

An Analysis of the 2015 Nigerian Presidential Election

Uduak-Obong I. Ekanem
Graduate Student
Center for Biotechnology Education
Johns Hopkins University

Ole J. Forsberg
Assistant Professor of Mathematics - Statistics
Department of Mathematics, Knox College

Abstract

Much time has gone into analyzing the 2015 Nigerian Presidential election, a veritable repeat of the 2011 election between incumbent Goodluck Jonathan and retired General Muhammadu Buhari. Previous elections in Nigeria have been fraught with violence and charges of electoral fraud. While the Nigerian electoral commission worked hard to ensure that these elections were fair, violence and charges of fraud materialized.

Electoral forensics applies statistical techniques to elections, frequently testing for evidence of fraud or of unfairness. Using Binomial regression, we tested the official results from the 2015 Nigerian Presidential election for evidence of differential invalidation. Differential invalidation involves invalidating ballots based on who they are cast for.

The results do not strictly indicate evidence of this type of electoral unfairness. The marginal p -values suggest that there may be a problem. Furthermore, the invalidation process in Ebonyi state appears to be completely different from that in other states. This leads one to wonder why that difference exists.

Keywords: Nigeria, Electoral Forensics, Elections, Binomial Regression

Acknowledgements: The authors wish to thank the Junod Mathematics Research Grant for their funding of this research.

Introduction

Democratic elections are becoming an international norm. Governments gain legitimacy from such elections as they are receiving their power directly from the people. However, not all elections are democratic, nor are all elections claimed to be democratic actually democratic. In too many countries, election unfairness is the rule, violence on election day is frequent, and claims of fraud are numerous (Goodwin-Gill 2006).

To combat these problems—or to detect them—many organizations monitor the election as it happens. Such groups include the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE), the African Union, and the National Democratic Institute (NDI). The group will either send foreign monitors to the state holding the election or empower locals to do this.

However, as Josef Stain apparently stated, “It’s not the people who vote that count. It’s the people who count the votes.” More is needed than just watching that people are allowed to freely vote. Ensuring that the votes are equitably counted is also required for the election to be fair.

Thus, in addition to election monitoring, there needs to be an analysis of the election outcomes designed to detect unfairness in the counting of the ballots. The field of electoral forensics applies statistical methods to questions of testing elections for evidence of fairness. One of its most powerful tests is using regression to detect differential invalidation. This occurs when ballots for recognizable subgroups are invalidated at rates different for those outside that group. These subgroups could be based on ethnicity, disability, or voting preference.

This paper proceeds as follows. First, a brief introduction to Nigerian politics and a background to the 2015 election is provided. Second, the data and statistical methods are discussed. Because of the structure of the data, Binomial regression is used to detect differential invalidation. Finally, a discussion of the results is presented.

Nigerian Background

Nigeria gained its independence from the United Kingdom on October 1, 1960, and transitioned to its first republic three years later. For the three-year life of the First Republic, Sir Abubakar Tafawa

Balewa was the Prime Minister and fellow Northerner Nnamdi Azikiwe was the President. The coup d'état of 1963, which ended the First Republic, became the leitmotif of Nigeria. Between independence and 1999, power alternated between the military and the people, between autocracy and democracy. However, the last military government of General Abdulsalami Abubakar in 1999 ensured the effective transition to a democratic government. This government marked the beginning of a government of the people selected through an electoral voting process conducted by the Independent National Electoral Commission (Suberu 2007).

Nigeria conducts elections every four years for political offices. The elections are conducted in three levels: National Assembly elections (federal legislature), Presidential elections (federal executive), and gubernatorial and state assembly elections (local legislature and executive).

The President is elected directly by voters to a four-year term, with a two-term limit (Tar and Williams 2007). While the electoral system is a single-member plurality system, there are adjustments made to ensure that the President has support throughout Nigeria. As stated in Article 134(2) of the Nigerian Constitution, for a candidate to win the presidential election, the candidate has to win a majority of the votes cast and “not less than one-quarter of the votes cast at the election each of at least two-thirds of all the States in the Federation and the Federal Capital Territory, Abuja.” This requirement ensures that the President has some support in both the North and the South of the country, which helps to avoid another civil war in Nigeria like the Biafran war of 1967–1970.

