

Who Votes and Why? An Empirical Analysis Reflecting the 2015 General Election in Tanzania

*Muhanga, M. and Rodgers, A.

Development Studies Institute, Sokoine University of Agriculture, P.O. Box 3024, Morogoro-Tanzania. Email: mikidadi@suanet.ac.tz , mikid.muhanga@gmail.com
Development Studies Institute, Sokoine University of Agriculture, P.O. Box 3024, Morogoro-Tanzania. Email: niyindagila@gmail.com

*Corresponding author

Abstract

This paper empirically provides answers to very central questions towards understanding elections and voting behaviour in the context of democratic systems: who votes and why. The paper analyses the aspects of voters turn out decline to characterize who are still turning out to vote and what propels them to vote as reflected in the 2015 General Election based on a study conducted in Morogoro, Tanzania. A questionnaire administered through Computer Aided Personal Interviewing (CAPI) platform was used for data collection from 240 randomly drawn respondents from four randomly selected wards (Kichangani, Tungi, Mazimbu and Mji Mpya) from Morogoro urban which was purposively selected. A Discrete Choice Framework and Random Utility Approach were employed to determine factors that affected voters to go for election or not using a Logit model. Data analysis and processing were done using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) computer software. The study found that; older people were more likely to vote compared to younger people; single citizens were more likely to vote compared to married ones, people in the informal sector were more likely to vote than citizens who were formally employed, males were more likely to vote than females; Christians were more likely to vote than Muslims; those affiliated to political party were more likely to vote than non party members; citizens who attended to election campaign were more likely to vote than none-attendees, and citizen living near the polling station were more likely to vote compared to citizens living further away. The reasons for voting included: exercising democracy (67.5 %), exercising the right of each citizen aged 18 years and above (95%), holding elected leaders accountable (60%), to get leaders of their choice (80 %), another 62.5% were enticed to vote due to the performance of past leaders in relation to meeting development goals in the respective area. Another reason for voting was stated as, exposure to information on voting (77.5%). The study recommends the need to emphasize participation in voting among the females, formally employed, and younger citizens who had become eligible for voting.

Keywords: *Tanzania 2015 General Election, Voting Behaviour, Discrete Choice Framework, Random Utility Approach*

Introduction

Background Information and Problem Statement

Who votes and why do people vote? These questions are very central towards understanding elections and voting behaviour in the context of democratic systems (Muhanga, 2015; Myatt, 2015: 1; Andersen and Heath, 2000). Voting is the cornerstone of a democracy, voting matters both to the health of a political system and to the people who participate in it. In any democratic political system, voting is one of the forms of political participation. Voters' turnout in an election accounts for the level of citizens' civic political participation (Chinsinga, 2006). A drop in the voters turnout in elections reveal low political participation whereas a high turnout is generally seen as evidence of the legitimacy of the current system (Niemi, and Weisberg, 2001; Pintor *et al.*, n.d).

The literature associates turn out to vote with aspects such as: perceived importance of the election, the cost of voting, the perceived popularity of the candidates, voters' preference intensity, candidates' policy positions, and to voters' pre-election information (Fowler, 2006; Kinder and Kiewiet, 1981; MacKuen, Erikson, and Stimson, 1992; Clarke and Stewart, 1994; Mutz and Mondak, 1997; Knack, 1992^{a, b}; Knack and Kropf, 1998). Past empirical work has reported evidence that voters incorporate the so-called sociotropic (society level) factors in their decision to participate in voting. Hence, participation in elections is associated with other similar activities that reflect social cooperation, such as jury service and census response. Experimental researchers have reported an association between the self-reported electoral turnout behaviour of subjects and the extent of altruistic allocation in a dictator game. Notice that the social preferences considered here are derived from a voter's anticipated instrumental effect on the electoral outcome, and so it differs from the addition of a civic duty in term to a voter's payoff (Riker and Ordeshook, 1968; Goldfarb and Sigelman, 2010; Feddersen and Sandroni, 2006^{a, b}; Feddersen, Gailmard, and Sandroni, 2009), and from the pressure of social norms (Gerber, Green, and Larimer, 2008).

A significant body of research shows that political attitudes are more resistance to change as people age (Alwin and Kosniak, 1991; Glenn, 1980; Jennings and Markus, 1984; Markus, 1979), with people becoming more socially conservative (Park, 2000). This tells that the elderly are more authoritarian and more likely to vote compared to younger citizens (those under 30 years old). Those who regularly attend religious services are said to be more authoritarian and therefore more likely to vote for right-wing parties than those who seldom

or never attend religious services. A great deal of recent research has shown that, while the relationship may be weakening, class is still significantly related to voting (see an edited volume by Evans, 1999; Lambert and Curtis, 1993). Marital Status, occupation of the respondents, sex of the respondent, political party membership, campaign attendance, and distance to a polling station are reported to influence the decision to vote or not to vote (Lijphart 1979, 1980; Evans, 1999; Campbell *et al.*, 1960; Olson, 1965; Downs, 1958; Fiorina, 1981).

