INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF ARTS MANAGEMENT AND PROFESSIONAL STUDIES
ISSN: 2814-0370, ORCID ID: 0009-0003-3878-0137
VOL. 6, ISSUE 2, 2026
AVAILABLE ONLINE: www.ijamps.com

THE DEMOPRENEURSHIP CYCLE: POLITICAL INVESTMENT, PATRONAGE OBLIGATIONS AND THE GOVERNANCE CONSEQUENCES OF ELECTORAL FINANCE IN NIGERIA

Eze Chidi Nwauba
Professor of Intrapreneurship, Strategic Policy and Administration
Department of Public Administration,
i-FATOSS University, Republic of Benin
E-mail: dparlay@gmail.com
vc@ifatossuniversity.edu.bj
+2349124673109
+22996547204

ABSTRACT

This article develops the Demopreneurship Cycle as a focused analytical model for explaining how the financial structure of electoral competition may transmit into post-election political obligations and governance pressures in Nigeria. Building on the concept of Demopreneurship originally developed by the author in Politics for Sale: Demopreneurship and the Fight for Nigeria's Democratic Dividend (Nwauba, 2026), the article moves beyond a general description of expensive politics to specify a sequential mechanism linking political ambition, capital mobilisation, electoral competition, victory, financial obligations, patronage, governance pressures, public dissatisfaction and renewed political ambition. The article is conceptual and uses a qualitative analytical approach based on critical engagement with the author's original conceptual framework and relevant literature on political finance, clientelism, patronage, prebendalism and Nigerian electoral politics. It argues that the analytical value of Demopreneurship lies not in treating politicians as literal entrepreneurs or assuming that campaign expenditure necessarily produces corruption, but in examining how the financing of political entry can create obligations and incentives that persist after elections. The article distinguishes the Demopreneurship Cycle from established theories by locating the starting point of analysis in the financing of political participation and tracing its possible transmission into governance. Six analytical propositions are advanced concerning political capital, sponsor leverage, financial obligation, governance discretion, institutional mediation and cycle reproduction. The article concludes that the framework provides a basis for studying the relationship between electoral finance and governance while identifying empirical questions for future research.

Keywords

Demopreneurship; political investment; electoral finance; patronage; clientelism; political capital; governance; Nigeria; democratic accountability

1. Introduction

Political finance occupies a central position in the study of democratic competition because elections require resources, while the distribution and control of those resources can affect who enters politics, how campaigns are organised and what relationships are established during electoral competition. In Nigeria, the financial dimension of politics has attracted sustained scholarly attention because the cost of political participation, campaign finance practices, patronage networks and vote buying can interact with institutional weaknesses and socio-economic vulnerability. Existing research has examined the regulatory environment surrounding campaign finance, the persistence of money politics and the relationship between political finance and clientelist practices (Bratton, 2008; Okeke & Nwali, 2020). More recent work has also examined political financing and the politicisation of social protection programmes for electoral purposes (Nwangwu, 2025).

The concept of Demopreneurship provides a different but complementary entry point into this literature. The concept was originally developed by Nwauba (2026) to describe the political-economic process through which participation in democratic politics increasingly assumes entrepreneurial characteristics: political actors mobilise capital, assume risks, build networks and commit resources in pursuit of electoral success, with the possibility that electoral victory will subsequently generate pressures to recover or justify those investments. The framework does not equate political participation with corruption. Rather, it directs analytical attention toward the institutional incentives created by the financial structure of political competition.

The present article narrows that broader framework to one specific proposition: political investment may generate a cycle of obligations that extends beyond election day. The central analytical question is therefore not simply how much money is spent on elections, but what happens to the relationships, expectations and financial commitments created by that expenditure after an election has been won. Political actors enter office carrying relationships formed during nomination processes, campaigns, fundraising, sponsorship, coalition building and electoral competition. The book from which this framework is developed describes this process through the Demopreneurship Cycle, moving from political ambition and capital mobilisation through electoral competition and victory to financial obligations, patronage, governance pressures, public dissatisfaction and renewed political ambition (Nwauba, 2026).

