International Journal of Peace and Development Studies Vol. 3(3), pp. 33-56, May 2012
Available online at http://www.academicjournals.org/IJPDS
DOI: 10.5897/IJPDS11.055
ISSN 2141-6621 ©2012 Academic Journals

Full Length Research Paper

"Where have all researchers gone?" Use and abuse of polls for the 2010 elections in Tanzania

Alexander Boniface Makulilo

Department of Political Science and Public Administration, University of Dar es Salaam,
P. O. Box 35042 Dar es Salaam, Tanzania. E-mail: makulilo76@yahoo.co.uk.

Accepted 19 December, 2011

More than any other period in the history of Tanzania since the introduction of multipartism in 1992, opinion polls for the 2010 general elections were highly disputed by stakeholders on the ground that they were partisan. It was claimed that the polls by the Research and Education for Democracy in Tanzania (REDET) and the SYNOVATE were in favour of the ruling party, Chama Cha Mapinduzi (CCM) while that by the Tanzania Citizens' Information Bureau (TCIB) leaned towards the opposition party, Chama Cha Demokrasia na Maendeleo (CHADEMA). In this article, the methodological rigor of these polls was compared and the use and abuse of research were unpacked. Three interrelated questions formed the central focus of this article: Were polls biased against or in favour of particular parties and or candidates? How successful were pollsters in projecting electoral support for candidates or political parties that reasonably reflected the actual electoral outcomes? And what were the sources of errors committed by pollsters? In order to respond to these questions, a critical examination of research methodology for each pollster was made. The article found that the sampling, framing of questions as well as reporting were either by default or design flawed culminating in controversial polling outcomes.

Key words: Opinion polls in Tanzania, SYNOVATE, Tanzania Citizens' Information Bureau (TCIB), Research and Education for Democracy in Tanzania (REDET), Chama Cha Mapinduzi (CCM), Chama Cha Demokrasia na Maendeleo (CHADEMA), elections in Tanzania.

INTRODUCTION

The 2010 general election in Tanzania was a disaster for the opinion poll industry. Two polls published before June 2010 by the Research and Education for Democracy in Tanzania (REDET) and SYNOVATE put the ruling party, Chama Cha Mapinduzi (CCM) ahead of all opposition parties at a far margin. However, the September polls were slightly different. While the very same pollsters maintained CCM's victory albeit in a diminishing trend, the new pollster, the Tanzania Citizens' Information Bureau (TCIB) put an opposition party, Chama Cha Demokrasia na Maendeleo (CHADEMA) to the lead of CCM though with a narrow gap. This was the first time in the history of the country to see a pollster issuing results that accorded an opposition party victory. It is noteworthy that all these polls were disputed. Nonetheless the polls by REDET were highly disputed probably because the organisation is affiliated to the University of Dar es Salaam (the oldest and largest in Tanzania) with its researchers mostly drawn there. This made the general public to expect the poll by REDET to be more scientific. In the past, only opposition parties were sceptical with polls. However, the 2010 polls attracted plenty of criticism and questions not only from opposition parties but also from academics, politicians, civil societies, and the general public. The most important registered complaint was that the results were biased in favour of the ruling party. For instance, Prof. Peter Maina of the School of Law, University of Dar es Salaam contended that the polls were questionable and unrealistic (*This Day* 12.10.2010). Similarly, opposition parties dismissed the polls claiming that they were strategically designed to favour CCM. The Civic United Front (CUF) Deputy

Electronic copy available at: http://ssrn.com/abstract=2461498

Secretary-General, Mr. Joram Bashange described research and education for democracy in Tanzania (REDET) polls as "a sham" (*The Citizen* 09.10.2010) while the Tanzania Labour Party (TLP) Deputy Secretary-General, Mr. Hamad Tao was so detailed by positing that his party did not agree with the way the institution conducted its surveys, and described its report as 'debatable.' He furthered that while it could be true that Mr. Kikwete was at the forefront of the polls, the margin of his lead in REDET's report was "outrageous." Mr. Tao contended, "my worry is that this misleading survey can change voters' perception, people might start thinking that opposition parties are too weak to win any seat, and thus decide to vote for CCM" (*The Citizen* 9.10.2010).

SYNOVATE's poll was similarly accused of being biased. CHADEMA for instance went extra-mile to allege that the poll conducted by SYNOVATE was doctored in favour of CCM. To be sure, the Chairman of CHADEMA, Mr. Freeman Mbowe complained that CCM pressured SYNOVATE to make sure that its candidate, Mr. Kikwete become the leading one (*Mwananchi* 20.09.2010). This claim when assessed in the context of the only most recent post-2010 general election poll released by SYNOVATE, a lot is to be desired[1]. It is interesting to note that there were no serious public outcries with the TCIB's poll, except from the ruling party which suspiciously saw the poll to be in favour of CHADEMA (*Majira* 17.10.2010). There are many hypotheses to this silence: those who used to query polls especially opposition parties were positively rated by the pollster; TCIB was new and this was its first poll, as such people wanted to know it better and its science; or probably it disapproved the ruling party which is considered by many people to have failed to bring "Maisha Bora kwa kila Mtanzania"[2] as it promised during the 2005 elections.