Substantial decline in voters turn out has been observed globally (Chinsinga, 2006; TEMCO, 2010; Hansford and Gomez, 2010; Murphy and Freyman, 2009; Pintor *et al.*, n.d; Ferrini, 2012; IDEA, 2007; IDEA, 2004; African Elections Database, 2011; Tairo, 2011). This raises concern because turning out to vote is the most common act citizens take in a democracy and yet it is not well understood (Aldrich 1993:246). This argument is substantiated by Barzel and Silberberg (1973) who looked back at work by Arrow (1969:61) who said that it is “hard to explain why an individual votes at all in a large election, since the probability that their vote will be decisive is so negligible.” This paper is based on the fact that for any intervention intending to increase voters turnout to be effective there is a need to characterize individuals who are still turning out to vote and their motives for voting so that interventions that are designed to increase voter turnout should take into account the needs spelled out by those who do not turn out to vote. It is against this background that this paper attempts to provide insights to the question: who voted and why during the last general election in Tanzania, drawing lessons from Morogoro Municipality. The citizen’s behaviour in relation to voting is guided by several theories that are discussed in the next section.

Theoretical Approaches to Voting Behaviour

Sociological Approach to Voting

The Sociological Approach to voting behaviour emphasizes the impact of social structures suggesting that membership to social group influences voting choices (Lazarsfeld *et al.*, 1944; Alford 1967, Rose and Urwin 1969, 1970, Lijphart 1979, 1980). Voter turnout is considered to be instrumental in an election since those who turn out tend to vote for parties that best reflect the interests of their groups.

The Sociological Approach, then, holds that group identities affect attitudes and interests. These attitudes in turn affect how people vote. By implication in any given society the effects of group membership should be the same on attitudes as they are on vote. It is difficult to deny the existence of social cleavages and their potential effects on attitudes and voting (Evans, 1999).

Party Identification Model

The party identification model assumes voters to be expressive rather than instrumental, and attitudes and issue preferences are considered to be endogenous to voting. This approach holds that voters have long-standing psychological ties to specific political parties, and seldom waver from voting for their parties (Belknap and Campbell 1952, Campbell *et al.*, 1960, Converse 1964). These party attachments are largely due to early socialization, reflecting mostly family influences. Simply put, people are influenced by the partisanship of their parents. It holds that causation runs in both directions between attitudes and votes. As Campbell *et al.* (1960:128) state, "In the competition of voices reaching the individual the political party is an opinion-forming agency of great importance. The strength of relationships between party identification and the dimensions of partisan attitude suggests that responses to each element of national politics are deeply affected by the individual's enduring party attachments." This implies that the relationship between group membership and attitudes should be similar to that between group membership and their vote.

The Rational Choice Approach

Although instrumental like the sociological model, the rational choice approach is much more individualistic, suggesting that voting decisions are based on cost-benefit analyses where voters match their individual issue preferences with party platforms. As Olson (1965:51) states, "only a separate and 'selective' incentive will stimulate a rational individual in a latent group to act in a group-oriented way." According to Downs (1958:39), if the voter "is rational, he knows that no party will be able to do everything that it says it will do. Hence they cannot merely compare platforms: instead they must estimate in their own mind what the parties would actually do if they were in power."

According to the Rational Choice Approach, then, policy preferences are exogenous, but voters' choices depend on the interplay between voters' preferences and parties' policy positions. Although not explicit, rational choice theory allows for the possibility that social identity plays a role in voting decisions since individual preferences can be determined by one's position in society. Moreover, not all rational choice theorists discount party attachments. Rather than see them as influencing attitudes, however, these attachments are considered to represent ongoing tallies by the voter's assessments of party performances (Fiorina, 1981).

While social groups may affect attitudes, this does not mean that voting decisions are made solely on the basis of these group-determined attitudes. Accordingly, the Rational Choice Model implies that the relationship between

preferences and vote will vary across different political contexts: if voters are given different political options from which to choose, then the relationship between attitudes and vote may also vary. All these theories are assessed in the context of voter turnout in Morogoro municipality during the last national election in 2015.

Methodology

Description of the Study Area and Justification for its Selection

This paper is based on a study that was conducted in Morogoro municipality in Morogoro region. The municipality is about 195 km West of Dar es Salaam city along the Tanzania – Zambia highway lying on the foot of Uluguru Mountains. The municipality covers 260 Km², being bordered to the west and north by Mvomero district and to the east and the south by the Morogoro rural district. According to the 2012 Population Census, Morogoro municipality had a population of 315,866 comprising of 164 166 (52%) women and 151 700 (48%) men. The population growth rate is 2.4% per annum. The municipality is subdivided into 19 administrative wards and 275 streets (NBS and OCGS, 2012).

