

Money Politics in Election Campaigns: The Power of “*Money Politics*” and “*Ethnicity*” in Voting Decisions in Tanzania

Mpawenimana Abdallah Saidi *

Department of International Relations, University of Malaysia Sarawak

Mwidima Peter Charles

*Department of Journalism and Mass Communications, St Augustine University of
Tanzania*

Robert Renatus Bujiku

Directorate of Planning and Evaluation, CDM, Dar es Salaam

** Corresponding Author*

Abstract

This study sought to examine the influence of “money politics” and “ethnicity” in the voting decisions amongst voters in Tanzania. It was carried out immediately after the 2015 general election in the country. It is a qualitative research which used six Focus Group Discussions to collect data from the districts of Ilemela and Nyamagana in Mwanza Tanzania. Each group comprised of 12 participants who were purposefully selected. A thematic analysis was used to analyse and manage the data whereby all necessary cleanings, transcription, coding, organizing, and theming were observed in the process. The findings reveal that ethnicity has a slight influence (54%) in the voting decisions amongst voters in Tanzania compared to money politics (46%). The findings further reveal that women voters in Tanzania are more influenced (63%) by money politics than men (37%). Likewise, men voters are more influenced (57%) by ethnicity in their voting decisions and preferences than women. Thus, the study recommends actionable implementation of the National election Act of 2010 subsection 102, so as to combat corrupting behavior in Tanzanian elections.

Keywords: Examining, money politics, ethnicity, election campaigns, voting decisions, Tanzania

Background of the study

Money politics in this study is used to refer to the excessive use of money in terms of cash, free lunch, free gifts, free transports, and distribution of salt, t-shirts, caps, mobile phones, sugar, clothes (Khanga), matchboxes, and the like items during election campaigns. According to Bartels (1996) the process of election normally goes hand in hand with some campaigns where aspirants are given platforms to advertise their policies and manifestos to their prospective voters. During this process, politicians use different techniques to make sure that they catch the attentions of prospective voters and eventually win the elections. Among the technique used is the use of money and ethnicity whereby politicians or their agents use money or ethnicity to influence the voting decisions of prospective voters.

Money politics during elections encompasses not only the distribution of money (Nadeau, 2001) but it also covers issues like free gifts as previously stated. In Tanzania, money politics mainly covers the distribution of caps, clothes, salt, matchbox, money (cash), and many other

free items which politicians use to manipulate the minds of prospective voters toward their voting decisions.

On the other hand, the history of political campaigns in Tanzania can be traced back in early 1990s when the country had transformed from a one party system to multiparty system. As such, in 1995 the country for the first time witnessed seriously and competitive election campaigns which involved about 10 political parties. Just for noting, there are normally two types of election campaigns in the country; these are (i) the general election and (ii) the local government election. The general election is conducted to elect the President of the United Republic of Tanzania and the President of Zanzibar, and also to elect Members of Parliaments and Ward Councillors. On the other hand, the local government election is conducted to elect local government representatives such as village chairpersons and street or sub-ward chairpersons at the grassroots leadership of the government. Furthermore, both general and local government elections are done every five years though they are not done concurrently; local government elections are conducted one year earlier than the general election.

Furthermore, it should be noted that these two types of elections are consecutively done in the two sides of the country, that is, Tanzania main land and Zanzibar Island. Historically, Tanzania is the united republic, established after the union of the two countries of Zanzibar and Tanganyika which merged in 1964 to form the United Republic of Tanzania commonly known as Tanzania whereby the two countries agreed to have two governments, namely; the government of the United Republic of Tanzania and the government of Zanzibar whereby the President of the United Republic of Tanzania takes charge of all matters of the government of Tanzania as determined by the constitution meanwhile the President of Zanzibar takes charge of all matters of Zanzibar government.

Election Campaigns in Tanzania

Since the establishment of multiparty politics in 1992, Tanzania has conducted a total of five general elections to elect the President of the United Republic of Tanzania, President of Zanzibar, Members of Parliaments and Ward Councillors. Under multiparty system, Tanzania witnessed a number of political parties being established to compete with the ruling party Chama Cha Mapinduzi (CCM), some of those political parties includes; Civil United Front (CUF), NCCR Mageuzi, and Chama Cha Demokrasia na Maendeleo (CHADEMA).