The article has four objectives. First, it formalises the Demopreneurship Cycle as a conceptual model. Second, it identifies mechanisms through which electoral investment can become political obligation. Third, it differentiates the model from related theories of clientelism, patronage, prebendalism, rent-seeking and political entrepreneurship. Fourth, it develops analytical propositions that can be tested in future empirical research on Nigeria and comparable political systems.

2. Conceptual and Theoretical Background

2.1 Political finance as an institutional question

Political finance is commonly discussed in relation to transparency, spending limits, donations, party funding and enforcement. Yet its significance extends beyond compliance with formal rules. The way resources are mobilised can shape access to political competition and the relationships candidates establish with supporters and financiers. Okeke and Nwali (2020), for example, examine the political economy of campaign-finance regulation in Nigeria, while Bratton (2008) demonstrates how material inducements can become embedded in electoral competition. These perspectives support an analytical shift from campaign expenditure as an isolated electoral event toward finance as part of the institutional environment of political competition.

The Demopreneurship perspective builds on this insight by treating political finance as a process. In the author's original framework, political expenditure begins well before the formal campaign period and can extend through party processes, campaign organisation, election-day operations and post-election litigation. Political participation therefore resembles a pipeline in which resources are progressively committed to a political objective (Nwauba, 2026).

2.2 Clientelism, patronage and political exchange

Clientelism explains reciprocal relationships in which political support is exchanged for material or other benefits. Patronage focuses more specifically on the distribution of offices, contracts, resources or opportunities through political networks. Stokes et al. (2013) show how brokers can connect political actors to voters through distributive relationships, while Kitschelt and Wilkinson (2007) locate patron-client relationships within broader patterns of democratic accountability and political competition. These perspectives are essential to understanding Nigerian politics because they illuminate relationships that can develop between political patrons, brokers and clients.

However, the Demopreneurship Cycle begins at an earlier point. It asks how the financial requirements of political entry may contribute to the formation of obligations and relationships that later resemble patronage or clientelist exchange. This distinction is analytical rather than absolute. The same political relationship may be interpreted through multiple theoretical lenses. A financier supporting a candidate can be studied as a patron-client relationship, campaign finance, political investment, or part of a broader network of political entrepreneurship. Demopreneurship adds attention to the temporal sequence linking these processes.

2.3 Prebendalism and the post-election environment

Joseph's (1987) analysis of prebendal politics directs attention to the use of public office for the benefit of individuals and groups connected to office holders. Demopreneurship does not replace this perspective. Instead, it asks a prior question: what financial and relational processes may contribute to the incentives confronting office holders once they enter government? This creates a conceptual bridge between pre-election finance and post-election distribution.

2.4 Political entrepreneurship

Political entrepreneurship concerns actors who identify opportunities, mobilise resources, construct coalitions and pursue political objectives. Demopreneurship draws on this entrepreneurial vocabulary but places financial investment and electoral risk at the centre of analysis. The distinction matters because political entrepreneurship can describe innovation and coalition building without necessarily addressing the financing burden attached to electoral entry. Demopreneurship brings that financial burden into the centre of the model.

3. Research Design and Analytical Approach

This article adopts a conceptual and qualitative analytical design. Its principal source is the author's published conceptual work, Politics for Sale: Demopreneurship and the Fight for Nigeria's Democratic Dividend (Nwauba, 2026), particularly the sections defining Demopreneurship, identifying sources of political capital, describing the political investment pipeline and presenting the Demopreneurship Cycle. The analysis is supplemented by established scholarship on political finance, clientelism, patronage, vote buying and Nigerian political economy.

The purpose is theoretical development rather than causal estimation. The article does not claim that every political financier expects private returns, that every elected official is financially indebted, or that campaign expenditure necessarily produces corrupt conduct. Instead, it proposes a mechanism that can be examined empirically.