Morogoro Municipality was selected for this study because during the previous general election (2010) 65.4% of registered voters did not turn to vote which was above the national average of 57.2% for non-turnout (NEC, 2010). Such a low turnout in Morogoro municipality reflected a problem of turnout that required to be informed by research.

Research Design

The research used a cross sectional design, where data was collected at a single point in time for determining the relationship between variables (Kothari, 2004). The design is suitable for descriptive studies as well as for determining the relationship between variables.

Sampling and Sample Size

The population from which the sample was drawn included all females and males aged 18 years and above from wards in Morogoro municipality. Morogoro municipality was purposively selected because it recorded a low turnout since 65.4% of all registered voters did not vote during the General Election of 2010. Four wards namely Mazimbu, Kichangani, Tungi and Mji Mpya were randomly selected from among 19 wards in the municipality. A sampling frame was then established by listing of all the members of a population that met the sampling criteria (Burns and Grove, 1997). From each ward 60 respondents were randomly selected from the sampling frames.

In order to get a proportionate balanced sample between female and male respondents stratified sampling was employed. The total sample size comprised of 240 respondents (30 females and 30 males from 4 randomly chosen wards within each stratum). The sample size is justified by the fact that a sub-sample of 30 respondents is the bare minimum for studies in which statistical data analysis is to be done regardless of the population size and inference made to the entire population (Bailey, 1994).

Data Sources, Collection and Analysis

Data were collected from primary and secondary sources comprising of qualitative and quantitative information through a Computer Aided Personal Interviewing (CAPI) platform using tablet devices. Later the data were summarized, sorted, edited, coded, and analyzed. Analysis was done using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) computer software. Descriptive and inferential statistics were analyzed based on various variables relevant for assessing voter turnout.

Analysis to determine factors affected voters to participate in voting during elections or not fit within a discrete choice framework, which expresses a set of alternatives, called the choice set with the following three characteristics. First, the alternatives must be mutually exclusive from the decision maker's perspective. Choosing one alternative necessarily implies not choosing any of the other alternatives. The voter chooses only one alternative from the choice set. Second, the choice set must be exhaustive, in that all possible alternatives are included. The decision maker necessarily chooses one of the alternatives. Third, the number of alternatives must be finite (Gujarati, 1995).

In this study the Random Utility Approach was applied to determine factors affecting the decision to vote. Utility derived from each choice is unknown to the analyst, but can be measured as a probability (random variable) that a decision is likely to be made. The respondent derives utility from voting as: $U_0 = \beta'_0x + \varepsilon_0$ from choice 0 (not to vote) and $U_1 = \beta'_1x + \varepsilon_1$ from choice 1 (to vote), in which ε_0 and ε_1 are the individual specific, random components of the individual's utility that are unaccounted for by the measured covariates, x . The choice of alternative 1 reveals that $U_1 > U_0$, or that $\varepsilon_0 - \varepsilon_1 < \beta'_0x - \beta'_1x$. Scholars usually treat voting as a discrete choice process where voters are assumed to have certain levels of utility associated with each choice. They decide to choose the candidate or party that maximizes that utility (Wilson and Steenbergen, 2008).

Following Revelt and Train (1998), the utility obtained by individual n from alternative i in choice situation (or time period) t is expressed as:

$$U_{in} = \beta_{in} \sum_i^n X_{in} + \varepsilon_{in} \dots \dots \dots (1)$$

Where X_{in} is a vector of observable variables, β_{in} is an unobserved vector of coefficients for each decision maker, which varies in the population with a density function $f(\beta_n|\theta)$ where θ are parameters of this distribution. The error term (ε_{in}) is an unobserved random term. The probability that individual n voted (1) during 2015 is given by the Logit model presented in equation 2.

$$\text{Prob}(y = 1) = \frac{\exp(\beta' X_i)}{1 + \exp(\beta X_i)} \dots \dots \dots (2)$$

The Logit model is commonly used for analysing election outcomes involving voting (Janet and David, 1999). A respondent has two options; 1 if the person decides to vote and 0 if they do not. This model, draws from Manski (1977), who argues explicitly recognizes the electoral choice process as sequential, where voters develop a choice set in the first stage and chooses from among available alternatives in this set in the second stage. Using the Logit one can determine factors affected potential voters' probable decision to vote or not to vote. In the next section the findings from analysing voters' turn out in the last General election are presented.

Results and Discussion

Socio-Demographic Characteristics of the Respondents

Eight aspects of socio-demographic characteristics namely age, sex, education level, religion, marital status, occupation, civic education and membership to political parties of respondents were sought from the respondents, and the results are presented below.