The first election to be conducted in the country was that of 1995 where Mr. Benjamin Mkapa of CCM emerged winner amongst other Presidential candidates after a winning threshold of about 61.8 percent. The second election was again conducted in 2000 whereby Mr. Benjamin Mkapa from the ruling party CCM maintained his seat. The third election was done in 2005 where Dr. Jakaya Kikwete from the ruling party emerged winner, and likewise re-elected again in 2010 general election. The fifth election in the country is that of 2015 which put in power the incumbent President Dr. John Pombe Magufuli from the ruling party CCM after a slight victory of about 58 percent against his giant counterpart, the former Prime Minister Mr. Edward Lowassa of Chama Cha Maendeleo (CHADEMA) who earned about 40 percent of the total votes.

However, in all the past five general elections in the country, Tanzania has also witnessed a number of election campaigns being done by politicians and their agents or followers. It should be noted that it is mandated by the National Election Commission (1995) that any candidate contesting for any political position in the country should conduct a campaign to advertise his or her policies, and such a campaign may be done by the respective candidate himself of his or her agent.

According to Mwidima (2017) as cited from the National Election Commission (2010) of Tanzania, the campaign period begins one day after the nomination of candidates from the respective political parties and ends one day before the election day, thus, the 2015 general election campaigns begun immediately after the nomination of such candidates on 22nd August, 2015 and ended on the 23rd October 2015. In response to sections 40 – 43 of the presidential and parliamentary regulations of 2015, and sections 35 – 37 of the Councillors' (elections) regulations of 2015, political parties which had candidates vying for various posts in the general election were required to provide their tentative campaign timetable to the Electoral Commission for co-ordination during the campaign period.

Furthermore, the National Electoral Commission (NEC) sets the rules of the game during election campaigns. For example; according to NEC (2000) the presidential election campaign should be comprised of at least some representatives from political parties with candidate contesting for such a presidential post. Other guidelines provided by the National Electoral Commission are found in the Act No. 6 of 2010 which intends among other things, to control excessive use of funds in election activities. The law requires transparency in the sources of income, expenditure, contributions and it also provides ceilings on the amount of money to be spent during Elections. This is to prohibit corrupt practices within political parties and in elections. The registrar of political parties is responsible for the enforcement of this law.

Money Politics in Tanzania's Elections

The use of money to win election in Tanzania is very common. Apart from the use of other techniques, politicians have concentrated much into the use of their wealth to influence prospective voters. In other words, money politics in Tanzania has been suspected to influence most of the voting decisions amongst prospective voters. Generally, the essence of money politics during election campaigns in Tanzania specifically entails the distribution of money, free lunch, salt, sugar, caps, mobile phones, matchbox, clothes, t-shirts, and many others.

Babeiya (2011) notes that money politics in Tanzania became very common since the beginning of the multiparty election in the country, specifically during the first election under multiparty system election in 1995. Babeiya explains that due to the presence of competitions amongst political parties, the use of money and other incentives in election campaigns has been visible in most of the elections in the country. Babeiya further points out that during elections in Tanzania, politicians usually use their agents to distribute money to the prospective voters with a purpose of winning the elections. Those agents are usually their friends, family members, local leaders, other political leaders affiliated to the candidate, and many other agents as it may be determined by the candidate.

It is noted that the distribution of money is usually done in the night whereby candidates or their agents visit households of prospective voters and give them such money with a condition that they should vote for the respective candidate. The sum of money given normally varies as it depends on various situations such as the level of education of the voter, geographical location, the tension of election in such a place, and the physical appearance of the voters, but the minimal money given is usually 500 Tanzania shillings. It is noted that during election campaigns in Tanzania, politicians do fetch prospective voters from different areas in the constituencies; they hire Lorries and trucks to collect people from different corners of the country especially from the rural areas and suburbs and bring them to one stationed place where candidates would give their speeches and pledges. Likewise, politicians often use their agents to provide some free lunch to those prospective voters gathered in those

places. In return, prospective voters are conditioned and expected to support the candidates who have offered them free transport and free lunch as loyalty for their services.

Furthermore, the distributions of salt, sugar, caps, mobile phones, matchbox, clothes, t-shirts, and many others have been so common during election campaigns in Tanzania. It is observed that during election campaigns, politicians and their agents invest much in giving free gifts with a purpose of influencing prospective voters in their voting decisions. The distribution of these gifts are usually directed to the low income voters, uneducated voters, and the marginalized groups such as women in the rural areas, the disabled men and women and many others.

