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The ‘Not Too Young to Run Act’ was signed into law in May 2018 to reduce the constitutional age requirements for running for office and pave the way for young Nigerians to participate actively in electoral politics. The signing of the Bill into law by President Muhammadu Buhari was the result of unrelenting and effective advocacy by YIAGA AFRICA and members of the Not Too Young To Run Movement. For the first time in Nigeria’s post-independence history, young people between the ages of 25-30 were legally empowered to contest for seats in the House of Representatives and State Houses of Assembly. YIAGA AFRICA also launched the ‘Ready To Run Campaign’ to support young political candidates through all stages of the 2019 elections with technical resources, strategic networks and media visibility. A key component of this novel undertaking was the ‘Ready To Run Platform’, the largest and the most comprehensive database on youth candidates running for office in the 2019 elections. In the build-up to the general elections, YIAGA AFRICA undertook an assessment of youth candidates’ campaign activities to identify their strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats (SWOT). The SWOT analysis was designed to facilitate evidence based and constructive advise to youth candidates. This report serves as a resource for supporting youth candidates and promoting youth participation in politics.

The findings of the study are presented in three broad groups:

1. General Findings
2. Key findings of the SWOT Analysis
3. Findings from the Interviews with Influential Group Leaders (IGL).
1. General findings

- Of the 99 youth candidates sampled in the study, only 12 (12.1%), were women while 87 (87.9%) were men. This is consistent with the low participation of women in politics and poor representation in National and State Legislatures in particular.

- Of the total number of candidates aged between 25 and 39 years that were interviewed, 36.4% were in that age bracket indicating that they were direct beneficiaries of the 'Not Too Young To Run' Bill. Majority of the youth candidates, 44.4%, were aged 30-34 years, while only 19.2% were aged 35-39 years. The North-Central, North-East and North-West had the same number of youth candidates, 18 each, while the South-East, with 12, had the least number of youth candidates.

- Young people in the age group 25-29 years were dominant among youth candidates in the North-East, North-West and South-West. Those in the age group 30-34 years formed the majority among youth candidates in the North-Central, South-East and South-South.

- Two political parties, Alliance for New Nigeria (ANN) and Social Democratic Party (SDP), had the highest number of youth candidates, 9 each, while seventeen 17 other parties were least represented by youth candidates, only one (1) each.

---

*All the interviews were conducted YIAGA AFRICA’s field enumerators between December 2018 and January 2019.*
2 Key Findings of the SWOT Analysis

1 Strengths of Youth Candidates

The popularity of youth candidates or parties, projects undertaken by youth candidates in their constituencies, personal leadership qualities, candidates' visibility to the various categories of voters, financial backing and strong party structure, were identified as strengths by youth candidates and IGLs interviewed.

37% of youth candidates acknowledged that they received some form of financial support from their political parties.

21% of the IGLs surveyed considered qualities such as compassion, being truthful and respectful; being a visionary leader and being academically sound, among others, as the major strengths of the youth-candidates. This observation however varied significantly by geopolitical zone.

2 Weakness of Youth Candidates

Inadequate funding/inability to access enough funds, unpopularity of a youth candidate’s party platform, political inexperience, gender, religious and ethnic discrimination and candidates' inability to meet with local, community or constituency associations, were considered as key weaknesses by the youth candidates.

Three out of five, 59.9% of the youth candidates, identified inadequate finance as a major weakness and challenge to their electoral success.

Only 26% of IGLs identified funding as an important limitation for youth candidates.

7% of IGLs were of the view that failure of the youth candidates to reach out to influential members in their constituencies was a serious weakness.
Opportunities of Youth Candidates

Availability of and access to social media as a tool of mass communication and mobilisation; unpopularity of the incumbent, popularity of the youth candidates’ party platform especially in their own constituencies, were all identified by IGLs as opportunities for youth candidates, and if utilised effectively, they could enhance their electoral chances.