Age of Respondents

The results in Table 1 show that 35% of the respondents were aged between 21 to 30 years, 37.5% were between 31 to 40 years, 12.5% were aged between 41 to 50 years, 5% were between 51 to 60 years while 10% were above 61 years. Thus, more than 70% of the respondents were 40 years old or younger and only 15% were above 50 years of age.

Table 1: Age of Respondents (n = 240)

Variables	Values	Frequency	Percent %
Age	21 - 30	84	35.0
	31 - 40	90	37.5
	41 - 50	30	12.5
	51 - 60	12	5.0
	>61	24	10.0
Total		240	100.0

Sex of Respondents and marital status

The composition of the sample by sex is 50:50 (Table 2) is by sampling design as explained under the methodology. About 57.5% of the respondents were married, 35% were single, 2.5% were widow and 5% were separated.

Table 2: Sex and Marital status of Respondents (n=240)

Variables	Values	Frequency	Percent%
Sex	Male	120	50.0
	Female	120	50.0
Total		240	100
Marital status	Married	138	57.5
	Single	84	35.0
	Widowed	6	2.5
	Separated	12	5.0
Total		240	100.0

Respondents' Education Level

The results in Table 3 indicates that 42.5% of the respondents had primary school education (Table 2), 7.5% of respondents had adult attained education, 27.5% completed form four, 2.5 % had completed form six, 7.5% had certificate level training, 10% had diploma qualifications while 2.5 had attained higher education. These findings indicate that about half of the respondents had primary education or less; slightly more than one third had secondary education and only a small proportion (2.5%) had tertiary education. Given such a level of education, extension messages can be easily comprehended by most respondents, who represent the population.

Respondents' Occupation

The results in Table 3 show 25% of the interviewed respondents were peasants, 37.5% were businessmen/women, 15% were public servants, 5% were unemployed, and 7.5% were Retired Officers while 10% were employees in the private sector.

**Table 3: Marital Status, Education level and Occupation of Respondents
(n = 240)**

Variables	Values	Frequency	Percent %
Education level	Primary Level	102	42.5
	Adult education	18	7.5
	Secondary level (O)	66	27.5
	Secondary level a(A)	6	2.5
	Certificate	18	7.5
	Diploma	24	10.0
	Higher education	6	2.5
	Total	240	100
Occupation	Peasant	60	25.0
	Businessmen/women	90	37.5
	Public servant	36	15.0
	Unemployed	12	5.0
	Retired officer	18	7.5
	Employees Private sector	24	10.0
Total		240	100.0

Results of the Econometric Model

The regression model results that are used to assess the relative influence of different factors on the voters' decision to vote in 2015 election in Morogoro Municipality are presented in Table 4. The Logit model was estimated by the Maximum likelihood estimation procedure using the statistical programme for social sciences (SPSS version 16). The likelihood ratio test statistics exceed the chi-square critical values at less than 1% probability levels indicating that the hypothesis that all the coefficients, except the intercept are equal to zero is rejected. The value of the Pseudo R Square test shows the overall goodness of-fit is 46.6%, implying that the model was able to explain variation in decision to vote or not to vote by 46.6%. Among the explanatory variables used in the model, 8 variables were significant at 5% probability level with respect to the decision to vote. The sign and coefficients of individual coefficients are discussed below.

Age

The age of respondents was considered to be an important variable to contribute relatively in a decision to vote or not to vote. The result indicates that being old had a positive association with the probability of deciding to vote at 5% significance level. Older people had a higher probability of deciding to vote compared to the younger respondents in the sample having a coefficient 0.966 and an odds ratio 2.627. Based on the odds ratio, older people were more likely to vote by a factor of 2.627; which is equivalent to 423.6 (the antilog of

the odds ratio). This implies that older people were about 423.6 times more likely to vote compared to youths' decision to vote. The preceded value of the ant log of odd ratio is a very extreme case and it implies that among the respondents who were interviewed almost all older people decided to vote.

This result conforms to the study by the South African Reconciliation Barometer (2013) which claims that youths have always been, and continue to be, politically active. However, their interest in the elections as an instrument of political contestation is moderate. Instead, other forms of political expression through cultural channels such as theatre and music, as well as direct action and protest remain salient features, and indeed appear to have gained a grip in the political armament of young people. Also the result corresponds to New Zealand's experience on low voting turnout among the youth during the 2008 and 2011 election (Statistics New Zealand, 2014). A systematic review of voting trend in USA affirms that young voters participate less compared to older citizens due to the fact that younger people do not have steady jobs, hence they are more mobile, which reduces their incentive to vote compared to older citizens (Boundless, 2015).