The analytical unit is the political investment relationship rather than the individual politician alone. This allows attention to be directed toward the structure of financing: who supplies resources, how concentrated those resources are, what expectations accompany them, how institutional rules constrain subsequent exchanges, and whether relationships persist across electoral cycles. The approach therefore treats finance as relational and longitudinal rather than merely monetary.

4. The Demopreneurship Cycle

The Demopreneurship Cycle consists of ten analytically connected stages: (1) political ambition; (2) capital mobilisation; (3) electoral competition; (4) election victory; (5) financial obligations; (6) political patronage; (7) governance pressures; (8) public dissatisfaction; (9) demand for political change; and (10) renewed political ambition. The cycle then becomes capable of repetition (Nwauba, 2026).

The model is best understood as a heuristic sequence rather than a claim that every political career follows an identical path. Its principal contribution is to place time and transmission at the centre of analysis. Political finance is not treated as an event that ends when votes are counted. Instead, relationships created through resource mobilisation may continue into governance, where they can interact with institutional rules, political competition and public expectations.

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF ARTS MANAGEMENT AND PROFESSIONAL STUDIES
ISSN: 2814-0370, ORCID ID: 0009-0003-3878-0137
VOL. 6, ISSUE 2, 2026
AVAILABLE ONLINE: www.ijamps.com

The cycle can also be understood as a feedback model. Political ambition generates demand for capital; capital supports competition; competition produces either victory or defeat; victory changes access to public authority; financial relationships may create obligations; obligations can influence political distribution; governance outcomes affect public perceptions; and those perceptions can shape the next electoral contest. The model is therefore concerned with both forward movement and feedback.

5. Political Ambition and Entry Costs

Political ambition is the starting point because political investment requires an actor to identify public office as an objective worth pursuing. The original framework emphasises that political expenditure can begin long before formal campaigns through consultations, stakeholder engagement, party activities and coalition building (Nwauba, 2026).

When political competition becomes expensive, individuals with limited access to capital may be discouraged from entering. Existing Nigerian research similarly identifies political financing as an important dimension of democratic consolidation and access to political competition (Igbinovia, 2022). The issue is not simply whether elections are expensive in aggregate, but whether the cost structure disproportionately favours candidates with access to established financial networks.

Entry costs can also alter the composition of political competition. When nomination fees, campaign logistics, media expenditure, mobilisation and legal expenses accumulate, citizens with professional competence but limited capital may decide not to contest. The resulting effect is potentially institutional: the candidate pool becomes shaped partly by financing capacity. Demopreneurship therefore begins before an individual becomes a candidate; it begins when the expected cost of political entry becomes part of the decision to participate.

6. Capital Mobilisation and Political Investment

Capital mobilisation is the point at which political ambition becomes a resource commitment. The original framework identifies personal savings, family contributions, business networks, loans, political sponsors and citizen donations among potential sources of political capital (Nwauba, 2026). These sources carry different expectations, risks and degrees of independence.

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF ARTS MANAGEMENT AND PROFESSIONAL STUDIES
ISSN: 2814-0370, ORCID ID: 0009-0003-3878-0137
VOL. 6, ISSUE 2, 2026
AVAILABLE ONLINE: www.ijamps.com

A candidate financed largely from personal resources may face different pressures from a candidate whose campaign depends heavily on external sponsors. Likewise, citizen donations may generate accountability expectations that differ from those associated with concentrated private sponsorship. The key variable is therefore not simply the amount of money mobilised but the structure of the financial relationships through which it is mobilised.

Capital mobilisation also creates a question of concentration. A broad base of relatively small contributions may distribute influence among many contributors, whereas a campaign financed by a small number of large contributors may create more concentrated relationships. This is not a deterministic claim; rather, it identifies a measurable characteristic that can be tested in empirical research.

7. Electoral Competition as an Investment Process

The political investment pipeline identified in the original framework includes consultations, coalition building, party registration or alignment, nomination forms, primary elections, campaign organisation, media engagement, election-day operations, litigation, assumption of office and preparation for subsequent political competition (Nwauba, 2026). This sequence demonstrates why election expenditure should not be reduced to advertising or vote mobilisation during the official campaign period.

