Current Journal of Humanities, Arts and Social Sciences (CJHASS)
Volume.11, Number 6; November-December-2024;
ISSN: 2836-7995 | Impact Factor: 5.93
https://zapjournals.com/Journals/index.php/cjhass
Published By: Zendo Academic Publishing

THE ROLE OF THE INEC IN POLITICAL FINANCE IN NIGERIA'S FOURTH REPUBLIC

[1]Olajide Olufunsho Ayobolu
Email: ooayobolu@gmail.com

Article Info
Keywords: Election, INEC, Political finance, Nigeria

DOI
10.5281/zenodo.14244271

Abstract
The role of the Independent National Electoral Commission (INEC) in the management, monitoring, and supervision of political finance is spelt out in both the 1999 Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria and the Electoral Act 2022. However, in every election held since the start of the Fourth Republic in 1999, there has been a continued and blatant violation of the electoral laws guiding political finance in the country. It is important to stress that the issue of political finance is central to the overall integrity of the electoral process, so that, few moneybags with very deep pockets will not hijack the electoral process. To make matters worse, no political party, political candidate, political gladiator, or their collaborators have been brought before any court of competent jurisdiction for any electoral offense. This has encouraged a culture of impunity, as more talks have conducted than the much-needed concrete steps of implementable actions to nip this sorry pass in the bud. Hence, the questions that come up are: one, what are the roles of the INEC in the supervision of political finance? Two, what challenges do the INEC face in its discharge of this onerous responsibility? Three, why has the same electoral infraction repeated at every election circle in the country, without any silver lining on the horizon? Fourth, what options are available to remedy this anomaly? The theoretical framework used is the elitist theory, and the research methodology is predicated on a qualitative data-gathering technique, after which the findings, conclusion and recommendations are put forward.

Introduction

The Independent National Electoral Commission (INEC) plays a crucial role in overseeing the conduct of elections in Nigeria, a function that extends to monitoring political finance, as delineated in the 1999 Constitution and the Electoral Act 2022. Political finance refers to the funds that political parties and candidates use for campaign activities, and is an essential component of the electoral process. Given the pervasive corruption and financial malfeasance issues in Nigerian politics, INEC's regulatory framework regarding political finance is integral to ensuring free, fair, and credible elections.

[1]PhD student, Federal University of Lokoja, Kogi State, Nigeria

The Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria (1999) provides the legal foundation for the electoral framework in the country. Specifically, Section 153 establishes the INEC and grants it the power to organize, undertake, and oversee elections in Nigeria. Recognizing the significance of political finance in the electoral process, the Constitution mandates that INEC facilitates transparency in the financing of political campaigns and, ensure compliance with electoral laws. The Electoral Act 2022 further elaborates on the role of the INEC in regulating political finance. It serves as an update to previous electoral laws and is designed to promote integrity and accountability within the political financing landscape. The Act defines key provisions regarding campaign financing, including limits on expenditures, requirements for financial disclosures, and penalties for violations.

One of INEC’s primary responsibilities under the Electoral Act is to set spending limits on political campaigns. This involves defining the maximum amount of time candidates and political parties can spend in elections. This regulatory mechanism helps level the playing field, ensuring that elections are not determined solely by the financial clout of candidates or their political parties. For example, the Act stipulates expenditures based on the level of office contested, thereby encouraging political participation across various socioeconomic strata. INEC is also tasked with the monitoring financial contributions to political parties and campaigns. The Electoral Act requires political parties to maintain transparent records of their sources of income and expenditure. Every political party must submit a detailed account of its financial activities to the INEC, which includes information on donations received, expenditures incurred, and other financial transactions. This requirement helps ensure accountability and discourages the acceptance of illicit funds, which can undermine the electoral process.

To enforce compliance with these regulations, the INEC possesses the authority to investigate financial improprieties and impose penalties on erring parties or candidates. The Electoral Act 2022 empowers the INEC to disqualify candidates and political parties that fail to comply with financial reporting requirements. This deterrent mechanism is essential to promote adherence to the rules governing political finance and combat electoral corruption. Moreover, the Act mandates that INEC establish a system for the monitoring and overseeing campaign finance. This entails regular auditing of financial records submitted by political parties and candidates. By implementing such auditing processes, the INEC can detect any discrepancies or violations, ensuring that all electoral participants operate within the limits of the law.

Transparency in political financing is crucial for fostering public trust in the electoral process. The INEC’s efforts in regulating political finance are significant in dispelling the cynicism that often accompanies elections in Nigeria. When the electorate sees that mechanisms are in place for accountability, they are more likely to have confidence in the integrity of the elections. Additionally, by promoting fairness in campaign financing, INEC helps to create a more competitive political environment. This encourages new and emerging political parties and candidates, stimulating democratic participation, and ensuring that the political landscape is not dominated by only a few wealthy individuals or established parties.

In summary, the INEC plays a pivotal role in regulating political finance in Nigeria, as outlined in the 1999 Constitution and the Electoral Act 2022. Through its regulatory and enforcement functions, INEC seeks to ensure that political financing remains transparent, accountable, and equitable. By setting spending limits, requiring detailed financial disclosures, and implementing compliance measures, INEC promotes electoral integrity. As Nigeria continues to grapple with issues of corruption and electoral malpractise, the role of the INEC in overseeing political finance becomes increasingly essential to the realization of free, fair, and credible elections. Thus, strengthening INEC capacity to monitor and enforce political financing regulations is vital for the future of Nigeria democratic governance.

Literature Review

The Independent National Electoral Commission (INEC) has played a crucial role in shaping Nigeria’s electoral landscape since the inception of the Fourth Republic in 1999. As the statutory body charged with the administration of elections in Nigeria, the INEC mandate extends beyond organizing elections to encompass various governance functions, including the regulation of political finance. This literature review critically examines INEC's role in political finance within Nigeria, exploring its regulatory framework, enforcement challenges, and broader implications for democracy and governance.

Political finance in Nigeria has historically been characterized by a lack of transparency and accountability, leading to pervasive corruption and the entrenchment of elite interests. Before the Fourth Republic, political financing was often opaque, with funding sources unaccounted for and little regulatory oversight. The return to civilian rule in 1999 prompted a re-evaluation of electoral processes and political financing mechanisms, along with an urgent need for institutional reforms to mitigate corruption (Ibeanu, 2007). As part of these reforms, the INEC was empowered to establish a framework for political finance, aiming to introduce transparency and foster a more equitable electoral environment. The Electoral Act of 2006, subsequently revised in 2010 and 2022, provided INEC with the authority to regulate campaign financing, candidate expenditures, and party finances (Bamisile & Ojo, 2020).

INEC role in political finance has evolved alongside legislative reforms, aligning with global best practices aimed at enhancing electoral integrity. The Electoral Act sets out specific provisions regarding the financial operations of political parties and candidates, mandating disclosure of campaign expenditures and sources of income.

The Electoral Act stipulates limits on the amount of money that candidates can use in their campaigns. For example, the 2022 amendment established cash limits for individual candidates, ranging from Naira 100 million for presidential candidates to lower cap for state and local elections (INEC, 2022). This regulatory framework aims to curb excessive spending, reduce the influence of money in politics, and promote a level playing field. INEC mandates that political parties provide detailed financial reports, including income sources and expenditures. These reports are intended to ensure transparency and accountability, allowing for scrutiny of political financing practices (Agbaje, 2019). However, compliance has often been inconsistent, with many parties and candidates failing to submit the required documents.

The INEC also regulates the sources of funding for political parties and candidates. According to the Electoral Act, party financing must come from legitimate sources, and foreign funding is prohibited (Nwankwo, 2021). This provision prevents undue influence by foreign entities in Nigerian elections. Although the INEC has established a regulatory framework for political finance, its effectiveness largely hinges on enforcement mechanisms. The commission is tasked with monitoring compliance with campaign finance regulations, but various challenges have impeded its efforts.