Table: 4: Influence of various factors on decision to vote

Variables	B	S.E.	Wald	Sig.	Exp(B)
Age	.966	.253	14.537	.000	2.627
Marital status (1= married,0= single)	-.682	.260	6.863	.009	.506
Education level (number of years spent in schooling)	.037	.124	.091	.763	1.038
Main Occupation (1= formal, 0=informal)	-.309	.135	5.197	.023	.734
Religion (1= Christian, 0= Muslim)	1.486	.471	9.946	.002	4.421
Member of any political party (1= no, 0= yes)	1.483	.501	8.748	.003	.227
Attended election campaign (1= yes, 0=no)	.592	.183	10.466	.001	.553
Distance from home to polling station (1=near, 0= distant)	.507	.200	6.412	.011	1.661
Sex (1= male, 0= female)	1.084	.512	4.480	.034	2.957
Constant	-.103	1.243	.007	.934	.902
-2 Log likelihood			197.18		
Pseudo R Square			46.6%		

Marital Status

Marital status is another important variable that has significant influence on decision making. The results presented in Table 4 show that single voters were more likely to vote compared to married respondents and the difference between their turnout was significant at the 5% level. The coefficient is -0.682

and the odds ratio is 0.506. The Antilog of an odds ratio gives the value of 3.2, which explains how many times one category decided to vote compared to the other group. The negative sign of the coefficient implies that the probability of the decision to vote was in favour of single citizens (unmarried). This observation is contrary to the findings from the study by Slrin, (2008) which reported that marital status has an impact on the level of political participation and a higher voter turnout is generally observed among married people.

Occupation of the Respondents

The main occupation of respondents was included in this study to compare how voters employed in the formal sector reacted towards voting compared to those employed in the informal sector. The informal sector included farmers, shop owners, food vendors, motor cycle (*bodaboda*) owners and drivers, motorcycle repair and other related activities. Results of the binary Logit model indicate that being employed in the formal sector had a negative association with the probability of deciding to vote, being significant at $p = 0.05$. Voters whose main occupation was in the informal sector were more likely to vote compared respondents who were employed in the formal sector with a coefficient of -0.309 and an odds ratio of 0.734. The negative sign implies that the decision to vote was in favour of respondents who were employed in the informal sector while the odd ratio of 0.734 implies that voters who are in the informal sector decided to vote 5.4 times (Antilog for 0.734) than voters from the formal employed. This result is also consistent with a prior expectation that formally employed people are less motivated to participate in the voting process. This finding however contradicts the report by Statistics New Zealand (2014) whereby it found that being formally employed increased the probability of voting compared to citizens who were informally employed.

Sex of the Respondents

The sex of the respondent was considered to be another key variable which was associated with the decision to vote. The result in Table 4 reveal that being a male has a positive association with the probability of voting compared to female respondents. The coefficient for this variable is 1.084 while the odds ratio is 2.957 implying that male respondents were more likely to vote compare to females. This finding are consistent with similar findings by Pintor *et al.* (2006) who reported that globally women's participation in voting was very low even in the developed world.

Religious Affiliation

Religious affiliation is another important variable expected to influence the decision to vote. In this study, respondents belonged to Christian and Muslim

faiths. The study wanted to test whether there was any significant difference between two groups in their decision to participate in voting during the 2015 general election. The result revealed that being a Christian had a positive association with the probability of participating in voting with coefficient 1.486 significant at the 5% level and an odds ratio 4.421. This implies that Christians decided to vote 145.6% more compared to Muslim.

Membership to a Political party

The result in Table 4 shows that the respondents' political affiliation had a coefficient of 1.483, which was 5% significance level and the odds ratio was 0.227. The coefficient implies that membership to political parties had an influence to voting decision. Based on the ant log of the odds ratio, it implies that being a member of a political party increased the probability of voting 1.68 times compared to non members. These findings are in line with what Martinez and Gill (2005) found in their study.

Campaign Attendance

Political campaigns are specifically designed to entice voters to vote for a candidate of a particular party. The result indicates that attending election campaign had a positive association with the probability of deciding to vote with a coefficient 0.592 significant at 5% level and an odds ratio of 0.553. This implies respondents who attended election campaign decided to vote 3.6 times compared to those who attend campaign. This result is consistent to Aldrich (1993) who concluded that campaigns have a positive impact to voters' decision. For this reason, political parties carefully plan their campaigns as a strategy for mobilizing voters.

Distance to Polling Station

Distance from home to polling station influenced voters' decision to vote. The result indicates that probability of deciding voting was relatively influenced by the distance from home to polling station. Voters nearer the polling station had a higher probability to vote more compared to those who lived further away; with a coefficient 0.507 and an odd ratio 1.661. This finding implies that voters nearer to polling station were likely to decide to voter 45.8 times compared distant citizens, which is consistent with the study by Dyck and Gimpel (2005) who found that even small difference in distance from polling station had a significant negative impact on voter turnout.

Why do People Vote?