Although, people kept questioning poll results that they were unrealistic, no one went extra mile to thoroughly examine their scientific side. Indeed, scholars have neglected studying polls in the country. There are two major reasons for this: first is the fact that since the inception of multipartism, it was only REDET that used to conduct polls. Being a property of the oldest and largest university in the country, the University of Dar es Salaam, where professors, lecturers and students were involved in its undertaking, the general public tended to believe that the educated and "neutral" actors were always right.[3] Second is that there is a myth propagated by pollsters that research should be disputed by another research, implying that one should do another "scientific" research to query polls.[4]

Though this claim gave pollsters a leeway to defend themselves as being "scientific" for quite some time, opinion polls, however, are not perfect. As with any measurement strategy, the use of survey data comes with its own collection of potential problems (Berinsky and Tucker, 2006). Hence their claim is untenable. From that backdrop, the main purpose of this article is therefore to shed some light on these claims about polls particularly from scientific point of view.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

Opinion polls are relatively new in Tanzania. So far there are only TCIB, SYNOVATE and REDET as pollsters. Of course, REDET is the oldest. As is well known, this work is the first one to be accomplished to understand opinion polls in the country. Prior to this study, polls were only analysed on newspapers as immediate reaction by stakeholders. It was on that basis that a study was needed to explore their undertakings in a more systematic and rigorous manner. Hence three questions were used to aid the study:

(1) Were polls biased against or in favour of particular parties and or candidates?
(2) How successful were pollsters in projecting electoral support for candidates/political parties that reasonably reflected the actual electoral outcomes?
(3) What were the sources of errors committed by pollsters?

These questions were answered by examining pollsters on an individual basis focusing on their respective sampling designs, questions, and reports. As already noted, the study is mainly about the 2010 pre-election polls. However, in some occasions, past and post 2010 polls by pollsters were brought into analysis to understand consistence of their methodology and reports.

[1] Less than a year after the 2010 General Election in Tanzania which witnessed the return into power of the CCM presidential candidate Mr. Jakaya Mrisho Kikwete, SYNOVATE released a new poll on 5 July 2011 putting CHADEMA with its 'would be' presidential candidate Dr. Wilibroad Slaa, to the lead of the polls. This is if the election would have been conducted at the time of the poll. For detailed comments about this recent poll by SYNOVATE see, Makulilo Alexander Boniface, '*kutoaminika kwa utafiti wa synovate*', Mwananchi, p.5, 7th August, 2011.

[2] Better Life for every Tanzanian.

[3] Like other REDET opinion polls, University Professors and Lecturers supervised research assistants who administered the questionnaires (REDET 2005 October Poll No. 10).

[4] The pollsters know very well that carrying out research is an expensive endeavour. For that case it is difficult for individuals to conduct another research to validate their findings. Besides, it requires research expertise which majority Tanzanians may not necessarily have. These two grounds are popularly used by pollsters to impose their "science" to the general public. If professors across universities have been able to supervise Master and PhD research students without first carrying out parallel researches on the same topic as with their students, why should pollsters demand a parallel study? It should be noted that most polls are two weeks study with simple questions which require simple responses such as Yes, No, Don't Know, Refused to Answer etc. Moreover they do not provide any rigorous analysis. In contrast, Master/PhD research takes years and demands critical and rigorous analysis. Be as it may, pollsters are unjustified to shield themselves from criticisms.

Electronic copy available at: http://ssrn.com/abstract=2461498

THEORETICAL NOTE

Sampling

Public opinion is central to how democracies work Firstly, it provides the ruled with a mechanism to hold their leaders accountable; and secondly, it gives the governors an opportunity of getting feedback from the ruled (Althaus, 1996). Indeed, it is a form of involving directly the masses to participate in political processes. Unlike other forms of participation, opinion polls are founded on the idea of representation. Yet, such representation is obtained through a probability sampling. This simply means, every member of a population has an equal chance of being included in a sample without undue influence (Berinsky, 2004; Curtice, 1995; Wlezien, 2003). Thus, a fundamental principle is that a randomly selected, small percent of a population of people can represent the attitudes, opinions, or project behaviour typical of all the people, if the sample is selected correctly (Golay, 1997; Verba, 1996). As a general rule, the whole-mark of opinion polls rests on "a random sample" in order to assure "representativeness" of the characteristics of the population. Any slight distortation in selecting a sample is harmful to the entire public opinion since the typicality of the characteristics between the population and the sample would not be attained hence posing difficulty in generalization (Traugott and Wlezien, 2009).

Yet, selection of a sample is complex and indeed requires pollsters to be as careful as possible. For political opinion polls which attempt to project how citizens are likely to vote in a given election, it is necessary that the pollster is informed of political behaviour of the population as well as political system and history of the respective people. Similarly, the pollster should have competent expertise on political behaviour related studies. Though on average polls are considered fairly accurate, occasionally they fail to project what happens in the real world (Magalhães, 2005). One underlying problem associated with this state of affairs is a failure to sample correctly hence "sampling bias". Heckman (1979) posits that "Sample selection bias may arise in practice for two reasons. First, there may be self selection by the individuals or data units being investigated. Second, sample selection decisions by analysts or data processors operate in much the same fashion as self selection".