Many scholars, including Adebayo and Adebulu (2018), argue that INEC lacks the institutional capacity to effectively oversee political financing. Insufficient personnel, limited financial resources, and inadequate training hinder the commission's ability to enforce compliance and thoroughly investigate violations. The independence of the the INEC has been a topic of ongoing debate, as political interference can undermine its authority. Several authors, such as Nnoli and Nwankwo (2020), highlighted instances where political actors have exerted influence over the INEC, leading to a lack of robust enforcement of political finance regulations. Although the INEC is empowered to sanction parties and candidates for violations of campaign finance laws, the process for imposing penalties is often seen as weak. Reports by the National Democratic Institute (2018) indicate that despite numerous infractions, few penalties have been levied, raising questions about the commission's accountability and commitment to enforcing regulations.

The challenges faced by the INEC in managing political finance reveal critical limitations in Nigeria electoral framework. Awareness of political finance regulations among candidates, parties, and the public is often limited, undermining compliance. Ojo (2020) emphasized the need for civic education to enhance political actors' understanding of campaign finance laws and promote accountability.understanding. Corruption remains a significant barrier to effective political finance management. Many candidates resort to illicit funding sources, and the lack of oversight allows for the diversion of public funds into political campaigns (Bamikole, 2021). This corruption undermines the democratic process and perpetuates a culture of impunity. The regulatory framework governing political finance in Nigeria is often criticized for being fragmented and lacking coherence. Scholars like Adams (2019) have argued that multiple laws and regulations complicate compliance and enforcement, leading to confusion among stakeholders.

Political finance in Nigeria is inherently linked to broader political and economic dynamics. The nexus between wealth and political power significantly influences both funding mechanisms and the regulatory environment. The concentration of wealth among political elites facilitates the capture of political processes, and distorts democratic outcomes. Owewe (2019) illustrates how wealthy candidates leverage their financial resources to dominate elections, often at the expense of less affluent candidates. This phenomenon perpetuates a cycle of inequality, in which political access becomes contingent on financial resources. The role of clientelistic networks in political finance is prominent in Nigeria, where politicians often financing electoral campaigns in exchange for loyalty and support. Ibeanu (2019) argued that this system of patronage undermines democratic accountability, because elected officials prioritize personal patron-client relationships over public interest. Political parties often rely on internal funds, donations from wealthy individuals, and corporate sponsorships to finance their activities. Ibrahim and Ibrahim (2021) stated that, this dependency on external funding sources can lead to compromises in party integrity and policy decisions, as financial contributors seek to influence party platforms.

The advent of technology can enhance the INEC capacity to effectively monitor political finance. Digital tools can facilitate real-time tracking of campaign contributions and expenditures, promoting transparency and accountability. Implementing of electronic financial reporting systems could streamline the submission of financial disclosures by candidates and parties. Agbaje (2019) emphasized the need for INEC to adopt technology-driven solutions to minimize errors, enhance accuracy, and improve monitoring capabilities. Leveraging social media can help the public engage in oversight activities, empowering citizens to report violations and holding political actors accountable. According to Nwankwo (2021), increased public scrutiny facilitated by technological tools can help to curb corrupt practices in political finance.

Comparative studies highlight various best practices in political finance regulation that could inform INEC's approach in Nigeria. Countries like Canada and Ghana have implemented successful monitoring mechanisms that could serve as models for Nigeria. Other nations have developed comprehensive legal frameworks governing political financing, ensuring clear guidelines and obligations for parties and candidates. According to Sanya and Oduwole (2020), such frameworks include stringent penalties for violations, and promote compliance and accountability. The public funding of political parties can mitigate the influence of private donors and contribute to a more equitable electoral landscape. Bamisile and Ojo (2020) recommended exploring options for partial public funding, enabling parties with limited resources to engage in competitive campaigning without relying on corrupt funding sources. Establishing fully independent bodies to oversee political finance can enhance transparency and accountability. Ghana Electoral Commission is often cited as a model for its effective monitoring mechanisms and independence.

The literature highlights the critical role of the INEC in regulating political finance in Nigeria's Fourth Republic. Although significant strides have been made since 1999 to create a regulatory framework governing campaign financing, challenges persist. Capacity constraints, political interference, and widespread corruption hinder

INEC's ability to effectively enforce compliance. Addressing these challenges requires a multifaceted approach that includes public awareness initiatives, technological innovations, and comprehensive legal reforms.

Furthermore, learning from comparative perspectives offers valuable insights into best practices that could enhance the effectiveness of political finance regulation in Nigeria. As the nation continues to grapple with the implications of political finance on its democratic trajectory, strengthening INEC role and fostering greater transparency in political financing will be essential for promoting a more accountable and equitable electoral process.

Theoretical Framework

Elite theory emerged from the works of sociologists such as V. Pareto, G. Mosca, and R. Michels. (https://politicalsciencesolution.com/). The elite theory is a theory of the state that seeks to describe and explain power relationships in society. The theory posits that a small minority, consisting of members of the economic elite and policymaking networks, holds the most power, and that this power is independent of democratic elections. (https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/). The basic characteristics of this theory are that power is concentrated, the elites are unified, the non-elites are diverse and powerless, the elites' interests are unified due to common backgrounds and positions and, the defining characteristic of power is institutional position (Deric 2011).

It asserts that even in ostensibly democratic societies, a relatively small group of elites dominated political power. Pareto emphasized the cyclic nature of elites, suggesting that Although leaders may change, the underlying power dynamics remain constant. In Nigeria, this manifests in the political landscape characterized by a network of influential individuals and families that sustain their power through control over significant economic resources and political institutions. Political finance in Nigeria is marked by significant challenges, including corruption, lack of transparency, and violations of electoral regulations. The financing of political parties and candidates often relies on substantial donations from wealthy individuals and corporate entities, many whom expect favours in return. This reliance on elite money for campaign financing leads to a myriad of infractions, ranging from the use of illicit funds to failure to disclose financial sources, ultimately undermining the integrity of the electoral process. In Nigeria, political elites frequently dominate both business and political arenas. This overlap creates an environment in which financial influence is concentrated among select firms. Elites often fund political campaigns not merely as a way to contribute to democracy but as an investment in political power that ensures that their interests are protected. This can lead to infractions such as unreported donations, which can skew the political landscape in favour of those with wealth, thus disenfranchizing average voters and undermining the concept of equal representation.

The elite theory posits that a small group of elite individuals or organizations controls political power, influencing decision-making processes and governance structures within a society. This theory suggests that, regardless of the political system, whether it be, be it a democracy, oligarchy, or authoritarian regime, power remains in the hands of a select few. The elite theory serves as a powerful framework for analyzing political finance in Nigeria Fourth Republic, particularly the role of the Independent National Electoral Commission (INEC) in managing electoral processes, funding, and ensuring compliance with political finance regulations. This paper explores elite theory's implications for understanding INEC function in political finance in Nigeria by, analyzing how elite interests influence the electoral landscape, party financing, and the overall integrity of the electoral process.

Elites are individuals or groups that hold disproportionate share of significant resources, whether political, economic, or social (Mills, 1956). According to Pareto (1935), elites are necessary for any society, because they bring skills and capabilities that guide governance and decision-making processes. Elite theory emphasizes that power is concentrated in the hands of a few, who shape policies and political agendas. Domhoff (1967) argued that these elites often work within established institutions, forming networks that maintain their status and interests. They manipulate political institutions to serve their agendas, leading to systemic inequalities and social tensions. In democratic systems, elites can distort the democratic process by exerting influence over political parties and candidates. Their control over financial resources enables them to shape electoral outcomes, thereby perpetuating their power and interests (Lijphart, 1999).

Elite theory gained prominence from the early to mid-20th century, particularly in the works of sociologists and political scientists. Wright Mills's "The Power Elite" (1956) examined the interconnections among political, corporate, and military elites in the United States, laying the groundwork for understanding how elite networks maintain control over society. Elite Theory in the Context of Nigeria Fourth Republic The Fourth Republic, established in 1999 after years of military rule, marked a significant transition toward civilian governance in Nigeria. However, the political environment remains deeply influenced by elite interests: The political party system in Nigeria is characterized by the dominance of a few parties, primarily the Peoples Democratic Party (PDP) and the All Progressives Congress (APC). The elite networks within these parties often dictate the direction of politics, leading to systemic issues such as factionalism and patronage (Adebayo, 2016). Corruption has been endemic in Nigeria, with elite interests often undermining democracy. Political elites engage in corrupt practices, including vote buying and manipulation of electoral outcomes, to maintain their grip on power (Adeniyi, 2019).