Voting is one of the constitutional rights guaranteed by the 1977 Constitution of the United Republic of Tanzania (URT, 1977). Nonetheless, it is sad to note

that a number of people have in recent years lost interest in exercising this right by not turning out to vote (Chinsinga, 2006; TEMCO, 2010; Hansford and Gomez, 2010; Murphy and Freyman, 2009; Pintor *et al.*, n.d; Ferrini, 2012; IDEA, 2007; IDEA, 2004: African Elections Database, 2011; Tairo, 2011). Literature (Mwinyi and Kayunze, 2014; Chinsinga, 2006; Settle and Abrams, *n.d*). Some of these authors report a number of attributes associated with voters turn out.

For voters who participated in the last general election (2015) this study attempted to identify reasons for participating and the importance they attached to voting. The findings reveal that 67.5 % of the respondents said that they voted to exercise democracy, while 95% voted because it is the right of each citizen aged 18 years and above, whereas 60% voted in order to hold elected leaders accountable, the other 80 % they said they voted in order to get leaders of their choice who would serve the majority rather than minority interests, another 62.5% were enticed to vote due to the poor performance of the past leaders who failed to meet development goals in their respective area, and 77.5% claimed that they managed to vote because they were exposed to enough information regarding the issues related to the election and the importance voting. Table 5 summarizes the responses.

Table 5: Reasons for Voting

Reasons for Voting	Response		Total
	Yes	No	
Exercising democracy	162 (67.5)	78 (32.5)	240 (100)
Right of each citizen aged 18 years and above	228 (95)	12 (5)	240 (100)
Holding elected leaders accountable	144 (60)	96 (40)	240 (100)
To get leaders of their choice who will serve for majority not for minority interests	192 (80)	48 (20)	240 (100)
Enticed to vote due to performance of the past leaders	150 (62.5)	90 (37.5)	240 (100)
Exposed to information on issues related to voting	186 (77.5)	54 (22.5)	240 (100)

These findings are in line with similar findings other studies as reported by Ashenfelter and Kelley, (1975); DeGraaf, *et al.*, (2001); Goodwin-Gill, (2006); Downs (1957) and Matsusaka, (1995), which found similar reasons as listed in Table 5.

Conclusion and Recommendations

The decision to vote seems to be influenced by a number of socio-economic and demographic factors. An individual's decision about whether to vote or not

is a function of his or her motivation to vote and their ability to vote. It is obvious that people are more likely to vote after perceiving or realizing that satisfaction can be derived from voting including the fact that desired results will be realized from such participation. This means specific actions that educate citizens regarding the importance of participation in elections can enhance voters' participation in elections, thereby improving voter turnout. Based on these findings, it is recommended that specific educational efforts should be directed at categories of citizens who exhibited low turnout. These include: females, employees in the formal sector and youths

References

- African Elections Database (2011). Elections in Tanzania. Available at <http://www.africanelections.tripod.com/tz.html>. African Elections Database. Visited on Sunday 21/10/2015 at 10.15 pm.
- Aldrich, J.H. (1993): "Rational Choice and Turnout," *American Journal of Political Science*, 37(1), 246-278.
- Alford, R. (1967) "Class Voting in the Anglo-American Political Systems" In S. M. Lipset and S. Rokkan (eds), *Party Systems and Voter Alignments: Cross National Perspectives*. New York: The Free Press.
- Alwin, D.F. and Krosnick, J.A. (1991). "Aging, Cohorts, and the Stability of Sociopolitical Orientations over the Life Span." *American Journal of Sociology*, 97:169-95.
- Andersen, R. and Heath, A. (2000). *Social Cleavages, Attitudes and Voting Patterns: A Comparison of Canada and Great Britain Working Paper Number 81*.
- Ashenfelter, O. and Kelley, S. (1975). Determinants of participation in presidential elections. *Journal of Law and Economics*, 18(3, Economic Analysis of Political Behavior: Universities-National Bureau Conference Series Number 29), 695-733.
- Bailey, K.D. (1994). *Methods of social research*. (4th ed.). New York: The Free Press.
- Barzel, Y. and Silberberg, E. (1973). "Is the Act of Voting Rational?." *Public Choice*, 16(1), 51-58.
- Belknap, G. and Campbell, A. (1952). "Political party identification and attitudes toward foreign policy." *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 15:601-23.