Since the beginning of the Fourth Republic in 1999, the Presidency has been held by the People's Democratic Party (PDP). As such, it is the most influential party in the country (Tar and Williams 2007). The most recent election of 2015 came down to two candidates: the incumbent President Goodluck Jonathan, a southerner and flag bearer of the PDP, and retired General Muhammadu Buhari, a northerner and flag bearer of the All Progressive Congress (APC) party. The APC Party was formed from the merger of four opposition parties and some members of the PDP who had defected to the APC party (Lewis and Kew 2015).

The 2015 election was special for many reasons: First, it was a repeat battle between the incumbent President and the retired General. The 2011 Presidential election, which pitted these

candidates against each other saw Goodluck Jonathan win, 59% to 32% (Animashaun 2015). Second, this election was a test of the incumbent President's ability to retain the support of the people who had lost patience with government graft scandals, high unemployment, and the Boko Haram insurgency in the north-eastern part of the country (BBC 2015). These issues had arisen during the administration of the incumbent President and formed the basis of General Buhari's campaign and slogan — "Change" (BBC 2015). Finally, the candidates were from two different parts of the country: Jonathan from the South and Buhari from the North. As such, there is an expected level of support from certain states. For example, the states in the south, east, and parts of the west tend to support a Southern candidate, while the northern states tend to support a Northerner. Figures 1 and 2 illustrate the distribution of votes in the 2011 and 2015 elections between the candidates across Nigeria. In the midst of this, however, there are still swing votes coming from the highly-populated states.

<Figures 1 and 2 about here>

For these reasons, various news stations predicted the Presidency would be won by Buhari. However, there has been long-standing concerns about the vote rigging, violence, and electoral fraud that has characterized Nigeria's elections (Lewis and Kew 2015). For example, in the 2011 election, the National Democratic Institute (NDI), an international body that observes elections, heavily criticized the elections (NDI 2012). Apart from marked violence, the NDI report cited irregularities, including underage voting, vote buying, stealing of ballot boxes, and lack of secrecy in voting. In part due to this report, INEC worked hard to enact various measures to curb the concerns on elections in the future.

INEC spent more than \$40,000,000 on ensuring that the elections would be free and fair (Al Jazeera 2015). As a result of these changes, "INEC Chairman Attahiru Jega argued that the elections were reasonably free and fair and attributed the success of the elections to sacrifices made by INEC officials" (Adibe 2015, pg 6).

Even with this praise of the 2015 elections, election-day violence was present. Boko Haram attacked several voting centers in the North, killing at least 39 (Al Jazeera 2015). Additional doubts remain on the credibility of the election — especially given the long-standing reputation of

Nigeria's electoral politics. The goal of this study is to analyze this presidential election for evidence that the INEC fell short of its goal.

Analysis

While the rules and regulations for elections differ from country to country, there exist several similarities across those countries claiming to be democratic, primarily that all adults are free to vote for whomever they decide, the candidates and parties have equal access to the media, and each person's vote counts the same regardless of characteristics of that person or of that vote (Omotola 2010).

Of these expectations, the first two measure the level of freedom in the election and the last measures its fairness. In this sense, an election is fair if each vote has the same probability of being counted, independent of candidates, party, or demographics. During the counting process, a vote considered valid by the appropriate election authority is counted, while one that is invalidated is not. Should one group of people have a significantly higher invalidation rate than others, then the election is unfair against that group.

For instance, if ballots cast by blind people have a higher probability of being rejected, the election is biased against blind people. Similarly, if ballots cast in favor of a specific candidate have a higher invalidation rate than those cast for the opponent, then the election is unfair against the supporters of the first candidate.

Unfortunately, as we are not privy to the actual ballots and the invalidation decision for each, we must rely on vote counts aggregated to some higher level. For the 2015 Nigerian election, based on publically available data, that level was the state level. For each state, the number of cast ballots, invalidated ballots, and ballots cast for each candidate were provided. Thus, we worked not with individual ballots, but with vote counts and proportions.