The Independent National Electoral Commission (INEC) was established to regulate electoral processes in Nigeria, particularly political finance. However, its effectiveness has been questioned in light of elite theory. INEC is responsible for ensuring compliance with political finance laws, which include limits on campaign expenditures and requirements for financial disclosures (INEC, 2021). However, the influence of elites often compromises the effectiveness of such regulations. Despite having a regulatory framework, the INEC faces significant challenges in enforcing compliance due to limited resources, corruption within the system, and political pressure from elite actors (Uwais, 2007).

Political parties in Nigeria rely heavily on funding from elite actors. The elite theory posits that financial resources in politics create an uneven playing field, allowing those with significant wealth to dominate the electoral landscape (Ojo, 2015). According to Adeniyi (2019), this has led to elections characterized by "money politics," where potential candidates must secure substantial financial backing from elites to compete effectively. Regarding the INEC, its oversight capacity is hampered by its reliance on elite funding. Political parties often attempt to circumvent financial regulations, while elites exploit the gaps in enforcement to manipulate financial contributions, undermining the INEC authority (Adetula, 2015).

The elite theory underscores the prevalence of patronage networks within Nigeria's political landscape. Political elites often use financial resources to maintain loyalty among constituents and party members. This dynamic significantly impacts the electoral process: The prevalence of vote buying reflects the influence elite interests have on electoral outcomes. Political elites often provide monetary inducements to voters to secure support, undermining the integrity of the electoral process and circumventing the laws enforced by INEC (Jinadu, 2005). INEC may find itself complicit, either due to corruption or pressure from political elites, leading to a weakened enforcement of political finance laws and enabling patronage relationships to persist (Ojo, 2015).

Elite networks play a crucial role in shaping the political landscape of Nigeria. These networks often transcend party lines, involving influential individuals from various sectors, including business, politics, and civil society. Access to these elite networks can significantly influence a candidate electoral success. INEC's efforts to regulate campaign financing may be stymied by the interconnectedness of these elites, who can manipulate the political landscape to maintain their interests (Krause, 2021). The influence of elites on policy formulation can restrict public accountability and transparency. Political elites often work with prominent members of INEC to promote legislative agendas favoring their interests, further distorting democratic processes (Adebanwi, 2015).

The 2015 elections in Nigeria provide an illustrative case study of how elite interests have influenced political finance and INEC's role in the electoral process. By 2015, the political landscape was predominantly marked by the struggle between the PDP and the APC: The APC's financial mobilization, characterized by substantial donations from wealthy businessmen and political elites, enabled it to mount a formidable challenge to the incumbent PDP (Ogundiya, 2015). INEC faced challenges in monitoring and regulating this influx of funds, undermining its role as an electoral watchdog. The 2015 elections saw unprecedented campaign spending. According to a study by the Center for Democracy and Development (CDD), both major parties collectively spent over 124 billion naira (approximately $320 million) (CDD, 2015). Elite interests directly influenced this spending, often undermining the INEC regulatory authority.

The 2019 elections further exemplified the elites' of political finance in Nigeria. Research by the International Foundation for Electoral Systems (IFES) indicated that despite the legal frameworks established by the INEC, party financing remained opaque, reflecting the dominance of elite interests (IFES, 2019). Reports indicated that financing during the 2019 elections involved significant illicit financial flows, bypassing the mechanisms laid out by the INEC for transparency and accountability (IFES, 2019). The INEC struggled to implement its financial regulations amid intense pressure from powerful elites who sought to evade scrutiny. This incapacity reveals a systemic failure to uphold electoral integrity, as elites continued to exploit the gaps in the political finance regulatory framework (Krause, 2021).

The elite-centric nature of political finance undermines Nigeria democratic values. When a small group of elites control significant resources, the broader electorate is often sidelined in the political process, leading to a disconnection between officials and the public: The reliance on elite funding complicates the electoral engagement of ordinary citizens. Voter apathy increases when citizens doubt their influence over the electoral process, resulting in lower voter turnout (INEC, 2021). The entrenched relationships between political elites and INEC may hinder accountability measures, further erode public trust in democratic institutions and processes (Uwais, 2007).

Given the influence of elite interests on the INEC's role in political finance, significant reforms are necessary to strengthen Nigeria's electoral system: Enhancing the regulatory frameworks governing political finance will require robust oversight and transparency measures, allowing INEC to effectively monitor campaign financing (Lijphart, 1999). Increasing public awareness and promoting civic engagement can mitigate elites' impact on political process. Civic education initiatives can empower citizens to demand accountability from political actors (Adeniyi, 2019). Implementing comprehensive campaign finance reform that limits the influence of money in politics could help alleviate the disparities created by elite interests. This may include establishing cap on campaign expenditures and encouraging public financing of elections (Salim, 2017).

The elite theory provides a valuable framework for examining the role of the Independent National Electoral Commission (INEC) in political finance in Nigeria's Fourth Republic. The analysis reveals how elite interests shape the electoral landscape, influencing campaign financing, party behavior, and the overall integrity of the electoral process. The entrenched relationships between political elites and INEC raise critical questions about accountability and transparency, underscoring the need for significant reforms to strengthen Nigeria's democratic institutions. Ultimately, addressing the challenges posed by elite influence will be essential for ensuring fair and credible elections, allowing the broader populace to engage meaningfully in the democratic process.

What is Political Finance about?

According to the International Foundation for Electoral Systems, Political Finance means how political parties finance their regular activities, how parties, candidates, and non-contestants raise and spend money for election campaigns, and how this funding and spending is regulated and disclosed. According to Wikipedia: The Free Encyclopedia, Political finance covers all funds raised and spent for political purposes. Such purposes include all political contests for citizens' voting especially election campaigns for various public offices run by parties and candidates. According to International IDEA 2024, "In general terms, political finance refers to all money in the political process". Regarding electoral democracies, political finance can be defined as "the (legal and illegal) financing of ongoing political party activities and electoral campaigns (in particular campaigns by candidates and political parties, but also by third parties)".

The West Minister Foundation for Democracy (WFD) posited that "Political finance is a pivotal issue in the fight against corruption. The integrity of democratic processes is contingent on financial transparency in political finance… When financial contributions to political parties, electoral campaigns, or candidates are opaque and unaccountable, this enables clientelism, fuels corruption, increases the cost of political participation, and destroys trust in governments."

Political finance refers to the funding of political activities, including political parties, campaigns, and other activities related to electoral processes. It is crucial in shaping political competition, influencing governance, and determining the relationship between elected officials and citizens. The effectiveness of democracies often hinges on how political financing is structured and regulated. This paper explores several dimensions of political finance—its definitions, mechanisms, sources, impacts on democracy, and governing regulations. Furthermore, it discusses the challenges associated with political finance, particularly in developing democracies. The analysis draws from a range of scholarly sources to provide a comprehensive understanding of this critical aspect of politics.

Political finance refers to all monetary contributions made to political parties, candidates, and related entities for participating in elections and governance (Biezen & Hodgson, 2016). It consists of various forms of funding, including donations, public funding, and loans, used for campaign activities, party operations, and political advocacy.

Key components of political finance include, campaign finance which refers to the money spent on candidates' election campaigns, including advertising, staff salaries, and event costs (Brunell, 2016). Party Finance:- Financial resources allocated to political parties for operational expenses, including organizational tasks, outreach, and infrastructure. Public Funding :- Funding provided by the government to political parties or candidates, typically contingent upon meeting specific requirements (Dahl, 1989). Public funding seeks to level the playing field among candidates to promote fairness in the electoral process. Political Contributions-Donations made by individuals, corporations, or other organizations to support political candidates or parties, including in-kind contributions such as goods and services (Doherty et al., 2016).

Private Contribution: Individual Donors often contribute financially to candidates or parties they support. Individual donations can vary significantly based on socioeconomic status, political engagement, and personal beliefs (Ferguson, 2018). Corporate Contributions:- Businesses may contribute directly or through Political Action Committees (PACs) in systems like that of the United States, where legal frameworks allow for such financing. Corporate contributions raise concerns about their undue influence on policy and governance (Gordon, 2019). Special Interest Groups-Organizations representing specific interests (e.g., labor unions, environmental groups, etc.) often engage in political finance to advocate for policies that align with their goals (Nownes, 2010).

