help to promote transparency in the 2023 election. But reverse was the case; the technology was not use as when it should be used (During). It was used after and this has left much more to be desired. Base on the finding of the study, the following were proffered:

- (a) As it is done in other mature democracy, IREV portal should be used during and not after the election. This will help to instill confidence and trust in the system.
- (b) There is need to reconcile the definition of “mandatory” in the Electoral Guideline of 2023 and the Electoral Act of 2022 on the use of IREV portal and the pronouncement of the Supreme Court that its non-usage is not a sufficient justification to discredit the outcome of the election.
- (c) The Electoral Act should in clear terms define how, when and the impact of IREV portal to an Election. This will go a long way to check the excess of INEC and improve electoral practices in the country.

References

- Abodurin, O. & Abdulhameed, A, (2018). *Technology based device and electoral process in Nigeria*, <https://www.reseachgate.net/publication/342159431>
- Achieng, M., & Ephias, R., (2013). The adoption and challenges of electronic voting technologies within the South African context, *International Journal of Managing Information Technology*, 5(4), 1-12.
- Adeyemo, A. B. (2013). E-government implementation in Nigeria: An assessment of Nigeria's global e-government ranking, *Journal of Internet and Information System*, 2(1), 11-19.
- Ayogu, G. I., et al, (2019). Credible elections in Nigeria: Panacea for stability, growth and development, *International Journal in Management and Social Science* 07(05), ISSN: 2321-1784 Impact Factor: 6.178
- Cheaseman, N, Gabrielle, L. & Justin, W., (2018). Digital dilemmas: The unintended consequences of election technology, *Democratization*, 25(8), 1397-1418.
- Cinjel, N. D. & Lumi, M. (2016). Political ideology and economic system as a determinant of Nigerian Development, *Nigerian Journal of Management Technology and Development*, 3 (1). 131-137
- Cinjel, N. D. & Nnadozie, O. U. (2018). Money politics and challenges of development in Nigeria: Plateau State Perspective, 1999-2015. *Umaru Yar'adua Journal of Management and Social Science*, 4(1). 72- 89
- Cinjel, N. D, el al. (2019). The impact of poverty and on the practice of Vote Buy in Nigeria: A focus on the 2015 and 2019 general election, *Gombe Journal of Administration and Management (GJAM)*, 2(2), 198-211
- Cinjel, N. D, el al. (2020). Prominence of national interest over rule of law and the status of good governance under Mohammadu Buhari's Civilian Regime in Nigeria, 2015 – 2019, *FUDMA Journal of Politics and Internal Affairs*, 3(3), 76-86
- Cinjel, N. D, el al. (2021). Who should determine the outcome of an election: The court or the Electoral Umpire? *FUDMA Journal of Politics and International Affairs*, 4(2), 1-7
- Dahl, R. (1971). *Polyarchy: Participation and opposition*, New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Deborah, E., John, E., & Isaac, O., (2018). Does the use of a biometric system guarantee an acceptable election's outcome? Evidence from Ghana's 2012 election, *African Studies*, 28, 3, 1-23.

- Enweremadu, D. U. (2011). The judiciary and the survival of democracy in Nigeria: Analysis of the 2003 and 2007 elections, *Journal of African Election*, 10(1), 114 – 142.
- Flood R. L, & Jackson, M. C, (1988). Cybernetics and organizational theory: Critical review. *Cybernetics systems, International Journal*, 19:13-33.
- Munya., P. (2022). *Electronic governance and election administration in Nigeria: Challenges and Prospect (2015-2019)*. In Omenka, Cinjel., and Achanya (Ed.) *Public Administration. Theory and Practice*. Chanan Prints.
- Mustapher, D. (2011). The Nigerian judiciary: Toward reforms of the bastion of constitutional democracy, *Nigerian Journal of Politics and Law*, 4 (2), 128 – 138
- Nnoli, O. (2003). *Introduction to politics*, Enugu: Pan – African Centre for Research on Peace and Conflict Resolution.
- Nwagboso, C. I. (2011). Elections and electoral tribunal in Nigeria, *African Research Review*, 5(2), 42 – 45.
- Nwagwu, J., (2016). Information and communication technology and administration of 2015 general election in Nigeria, *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 7, 4, 303-316.
- Okoye, R. (2009). *Restorative justice and the defense of people's mandate: The judiciary in the aftermath of the 2007 election in Nigeria*. In 3. Ibrahim & O. Ibeanu (Ed.), *the 2007 Nigerian elections and subversion of popular sovereignty*. Abuja: Centre for Democracy and Development.
- Oladeji, T, Chidiebere, O. A, & Agbailu., A. O, (2023). Nigeria's electoral integrity and bimodal voter accreditation system: An assessment of public opinion and voting behavior, *African Journal of Law, Political Research and Administration*, 6(2), 22-40
- Oni, E. O. (2014). The challenges of democratic consolidation in Nigeria, 1999 – 2007. *International Journal of Politics and Good Governance*, 5(5) 1 – 129.
- Sunday, O. J. (2014) E-governance: An imperative for sustainable grass root development in Nigeria. *Journal of Public Administration and Policy Research*, 6(4) 77-89.
- Ugochukwu, B. (2009). *Democracy by court order. An analytical evaluation of the 2007 election petition tribunals in Nigeria*, Lagos: Legal Defence Centre.