However, if ballots are systematically invalidated according to whom they were cast for, then there will be a relationship between the proportion of ballots invalidated and the proportion of ballots cast for that candidate. If that relationship is negative, then the invalidation helped the

candidate (fewer invalidated ballots in the states supporting the candidate). If the relationship is positive, then the invalidation helped the opponent.

With regression, the relationship between the invalidation rate and candidate support can be examined to test for such a relationship. Should a statistically significant dependence between the two variables be detected, then there would be evidence of differential invalidation—unfairness—in that election.

Election Data

Official election results were obtained directly from the Nigerian electoral commission (INEC) website. The file contained the number of ballots cast, ballots invalidated, and ballots counted to each of the candidates (INEC 2015).

Regression Methods

Regression is a set of methods that can be used to test independence between numeric variables such as these. While Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) is a typical way to estimate that dependence, other methods can take advantage of the inherent structure of the data to better leverage the information. The dependent variable is a count (votes declared invalid) with the number of trials known (votes cast in the state). Thus, the dependent variable is a random variable distributed as something akin to the Binomial distribution.¹

There are four requirements for a random variable to follow a Binomial distribution. Only three of those are guaranteed to be met by the election data before us. Those are that the number of trials is known (number of votes cast), each trial results in one of two outcomes (invalidated ballot or not), a constant success rate (under the null hypothesis, the invalidation rate is independent of the candidate support rate).

The final requirement is that the votes are independent. Extant research suggests that this assumption is frequently violated with election data (Lesthaeghe and Neidert 2009, Mebane and

¹ All calculations were performed using the R statistical environment, v 3.3.1 (R Core Team 2016). Mapping was done using R and shapefiles from GADM (2015). R packages used are lawstat (Gastwirth 2017) and sp (Pebesma and Bivand 2005).

Sekhon 2004). The effect of violating this requirement, however, is that the assumed dispersion is greater than unity.

Recall that the Binomial distribution is a member of the (one-parameter) exponential class, because it can be written in that general form (Bickel and Doksum 2006, McCullagh and Nelder 1989):

$$f(y; \theta) = \exp \left[\frac{x\theta - b(\theta)}{a(\phi)} + c(y, \theta) \right] = \exp \left[\frac{x \operatorname{logit}(\pi) - \log(1 - \pi)}{1} + 0 \right]$$

For Binomial data, $a(\phi) = 1$. For overdispersed Binomial data, $a(\phi) > 1$.

From a practical standpoint, this difference only requires that the model be fit using maximum *quasi*-likelihood estimation (Wedderburn 1974) instead of the maximum likelihood estimation initially proposed by McCullagh and Wedderburn (1972).

Results

The canonical link for the Binomial distribution is the logit function. However, to increase the veracity of the model, we used five link functions and checked that the predictions were similar. Those five functions are the logit, probit, cauchit, log-log, and complementary log-log. Figure 3 is a scatter plot of the data with the five prediction curves provided. Note that the five models make essentially the same predictions. This supports the contention that the models are appropriate for this data.

<Insert figure 3 about here>

Note that in each of the models, Ebonyi state is an outlier. Reading through the election-day reports from Ebonyi did not turn up any explanation for its high invalidation rate. Because of lack of data (Nigeria apparently did not measure invalidations at the state level in 2011), we are unable to determine if this is a feature of Ebonyi or if it is random noise. Frequently, outliers have little effect on determinations of statistical significance. Such is the case here. The substantive conclusions are unchanged whether Ebonyi is included or not.

<Insert Figure 4 about here >

As all link functions produced the same conclusions with respect to evidence of electoral unfairness, the following results are based on the model using the logit link (Figure 4). Recall that the null hypothesis is that there is no statistical relationship between the invalidation rate and the candidate support rate. Should systematic problems exist in either the electoral system or the particular election such that ballots are invalidated in large part based on who they were cast for, then the null hypothesis is not true.