Public funding for political campaigns is designed to promote equitable competition among candidates. It can take several forms: In some cases, such as in public funding systems in Finland, candidates receive full funding from the government to run their campaigns (Niemi, 2015). Matching Funds-Some jurisdictions implement matching systems in which government funds match the contributions received from individual donors, thereby encouraging small donations (Doherty et al., 2016). Direct Grants- Governments may provide direct grants to parties or candidates who meet specific criteria, often based on their electoral performance in previous elections (Biezen, 2004).

Other Sources include Loans- Candidates and parties may obtain loans to finance their campaigns. These loans can pose risks when the loaning institutions expect preferential policy treatment in return for their financial support (Biezen & Hodgson, 2016). Self-Financing- Some candidates use their personal wealth to fund their campaigns, raising questions about equity and representation (Ferguson, 2018).

Political finance plays a pivotal role in determining the competitiveness of elections:-A well-regulated political finance system can help level the playing field, allowing candidates from diverse backgrounds to compete effectively. Conversely, inequitable financing structures can lead to political monopolies, in which incumbents maintain power through access to substantial resources (Sartori, 1990). Public funding mechanisms that support grassroots candidates can lead to higher voter engagement and turnout, thus reinvigorating democratic participation (Niemi, 2015).

The influence of money in politics can significantly affect governance: When certain groups or individuals exert excessive financial influence, they might succeed in swaying policymakers toward particular agendas, sidelining broader public interests (Gordon, 2019). An opaque political finance system can undermine public trust in the government. Transparency measures, such, as mandatory disclosure of contributions can, enhance accountability (Biezen, 2004).

Political finance systems that lack adequate regulation are especially susceptible to corruption: Funds intended for legitimate political activities can be diverted into corrupt practices, such as bribery and vote buying, leading to a compromised democratic process (Jinadu, 2005). A situation in which businesses provide financial support to politicians in exchange for preferential treatment and contracts can lead to cronyism, further undermining democratic principles (Nownes, 2010). Effective regulation of political finance is crucial for maintaining transparency, integrity, and fairness in elections. Regulations typically focus on three key areas: contribution limits, disclosure requirements, and public funding provisions (Dahl, 1989).

Many countries impose limits on the amounts that individuals and organizations can donate to political campaigns. These prevents excessive influence from wealthy donors and ensure equal opportunities for candidates (Brunell, 2016). For instance, the U.S. Federal Election Commission (FEC) enforces stringent limits on campaign contributions at both the federal and state levels (FEC, 2021). Mandatory disclosure of contributions is another fundamental aspect of political finance regulation. Such regulations require candidates and parties to report their sources of funding, help to identify potential conflicts of interest and foster public accountability (Doherty et al., 2016). Studies have demonstrated that transparent reporting can enhance public trust in the political system and provide voters with valuable information about candidates (Biezen, 2004). Public funding can mitigate the negative impacts of private funding, promoting greater equity in campaign financing: Research indicates that public funding schemes can increase the competitiveness of elections and encourage the participation of underrepresented groups (Niemi, 2015). However, the distribution of public funds must be equitable to achieve these benefits.

Despite regulatory efforts, many political finance systems face criticism for perpetuating political influence inequality. Wealthy individuals and organizations often retain disproportionate power, undermining democratic principles (Dahl, 1989). Candidates without access to substantial financial resources struggle to compete against better-funded opponents, limiting the diversity of political representation (Sartori, 1990). Political finance regulations can become convoluted, making compliance challenging for candidates and parties. In some cases, overly complex regulations may lead to unintended consequences, such as increased compliance costs (Gordon, 2019). Existing regulations may allow wealthy contributors to exploit loopholes, thus circumventing the intended limits on political donations (Brunell, 2016).

Cultural attitudes toward political finance can influence how citizens perceive and engage with the system. In countries where political corruption is widespread, public skepticism of political finance regulations may hinder their effectiveness (Nownes, 2010). In developing democracies, political finance often faces distinct challenges, such as limited regulatory capacity, inadequate transparency mechanisms, and entrenched corruption. These factors can exacerbate the negative impacts of political finance: Many developing countries lack the resources or institutional capacity to enforce political finance regulations effectively (Ainley et al., 2021). Corruption may be normalized, leading to entrenched practices in which financial contributions are viewed as necessary for political success, regardless of their legality (Jinadu, 2005).

Despite these challenges, there is potential for reform in political finance systems in developing democracies: Increased civic engagement and activism can push for greater accountability in political finance, fostering a more participatory democratic culture (Niemi, 2015). External support for building regulatory capacities and implementing transparency measures can strengthen political finance systems in developing countries (Ainley et al., 2021).

Political finance is a critical aspect of the political landscape, influencing electoral processes, governance, and the overall health of democratic systems. Recognizing its complexities—from sources and mechanisms to the challenges posed by inequality and corruption—illustrates the need for robust regulatory frameworks. Effective political finance regulations can promote transparency, accountability, and equity, thereby fostering a healthy democratic environment. Despite the significant challenges faced in both established and developing democracies, opportunities for reform exist that can empower citizens and encourage political actors'. Future work will be essential to address the evolving nature of political finance, with particular attention paid to how technology, changing societal norms, and global patterns of influence shape the landscape in which political financing occurs.

The role of INEC in monitoring of political finance

Political finance is a critical aspect of democratic governance, because it influences the integrity of elections, the representation of political parties, and the accountability of elected officials. In Nigeria, where electoral malpractise and corruption have historically posed significant challenges to democracy, the Independent National Electoral Commission (INEC) plays a vital role in monitoring political finance. Established to oversee the electoral process, the INEC is tasked with ensuring compliance with regulations governing campaign financing, promoting transparency, and enhancing the credibility of elections. This paper explores the mechanisms through which INEC monitors political finance in Nigeria's Fourth Republic, assesses challenges it faces, and discusses the implications of its effectiveness for democratic governance.

The Independent National Electoral Commission (INEC) was established under the Constitution of Nigeria to oversee free and fair elections across the country. Its core mandates encompass the registration of voters, management of electoral processes, and ensuring compliance with laws governing political parties and campaign financing (Suleiman, 2018). INEC operates under the Electoral Act of Nigeria, which outlines its responsibilities regarding the regulation of political finance. The Act mandates INEC to develop and enforce guidelines for political party funding and campaign expenses (INEC, 2021). The primary goals of INEC include promoting transparency, accountability, and credible electoral processes while, fostering public confidence in the democratic system (Eze, 2019).

Political finance in Nigeria is governed by a combination of statutory regulations and guidelines set forth by the INEC. The Electoral Act of 2010, as amended in subsequent years, stipulates regulations on campaign financing, including contribution limits and disclosure requirements for political parties and candidates (Akintola, 2018). INEC has developed various guidelines to implement the provisions of the Electoral Act, outlining procedures for the submission of financial reports and the mechanisms for monitoring compliance.

The INEC requires political parties and candidates to submit financial reports detailing their income, expenditures, and sources of funding. Parties are mandated to submit annual audited financial statements to the INEC, to provide transparency regarding their financial activities (INEC, 2021). This includes details such as the names of contributors, amounts received, and expenditures made during election campaigns. The Electoral Act prescribes limits on campaign expenditures for candidates, that INEC is tasked with monitoring. Candidates must report expenditures against these limits to ensure compliance (Uwais, 2007).

The INEC conducts audits and investigations to ensure the accuracy and authenticity of financial reports submitted by political parties. It employs random audits to assess the financial records of parties and candidates, and to check for discrepancies between reported income and actual contributions (Osho, 2021). INEC has the authority to investigate any suspected violations related to campaign financing. This includes inquiries into sources of funding and expenditure patterns (Adebanwi, 2015).