The most popular media used by the youth candidates were Facebook (used by 91 of 99 candidates), posters (87) and WhatsApp (85). This supports the view that youth candidates are very active on social media platforms which they could convert into opportunities to garner support from young voters.

About a quarter or 24.2% of the youth candidates identified increased voter education, increased awareness created on Radio/TV, 3%; empowering the youth, 20.2%, as opportunities.

17.3% of the IGLs interviewed believed that the ‘youthfulness’ of youth candidates is an opportunity that could be leveraged upon to mobilise young voters who constitute the majority of the voting population. This view was corroborated by majority of the leaders in North-West, 4.6%, and North-East, 4.2%.

33.3% of youth candidates acknowledged that more consultations, giving gifts to traditional rulers, access to a vehicle or vehicles for political campaigns, and using the mass media as campaign platforms, presented opportunities to be explored further.

13.6% of the IGLs identified zoning, being a female, the only youthful candidate in the election, as potential opportunities, which if skilfully mobilised, could enhance the chances of youth candidates at the polls.

Youth candidates were of the view that the unpopularity of an incumbent presented them an opportunity, especially for those of them in the major parties.
Electoral malpractices, destruction of candidates’ billboards, posters and fliers, verbal attacks and physical violence against the youth candidates and their supporters; conflict between the youth candidates and the leaderships of their political parties, competing against opponents with strong financial backing, were identified by the youth candidates as electoral threats.

45.3% of the youth candidates believed that the actions of their opponents had negative impacts on their campaign, while only 6.3% believed that their opponents’ actions had a positive impact on their political activities and chances.

48.4% of youth candidates averred that their political opponents’ actions had no impact on their campaigns, but 46.9% of youth candidates confirmed that they suffered verbal or physical attacks from their political opponents;

4.8%, of youth candidates claimed that discrimination and intimidation on the basis of their age or gender, was a threat while only 3% believed that absence of or vague track record, and lack of a political godfather were threats to their chances of success in the 2019 elections.
3 Key findings from the interviews with influential group leaders

More than three-quarters of the IGLs interviewed or 80% admitted they knew the candidates, while 20% confessed they had no prior knowledge of the youth-candidates contesting the 2019 elections in their constituencies.

80% of the IGLs interviewed were aware of the campaign activities of the youth candidates in their constituencies, while 21% learned of the campaigns through posters, 23% through personal meetings, 5% through TV or radio advertisements and only 3% through social media. 20% of IGLs interviewed were not aware of their local youth candidates at all.

The fact that only 3% of IGLs heard of candidates through social media is troubling given the high use of Facebook and WhatsApp by the youth candidates.

Social media activism should be used by the youth candidates as a supplement to, and not a replacement for, traditional campaign tools like posters and face-to-face meetings with community leaders and elders.

More than half, 54% of the IGL of associations had been contacted directly by the youth candidates’ campaign teams, while 46% had not been contacted by the candidates. 40% of youth candidates had visited at least two of the IGL’s in their constituencies.

Youth candidates sought visibility by executing projects in their constituencies. It was observed that only 38.4% of the youth-candidates had undertaken one form of project or the other within their constituencies. Some of the projects undertaken by the candidates include: provision of borehole, drugs for health care centres, and scholarships for students, among others. Majority, 10.3% of the youth candidates with projects are in the North-East, 8.8% in the South-South, 6.3% in the North-West, 6.1% in the North-Central, 4.4% in the South-West and 2.5% in the South-East.

33% of IGLs believed that youth voters are most likely to vote for the youth candidates.
21% of the IGLs thought youth and women are likely to vote for the youth candidates. About one tenth, 8% of the IGLs, considered the ‘youth’ and age of voters as important factors in their decision to vote for youth candidates. Only 1% believed that members of occupational and religious groups are likely to vote for the youth candidates. Similarly, only 8% of the IGLs believed that they are most likely to be voted for by all categories of voters. 7% of IGLs did not know which groups if any, were likely to vote for youth candidates.

52% of IGLs said that youth candidates needed to expand their campaigns by touring more wards and LGAs in their constituencies to create better awareness among their constituents.