The investment analogy highlights risk. Political actors commit resources without certainty of victory. When financing is concentrated among sponsors or creditors, electoral defeat can produce substantial financial consequences. When victory occurs, the same investment relationships may generate expectations concerning access, influence or future political support.

This stage also clarifies why the concept is not identical to corruption. Investment is a descriptive feature of resource mobilisation. Corruption is a separate legal and ethical category involving abuse of entrusted power. The Demopreneurship framework examines the incentives and relationships produced by financing without assuming that the resulting conduct is necessarily unlawful.

8. Election Victory and Financial Relationships

Election victory changes the institutional position of the candidate. Before victory, the candidate seeks resources and support. After victory, the candidate occupies an office through which public authority and public resources can be exercised within constitutional and legal limits. The transition therefore changes the bargaining environment surrounding previous relationships.

The Demopreneurship framework proposes that the analytical question is whether electoral financing creates obligations that survive electoral competition. Such obligations may involve expectations of appointments, access, contracts, influence, future support or protection of established interests. The existence of such expectations does not by itself prove wrongdoing; it identifies a mechanism requiring empirical investigation.

The transition from campaign to government is therefore a critical analytical boundary. Researchers can compare the financial network surrounding a candidate before election with appointments, contracting relationships and access patterns after election. Such comparisons would permit the framework to move from conceptual proposition to empirical testing.

9. Financial Obligations and Sponsor Leverage

Financial obligations represent the critical transmission point in the Demopreneurship Cycle. The original framework describes the return-on-investment problem as arising when political expenditure becomes so expensive that recovering campaign expenditure becomes a practical pressure rather than merely a personal temptation (Nwauba, 2026). Sponsor leverage can vary according to concentration of funding, size of contribution, relationship between sponsor and candidate, candidate dependence on external resources and institutional safeguards.

The framework therefore directs attention toward leverage rather than expenditure alone. A large campaign may be financed through thousands of small contributions, through public party resources, or through a few dominant sponsors. These arrangements may produce different post-election incentive structures. Future research should examine both the amount and the concentration of political finance.

Sponsor leverage may also be dynamic. A sponsor who provides resources during one electoral cycle may acquire a relationship that affects subsequent nominations, appointments or coalition formation. Conversely, institutional constraints may prevent the relationship from producing material influence. The concept therefore requires attention to both financial dependence and institutional mediation.

10. Political Patronage

Political patronage is the stage at which financial and political relationships may become institutionalised through appointments, contracts, access, influence and other forms of political distribution. Research on Nigerian political economy provides evidence that campaign financing can intersect with patronage and crony relationships. Okorie, Abada and Adibe (2021), for example, examined patronage funding of the Peoples Democratic Party and its relationship with power-sector reform.

The Demopreneurship Cycle interprets such relationships as one possible pathway through which pre-election investment can acquire post-election consequences. It does not assume that all sponsorship produces patronage. Instead, it identifies a relationship that can be investigated through documentary, network and longitudinal evidence.

The distinction between legitimate political support and patronage is also important. Parties require donors, volunteers, organisers and coalition partners. The analytical issue arises where private political relationships influence the allocation of public resources in ways inconsistent with transparent institutional rules. Demopreneurship therefore directs researchers toward the boundary between ordinary political support and institutionally consequential dependence.

11. Governance Pressures

Governance pressure occurs when the demands associated with political relationships interact with the responsibilities of public office. These pressures may arise from sponsors, party structures, coalition partners, supporters, creditors or expectations created during the electoral process. The resulting tension is between network-based obligations and broader requirements of public accountability.

Recent research on the politicisation of social protection in Nigeria demonstrates how public programmes can become connected to electoral and patronage objectives, illustrating the broader problem of state resources entering political exchange networks (Nwangwu, 2025). The Demopreneurship framework does not claim that every such outcome is caused by campaign finance. Rather, it asks whether political financing creates relationships that become relevant when public decisions are made.