The INEC monitors political donations to detect illicit financing and ensures that political parties adhere to legal parameters regarding contributors: The Electoral Act prohibits anonymous donations, requiring that all contributions be disclosed. The INEC is responsible for ensuring the identification of contributors to assess compliance (Eze, 2019). Foreign funding for political campaigns is strictly prohibited in Nigeria. The INEC is tasked with monitoring and evaluating financial reports to identify any violations concerning foreign contributions (Akintola, 2018).

Despite its mandate, the INEC faces several challenges that hinder its ability to effectively monitor political finance in Nigeria. INEC's capacity to monitor political finance is often hampered by inadequate resources and funding: Limited budget allocations restrict its ability to conduct extensive audits and investigations. Insufficient funding can lead to delays in implementing monitoring mechanisms (Eze, 2019). The agency frequently suffers from a lack of skilled personnel equipped to handle the complexities of financial monitoring. This impacts the effectiveness of conducting audits and investigations (Osho, 2021).

The INEC operates within a politically charged environment, and is often subject to pressure from political elites and parties: Political parties and candidates may attempt to exert undue influence on the INEC, compromising its independence and ability to enforce regulations properly (Uwais, 2007). Such pressures can lead to selective enforcement of financial rules. INEC officials may face threats and intimidation from political actors when conducting audits or investigations, undermining their ability to operate transparently (Adebanwi, 2015).

Public awareness and trust in the INEC's monitoring efforts are crucial for enhancing electoral integrity: High levels of perceived corruption in the political system decrease public confidence in the effectiveness of the INEC's monitoring activities. Negative perceptions may discourage public participation in election (Fagbohun, 2020).

Insufficient civic education regarding political finance regulations limits public understanding of the importance of transparency and accountability in financing politics (Osho, 2021).

The INEC's effective monitoring of political finance is indispensable for enhancing electoral integrity in Nigeria: By enforcing compliance with campaign finance regulations, the INEC can significantly reduce instances of electoral malpracticse, including vote buying and fraud (Adeniyi, 2019). Monitoring ensures that all candidates compete on a level playing field, promoting fairness and democracy (Akintola, 2018).

INEC's efforts to monitor political finance contribute to greater accountability among political actors: Consistent enforcement of financial regulations helps build public trust in the electoral system, empowering citizens to hold their elected officials accountable (Eze, 2019). Public disclosure of financial reports fosters transparency and allows voters to assess the sources and implications of campaign financing (Osho, 2021).

INEC monitoring capabilities can inform ongoing reforms related to political finance regulations: Findings from audits and investigations can provide policymakers with data to identify gaps and weaknesses in the current regulatory framework, leading to improved legislation (Ibeanu, 2008). Continuous monitoring can help INEC adapt its regulations based on emerging trends in political finance, maximizing the effectiveness of governance (Adeniyi, 2019).

To enhance the INEC's capacity to effectively monitor political finance in Nigeria, several recommendations can be made: the INEC should receive adequate financial resources to conduct comprehensive audits and investigations, enabling it to fulfill its monitoring role effectively (Eze, 2019). Training programs for INEC personnel can improve their skills related to financial monitoring and compliance enforcement (Osho, 2021). Measures should be taken to safeguard the INEC's independence from political interference. This may include legal protections and institutional reforms to ensure impartiality (Uwais, 2007). Establishing robust protections for whistleblowers can encourage reporting of financial malpractise, enhancing the transparency of political finance (Adebanwi, 2015). INEC should invest in public awareness campaigns to educate citizens about the importance of political finance regulations and their role in promoting accountability (Fagbohun, 2020). Collaboration with civil-society organizations can enhance INEC's monitoring capabilities, leveraging their networks to promote transparency in political finance (Eze, 2019).

The Independent National Electoral Commission (INEC) plays a pivotal role in monitoring political finance in Nigeria's Fourth Republic. Its efforts to enforce compliance with funding regulations are essential to enhance electoral integrity, promoting accountability, and fostering public trust in the democratic process. However, the INEC faces significant challenges, including limited resources, political pressure, and public skepticism, which hinder its effectiveness. To strengthen INEC's monitoring capabilities, targeted reforms are necessary. By increasing funding, safeguarding its independence, and enhancing public awareness, INEC can bolster its role in ensuring transparent and accountable political finance in Nigeria. Ultimately, a well-regulated political finance system will contribute to a more vibrant democracy, enabling broader public participation and trust in the electoral process.

Research Methodology

The Independent National Electoral Commission (INEC) plays a pivotal role in regulating political finance within Nigeria Fourth Republic, which began in 1999. This research investigates the extent of INEC's effectiveness in monitoring and regulating political finance, as well as the challenges faced in this field. Given the complex and multifaceted nature of political finance, a qualitative research methodology is appropriated, using descriptive and narrative prose coupled with a comprehensive research design to capture diverse stakeholder perspectives and experiences.

The research design will be qualitative, aiming to provide rich, detailed information through descriptive and narrative accounts of participants. This design is appropriate for understanding the nuanced dynamics of political finance regulation, particularly how INEC operates in this context. The qualitative approach allows for flexibility in exploring the various experiences and perceptions of stakeholders involved in political finance, including INEC officials, political party representatives, civil society organizations (CSOs), and electorate members.

To achieve the research objectives and provide an in-depth analysis of INEC's role in political finance, the study will employ qualitative data-gathering techniques. This study includes content analysis of relevant documents, such as Electoral Acts and Regulations: A review of the legislative framework governing political finance, including the Electoral Act and subsequent amendments, to understand the formal rules established for political financing. INEC Reports: Analysis of INEC's annual reports and publications that detail its activities in regulating political finance, including compliance assessments and challenges faced. Civil Society Reports: Reports and publications by civil society organizations criticizing political finance practices and INEC effectiveness in oversight.

This study focused on Nigeria, particularly within the political context of the Fourth Republic (1999 to present). This research methodology outlines a comprehensive qualitative approach to examining the role of the INEC in political finance during Nigeria Fourth Republic. document analysis enables a robust exploration of stakeholder perspectives and experiences. Through this research, the study aims to provide insightful conclusions regarding the effectiveness of INEC’s regulatory role, the challenges it faces, and the overall impact of political finance on Nigeria’s democratic processes. Ultimately, these findings will contribute to the discourse on enhancing democratic governance and accountability within the electoral framework in Nigeria.

Analysis and Discussion

Challenges in Political Finance Monitoring

It has been pointed out that political parties do not respect the laws regarding the issue of political finance. According to the Punch Newspaper on 9th of December, 2018, the Chairman of INEC, Prof. Mahmood Yakubu, in seeking the help of the EFCC, said that most political parties and politicians had no regard for the law. “We want the EFCC, which has the mandate and capacity to track and trace sources of funds, to work closely with us so that we can trace within the limits of the law. Our democracy should never be on sale, and I believe that by working closely with the EFCC, we can achieve that,” Yakubu said. Expectedly, the EFCC has taken up the responsibility. Before the last governorship election in Ekiti State, on July 14, the commission set up teams to monitor the election. The move was a follow-up to a meeting between the EFCC’s acting Chairman, Ibrahim Magu, and the compliance officers of banks on May 30. Magu asked the banks to report all suspicious transactions ahead of the elections, and threatened to prosecute any bank that failed to cooperate. The warning came after INEC asked the EFCC to help with vote buying at polling units.

It has also been observed that the regulations on party financing in Nigeria are beautiful. The problem is a practical application. On several occasions, the electoral body was deterred from undertaking its investigation by the constituted powers to shield its parties from being exposed to illegal financial activity that violates the rules.

In another view, it was observed that

… Party financing in Nigeria is a business activity that defies enforcement from agency concern because it is conducted in a patron-client manner just like a business venture between the business owner and the customer. All efforts by the electoral body to address the issue have been hijacked and blocked by powerful hands in Nigerian politics. This is why the enforcement is weak and uncoordinated. (Babayo et at 2022).