96% of the youth candidates interviewed had a campaign manifesto which they made available during their visits to the IGLs.

19% of IGLs identified youth and women empowerment, job creation, 7%, effective representation, 16%, as the main highlights of the youth-candidates' manifestoes.

28% of the IGLs observed issues like improving education, promoting health care delivery, sponsoring social welfare bills, providing security and bringing prosperity to the people as the concern of the candidates.

26.6% of the IGLs viewed the youth candidates' chances in 2019 as “very likely” to win election, while 37.1% considered them “likely”.

63.7% of IGLs had a favourable assessment of youth candidate's ability to win in the election.

Majority, 80% of the IGLs, were aware of the youth candidates prior to the interviews, indicating that they might have also witnessed or heard about the candidates' campaign activities.
More importantly, youth candidates had visited 54% of the interest group associations with 40% of them having visited two or more of the associations.

96% of the campaign organizations of the youth-candidates have manifestoes. More than three quarters, 79% of the youth candidates presented their manifestoes during visits to the different interest groups.

Fewer than 40% of interest group leaders had knowledge of any projects undertaken by the youth-candidates in their constituencies. Majority of the projects by the youth candidates are in the North-East while the least is by candidates in the South West.

Recommendations

• Interpersonal engagements are valuable for political campaigns. Youth candidates should organise face-to-face meetings and adopt a door-to-door approach in their political campaigns. Visiting community leaders in their constituency would increase visibility to local elders and enhance the seriousness with which the later view campaigns by youth candidates.

• Political parties should demonstrate commitment to youth inclusion by providing direct technical and funding support to youth candidates.

• Electoral stakeholders like political parties, civil society groups and youth groups should develop a leadership capital development strategy aimed at recruiting and grooming leaders and facilitating political and leadership transition at all levels.

• NGOs and development partners should focus interventions on youth candidates with defined campaign structures in their constituencies. Such interventions should evolve from consultation with local stakeholders.

• Youth candidates and NGOs alike should be aware of and be realistic about the threats to the youth candidates’ campaigns posed by, among others; relatively unknown party platforms, popular and wealthy opponents, election malfeasance by opponents, and negative perceptions of youth candidacy by elders and community leaders.
Introduction

The ‘Not Too Young to Run Act’ was signed into law in May 2018 to reduce the constitutional age requirements for running for office and pave the way for young Nigerians to participate actively in electoral politics. The signing of the Bill into law by President Muhammadu Buhari was the result of unrelenting and effective advocacy by YIAGA AFRICA and members of the Not Too Young To Run Movement. For the first time in Nigeria’s post-independence history, young people between the ages of 25-30 were legally empowered to contest for seats in the House of Representatives and State Houses of Assembly. YIAGA AFRICA also launched the ‘Ready To Run Campaign’ to support young political candidates through all stages of the 2019 elections with technical resources, strategic networks and media visibility. A key component of this novel undertaking was the ‘Ready To Run Platform’, the largest and the most comprehensive database on youth candidates running for office in the 2019 elections. In the build-up to the general elections, YIAGA AFRICA undertook an assessment of youth candidates’ campaign activities to identify their strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats (SWOT). The SWOT analysis was designed to facilitate evidence based and constructive advise to youth candidates. This report serves as a resource for supporting youth candidates and promoting youth participation in politics.

Methodology and scope of the Study

The study population comprised of 334 youth candidates on YIAGA AFRICA ‘Ready To Run’ online platform. From the 334 candidates, a purposive sample of 99 candidates from 36 parties were selected for the research. 37 field researchers, one from each state and the Federal Capital Territory (FCT), were recruited and trained by YIAGA AFRICA to undertake the field work on the campaigns of young candidates. YIAGA AFRICA also identified and interviewed Influential Group Leaders (IGL), from each geopolitical zone between December 2018 to January 2019.