- Boundless (2015). Additional Factors: Gender, Age, Religion, Race, and Ethnicity." Boundless Political Science.[<https://www.boundless.com/political-science/textbooks/boundless-political-science-textbook/political-participation-and-voting-9/why-people-vote-68/additional-factors-gender-age-religion-race-and-ethnicity-376-4273/>]. Site visited on 20/11/2015.
- Burns, N. and Grove, S. (1997). *The Practice of Nursing Research: Conduct, Critique and Utilization*. 3rd edition. Philadelphia, Saunders. 752pp.
- Campbell, A., Converse, P.E., Miller, W.E. and Stokes, D.E. (1960). *The American Voter*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Chinsinga, B. (2006). Voter apathy in Malawi: a critical appraisal. Centre for Multiparty Democracy – Malawi. 31pp.
- Clarke, H. D. and Stewart, M. C. (1994). "Prospections, Retrospections, and Rationality: The 'Bankers' Model of Presidential Approval Reconsidered," *American Journal of Political Science*, 38(4), 1104-1123.
- Converse, P. (1964). "The nature of belief systems in mass publics," In D. Apter (ed) *Ideology and Discontent*. New York: Free Press.
- DeGraaf, N.D., Heath, A. and Need, A. (2001). "Declining cleavages and political choices: the interplay of social and political factors in the Netherlands," *Electoral Studies*, 20.
- Dyck, J.J. and Gimpel, J.G. (2005). Distance, Turnout, and the Convenience of Voting. *Social Science Quarterly*, Volume 86, Number 3, pp. 531-548
- Evans, G. (ed.) (1999). *The End of Class Politics?* Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Feddersen, T. and Sandroni, A. (2006^b). "A Theory of Participation in Elections." *American Economic Review*, 96(4), 1271-1282.
- Feddersen, T. and Sandroni, A. (2006^a). "The Calculus of Ethical Voting," *International Journal of Game Theory*, 35(1), 1-25.
- Feddersen, T., Gailmard, S. and Sandroni, A. (2009). "Moral Bias in Large Elections: Theory and Experimental Evidence." *American Political Science Review*, 103(2), 175-192.

- Ferrini, L. (2012). Why is Turnout at Elections Declining Across the Democratic World? E-International Relations (E-IR) <http://www.e-ir.info/2012/09/27/why-is-turnout-at-elections-declining-across-the-democratic-world/>. Site visited on 7th November 2015.
- Fiorina, M. (1981). *Retrospective Voting in American National Elections*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Fowler, J.H. (2006). "Altruism and Turnout." *Journal of Politics*, 68(3), 674–683.
- Gerber, A.S., Green D.P. and Larimer C.W. (2008). "Social Pressure and Voter Turnout: Evidence from a Large-Scale Field Experiment," *American Political Science Review*, 102(1), 33–48.
- Glenn, N.D. (1980). "Attitudes, Attitudes, and Beliefs," pp. 596-640 in O.G. Brim and J. Kegan (eds.) *Constancy and Change in Human Development*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.
- Goldfarb, R. S. and Sigelman, L. (2010). "Does 'Civic Duty' 'Solve' the Rational Choice Voter Turnout Puzzle?" *Journal of Theoretical Politics*, 22(3), 275–300.
- Goodwin-Gill, G.S. (2006). *Free and Fair Election: New Expanded Edition* (2nd ed) Interparliamentary Union 2006. Sadag Imprimerie: Bellegarde – France. 229pp.
- Gujarati, D. (1995). *Basic Econometrics*. (4th edn). McGraw-Hill, pp330 [www.mhhe.com/econometrics/gujarati4]. Site visited on 20/11/2015.
- Hansford T.G. and Gomez, B.T. (2010). Estimating the Electoral Effects of Voter Turnout. *American Political Science Review* Vol. 104, No. (2)268-288.
- International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance (International IDEA) (2004). *Participation and Turnout: Relating Knowledge and Tools to the Practical Questions facing Democratic Reformers*. International IDEA, Stockholm. 8pp.
- International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance (International IDEA) (2007). *Political Parties in Africa: Challenges for Sustained Multiparty Democracy*. International IDEA. Stockholm. 144pp.

- Kinder, D.R. and Kiewiet, D.R. (1981). "Sociotropic Politics: The American Case," *British Journal of Political Science*, 11(2), 129–161.
- Knack, S. (1992^a). "Civic Norms, Social Sanctions, and Voter Turnout," *Rationality and Society*, 4(2), 133–156.
- Knack, S. (1992^b). "Social Altruism and Voter Turnout: Evidence from the 1991 NES Pilot Study," National Election Studies working paper.
- Knack, S. and Kropf, M.E. (1998). "For Shame! The Effect of Community Cooperative Context on the Probability of Voting," *Political Psychology*, 19(3), 585–599.
- Kothari, C.R. (2004). *Research Methodology: Method and Techniques* (2nd edition). New Delhi: New Age International. 418pp.
- Lambert, R.D. and Curtis, J.E. (1993). "Perceived Party Choice and Class Voting," *Canadian Journal of Political Science*, 26:273-85.
- Lazarsfeld, P., Berelson, B. and Gaudet, H. (1944). *The People's Choice*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Lijphart, A. (1979). "Religion vs. Linguistic vs. Class Voting," *American Political Science Review* 65:686.
- Lijphart, A. (1980). "Language, Religion, Class, and Party Choice: Belgium, Canada, Switzerland and South Africa Compared," In R. Rose (ed.), *Electoral Participation: A Comparative Analysis*. Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Mackuen, M.B., Erikson, R.S. and Stimson, J.A. (1992). "Peasants or Bankers? The American Electorate and the U.S. Economy," *American Political Science Review*, 86(3), 597–611.
- Manski, C.F. (1977). *The Structure of Random Utility Models. Theory and Decision*. 8:229-254.
- Markus, G.B. (1979). "The Political Environment and the Dynamics of Public Attitudes: A Panel Study," *American Journal of Political Science Review*, 23:338-59.
- Martinez, M.D. and Gill, J. (2005). "The Effects of Turnout on Partisan Outcomes in U.S. Presidential Elections 1960-2000." *Journal of Politics* 67 (November): 1248–74.