The lack of enforcement by relevant institutions (INEC, as well as security and anti-corruption agencies) and the influence of money in politics remain a major challenge to the integrity of the electoral process in Nigeria. Furthermore, there is no mechanism to check, the unbridled spending of political parties and individuals and the limits to campaign finance regulations are glaring. The Independent National Electoral Commission (INEC) requires political parties to submit audited financial reports capturing revenue inflows and outflows after a general election and at specific periods of the year. However, as of 2022, most political parties have not submitted reports on their expenditures for the 2019 election, with some spending more than the law permitted. INEC has established that the APC and PDP spent N4.6 billion and N3.3 billion, respectively, in the 2019 election, which is three times more than the law permitted under the 2010 electoral act as amended. Similar infractions of spending above the threshold were recorded by the major parties in 14 out of the 29 states where governorship elections were conducted in the 2019 elections. (www.cddwestafrica.org).

The Westminster Foundation for Democracy (WFD) provided some reasons that explain the challenges the INEC face in the monitoring of political finance, and the first has to do with weak legal mechanisms, the electoral laws as presently constituted are fraught with several loopholes, secondly, there is the lack of enforcement capacity, INEC lacks the capacity and wherewithal to track and monitor political finance in the country, thirdly, is the apparent culture of corruption and impunity as well as the general laxity in the rule of law in the country and also issues like winners take all syndrome, monetary compensation and crowd renting, culture of free money, lack of volunteerism amongst several others.

Gaps in Political Financing Requirement of the Nigerian Constitution: The Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria (CFRN), Section 226(1) CFRN (as amended), spells out the procedure political parties must follow in furnishing INEC and the National Assembly with relevant account statements. Section 226(1) of the CFRN (as amended), requires the INEC report to the National Assembly when political parties fail to keep appropriate books and accounts. The section states that “INEC, shall in every year prepare and submit to the National Assembly a report on the accounts and balance sheet of every political party” Pertinent questions arise. What will the the National Assembly be expected to do if a political party is found to have contravened provisions of the law? Does the INEC or the National Assembly have legal grounds to punish defaulters? If a political party is found to have erred by failing to keep proper books and accounts, the Constitution only stipulates that the INEC report to the National Assembly. Nothing more. The law is not clear regarding what the INEC should do to the erring political party...

Gaps in the Electoral Act 2022 spending limits: Section 88 (2) – (7) of the 2022 Electoral Act places limitations on Election Expenses of candidates vying for political positions in Nigeria. However, this section simply states limits on expenses to be incurred by candidates vying for various types of political office without mentioning expenses to be incurred by the political parties.

Gaps in Electoral Act 2022 donation limits: Section 88 (8) states that No individual or other entity shall donate to a candidate more than N 50,000,000. Again, this section only dwells on donation limits for candidates and does not mention of political parties. Section 89-(1) of the 2022 electoral Act defines “election expenses” as the expense incurred by a political party within the period from the date notice is given by the INEC to conduct an election up to and including the, polling day in respect of the particular election. Undoubtedly, the section needs to clarify whether expense and donation limits mentioned in section 88 (2)-(8) apply to candidates alone or political parties as well. (Research Report 2022).

It has been argued in some quarters that the responsibilities placed on the shoulders of the INEC are too enormous, The Electoral Management Bodies (EMBs) are saddled with too many duties that it is weighed down by these functions, hence, there is the need for unbundled INEC and cede the responsibility of tracking and monitoring political finance to the EFCC and ICPC.

Some other challenges identified by INEC include a political culture characterized by violence; and partizan use of state resources at federal, state and local government levels, through the power of incumbency and monetized politics. In other words, an unrelenting culture of impunity persists and is probably the greatest danger to the conduct of credible, free and fair elections in Nigeria. Similarly, the political parties have not been accountable to members and are unable to practice internal democracy, leading to internal wrangling and factionalisation of parties. This is connected with the lingering poor mindset of the political class, political parties, and the public on what it takes to win elections, which usually involves malpractises. (INEC 2017).

Various electoral reforms have been introduced in Nigeria since the dawn of democracy in 1999. Yet it is one thing to have these laws and another to make them work. Sadly, Nigeria seems to lack the political will to pass important legislation. It is clear, for example, that the Independent National Electoral Commission (INEC) cannot check excessive spending of political parties. The forward of its operational handbook conveys this:

'Existing Nigerian Laws do not regulate the campaign expenditures individual candidates who are contesting elections. However, the laws require the Commission to exercise control over political campaign expenditure. Constitutional and other legal provisions require every political party to maintain proper accounts of its funds. Section 225 (2) of the Constitution specifically requires political parties to disclose their sources of funds and their manner of expenditures. Political parties and their candidates draw campaign funds from diverse sources, which may be beyond the capacity of the Commission to fully monitor. In addition, the Commission lacks any authority to enforce strict obedience to laws. As a first step, it therefore becomes imperative for the Commission to devise ways and means of implementing the reporting, and, disclosure of all monies and assets received by the political parties in aid of their campaign effort.'

(www.therepublic.com.ng).

What happened to violations of political finances in other climes and should encourage INEC to adhere to the rules of engagement are as follows:

- Former president of Brazil, Lula da Silva was ordered to serve a 12-year sentence in April 2018.
- Park Guen-Hye was impeached as South Korean president and, tried and sentenced to 24 years in prison in March 2018.
- Otto Perez, who succeeded Alfonso as president of Guatemala, was detained in 2015 and tried in 2018.
- Ollanta Humala, a former president of Peru, entered prison in 2017 for 18 months and was subsequently charged with murder.
- Ehud Olmert, former Israeli prime minister, served a 27-month prison term in 2016.
- Vlad Filat, former prime minister of Moldovia, was arrested in parliament and jailed for nine years in 2015.
- Jose Socrates, a former Portuguese prime minister, served a prison term in 2014.
- The prosecution of Michael Cohen in the United States, in connection with several felony charges and other abuses regarding president Donald Trump's campaign finance
- The replacement of Germany's defense minister Rudolf Scharping, in 2002, after national magazine Stern reported that the minister had taken DM 140000 from Mortiz Hunzinger, a PR consultant with links to the arms industry.

- Kimitaka Kuze, head of the Japanese Financial Reconstruction Commission, was forced to step down in July 2000 following revelations that he received nearly $2.1 million from Mitsubishi Trust and Banking Corporation between 1989 and 1994.
- The Fujimori-Montesinos case in Peru: in mid-September 2000, a videotape showed Vladimiro Montesinos, the Head of Peru's National Intelligence Service, apparently engaging in vote buying by handing some $15 000 to opposition congressman Luis Alberto Kuri, switching sides and giving the government a majority in the parliament. (Yagboyaju and Simbine 2020).

Remedying anomalies in political finance monitoring

Regardless of whether party financing is regulated through a general law on political parties, an electoral law, a specific law on the financing of political parties, or a combination of these, certain principles are fundamental to finance legislation. More specifically, the legal framework should be objective, clear, transparent and accessible. To that effect:

- Legislation should be stated in a clear and unambiguous language.
- Legislation should avoid conflicting provisions between laws governing the activities of political parties and those governing their financial activities.
- Legislation should avoid conflicting provisions between laws governing the financing of national and subnational parties and between laws governing the financing of national and subnational election campaigns.
- Legislation on party financing should cover at least fundamental issues such as traditional sources of finance, private donations, public subsidies to political parties, the financing of election campaigns, and provisions for disclosure, reporting, monitoring and enforcement.
- Legislation should be published and made readily available to the intended users, including political parties, candidates for public office, and the public.

(Biezen 2003).

Although INEC is the primary agency responsible for monitoring campaign finance, effective enforcement of political finance regulations requires effective collaboration and synergies with other agencies with unique capacities and resources in specialized areas and functions. For example, the involvement of the EFCC in the screening of candidates for election should be encouraged, and the capacity of the Code of Conduct Bureau needs to be strengthened and it should be involved in monitoring the assets of public servants. CSOs in Nigeria are increasingly being acknowledged as watchdogs, maintaining vigilance over the electoral process. Their monitoring ensures that campaign finance practices are transparent and that, they are also actively engaged in advocacy for political finance reform. Very few CSOs are currently engaged in these activities because they lack the required capacities. (Adetula 2004).

The Independent National Electoral Commission (INEC) serves as the guardian of Nigeria electoral processes, tasked with ensuring that elections are conducted fairly, transparently, and by law. Given the complexities and challenges surrounding political finance in Nigeria, the INEC must adopt concrete measures to establish a robust and implementable political finance regime. A well-regulated financial framework is essential for promoting transparency, reducing corruption, and enhancing the integrity of the electoral process. Here are several key steps that INEC can take to achieve these goals.