Surprisingly, Tanzania at one point appeared to give justifications on the use of money during election campaigns. Under the so called “Traditional Hospitality Act” (2000) which was commonly known as takrima [tips], politicians and the government through political parties, it was declared that the use of money during election campaigns was allowed due to what they deemed as “tips” or takrima. That being the case, money politics in the country became more vibrant especially to the political parties which were well off compared to the small parties. The implications of such justifications meant that candidates and political parties which had money were justified to use such money in giving voters under the umbrella of hospitality, but the fact was that such money were meant to influence voters in their voting decisions.

Money Politics in Elections

Money during election campaigns has been highlighted to be one of the major affecting variables amid decisions, particularly amid voting inclination where voters cast their votes to the candidates who gives them a few cash, guarantees, endowments, or a few other motivating forces. Concurring with Burkhanter (1997), Ginsberg (2009) argues that cash includes an incredible impact amid political campaigns and decisions where voters make their choices basing or depending on the money or endowments they gotten from candidates. Money is one of the major deciding components which most of Indian voters depend on amid voting process (Hazarak, 2015). Other components (such as media surrounding or group of onlookers framing) don't have significant influence on the gathering of people voting inclinations in spite of the fact that it can be conceivably for a few individuals to require the cash (since it is given in a deliberate way) and still they can vote for a distinctive candidate of their choices.

Big countries such as the United State of America is amongst other giant countries which have acknowledged and confirmed that the use of money during election campaigns has been one of the major factors which determines the voting decisions amongst prospective voters in that region. This claim is supported by Whatman (2009) who confirms that the use of money in elections has been one of the big influential factors in the voting decisions amongst American voters. Whatman cites the 1998 presidential election in the USA where it was estimated that candidates had raised to about one Billions US dollars which among other expenditures the money was used to influence prospective voters in that election.

Furthermore, money politics during election campaigns makes prospective voters loyal to the political parties of candidates who give them such money. Frederick & Streb (2010) notes a similar experience when they insist that in almost every election which is dominated by the use of money, it is very common that political parties or candidates who use such money have always emerged winners in such elections compared to the small parties especially the opposition parties which have all the time seemed to fail to influence or make prospective voters loyal during the voting decision. In other words, the practical implication here is that

those who have money to give to the voters are always likely to influence voters' voting preferences while those without it, have always continued losing in elections.

According to Hiatt (1998) as cited by Mwidima (2018) the influence of money in voting process amongst voters has been highly pronounced to decide who wins the elections. Hiatt explain that in the past years, political aspirants were voted due to their qualities and not because of money as it is in the current days. Hiatt (1998) further explains that in those days of 1920s democracy seemed to work better because it allowed political candidates of high competence and conscience to rise to the highest level of government. He notes that such candidates were elected on a level field by citizens, whose votes counted equally, but today, politics has become an arm's race – but with money, candidates are forced to give money to win elections. Babeiya (2011) concurs with Hiatt by adding that elections in the present days involve a lot of expenditures from politicians; including the extravagantly use of money and other resources planned to manipulate and win elections.

Very interesting, the influence of money during election campaigns in the Sub-Saharan Africa does not differ much from other parts of the world. Perhaps the only difference could be the nature and techniques used to give such money. Different from the developed countries, the use and influence of money in voting decisions amongst Sub-Saharan Africa is quite huge (Babeiya, 2011). It is very easy for African elections to determine or predict the winners during elections, this is due to the fact that political parties or candidates who use much money are normally more likely to win elections compared to those who use less or not at all, thus, the more a candidate spends the more likely he or she will win the election and the less he or she spends the least likely he or she will win in that election.

The Supremacy of Ethnicity in Elections

The word ethnicity has been used in different perspective by different scholars. Yearley & Bruce (2006) defines the term to refer to a group on the scale of a person or a nation; the members which claim descend from common ancestors and are usually united by common language, religion, culture and history. On the other hand, Gabsa (2004) defines the term ethnicity as a particular way of life of a given group of people that basically differentiates them from another types or class of people whether within the same territory or beyond. Gabsa adds that cultures, language, and sometimes physical appearance are some of the defining features of an ethnic group. When discussing the presence and role of ethnicity in Tanzanian elections, let us have an overview of the nature or presence of ethnic groups in Tanzania. The country is suspected to be comprised of about more than 120 ethnic groups among which more than 100 are alleged to be for native Tanzanians (indigenous) and the rest are the Tanzanian's inhabitants comprising Asians, Arabs, and Europeans (World Atlas, 2019).