Governance pressure can operate through several channels: appointments, procurement, regulatory decisions, allocation of development resources, party financing and electoral mobilisation. Each channel can be examined independently. This makes the model suitable for case studies that trace a particular financing relationship into a specific governance decision.

12. Public Dissatisfaction and Demand for Change

Where citizens perceive that governance is serving narrow political or financial interests rather than broader public objectives, dissatisfaction may develop. Public opinion is also shaped by economic conditions, service delivery, political communication, identity and institutional performance. The model therefore treats dissatisfaction as a potential feedback mechanism rather than an automatic consequence of patronage.

This stage is important because it returns the analysis to the citizen. Demopreneurship is not solely a theory of politicians and financiers. Its concern is the relationship between the financing of political competition and the democratic dividend expected by citizens. Where citizens perceive a persistent gap between electoral promises and governance outcomes, demand for political change can become part of the next electoral cycle.

The model consequently incorporates accountability as a feedback process. Elections do not simply select office holders; they also provide citizens with an opportunity to respond to perceived governance performance. The cycle remains open to interruption where citizens, institutions, parties, courts and oversight bodies alter the incentives facing political actors.

13. Renewed Political Ambition and Cycle Reproduction

Political systems are repetitive. Office holders may seek re-election, move to another office, support successors or maintain influence through party networks. Consequently, the financial and relational structures established during one electoral cycle can become resources for the next. The Demopreneurship Cycle therefore closes by returning to political ambition.

This recursive feature distinguishes the model from approaches that treat campaign finance as a single-period phenomenon. The empirical question is how financing networks evolve across electoral cycles. Researchers can examine whether sponsors recur, whether candidates change financing structures, whether previous office holders finance successors, and whether political networks become more concentrated or diversified over time.

Cycle reproduction is not inevitable. Defeat, institutional reform, party realignment, legal enforcement, financial transparency or changes in voter behaviour can interrupt the sequence. The cycle should therefore be treated as a conditional process rather than a mechanical law.

14. The Governance Transmission Mechanism

The central theoretical contribution of the Demopreneurship Cycle can be expressed as a transmission mechanism: political ambition creates a demand for resources; resource mobilisation creates financial and relational commitments; electoral victory changes access to public authority; those commitments may generate expectations; expectations may produce patronage pressures; and patronage pressures may influence governance choices where institutional constraints are insufficient to neutralise them.

The mechanism is conditional. Strong procurement rules, transparent political finance, independent oversight, effective party institutions, judicial review and civic accountability may interrupt the transmission process. Conversely, weak enforcement, concentrated financing, limited transparency and high dependence on political sponsors may strengthen it. This makes the framework compatible with institutional theories in which rules shape incentives and outcomes (North, 1990).

The mechanism can therefore be represented as a sequence of observable variables: financing structure, political dependence, post-election access, distributive decisions and governance outcomes. This operational character is important for future empirical work because it transforms an abstract concept into a set of relationships that can be investigated.

15. Demopreneurship and Existing Explanatory Frameworks

The Demopreneurship Cycle overlaps with established theories but differs in its starting point and temporal architecture. Prebendalism illuminates the use of public office for particularistic benefit. Clientelism explains reciprocal exchange relationships. Patronage theory focuses on distribution of offices and resources. Rent-seeking examines efforts to secure economic gains through political privilege. Political entrepreneurship focuses on resource mobilisation and opportunity seeking. Demopreneurship connects these perspectives through the financial process of entering politics and the possibility that electoral investment generates post-election obligations.

Its claim is complementary: Demopreneurship proposes a bridge between the pre-election financing environment and the post-election incentive environment. Its principal distinctive feature is the cycle itself, which treats political finance as a longitudinal process and makes the transition from electoral investment to governance pressure the central analytical problem.

This distinction also helps prevent conceptual inflation. Demopreneurship should not be used as a substitute label for every form of clientelism or patronage. Its strongest analytical use is where researchers can identify a financing relationship, trace its evolution through electoral competition and examine whether it has consequences for post-election political behaviour.