The INEC should develop detailed guidelines outlining the rules and regulations governing political finance in Nigeria. These guidelines must address: Establishing clear spending limits for political parties and candidates at various levels of government to create a level playing field. Clearly defining what constitutes acceptable political donations and, requiring timely and complete reporting of contributions and expenditures. Specifying sources deemed inappropriate for funding, such as foreign donations or funds from companies with government contracts, to avoid conflicts of interest. Including stakeholder consultations in the development of these guidelines will help foster consensus and ensure that they are widely understood and accepted within the political landscape.

INEC must enhance its monitoring systems to effectively track campaign financing. This can be accomplished through Requiring all political parties and candidates submit regular financial reports to the INEC, detailing their sources of funding and expenditures. These reports should be submitted before, during, and after elections to capture the full financial picture. Developing standardized forms and online platforms for financial reporting can help streamline the submission process. It can also facilitate easier auditing and comparison of financial activities among different political entities. Encouraging or requiring independent audits of campaign finances to verify the accuracy and legitimacy of reported figures. INEC can work with independent audit firms to ensure the integrity of the auditing process.

The INEC must build its capacity to effectively enforce political finance regulations. This can include: Providing training for INEC staff focused on monitoring political finance, compliance activities, and investigation procedures. This will allow them to adequately scrutinize financial reports and detect irregularities. Establish specialized units within the INEC dedicated to monitoring and enforcing political finance regulations. These units should have the authority to investigate violations and impose penalties. Working closely with law enforcement agencies to ensure that financial crimes related to political financing—such as money laundering or bribery—are investigated and prosecuted.

To foster a culture of transparency and accountability, INEC should invest in public awareness campaigns on political finance and the electoral process. Key initiatives may include: Launching campaigns to educate the public, political parties, and candidates on the rules governing political finance and the importance of compliance. Organizing regular dialogue and workshops with political parties, civil society organizations, and other stakeholders to discuss political finance issues, share best practices, and explore collaborative approaches to address challenges.

The INEC can use technology to enhance transparency and streamline the monitoring of political financing: Creating online platforms for parties and candidates to submit their financial reports can ease administrative burdens and improve data collection, analysis, and accessibility. Establish a public database of political contributions and expenditures that citizens can access to enhance accountability. This can empower voters to make informed decisions based on candidates' financial backing the financial backing.

For a political finance regime to be effective, there must be adequate consequences for violations: the INEC should define clear penalties for non-compliance with political finance regulations, including fines, disqualification from elections, or sanctions against offending political parties. Implementing measures to protect whistleblowers who report illicit campaign financing can encourage transparency and promote accountability.

Therefore, establishing a robust and implementable political finance regime in Nigeria requires decisive action from the INEC. Through the development of comprehensive guidelines, effective monitoring and enforcement mechanisms, public education, and leveraging technology, INEC can play a pivotal role in enhancing the integrity of elections in Nigeria. By focusing on transparency, accountability, and adherence to legal frameworks, INEC can foster a political environment in which the integrity of the electoral process thrives, ultimately strengthening Nigeria's democracy and governance.

Conclusion

The implications of an unregulated political finance regime in Nigeria are profound and multifaceted, significantly impacting the country democratic processes and governance. First, graft becomes rampant, because a lack of oversight allows political actors to engage in practices such as bribery and kickbacks. Wealthy individuals or corporations may corrupt electoral outcomes by funding candidates who will, in turn, advance their interests once in office. This creates an environment in which policies favour a select few rather than the public good. Second, inequality in political participation gains undue currency. Candidates with substantial financial resources can dominate electoral contests, marginalizing grassroots and less-affluent candidates. This leads to a political landscape that is skewed in favour of established elites, which undermines the democratic principles of equal representation and competition. Additionally, the absence of regulation fosters a culture of impunity. With no clear guidelines or consequences for financial misconduct, candidates may disregard ethical standards, further erode public trust in political institutions. Voter apathy can consequently ensue, as citizens lose faith in the electoral process, believing their votes hold little value in a system in which money, rather than merit, determines political success. Ultimately, an unregulated political finance regime undermines the legitimacy of democratic governance, jeopardizing the rule of law, and hindering socioeconomic development in Nigeria. Addressing these challenges requires urgent reforms to establish a framework that promotes transparency, accountability, and ethical conduct in political financing.

Conversely, a well-regulated political finance system offers numerous benefits that enhance the democratic process. This promotes transparency, ensuring that voters are informed about political funding sources, which helps build trust in electoral outcomes. Moreover, it fosters fair competition among candidates by leveling the playing field and, allowing individuals from diverse backgrounds to participate in political arena. This inclusivity promotes a broader range of perspectives and policies. In addition, it reduces corruption and undue influence, because it strict regulations limit the capacity for illicit funding and bribery. In the final analysis, a robust political finance system enhances accountability, ensuring that elected officials prioritize the interests of their constituents over those of wealthy donors, thereby improving governance and public service delivery.

Recommendations

Dealing with the issue of big money in Nigeria's electoral process is imperative for ensuring fair competition, transparency, and the integrity of democratic institutions. The Independent National Electoral Commission (INEC) can adopt several strategies to mitigate the influence of large financial contributions to elections. Here are some key recommendations:

The INEC should develop comprehensive regulations that limit the influence of big money in political campaigns. This includes Spending Cap: Implementing strict limits on the total amount that political parties and candidates can spend on election campaigns can help to level the playing field. By setting reasonable caps based on the type of election (local, gubernatorial, presidential), the INEC can reduce the advantage that wealthier candidates have over their opponents. Donation Limits: Establishing strict limits on individual and corporate contributions is critical. By capping donations, large influencers cannot dominate campaign financing, which curtails the potential for corruption and quid pro quo arrangements.

The INEC require robust financial disclosure from political entities: Regular Reporting: Political parties and candidates should be mandated to provide regular (quarterly or biannual) financial reports detailing their sources of funding and expenditures. This transparency ensures accountability and allows voters to scrutinize who finances political campaigns. Publicly Accessible Databases: Establishing an online database where voters can access financial disclosure fosters public scrutiny and discourages illicit funding. A transparent system discourages candidates from accepting questionable donations and encourages ethical behaviour.

To reduce reliance on private donations, INEC can promote public financing of electoral campaigns: Matching Funds for Small Donors: Implementing a matching fund system, where public funds are provided for every naira raised from small donations, can encourage grassroots support. This helps candidates raise funds more equitably without relying on major donors. Direct Grants: Allowing registered political parties to access direct grants from the government for campaign purposes base, on their electoral performance, can help reduce dependence on large private contributions.

The INEC must enhance its capacity to monitor and enforce compliance with electoral finance regulations: Dedicated Units for Oversight: Establish specialized units within the INEC responsible for overseeing campaign finance activities. These units should be equipped to conduct audits, investigate discrepancies, and enforce penalties for violations of financial regulations. Collaboration with Law Enforcement: Partnering with anticorruption agencies can provide additional resources and expertise in investigating financial misconduct and prosecuting offenders, thereby reinforcing accountability.

The INEC should engage in educational initiatives aimed at raising public awareness about the implications of big money in politics: Voter Education Campaigns: Conduct awareness campaigns to educate citizens about the importance of monitoring campaign finances and understanding candidates' funding sources. Informed voters are better equipped to challenge candidates who rely heavily on big money. Encouraging Whistle-blowing: Implement programs to encourage whistle-blowing on financial misconduct. Protecting whistle-blowers will motivate citizens to report irregularities without fear of retaliation and enhance public participation in the political finance system.

Leveraging technology can streamline processes and enhance transparency: Online Reporting and Monitoring Tools: Developing user-friendly online platforms for submitting financial reports can facilitate compliance while making it easier for the public to access and analyze financial data. Data Analytics: Using data analytics can help INEC identify patterns or trends in campaign financing that may indicate corruption or undue influence, allowing for proactive measures to be taken.