However, despite the existence of diverse ethnic groups in the country, there have been diverse points of views about the use of ethnicity in politics. The first point of view asserts that Tanzanians politics has been dominated by the use of ethnicity especially during election campaigns and voting decisions whereby prospective voters tend to support contestants from either their own ethnic group or from their own place of origin. The other point of view believe that despite of the availability of diverse ethnic groups, Tanzania does not have politics of ethnicity as compared to other countries. For example, German (1997) categorically states that Tanzania is one of the few African countries which does not rely much on the influence of ethnicity to determine who the winners of an election would be despite of the presence of diverse ethnic groups. On centrally, Laurentius (2012) has emphatically confirmed that the use of ethnicity in political competition amongst African countries particularly Tanzania is significantly pronounced. Laurentius mentions Kenya as

one of the other giant countries in East African where ethnicity is used as a determining factor for politicians to win elections.

Meanwhile, the use and influence of ethnicity during election campaigns has not only been pronounced in Tanzania but there are some other giant countries such as the United State of America which has also been reported to have a high level of ethnicity during election campaigns as well as voting decisions amongst prospective voters. Suhay (2008) reports that, most of the voters in the United States of America cast their votes basing on the ethnicity grounds especially on colour identity. For example, in 2008 when Americans in Chicago were electing the Mayor, it was witnessed that the voting decisions was dictated and determined by colours. Majority of the blacks voted for the black candidates while the white also casted their votes to the white candidates (Gabriela, 2005). He adds that, in United State of America, the question of ethnicity, precisely grounded on race is very high especially during political races among candidates. Race voting for states like California is very common, and class identity is used as a major predictor of the strength of race voting. That is, the higher the white voters' class the less likely they are to vote for a Latino, likewise, the Latino in California also vote for Latino candidates.

As mentioned earlier that Sub-Saharan African countries are mentioned (Nnabuihe, Aghemalo & Okebugwa, 2014, Adebayo, 2016) as the leading countries which are dominated by the use of ethnicity during elections and voting decisions. Ethnicity in Nigeria is said to have huge influence in determining the choices and voting preferences amongst prospective voters. Iwuji (1998) affirms that political parties like NPC in Nigeria, and other parties in the country have been dominantly covered by ethnicity objectives especially in the southern party of the country, likewise, the NCNC is a typical Ibo [ethnic group] political party, thus, the Ibo have always been voting for the party than other parties. Adegboyega (2006) and William (2011) explains that several attempts to form nationally integrative political parties in Nigeria has failed, instead, patterns of ethnic politics has sustained, illustrated by ethno-regional political parties, ethnic mobilization as well as ethnic voting.

Other countries mostly reported to be dominated by politics of ethnicity is Russia. It is reported (Bremmer, 1994) that ethnicity classes available in Russia have been determining the voting decisions amongst prospective voters. It is noted that this movement has led to the emergency of class formation in the Russia government whereby the minority ethnic groups have always been the looser in elections because of their small number. According to Bremmer (1994) as cited by Mwidima (2018), the popular ethnic groups in Russia have conquered the administration top positions in the country than the minority ethnic groups because of the benefits of appealing more votes from their own ethnic groups who are numerous in the country. Similarly, Brazil is likewise not left behindhand with the politics of ethnicity. It is reported (Powell, 2011) that voting partialities amid voters in Brazil is significantly predisposed by ethnicity grounds of voters in relation to the candidates or political parties (Powell, 2011). Powell mentions the Afro-Brazilian population who are the majority and they are over 75 percentages while the black or Preto Brazilian represent a socioeconomically and politically marginal minority, thus, during elections voting, the majority ethnic group have normally been winning the elections.

Other Sub-Saharan African countries struck by ethnicity in their elections are Zimbabwe and Cameroun. Starting with Zimbabwe, the power of ethnicity has always been used as a determining factor in predicting winners of elections in the region (Dewa, 2009). Dewa explains that ethnicity in Zimbabwe is mainly based on race just similar to South Africa where the blacks prefer voting for the black candidates whereas the white also prefer voting for the white candidates. On the other hand, in Cameroun as Gabsa (2004), and Beyene (2012) reports, voting decisions during election periods is influenced and determined by

ethnicity settings. This has led the country to continuously be led by the majority ethnic groups while the small or minority groups have always been occupying the low positions in the country because they cannot put in power their people due to their being small in numbers.