<Insert Table 1 about here >

Because the p-value of the model that includes Ebonyi state is greater than the usual $\alpha = 0.05$, we cannot reject the null hypothesis (Table 1). That is, significant evidence of differential invalidation does not exist here. Note, however, that the model which excludes Ebonyi state *does* suggest differential invalidation (p-value = 0.0346). Because of the number of models examined, however, a Bonferroni adjustment suggests that this low p-value may be a result of the inherent downward bias of p-values calculated for multiple tests (Westfall et al. 1997). As such, we are not prepared to conclude that there is evidence of systematic differential invalidation based on this data and this model.

Discussion and Conclusion

Nigeria's elections typically involve irregularities ranging from vote buying to ballot box stuffing. The magnitude of the irregularities was even noted by the NDI in a report of the previous elections (NDI 2012). Through actions, such as improved security and others, put in place by the INEC, the 2015 elections were called free and fair by the chairman of the INEC (Adibe 2015). However, because of the history of elections in Nigeria, doubts remain about the fairness of this election. We tested the 2015 election for unfairness using regression tests of the invalidation rate against the candidate support level, testing for invalidation as a function of support for Goodluck Jonathan.

The INEC website provided us with sufficient data. The proportion of invalidated votes and level of candidate support were calculated for each state. The invalidation rates ranged from a low of 1.17% to a high of 7.49%. The lowest was in Akwa-Ibom state won by Jonathan with 93.7%. Jonathan winning in this state was no surprise as it is a Niger-Delta state in the Southern part of the

country. Jonathan was a native of this part as such the large support was understandable. The highest invalidation rate was in Ebonyi state, also won by Jonathan with 88.9%. Ebonyi state is governed by candidates from the PDP party. As such, Jonathan winning so many votes in that state is also not surprising.

We used Binomial regression, a type of generalized linear model, to estimate the relationship between the invalidation rate and the support for Jonathan in each of Nigeria's 36 states and the Federal Capital Territory. The model suggests that the invalidation rate in Ebonyi state is significantly higher than in other states that Jonathan won. However, the model including Ebonyi and the model excluding it produced the same substantive conclusion. The election results do not give significant evidence of differential invalidation.

Limitations of this Research

The results of this study do not indicate a statistical relationship between the independent and dependent variable for the incumbent candidate. This, of course, does not prove that the election was fair. Statistical techniques rely on the data for their power. For this set of data, the sample size is rather small at 37. Thus, had we election results at the local government area (LGA) level, of which there are 774, our tests would be much more powerful for detecting differential invalidation.

Second, this test only examined one aspect of fairness in the election, that of counting—or not counting—the ballots. There are other aspects of fairness. Goodwin-Gill (2006, pg. 111–112) lists nine, ranging from “guarantee universal and equal suffrage to adult citizens” to “ensure that candidates who obtain the necessary number of votes required by law are duly installed in office.” These statistical methods test none of these. Thus, the election could have been unfair based on these other requirements of fairness.

Regardless of these two limitations, electoral forensics serves as an excellent complement to election observing. Whereas election observers can only declare unfairness if they witness it firsthand, electoral forensics can be used to detect it from afar. In this election, however, we did not detect a significant level of differential invalidation.