Addressing the challenge of big money in Nigeria electoral process requires a multi-faceted approach that includes regulations, transparency, public financing, enforcement, education, and technology. By adopting these strategies, INEC can mitigate the impact of large financial contributions, promote a more equitable electoral environment, and enhance the credibility of the democratic process. Ultimately, these efforts are essential for fostering a political landscape in which the voices of voters are prioritized over the interests of powerful financial backers.

References

Adebayo, A. (2016). Ethnicity and political party dynamics in Nigeria: Challenges and opportunities. African Journal of Political Science, 10(2), 45–60.

Adebayo, S., & Adebulu, J. (2018). INEC and the challenges of regulating political finance in Nigeria. African Journal of Political Science, 12(1), 23–34.

Adeniyi, O. (2019). Political corruption and the role of leadership in Nigeria: The case of the Fourth Republic. The Nigerian Journal of Politics, 17(2), 44–62.

Adetula, V. (2015). Electoral governance in Nigeria: The role of INEC and future prospects. African Journal of Political Science, 14(1), 10–20.

Adetula, V. (2024). Political finance in the digital age: The case of Nigeria. International IDEA, Stockholm, Sweden.

Adebanwi, W. (2015). The politics of everyday life in Nigeria: An exploration of the political economy of the state. Routledge.

Agbaje, A. (2019). Political finance in Nigeria: Challenges and prospects. Journal of Political and Legal Studies, 14(2), 67–79.

Ainley, B., Forte, S., & Williams, A. (2021). Political finance in developing countries: Trends, challenges, and reforms. International IDEA.

Akintola, A. (2018). Regulatory frameworks for political finance in Nigeria: Assessing the role of INEC. Journal of African Elections, 17(1), 115–132.

Babayo, S., Sambo, U., Mat, B., Sani, M. A., & Yahaya, M. (2022). Issues and regulations in party financing and electoral expenses in Nigeria (1999–2020). Journal of Contemporary African Studies, 40(27), 1–17.

Bamisile, A., & Ojo, E. (2020). The role of INEC in ensuring transparency and accountability in campaign financing in Nigeria. Nigerian Journal of Electoral Studies, 8(1), 49–62.

Bamikole, O. (2021). Political corruption and campaign finance in Nigeria: Issues and solutions. International Journal of African Governance, 6(3), 112–126.

Biezen, I. V. (2003). Financing political parties and election campaigns: Guidelines. Council of Europe Publishing.

Biezen, I. V., & Hodgson, G. (2016). Political party finance from an international perspective: A handbook. Party Politics, 22(2), 157–168.

Brunell, L. A. (2016). The effect of campaign finance reform on election outcomes: Evidence from the 2005 legislation in New Jersey. Election Studies, 44, 80–89.

Centre for Democracy and Development. (2023, April 27). Retrieved from https://cddwestafrica.org.

Dahl, R. A. (1989). Democracy and its critics. Yale University Press.

Deric, S. (2011). Political sociology: Resistance and the state. Pine Forge Press.

Doherty, D., Lioz, S., & Neff, C. (2016). The state of campaign finance policy: Recent developments and issues for Congress. Center for American Progress.

Domhoff, G. W. (1967). Who rules America? Random House.

Elections Act. (2022). Federal Republic of Nigeria Official Gazette. Retrieved from https://www.inecnigeria.org.

Eze, E. (2019). The role of INEC in ensuring electoral integrity in Nigeria. African Journal of Political Science, 14(3), 1–25.

Fagbohun, O. (2020). Perception of electoral integrity: A study of voter confidence in Nigeria's Fourth Republic. International Journal of Electoral Studies, 67, 102–113.

Ferguson, E. (2018). The role of money in politics: Campaign financing and its implications. Politics & Society, 46(3), 357–388.

Gordon, S. (2019). The dynamics of campaign financing: Implications for democracy and governance. Routledge.

International Foundation for Electoral Systems. (n.d.). Political finance. Retrieved from https://ifes.org/politicalfinance.

Westminster Foundation for Democracy. (n.d.). Political finance in Nigeria. Retrieved from https://wfd.org/Nigeria/Politicalfinance.

Ibeanu, O. (2007). Political finance, transparency, and accountability in Nigeria's Fourth Republic. African Journal of Political Science, 5(1), 28–40.

Ibeanu, O. (2008). The challenge of election governance in Nigeria. Nigeria Political Review, 15(2), 1–10.

Ibeanu, O. (2019). Clientelism and political financing in Nigeria: An analysis. Journal of African Studies, 15(2), 15–30.

Ibrahim, A., & Ibrahim, U. (2021). The influence of political finance on the democratic party governance in Nigeria. Journal of African Politics, 10(2), 55–75.

International IDEA. (2014). Funding of political parties and election campaigns: A handbook for political finance. Sweden.

International Foundation for Electoral Systems (IFES). (2019). Nigeria's 2019 general elections: An impact assessment. Retrieved from https://www.ifes.org/

Independent National Electoral Commission (INEC). (2005). Political party finance handbook. Abuja, Nigeria.

Independent National Electoral Commission (INEC). (2017). Consolidating free, fair and credible election in Nigeria: INEC strategic plan 2017–2021. Abuja, Nigeria.

Independent National Electoral Commission (INEC). (2021). INEC action plan for the 2023 general elections. Retrieved from https://www.inecnigeria.org/

Independent National Electoral Commission (INEC). (2022). Electoral Act 2022: Understanding the innovations. Abuja, Nigeria.

Jinadu, L. (2005). Electoral process and electoral violence in Nigeria: A study of 2003 elections. Journal of African Elections, 4(1), 1–24.

Krause, J. (2021). Public debt and political stability in Nigeria: A current analysis. African Governance Review, 9(3), 45–62.

Lijphart, A. (1999). Patterns of democracy: Government forms and performance in thirty-six countries. Yale University Press.

Mathwizurd. (2015, October 12). Three theories of American democracy. Retrieved August 8, 2024.

Mills, C. W. (1956). The power elite. Oxford University Press.

Niemi, R. G. (2015). Campaign finance in the United States: Are there people who don't follow the money? Measurement of Political Activity, 64(4), 275–299.

Nownes, A. J. (2010). Interest groups in American politics: A focus on the uncommon ones. Routledge.

Nnoli, O., & Nwankwo, J. (2020). The challenges of electoral management in Nigeria: Political accountability and election in Nigeria. Research Report, December 2022.

Nwankwo, J. (2021). The emergence of political finance regulation in Nigeria: Trends and implications. Nigerian Journal of Political Studies, 9(1), 11–26.

Ojo, E. (2015). Election management in Nigeria: The experience of the Independent National Electoral Commission. International Journal of Politics and Good Governance, 6(6.1), 1–15.

Ojo, A. (2020). Civic education and political finance in Nigeria: The path to accountability. Journal of Civic Engagement Studies, 7(1), 45–60.

Osho, M. (2021). The state of political finance in Nigeria: The role of INEC. Journal of Political Finance, 7(2), 55–73.

Owewe, C. (2019). Elite capture and political financing in Nigeria. African Journal of Political Economy, 11(3), 68–81.

Pareto, V. (1935). The mind and society. Harcourt, Brace and Company.

Salim, Y. (2017). Political financing in Nigeria: Exploring the challenges of reforms. Journal of African Political Economy and Development, 2(1), 14–27.

Sanya, A., & Oduwole, F. (2020). Lessons from comparative political finance regulation: Implications for Nigeria. Journal of Comparative Governance, 5(2), 94–106.

Sartori, G. (1990). Comparative constitutional engineering: An inquiry into structures, incentives and outcomes. NYU Press.

Suleiman, I. (2018). The evolving role of INEC in Nigeria's democratic landscape: Challenges and prospects. Journal of African Politics, 6(2), 123–140.

The 1999 Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria.

The 2010 Electoral Act.

U.S. Federal Election Commission (FEC). (2021). Campaign finance laws. Retrieved from https://www.fec.gov/

Uwais, M. (2007). Review of electoral laws and regulations in Nigeria: Progress and challenges. Nigerian Journal of Political Science, 3(2), 1–22.

The Republic. Retrieved from https://www.therepublic.com.ng/

Yagboyaju, D. A., & Simbine, A. (2020). Political finance and the 2019 general elections in Nigeria. Journal of African Elections, 19(1).