Statement of the problem

The existing literatures (Babeiya, 2011) suggest that money politics and ethnicity have significant influence in voting decisions amongst voters. However, despite of all these facts, there is scant literature on the influence of both money politics and ethnicity towards voting decisions amongst prospective voters in Tanzania. The purpose of this study was to examine the influence of money politics vis-a-vis ethnicity in the voting decisions amongst prospective voters in Tanzania. In other words, *what is the influence of money politics towards voting decisions in Tanzanian in relations to ethnicity?*

Research Methods

This is a qualitative research which used six Focus Group Discussions in collecting the data whereby three of the groups were done in the rural areas and the rest were done from the urban areas of Nyamagana and Ilemela districts in Mwanza region. The justifications of collecting data from rural areas and the rest to be done from the urban areas of Nyamagana and Ilemela districts is based on the fact that, the researcher was interested in understanding the dimensions and unique factors that influence money politics and ethnicity between the rural areas and urban. The three groups in the rural area were moderated by a researcher assistant who is a PhD candidate in the department of Journalism and Mass Communications at St Augustine University of Tanzania whereas the three groups in the urban area were moderated by the researcher himself. The level of education of participants ranged from primary education (30%), secondary education (33%), and postsecondary schools (37%). All the six Focus Group Discussions comprised of 12 participants. A purposive sampling technique was used to identify and select the participants who participated in the six Focus Group Discussions. Since the study was interested in getting opinions of active voters in the elections, the researchers used the local leaders to identify, select and organise appointments and venues for the discussions. During the discussions in every group, every participant was required to register his or her personal particulars as prepared by the researchers so as to know their basic demographic characteristics. All the six Focus Group Discussions were moderated by the two researchers and they lasted for between two to three hours. During the discussions, the researchers used tape recorders and note books to record and note down all important points said by the participants. Thematic analysis was used to analysis the data gotten from the Focus Group Discussions. Thematic analysis is a process of encoding qualitative information (Boyatzis, 1998). According to Braun and Clarke (2006), thematic analysis is the best in scrutinizing and reporting patterns and themes within qualitative data, thus, the choice of this data analysis method was considered suitable and relevant for this study. Likewise, this approach has been described as one of the most common approaches to qualitative data analysis (Bryman, 2008).

Research Findings

The focus of this study was to examine the influence of money politics towards voting decisions in relation to ethnicity in Tanzania. Specifically, the study sought to determine whether money politics and ethnicity had significance influence towards voting decisions amongst prospective voters in Tanzania.

Table 1:

	VOTING DECISIONS		
	Influenced by Ethnicity	Influenced by Money	Other Factors
FGD 1	54%	14%	32%
FGD 2	42%	27%	31%
FGD 3	29%	13%	52%
FGD 4	37%	19%	44%
FGD 5	52%	11%	37%
FGD 6	63%	14%	23%
Total	277%	98%	219%

The findings reveal that ethnicity has a significant influence towards voting decisions in Tanzania compared to money politics. Majority of participants across the six Focus Group Discussions confirmed to have casted their votes in the 2015 election basing on ethnicity while the rest of the participants were observed to have been influenced by money politics in their voting decisions. Though it was not part of this study, the findings show that the other factors such as pre-existing knowledge, political party's manifestos, political affiliations, and others were among other factors which influenced some of the other voters to cast their votes. The findings further reveal that participants who confirmed to have casted their votes basing on ethnicity, majority (57%) of them said to have done so because the candidates were from their own tribe while the rest (43%) claimed to have done so because the candidates were from their place of origin (geographical proximity).