Three research instruments were used in the Study: an interview guide for youth candidates, a resource mapping checklist for the field researchers to complete while visiting the constituencies, a questionnaire and interview guide for Influential Group Leaders (IGL). The questionnaire and interview guide were administered to five interest group leaders to gauge public perception of the youth candidates. The study was conducted in thirty-four states and the FCT. Measures were taken by YIAGA AFRICA to ensure the findings of this study represent as much as possible, the general perceptions of the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats to youth candidates as identified by the respondents that participated in the research.
General Findings

Of the 99 youth candidates used in the study, only 12 representing 12.1%, were women while 87 (87.9%) were men. This finding is consistent with the low participation of women in politics and poor representation in National and State legislatures.

The study also revealed that majority of youth candidates (69.7%) were running for State Houses of Assembly; 27.3% for seats in the House of Representatives, while only 3% were contesting for seats in Senate. The low number of youths contesting Senate seats is consistent with the constitutional age limit of 35 years and above.
Of the total number of candidates interviewed, 36.5% were between 25 and 39 years. Candidates with his age category are regarded as beneficiaries of the Not Too Young To Run Bill. Majority of the sample, 44.4%, were aged 30-34 years, while only 19.2% were aged 35-39 years. The North-Central, North-East and North-West had the same number of youth candidates, 18 each, while the South-East, with 12, had the least number of youth candidates.

Chart 1 above revealed that those youth candidates in the age group 25-29 years were dominant in the population of youth candidates in the North-East, North-West and South-West. Those in the age group 30-34 years formed the majority among youth candidates in the North-Central, South-East and South-South. The Study also found that 99 youth candidates are contesting under the platforms of 36 political parties.
Two political parties, Alliance for New Nigeria (ANN) and Social Democratic Party (SDP), had the highest number of youth candidates, 9 each, while seventeen 17 others were least represented by youth candidates, only one (1) each. The table below displays the top six political parties with the highest number of youth candidates.

Table 1: Political Parties with the highest number of Youth Candidates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Political Party</th>
<th>Number of Youth Candidates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alliance for New Nigeria (ANN)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Democratic Party (SDP)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People’s Democratic Party (PDP)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Progressives Congress (APC)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African Democratic Congress</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Rescue Movement</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total = 47

The total number of youth candidates of the six political parties was 47 and represented 47.5% of all the candidates presented by the 36 political parties. 69.7% of the candidates are contesting seats in State Houses of Assembly, 27.3% in the Federal House of Representatives and only 3% in the Senate.
Demographic Characteristics of Interest Group Leaders

In addition to the youth candidates, YIAGA AFRICA interviewed a total of 489 Interest Group Leaders (IGLs). A minimum of three IGLs and a maximum of four were interviewed for each candidate. The majority, 76%, of the IGLs interviewed were male, while 24% were female. 44% of the IGLs were between 35 and 40 years old, while 38% were older than 40. The IGLs were classified by YIAGA AFRICA into five categories according to: occupational associations, youth groups, women’s groups, religious organizations, and community development associations. The table below presents the proportion for each group interviewed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Proportion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Occupational Associations</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth groups</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s groups</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Organizations</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Development associations</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more groups</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Demographic Characteristics of Interest Group Leaders (IGLs)
Source: YIAGA AFRICA
PART 2
KEY FINDINGS FROM THE SWOT ANALYSIS
Key Findings from the SWOT Analysis

a. Strengths
For youth candidates to have a chance of winning elections they must possess attributes that endear them to the electorate in their constituents. Such positive qualities are usually classified as strengths. Strengths are internal to the candidates and their campaign teams. The following qualities were the most frequently cited as strengths by the youth candidates and influential group leaders, IGLs, in their constituencies:

1. Popularity
2. Projects undertaken in the constituency
3. Personal leadership qualities
4. Visibility to various categories of voters,
5. Financial backing
6. Strong party structure

Financial backing was considered by IGLs as particularly important. However only 37% of the candidates said they received some form of financial support from their political parties. The IGLs also identified factors such as personal/leadership qualities, youthfulness, endorsement by different interest groups, and popularity of the candidates’ party and party structure as potential factors that youth candidates can take advantage of to ensure success at the polls.