Muhanga, M. and Rodgers, A.,...

Matsusaka, J.G. (1993). Explaining Voter Turnout Patterns: An Information Theory. *Public Choice* Vol. 84, No. 1/2 (Jul., 1995), pp. 91-117.

Murphy, T. and Freyman, J. (2009). Why do People Vote? Examining the Determinants of Electoral Participation in the World's Democracies

Mutz, D.C. and Mondak, J.J. (1997). "Dimensions of Sociotropic Behavior: Group-Based Judgements of Fairness and Well-Being." *American Journal of Political Science*, 41(1), 284-308.

Myatt, D.P. (2015). *A Theory of Voter Turnout*. London Business School, Regent's Park, London, UK.

National Bureau of Statistics (NBS) and Office of Chief Government Statistician (OCGS) (2012). The 2012 Population and Housing Census (PHC) for United Republic of Tanzania: Population Distribution by Administrative Areas. <http://nbs.go.tz/nbs/sensa/PDF/2012%20PHC%20POPULAR%20VERSION.pdf>. 12pp.

National Election Commission-NEC (2010). *Voter Turnout for 2010 General Election*. Tanzania National Election Commission, Dar es Salaam: Tanzania.

Niemi, R.G. and Herbert, F. W. eds (2001). *Controversies in Voting Behaviour*, 4th ed. Washington, DC: Congressional Quarterly Press.

Park, A. (2000). "The generation game." in R. Jowell *et al.* (eds.) *British Social Attitudes, The 17th Report. Focusing on Diversity*. London: Sage Publications.

Pintor, R.L., Gratschew, M. and Sullivan, K. (2006). *Voter Turnout Rates from a Comparative Perspective*. [http://www.idea.int/publications/vt/upload/Voter%20turnout.pdf]. Site visited on 20/11/2015.

Revelt, D. and Train, K. (1998). *Mixed Logit with Repeated Choices: Households' Choices of Appliance Efficiency Level*. [http://eml.berkeley.edu/~train/revelttrain.pdf] 1pp.]

Riker, W.H. and Ordeshook, P.C. (1968). "A Theory of the Calculus of Voting." *American Political Science Review*, 62(1), 25-42.

Rose, R. and Urwin, D.W. (1970). "Persistence and Change in Western Party Systems since 1945." *Political Studies* 18:287-319.

- Rose, R. and Urwin, D.W. (1969). "Social Cohesion, Political Parties and Strains in Regime." *Comparative Political Studies* 2:7-67.
- Slrin, C. (2008). Marital status and voting behavior. In K. Warren (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of U.S. campaigns, elections, and electoral behavior*. (pp. 393-394). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781412963886.n203>.
- South African Reconciliation Barometer (2013). The future of youth participation in elections. Survey Report. [<http://reconciliationbarometer.org/volume-eight-2010/the-future-of-youth-participation-in-elections/>]. Site visited on 20/11/2015.
- Statistics New Zealand (2014). Non-voters in 2008 and 2011 general elections: Findings from New Zealand General Social Survey. Statistics New Zealand Tatauranga Aotearoa. Wellington, New Zealand. 12pp.
- Tairo, P. (2011). Should Tanzania Enact a Compulsory Voting Law? *The Citizen*. Tuesday, 11 October 2011. Available at www.thecitizen.co.tz › Magazines › Political Platform. Visited on 18/10/2014 at 10:15 pm.
- TEMCO, 2010; TEMCO (2006). *The 2005 Elections in Tanzania Mainland: Report of the Tanzania Election Monitoring Committee*, Dar es Salaam: TEMCO.
- TEMCO (2010). *An Interim Report on Performance of Tanzania's 2010 General Elections in Tanzania*. Dar es Salaam, Tanzania the Work of the Organizations.
- Wilson, C.J. and Steenbergen, M.R. (2008). *Winnowing Choices: Political Choice Sets in Multi-Party Elections*. [<http://www.freepdfs.net/winnowing-choices-political-choice-sets-in-multi-party-elections/3b15482675b8bdc5e5a61009206bd97c/>]. Site visited on 22/11/2015.