Moreover, the findings disclose that majority of participants who casted their votes because of money politics confirmed to have done so because they were given money/cash (23%), free transport and lunch (17%), and free gifts (60%). The free gifts given included the distributions of salt (9%), caps (28%), match box (11), mobile phones (3%), clothes/Khanga (37%), sugar (8), and others (4). It was revealed that politicians used their agents and local leaders to distribute the money and all the above listed items at their home places during night hours (70%) while some of the money and those items were distributed at the campaign venues (30%). In nutshell, the findings suggest that ethnicity in Tanzania still has a very significance influence in determining the voting behavior amongst prospective voters in the region compared to money politics. The findings further reveal that the elderly voters in Tanzania are more influenced (61%) by ethnicity than the young voters (39%). It was observed across the focus group discussions that most of the participants whose age were above 50 had casted their votes to the candidates from their own geographic location or those from their own ethnic group. In summary, the general findings from this study suggest that ethnicity still has tangible influence in the voting decisions amongst prospective voters in Tanzania compared to the use of money and other free gifts, in other words, a candidate who is from the majority ethnic group has a greater chance to win an election as compared with a candidate from the minority group. As shown on table 1.1, the overall findings indicate that 277% of informants all the six FGD mentioned to have been influenced by ethnicity factor towards their voting decisions compared to 98% of informants who agreed to have been lured by money factor while 219% said to have casted their votes basing on other factors.

Discussion

The overall findings from this study indicate that ethnicity still has a very significant (54%) influence in the voting decisions in Tanzania compared to the use of money (46%). In other words, candidates from the majority groups in Tanzania have more possibilities to win in elections against those from the minority group. Likewise, candidates who only rely in giving

money and other free gifts during election campaigns in Tanzania have least possibilities to win an election compared to candidates who do not give such incentives but they are from the majority group.

The practical implications of these findings could be that African politics is still dominated by what can be referred to as “*politics of ethnicity*”. This is because; these findings are in agreement with some other African countries such as Kenya, Uganda, Nigeria, and South Africa where the politics of ethnicity is still vibrant. The findings also suggest that prospective voters in some of the African countries such as Tanzania are still loyal and fully committed to their ethnic settings. This is due to the fact that however how much money or free gifts they were given by politicians, still they remained static in their voting decisions, thus, money was not an issue for them.

However, these findings suggest that poverty amongst prospective voters in Tanzania and perhaps in most of the developing countries has a very close connection with the voting behaviors amongst voters in the region. This is due to the fact that some of the participants confirmed to have casted their votes to the candidates who had given them money or some free gifts. In other words, most of the voters in Tanzania who cast their votes because of money they do so because they are being lured by money and not because the candidate is good.

Moreover, it is so surprising to see in these findings that the distribution of clothes during election campaign has a very significance influence in the voting decisions in Tanzania. This can also be considered to be an indicator of poverty amongst voters especially women. The findings revealed that 38% of women casted their votes to the candidates who had given them clothes commonly known as Khanga. It is also surprising in these findings to see that the distribution of money/cash during election campaigns in Tanzania had not ranked at the top compared to the distribution of clothes. What can be interpreted from these findings could be that perhaps the usage of money has been so fast compared to that of clothes which tend to be durable. Money by nature is just like perishable item whereby those who take it merely used hours to finish whereas those who take clothes it takes long duration and this could be why politicians in Tanzania prefer to give clothes to the prospective voters than money. To confirm this, the words of a class seven woman (47 years) represent the voices of other participants:

“I like candidates who give us clothes especially Khanga, this is because we stay with these clothes for a long time. Above all, these clothes help us to cover in the nights because I don’t have bed sheets. For example, this Khanga (clothes) I am wearing; were given to me in the last general election (in 2010) more than five years now, but my husband who was given ten thousand cash on the same day used that money to buy alcohol and was left with nothing, so that is why I cannot betray candidates who give me clothes, I will continue voting for them in the coming elections.”

One of the most interesting aspects about these findings is that there are some parts of the country where ethnicity had invisible influence in the voting decisions among voters. Though it was not part of this study but it was witnessed that there are parts of the country where candidates from Asian and Arabic origins were elected as Members of Parliaments despite of the fact that they are the minority group in the country. For example, voters from the Constituencies of Kwimba, Nzega, Iborogero, Dumila, Morogoro, Ilala casted their votes to the candidates who were Arabic by origin. Likewise, in Babati Constituence, a candidate from Asian origin was elected as Member of Parliament. Thus, these findings sometimes

inform us that the voting behavior among voters in Tanzania is dynamic and cannot directly be predicted. Had ethnicity being the most influencing factor in the voting decisions as suggested by these findings then the minority groups would not have been elected in political positions.