About one in five, 21% of the IGLs surveyed considered leadership qualities such as compassion, being truthful and respectful; being a visionary and academically sound, among others, as major strengths of the youth candidates. This observation however varied significantly by geopolitical zone. In the North Central, 27% of IGLs considered such personal and leadership qualities as strengths for the youth candidates in their constituencies. This figure was the same for the North-East, but slightly lower in the South-South 25%. The figures for the South-East, North-West and South-West were; 18%, 12% and 8% respectively.

b. Weaknesses
Weaknesses refer to the negative attributes of the youth candidates or their parties that are perceived as not favourable to their electoral chances. Such weaknesses are internal to the candidates and their campaign teams. The following factors were the most frequently cited weaknesses by the youth candidates themselves and by the IGLs in their constituencies:

1. Inadequate funding
2. Unpopularity of party platform
3. Inexperience in politics
4. Gender/religious/ethnic discrimination
5. Inability to meet with local, community or constituency associations
c. Opportunities
Like strengths, opportunities are positive in nature. They open up chances which if properly utilised, would make a positive impact on a youth candidate’s chances of electoral success. The study however revealed that available opportunities were external to the youth candidates and they emanated from the socio-political and cultural environments in which they were operating. When asked about the opportunities available to them, the young political aspirants and IGLs identified the following:

1. Availability of and access to social media as a tool of mass communication and mobilisation.
2. The Unpopularity of the incumbent.
3. Popularity of the candidates’ party platform especially in their constituencies.

17.3% of the IGLs interviewed considered the ‘youth’ of the candidates as an opportunity that could be leveraged upon by the youth candidates to mobilize young voters who constitute the majority of the voting population. This view was corroborated by majority of the interest group leaders in North-West, 4.6%, and North-East, 4.2%.

As well, 5% of the IGLs considered the structure/popularity of the youth candidates’ party as an opportunity. About half, 2.4%, of the IGLs in the North-East corroborated this finding of the Study. However, 13.6% of the IGLs were of the view that other important factors, such as zoning, being a female, or the only youthful candidate, as potential, which if skilfully mobilised, could enhance the chances of success of the youth candidates. About 6% of IGLs observed that the candidates had the support of different groups identified earlier in the Study in their constituencies. The percentages are respectively; North-East, 1.8%, North-West, 1.5%, South-West, 0.9%, North-Central, 0.7%, South-South, 0.4% and South-East, 0.2%. Finally, 13.8% of the IGLs were not able to identify the strengths of the youth candidates.

In addition to the opportunities identified above, the youth candidates also came up with other areas where opportunities can be found and maximized to improve their chances at the polls. About a quarter, or 24.2%, of the youth candidates identified increased voter education, increased awareness creation on Radio/TV, 3%; empowering the youth, 20.2%. However, 33.3% of youth candidates acknowledged that more consultations, giving gifts to traditional rulers, access to a vehicle or vehicles for political campaigns, and using the mass media as campaign platforms, presented opportunities to be explored further.

The youth candidates were of the view that the unpopularity of an incumbent presented an opportunity, especially for those of them in the major parties. For example, Felix Pascal Pulevo, candidate of the All Progressives Congress, APC, in the Taraba State House of Assembly, averred: “Everywhere I go I am introduced as the member awaiting for the swearing in; because the major huddle we had to cross was the primaries and people are tired of the
PDP and the member representing us is in PDP and he is serving a 3rd term.”

d Threats
Threats to the youth candidates’ chances of getting elected in 2019 are exactly the opposite of opportunities. They are negative factors that are external to youth candidates or their campaign teams. Significantly, the youth candidates have virtually no control over threats, and they can only try to manage them so that they do not get out of control or they are not overwhelmed by such damaging factors. The youth candidates and IGLs interviewed identified the following threats in the 2019 elections:

1. Electoral malpractices
2. Destruction of candidates’ billboards, posters and fliers
3. Verbal attacks and violence against youth candidates and their supporters
4. Conflict between youth candidates and the leadership of their political parties.
5. Competing against opponents with strong financial backing.