16. Analytical Propositions

Proposition 1: The higher the financial cost of political entry, the greater the potential for political participation to become dependent on concentrated sources of external capital.

Proposition 2: The greater the concentration of campaign finance among a small number of sponsors, the greater the potential for sponsor leverage over post-election political relationships.

Proposition 3: Where political financing creates substantial explicit or implicit obligations, the likelihood of post-election patronage pressure increases, subject to institutional constraints.

Proposition 4: Strong transparency, oversight and enforcement institutions can weaken the transmission of campaign-finance obligations into governance decisions.

Proposition 5: The relationship between political investment and governance outcomes is mediated by party institutions, legal rules, administrative capacity and the structure of political competition.

Proposition 6: Where political finance, patronage and weak institutional constraints persist across electoral cycles, the Demopreneurship Cycle may reproduce itself through renewed political ambition and repeated capital mobilisation.

17. Application to Nigeria

Nigeria provides a relevant context because political finance, patronage and clientelist practices have been extensively documented. Campaign-finance scholarship has identified problems involving regulation and enforcement, while research on political patronage has shown how financial relationships can intersect with policy and contracting. Recent research further demonstrates that electoral considerations can influence the distribution and politicisation of social protection programmes (Okeke & Nwali, 2020; Okorie et al., 2021; Nwangwu, 2025).

The Nigerian case should nevertheless be approached with analytical caution. The existence of expensive elections does not establish that every politician seeks private financial recovery. Nor does political sponsorship automatically constitute corruption. The framework instead identifies observable relationships that can be investigated: campaign-finance concentration, sponsor networks, post-election appointments, contracting patterns, policy access, party dependence and repeated financing relationships.

At the institutional level, Nigeria's political-finance regime provides a useful setting for studying the gap between formal regulation and practical political incentives. The relevant research question is not simply whether rules exist, but whether candidates, parties, sponsors and oversight bodies operate within an environment in which those rules meaningfully alter behaviour.

The Nigerian application also raises a comparative question. If similar political-finance pressures exist elsewhere, does the Demopreneurship Cycle operate in the same way, or do electoral systems, party organisation, campaign-finance regulation and state capacity alter the transmission mechanism? Such comparative research would help establish the scope conditions of the concept.

18. Implications for Democratic Accountability

The framework suggests that electoral reform should not be confined to voting technology, polling procedures or election-day administration. Political finance is part of the democratic infrastructure. Measures that broaden legitimate small-donor participation, improve disclosure, strengthen monitoring, clarify spending rules, enhance party financial accountability and reduce barriers to political entry may affect the incentives described by the Demopreneurship Cycle.

The implication is not that public financing alone can solve the problem. Reforms must address the wider institutional environment in which campaign finance operates. Existing scholarship demonstrates that legal provisions can have limited effects where enforcement is weak or socio-economic conditions make voters and candidates vulnerable to material inducement (Okeke & Nwali, 2020).

The framework also suggests that accountability should be considered across the full political investment pipeline. Transparency before elections, disclosure during campaigns, monitoring at election time and scrutiny of post-election appointments and procurement can be treated as connected elements of democratic accountability rather than separate policy domains.

19. Theoretical Contribution and Research Agenda

The article contributes a temporal mechanism to the study of political finance. Rather than examining finance only as an electoral input, it conceptualises political investment as a process whose consequences may extend into governance and subsequent electoral competition.

Future studies could operationalise the framework through campaign-finance datasets, interviews with candidates and political financiers, party records, procurement data, appointment records, election-petition documents and longitudinal case studies. Network analysis could map relationships among candidates, donors, party officials and post-election beneficiaries. Process tracing could examine whether a documented financial relationship preceded a particular appointment or policy decision. Comparative studies could test whether the cycle operates differently under different electoral systems and political-finance regimes.