In nutshell, these findings have continued to establish that ethnicity still has some effects in the voting decisions amongst voters and can still predict an outcome of voting trends of an election in Tanzania as Hazarak (2015); Ginsberg (2009) and Whatman (2009) have confirmed. Likewise, the findings suggest that the use of money politics also still hold water in determining winners of an election or can predict the voting trends in Tanzania as Gabsa (2004); Laurentius (2012); and Suhay (2008) have reported. The only uniqueness of these findings is that the study has somewhat managed to distinguish the power of money politics against ethnicity in voting decisions in Tanzania.

Conclusion and Recommendations

The study concludes that ethnicity still has significance influence in the voting decisions and preferences amongst prospective voters in Tanzania, hence; it is likely that most of the voters in Tanzania prefer voting for candidates from their own tribes, same origin, or candidates from same geographical location (geographic proximity). Therefore, candidates from the majority ethnic group in Tanzania are likely to continue gaining more votes from men than candidates from the minority groups. However, the influence of money politics cannot be over sighted as well. This is because money politics has more influence on women (63%) than on men, and since the rate of voting turnout of women has always been higher than that of men, then, their influence in predicting the results of an election in Tanzania is significantly high. Moreover, it can also be concluded that poverty amongst women is an accelerating factor to why they are more lured with money politics in their voting decisions compared to men. The distribution of clothes, sugar, salt, match boxes, free lunch and the like gifts during elections are just few indicators of poverty facing voters in Tanzania of which politicians use such weakness for their political gains, however it should be taken into consideration that according to Tanzania National Election Act, Cap 343 of 2010, under subsection 102 (a) and (b) It is clearly stipulated that inducing or procuring voters is an offence that a person who commits such an offence of a corrupt practices is liable to a fine or to imprisonment for a term not exceeding five years or both. Lastly, in order to further explore the voting trends in Tanzania, future researchers may expand this research by making a comparative study amongst the East African countries of Kenya, Uganda, Burundi, Sudan, and Rwanda. This would help to enlighten the readers about the country with high influence of money politics and ethnicity in their voting decisions.

References

- Adebayo, A. (2016). The Strength of Ethnicity in Voting Behaviour in the 2015 Presidential Election in Nigeria. *International Journal of Fundamental Psychology*, 6(1), 1-19.
- Adegboyega, S. (2006). *The Dynamics of Politics in Yoruba Land*. PhD thesis submitted to the Graduate School of the State University of New York at Alban.
- Ayeotero, O. (2016). Analysis of the influence of opinion leaders on voting decisions of rural voters. *Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 21(1), 46-53.
- Babeiya, E. (2011). Electoral Corruption and Politics of Election Financing in Tanzania. *Journal of Politics and Law*, 4(2), 67-77.

- Bakari, M. A. (2012). Religion, Secularism, and Political Discourse in Tanzania: Competing Perspectives by Religious Organizations. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Research on Religion*, 8(2), 1556-3723.
- Bartels, L. (2000). Partisanship and voting behaviour. *American Journal of Political Science*, 41(1), 35-50.
- Beyene, Z. (2012). *The Role of the Media in Ethnic Violence During Political Transformation in Africa: The Case of Rwanda and Kenya*. PhD thesis submitted to the Graduate School of the University of Nebraska.
- Bremmer, I. (1994). *The Politics of Ethnicity: Russia in the new Ukraine*. PhD thesis submitted to the Graduate School of Stanford University.
- Burkhanter, C. (1997). The credibility of campaign promises: “cheap talk by candidates”. Thesis submitted to the Graduate School of University of Maryland.
- Carvalho, J. R. (2008). *Learning Curves: Three Studies on Political Information Acquisition*. PhD thesis submitted to the Graduate School of Duke University.
- Chandrasekara, M. (2014). The Power of Opinion Leaders: A Study on First Time Voters of the University of Colombo. 3(2), 61-64.
- De Vreese, C. (2009). Religion and party choice in Europe. *West European Politics*, 32(6), 1266-1283.
- Dewa, D. (2009). Factors affecting behaviour and voting pattern in Zimbabwe’s 2008 harmonized election. *African Journal of Political Science and International Relations*, 3(3), 490-496.
- Dowd, R. (2003). *Christinity, Islam and Political Culture: Lesson from Sub-Sahara Africa in Comparative*. Los Angeles: PhD thesis submitted to the Graduate School of University of California.
- Ferree, K. E. (2011). *Framing the Race in South Africa*. New York: The Political of Origins or Racial Census.
- Frederick, B. & Streb, M.J. (2010). *When Money Can Encourage Participation: Campaign Spending and Rolloff in Low Visibility Judicial Elections*. Springer and Business Media, LLC.
- Gabriela, S. (2005). *Where is the Brown Vote? Race, Class, and Gender Voting and the Voting Rights Act in Santa Paula, CA* . PhD thesis submitted to the Graduate School of Cornell University.
- Gabsa, W. N. (2004). *Democratization and Ethnic Differential in Africa: An Analysis of the Impact of Democratization Process in the Politics of Ethnicity in Cameroun: 1971-2002* . Atlanta: PhD thesis submitted to the College of Arts and Sciences at Georgia State Univer.
- Ginsberg, B. S. (2009). *The Impact of Race and Ethnicity on Turnout in US Presidential Elections*. New York: A thesis submitted to the Graduate School of New York University.
- Hazarak, B. (2015). Voting behaviour in India and its determinants. *IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 20(10), 22-25.
- Hilliard, C. (2011). *Interpersonal influence on political behaviour*. California: PhD thesis submitted to postgraduate studies, university of California-riverside.
- Iwuji, M. N. (1998). *Ethnicity as a Socialization Agent in Nigeria: The Case of Ibos* . Manchester: PhD thesis submitted to the Graduate School of McMaster University.
- Jared, B. M.et al (2011). *What persuade voters? A field experiment on political campaigning*. Centre for Economic Science, George Masson University.
- Krutz, J. C. (2009). *Political Information and Electoral Behavior in Sub-Sahara Africa*. PhD thesis submitted to the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences of Columbia University.