The result of the study revealed that 45.3% of youth candidates believed the actions of their opponents had negative impacts on their campaign, while only 6.3% believed that their opponents’ actions had a positive impact on their political activities. More importantly, 48.4% of the youth candidates averred that their political opponents’ actions had no impact on their campaigns. 46.9% of the youth candidates confirmed that they suffered verbal or physical attacks from their political opponents; while 14.1% had their posters, fliers and billboards destroyed. The result from the geographical zones showed that 6.7% of the youth candidates experienced verbal attacks, while 3.8% suffered physical violence (with one case reported each in the North-East, North-West and South-West but none in the other regions). 12.3% of the youth candidates testified that they were victims of more than one form of attack.

7% of IGLs believed that if the political party platform of youth candidates was unpopular, it would pose a threat to their campaigns. Youth candidates, 4.8%, claimed that discrimination and intimidation on the basis of their age or gender was a threat, while 3% believed that absence of or a vague track record and lack of a political godfather, was a threat.

When the youth candidates were asked about other threats to their campaign, 11.1% identified electoral malpractice and intra-party interference as their top concerns. However, 10.1% of the youth candidates identified the financial potency of the political opponents as their biggest threat. Another 10.1% of the youth candidates considered insecurity, religious conflicts, inadequate voter education, poor transportation and unreliable communication channels as important factors that could affect their chances at the polls.

The character of a political party’s platform could also pose a threat to the political campaign and electoral success of youth candidates in other important ways. Youth candidates who joined “mushroom parties” faced the challenge of low name
One youth candidate in Akwa Ibom admitted that “...nothing has come from the party,” while another youth candidate belonging to the National Rescue Movement, also in Akwa Ibom, confessed; “I am just being hopeful, keeping my fingers crossed.” He regretted that it was hard to attract supporters because his party’s platform was relatively unknown compared with the established political parties; “They will always say I need to give people money because my party is not well known since it’s a new party, because other contestants do that too.” In contrast, the youth candidates of the larger and more established political parties were believed to be better known in their constituencies even when they were not directly supported by those parties. They also admitted that the youth candidates of new and less known political parties cannot compete with those in the big ones like the APC or the PDP: “...we can never equip ourselves like the APC or the PDP, if we decide to go and hire cars for a rally...and we hire ...10 next tomorrow they will come out with 100 so...we are doing what is called door to door campaign, instead.”
Other Significant Findings of the Study

a. Awareness of Youth Candidates

- A good knowledge of the youth-candidates in their constituencies is essential for them to stand any chance of success in the polls. More than three-quarters of the IGLs interviewed or 80% admitted they knew the candidates, while 20% confessed they had no prior knowledge of the youth-candidates contesting the 2019 elections in their constituencies.

- 80% of the IGLs interviewed were aware of the campaign activities of the youth candidates in their constituency, while 21% learned of the campaigns through posters, 23% through personal meetings, 5% through TV or radio advertisements and only 3% through social media. 20% of IGLs interviewed were not aware of their local youth candidates at all.

- Candidates used a variety of platforms to pass on their message to the electorate. The most popular media were Facebook (used by 91 of 99 candidates), posters (87) and WhatsApp (85).

- Radio (38) and TV (11) were used by relatively few candidates, most likely due to their expense. This may explain why such a small share of IGLs heard of youth candidates through TV or radio advertisements.

---

Chart 2: Media Platforms Used by Youth Candidates
Source: YIAGA AFRICA
The fact that only 3% of IGLs heard of candidates through social media is troubling given the high use of Facebook and WhatsApp by candidates. It is possible that the majority of these messages were aimed at voters who did not fit the demographics of the IGLs (recall that the IGLs are community leaders and the youngest among those interviewed was 35 years).

From the available data, social media activism should be used as a supplement to, and not a replacement for, traditional campaign tools like posters and face-to-face meetings.