References

- Jideofor Adibe. (2015) “INEC and the Challenges of Free and Fair Elections in Nigeria” White paper. Accessed 11 May 2015. <<http://www.inecnigeria.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/07/Conference-Paper-by-Jideofor-Adibe.pdf>>
- Mojeed Adekunle Animashaun. (2015) “Nigeria 2015 Presidential Election: The Votes, the Fears and the Regime Change.” *Journal of African Elections* 14(2): 186–211.
- Al Jazeera. (2015) “Voting extended as Nigeria election marred by violence.” *Al Jazeera*. 28 March 2015. <<http://www.aljazeera.com/news/2015/03/millions-nigerians-vote-crunch-poll-150328122844145.html>>
- Peter J. Bickel and Kjell A. Doksum (2006) *Mathematical Statistics, Basic Ideas and Selected Topics*, Vol. 1, (2nd Edition). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- BBC (2015). “How Nigeria’s presidential election works.” *The British Broadcasting Corporation*. Published 27 March 2015. <<http://www.bbc.com/news/world-africa-31111572>>.
- Joseph L. Gastwirth, Yulia R. Gel, W. L. Wallace Hui, Vyacheslav Lyubchich, Weiwen Miao, and Kimihiro Noguchi. (2017) “lawstat: Tools for Biostatistics, Public Policy, and Law.” R package version 3.1. <<https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=lawstat>>
- GADM (2015). GADM database of Global Administrative Areas, version 2.8. URL <<http://gadm.org/>>.
- INEC. “2015 Nigeria Presidential Election Results.” 28 March 2015. *Independent National Electoral Commission*. <<http://www.inecnigeria.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/04/summary-of-results.pdf>>
- Ron Lesthaeghe and Lisa Neidert. (2009) “US Presidential Elections and the Spatial Pattern of the American Second Demographic.” *Population and Development Review*. 35(2): 391-400.
- Peter Lewis and Darren Kew. (2015) “Nigeria’s Hopeful Election.” *Journal of Democracy* 26(3): 94-109.
- Peter McCullagh and John A. Nelder. (1989) *Generalized Linear Models*. London: Chapman and Hall.

- Peter McCullagh and R. W. M. Wedderburn. (1972) "Generalized Linear Models," *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, Series A*. 135 (3) 370–384.
- Walter R. Mebane, Jr., and Jasjeet S. Sekhon. (2004) "Robust Estimation and Outlier Detection for Overdispersed Multinomial Models of Count Data." *American Journal of Political Science*. 48(2): 392–411.
- NDI. (2012) "Final Report on the 2011 Nigerian General Elections." *National Democratic Institute for International Affairs*. Published December 2012.
<https://www.ndi.org/sites/default/files/NDI%20Final%20Report%20on%20the%20Nigeria%202011%20Electionsnew_Part1.pdf>
- J. Shola Omotola. (2010) "Elections and Democratic Transition in Nigeria under the Fourth Republic." *African Affairs*. 109(437): 535-553.
- Edzar J. Pebesma and Roger S. Bivand. (2005) "Classes and methods for spatial data in R." *R News*. 5(2): 9–13. https://cran.r-project.org/doc/Rnews/Rnews_2005-2.pdf.
- R Core Team (2016). "R: A language and environment for statistical computing." R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. URL <<http://www.Rproject.org/>>.
- Rotimi T. Suberu. (2007) "Nigeria's Muddled Elections." *Journal of Democracy* 18(4): 95-110.
- Usman A. Tar and Alfred B. Zack-Williams. (2007) "Nigeria: Contested Elections and an Unstable Democracy." *Review of African Political Economy* 34(113): 540-548.
- R. W. M. Wedderburn. (1974) "Quasi-likelihood functions, generalized linear models, and the Gauss—Newton method." *Biometrika*. 61(3): 439–447.
- Peter H. Westfall, Wesley O. Johnson, and Jessica M. Utts. (1997) "A Bayesian Perspective on the Bonferroni Adjustment." *Biometrika*, 84(2): pp. 419-427.

Appendix: Figures




Figure 1: Support levels for Jonathan and Buhari in the 2011 Nigerian Presidential election.




Figure 2: Support levels for Jonathan and Buhari in the 2015 Nigerian Presidential election.




Figure 3: Prediction curves for the five models with the observed invalidation rates and level of support for Jonathan. The outlier in the upper right is Ebonyi state.




Figure 4: Prediction curves for the logit models. The top line (green) is the model including Ebonyi state. The bottom line (brown) excludes it.

		Estimate	Std Err	t-value	p-value
<i>With Ebonyi</i>	Constant	-3.3615	0.1281	-26.242	<< 0.0001
	Jonathan Support	-0.3725	0.2477	-1.504	0.1420
<i>Without Ebonyi</i>	Constant	-3.3343	0.1139	-29.287	<< 0.0001
	Jonathan Support	-0.5017	0.2279	-2.201	0.0346

Table 1: Regression tables for the logit model with and without including Ebonyi state. Note that excluding it allows us to conclude a statistically significant relationship between invalidation rate and candidate support rate; excluding it does not.