- Manza, J. (1997). The religion factor in US presidential elections, 1960-1992. *AJS*, 103(1), 38-81.
- Marshall, M. (1996). Sampling qualitative research. *Family Practice*, 13 (6), 522-526.
- Mwangi, G. & Frank, H. (2009). The Deafult Politics of Ethnicity in Kenya. *The Brown Journal of Affairs*, 16(1), 101-117.
- Nadeau, R. et al (2001). Election Campaigns as Information Campaigns: Who Learns What and with What Effect? Department of Political Science, University of Montréal
- Nielson, R. K. (2010). *Ground wars: Personalized Political Communication in American campaigns*. PhD thesis submitted to the graduate school, Columbia University.
- Nnabuihe, N., Aghemalo, A. & Okebugwa, N. (2014). Ethnicity and Electoral Behaviour in Nigeria. *European Scientific Journal*, 2(1), 1857-7431.
- Powell, B. M. (2011). *Contours of the Groups: Using Internal Group Dynamics to Explain Ethnic Outcome in Brazil, North Ireland, and the United States*. PhD thesis submitted to the Graduate School of Harvard University.
- Rebecca, B. S. (2005). *Framing the 2004 Presidential Election: The Role of Media, Political Decision and Opinion Leaders*. PhD thesis submitted to the Graduate Study of the School of the Ohio State University.
- Romero, R. (2008). *The role of ethnicity identity and economic issues in the 2007 Kenyan elections*. Department of International development, university of Oxford.
- Smith, G. A. (2003). *Political Parishes: The Influence of Priests on the Voting Behaviour and Political Attitudes of American Catholic*. PhD thesis submitted to the Graduate School of the University of Virginia.
- Stephenson, L. (2010). *Voting behaviour in Canada*. Vancouver: UBC press.
- Suhay, E. A. (2008). *Group Influence and American Ideals: How Social Identity and Emotion Shape Our Political Values and Attitudes*. PhD thesis submitted to the Graduate School of the University of Michigan.
- Wafula, O. (2014). *Voter behaviour in general elections in Kenya, 1992-2007: Implications for the Development of Lliberal Democracy*. PhD thesis submitted to the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Kenyatta university.
- Whatman, J. M. (2009). *Does Targeted Messages Impact Vote Intention and Vote Choice? An Experimental Study of Alabama Seniors*. PhD thesis submitted to the Graduate School of Auburn University Montgomery.
- Whitehead, R. (2009). *Single Party Rule in Multiparty Age: Tanzania in Comparative Perspectives*. PhD thesis submitted to the Graduate School of the Temple University.
- William, E. (2011). Between the Devil and the Deep Blue Sea: The Displacement of Ethnicity by Corruption in Nigerian's Electoral Politics. *Journal of Third World Studies*, 28(2), 181-206.
- Yearley, S. & Bruce, S. (2006). *The Sage Dictionary of Sociology*. London: Sage Publications.