46% of IGLs interviewed admitted that their associations had not been visited by the youth candidates in their constituency.

More than half, 54% of the IGL associations had been contacted directly by the youth candidates’ campaign teams, while 46% had not been contacted by the candidates. 40% of candidates had visited at least two of the IGL’s in their constituency.

Youth candidates also sought visibility by executing projects in their constituencies. It was observed that only 38.4% of the youth-candidates have undertaken one form of project or the other within their constituencies. Some of the projects undertaken by the candidates include: provision of borehole, drugs for health care centres, and scholarships for students, among others. Majority, 10.3% of the youth-candidates with projects are in the North-East, 8.8% in the South-South, 6.3% in the North-West, 6.1% in the North-Central, 4.4% in the South-West and 2.5% in the South-East.

b. Support for and Expectations of Youth Candidates

With regard to who would support or vote for the youth candidates during the 2019 elections; 5% of the IGLs identified women as the likely voters, 33% believed youth voters are most likely to vote for youth-candidates.

21% of the IGLs thought that the youth and women only, are likely to vote for the youth-candidates. About one tenth, 8% of the IGLs considered the youth and age of voters made youth-candidates more appealing to them. Only 1% believed that members of occupational and religious groups were likely to vote for the youth candidates. Similarly, 8% of the IGLs also thought that they were most likely to be voted for by all the other categories of voters. 7% of IGLs did not know which groups if any, were likely to vote for the youth candidates.
To enhance the chances of the youth-candidates in the polls, 52% of IGLs said that the youth candidates needed to expand their campaigns by touring more wards and LGAs in their constituencies to create more awareness. 7% believed that the youth candidates should provide more voluntary support and services, while 6% thought that the youth candidates should focus on empowering women and the youth in their constituencies, while only 4% advocated for the provision of social amenities.

c. Election Manifestoes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>96%</td>
<td>96% of the youth candidates interviewed had a campaign manifesto which they made available during their visits to the IGLs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19%</td>
<td>19% of IGLs identified youth and women empowerment, job creation, 7%, effective representation, 16% as the main highlights of the youth-candidates’ manifestoes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9% of the IGLs noted that the manifestoes of the youth-candidates comprised two or all of youth and women empowerment, job creation, and effective representation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28%</td>
<td>28% of the IGL observed issues like improving education, promoting health care delivery, sponsoring social welfare bills, providing security and bringing prosperity to the people as the concerns of the candidates. 21% of the IGL observed that some of the youth candidates specifically, used the visits to solicit for support from the associations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

d. Chances of Youth Candidates at the 2019 Polls

- On the chances of the youth candidates in the forthcoming elections, 26.6% of the IGLs assessed the youth candidates’ chances of success as “very likely” to win election, while 37.1% described their chances of success as just “likely”.

- 63.7% of IGLs had a favourable assessment of the youth candidate’s ability to win in the 2019 elections.

- 19% of the IGLs had a negative assessment of their chance, saying the youth candidates were either “unlikely” or “very unlikely” to win election. 17.2% were unsure of the candidate’s chances.
Summary of the major Findings from the Interviews with Interest Group Leaders, IGLs

For the youth candidates to improve on their chances of success at the polls, it is important for them to avoid any thing that could undermine their strengths. They must also take advantage of opportunities as they present themselves, if they should stand any chance of doing well in the 2019 elections. Details of the study's findings based on interviews with interest group leaders in their constituencies, IGLs, are:

- Majority, 80% of the Interest Group Leaders, IGLs, were aware of the youth candidates prior to the interviews, indicating that they might have also witnessed or heard about the candidates' campaign.

- More importantly, the youth candidates had visited 54% of the interest group associations, with 40% of the youth candidates having visited two or more of the local associations.

- 96% of the campaign organizations of the youth candidates had manifestoes. More than three quarters, 79% of the youth candidates, presented their manifestoes during visits to the different interest groups in their constituencies.