The concept also creates opportunities for quantitative research. Measures of donor concentration, campaign expenditure, sponsor recurrence, post-election appointments and procurement outcomes could be analysed across electoral cycles. Survey research could examine whether citizens perceive a relationship between political finance and governance. Such research would allow the conceptual propositions developed here to be confirmed, modified or rejected on the basis of evidence.

20. Limitations

This article is conceptual and does not empirically establish the causal propositions advanced. The Demopreneurship Cycle should therefore be treated as a framework for investigation rather than a universal law of political behaviour. Further empirical work is necessary to determine the frequency, strength and conditions of the relationships proposed.

A second limitation concerns measurement. Political financing is often difficult to observe because formal disclosures may not capture informal contributions, in-kind support, personal networks or undocumented sponsorship. This creates an empirical challenge for testing the model. Researchers will therefore need to triangulate official records with interviews, investigative documentation, party records and other sources.

A third limitation is contextual variation. Political systems differ in their electoral rules, party structures, enforcement institutions and socio-economic conditions. The model should therefore be tested across contexts rather than assumed to operate identically everywhere.

21. Conclusion

The Demopreneurship Cycle provides a focused way of analysing the relationship between political investment and governance in Nigeria. Its central insight is that the financial history of an electoral campaign may matter after the election has ended. Candidates can enter political competition through personal resources, family contributions, business relationships, loans, sponsors and citizen support. These financing arrangements can create expectations and relationships that may persist into public office.

The framework does not claim that political finance inevitably produces corruption, nor that every political investment produces a private return. Its analytical purpose is to identify a potential mechanism through which the cost and structure of political competition can influence post-election incentives. By connecting political ambition, capital mobilisation, electoral competition, financial obligation, patronage, governance pressure and renewed political ambition, the Demopreneurship Cycle extends the study of political finance beyond election day and provides a basis for longitudinal research into democratic accountability in Nigeria.

The broader significance of the framework lies in its attempt to connect two domains that are often studied separately: the economics of political entry and the institutional behaviour of governments after elections. By making the connection explicit, Demopreneurship offers a research programme rather than a closed theory. Its propositions can be tested against evidence, refined through comparative research and evaluated against alternative explanations. The concept's contribution will ultimately depend on whether future empirical research can establish where, when and under what institutional conditions political investment becomes politically consequential after electoral victory.

References

Bratton, M. (2008). Vote buying and violence in Nigerian election campaigns. Electoral Studies, 27(4), 621–632. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.electstud.2008.04.013

Igbinovia, D. O. (2022). Political financing and democratic consolidation in Nigeria's Fourth Republic: A public perception survey of Edo South Senatorial District. University of Nigeria Journal of Political Economy, 10(1).

Joseph, R. A. (1987). Democracy and prebendal politics in Nigeria: The rise and fall of the Second Republic. Cambridge University Press.

Kitschelt, H., & Wilkinson, S. I. (Eds.). (2007). Patrons, clients and policies: Patterns of democratic accountability and political competition. Cambridge University Press.

North, D. C. (1990). Institutions, institutional change and economic performance. Cambridge University Press.

Nwangwu, C. (2025). Political financing and vulnerability: Social protection and election campaign financing in Nigeria. Society, 62, 878–891. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12115-025-01074-z

Nwauba, E. C. (2026). Politics for sale: Demopreneurship and the fight for Nigeria's democratic dividend (1st ed.). Independently published. ISBN 9798170233359.

Okeke, G. S. M., & Nwali, U. (2020). Campaign funding laws and the political economy of money politics in Nigeria. Review of African Political Economy, 47(164), 238–255. https://doi.org/10.1080/03056244.2019.1699043

Okorie, A., Abada, I., & Adibe, R. (2021). Crony capitalism in Nigeria: The case of patronage funding of the Peoples Democratic Party and the power sector reform, 1999–2015. Review of African Political Economy, 48(170), 581–608. https://doi.org/10.1080/03056244.2021.1958309

Stokes, S. C., Dunning, T., Nazareno, M., & Brusco, V. (2013). Brokers, voters, and clientelism: The puzzle of distributive politics. Cambridge University Press.