- Fewer than 40% of interest group leaders had knowledge of any projects undertaken by the youth candidates in their constituencies. Majority of the community development projects by the youth candidates were in the North-East, while the fewest of such projects by the youth candidates were in the South-West.

- Inadequate finance and funding were identified as the major threats to youth candidates' campaigns and their eventual the success at the polls.

- 19% of IGLs wanted the youth candidates to be financially strong in order for them to be to compete with and even defeat the more established politicians in their constituencies.

- Candidates' youthfulness, political party structure/popularity of the party, charisma and leadership qualities, and endorsement by different groups in their constituencies, were identified as some of the strengths and opportunities available to youth candidates in 2019.
Inadequate finance, discrimination/intimidation, inexperience, unpopular party/candidacy, inability to reach out to some influential groups in their constituencies or outside their constituencies and electoral malpractices, were identified as some of the major weaknesses and threats that were common to all youth candidates irrespective of the state or geopolitical zones.

Figure 5: Are Youth Candidates Visible in their Constituencies?
Source: YIAGA AFRICA

Figure 6: Youth Candidates’ Access to Campaign Offices
Source: YIAGA AFRICA

Figure 7: Do Youth Candidates have Access to Campaign Finance Officers?
Source: YIAGA AFRICA

Figure 8: Do Youth Candidates have Access to Campaign Media Officers?
Source: YIAGA AFRICA

Figure 9: Do Youth Candidates have Access to Campaign Legal Advisers?
Source: YIAGA AFRICA

Figure 10: Do Youth Candidates have Campaign Calendars?
Source: YIAGA AFRICA

Figure 11: Do the Youth Candidates have Manifestoes?
Source: YIAGA AFRICA

Figure 12: Do the Youth Candidates Campaign Budgets?
Source: YIAGA AFRICA
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Figure 13: Do the Youth Candidates’ Parties Offices in the Constituencies?
Source: YIAGA AFRICA

Yes 73.7%
No 26.3%

Figure 14: Has the Leadership of the Youth Candidates’ Parties Visited their Constituencies?
Source: YIAGA AFRICA

Yes 61.6%
No 38.4%

Figure 15: Youth Candidates’ Recognition among the interviewed Interest Group Leaders in their Constituencies in Percentages
Source: YIAGA AFRICA

20% Recognition 7.1%
40% Recognition 14.1%
60% Recognition 12.1%
80% Recognition 16.2%
100% Recognition 50.5%

Figure 16: Percentage Share of IGLs who thought that Youth Candidates were likely to Win
Source: YIAGA AFRICA

0% of Interviewers 5.1%
100% of Interviewers 12.1%
40% of Interviewers 16.2%
60% of Interviewers 21.2%

Figure 17: Percentage Share of Constituents who met with the Youth Candidates
Source: YIAGA AFRICA

Candidate met with none 14.1%
Candidate met with one 13.1%
Candidate met with two 14.1%
Candidate met with three 14.1%
Candidate met with all 23.2%
PART 4
RECOMMENDATIONS
Recommendations

Below is a summary of the key recommendations of the Study:

1. **Interpersonal engagements are valuable for political campaigns.** Youth candidates should organise face-to-face meetings and adopt a door-to-door approach in their political campaigns. Visiting community leaders in their constituency would increase visibility to local elders and enhance the seriousness with which the later view campaigns by youth candidates.

2. Political parties should demonstrate commitment to youth inclusion by providing direct technical and funding support to youth candidates.

3. Electoral stakeholders like political parties, civil society groups and youth groups should develop a leadership capital development strategy aimed at recruiting and grooming leaders and facilitating political and leadership transition at all levels.

4. NGOs and development partners should focus interventions on youth candidates with defined campaign structures in their constituencies. Such interventions should evolve from consultation with local stakeholders.

5. Youth candidates and NGOs alike should be aware of and be realistic about the threats to the youth candidates' campaigns posed by, among others; relatively unknown party platforms, popular and wealthy opponents, election malfeasance by opponents, and negative perceptions of youth candidacy by elders and community leaders.