Normally, the first bias of any research is detected from its sampling design (Rothschild, 2009; Gelman and King, 1993). There is no way that this can be repaired in due course. As a result, the findings can either be over-estimated or underestimated due to a defective sample (Wlezien and Erikson, 2006). This is despite the fact that occasionally, with a defective sample, a pollster can happen to project close to the actual reality. In that scenario, it can be argued that such findings remain defective or arrived at by design and not by chance. In pre-election polls, manipulation of this nature can be possible if there is a prior arrangement between a pollster and a candidate or a political party to manoeuvre what the findings should be in relation to the actual voting outcome. This state of affairs is described as a "rigged poll" to justify a "rigged election." In this case, a rigged poll is used as a tool to prepare the psychological minds of the electorates to accept the electoral outcome. This has been the case with ruling regimes in Africa. In contrast, opposition parties and their respective candidates that are quite aware they could not win elections usually can craft opinion polls (rigged polls) to indicate their possibility to win in the eyes of the public. The findings of such polls are then used after elections to dispute results.

The impact of a rigged poll is disastrous. In Africa and more particularly war torn societies, such polls can be a source of conflicts and/or exacerbate the same. This is because polls are not mere political gimmicks. Observers put that polls influence the timing, strategy and course of election campaigns and, to that extent, the results (Crewe, 1992; Sonck and Loosveldt, 2010). Similarly, rigged polls distort the credibility and trust of the entire polling industry in a given country. Normally, the credibility of polls rests on their "scientificiness" as well as their ability to project close to the actual results on the voting day. In this regard, Newport et al. (1997) argue that "Public opinion polls would have less value in a democracy if the public - the very people whose views are represented by the polls – didn't have confidence in the results".

Notwithstanding, virtually, all samples carry some degree of error known as "sampling error." Sampling error is defined as "a measurement of the uncertainty that stems from inferring the state of a population from a study of a random sampling of that same population" (Groves and Lyberg, 2010). The error occurs because the population under study is not fully enumerated, but merely sampled (Converse and Traugott, 1986; Biemer, 2010; Walker, 2006). Yet, there are many ways of computing sampling error in different situations.

In political polling, the maximum margin of error (MMOE) is the standard sampling error measurement. The MMOE is calculated using an approximation to a normal distribution to find the length of the 95% confidence interval. In common terms, the MMOE is the number of percentage points from the estimate for which a statistician is confident the population's actual percentage (called a population parameter) will be 95% of the time (Sinnott, 2009).

The basic principle is that in selecting the sample the levels of clustering should be kept at minimum to avoid magnified standard error. In contrast, the larger the size of the sample, the more certain one should be about the population parameter's true value and the more accuracy (the less sampling error) it should have (Sinnott, 2009; Sirkin, 2006). This rule of a thumb is correct, as evinced by the formula for the MMOE. Using a sample of size *n*, the calculation for the MMOE is:

$$\text{Marximum Margin of Error } (95\%) = 1.96.\frac{\sqrt{0.5^2}}{n} = \frac{0.98}{\sqrt{n}}.$$

Given the previous formula, for example, sample sizes of *n* = 2*,* 400 provide a MMOE of 2%, *n* = 600 provides a MMOE of 4% (Sinnott, 2009). The previous calculation is the maximum of the standard Margin of Error Calculation:

$$\text{Margin of Error } (95\%) = t_{n-1,1-\frac{\alpha}{2}} \times \sqrt{p(1-p)/n}$$ [5]

Question design

The issue of designing questions is not simple. First and foremost it depends on the nature of a study as well as the objectives to be achieved. However, there are generally three types of questions: those which seek face sheet information (that is age, income, housing, religion) about respondents. The most important requirement is that such questions should be relevant to the study and would be cross-tabulated as explanatory variables. The other types of questions are those which are concerned with facts. They give an interviewer more latitude to probe, explain and even vary the question wordings in order to solicit factual information that would not readily be given by a respondent in answering the initial question (May, 2006). The last type of questions is opinion based. These seek attitude or behaviour of a respondent. Any wording alterations by an interviewer can lead to a biased response. For that case, an interviewer can only repeat the question as opposed to offering elaboration since doing that can lead to a different question (West and Olson, 2010; Traugott and Price, 1992). It should be kept forth that questions of any type can either be open or closed. The former gives a respondent greater freedom in responding. They are more useful when seeking for an in-depth understanding of a social phenomenon. In contrast, closed questions limit the number of possible responses. They are relatively cheaper to analyse and above all they can allow easy comparison. The decision to use open or closed ended questions depends on the objective of the study and the nature of data needed.

In designing questions, the principle of impartiality should be maintained. Moreover, such questions must yield the information that is required (Sakshaug et al., 2010). There is a general consensus among scholars that questions must: not be too general or insufficiently specific; use the simplest language in line with the intended respondents; avoid prejudicial language; avoid ambiguity; eliminate vague words; avoid leading questions; ensure that respondents have the minimum knowledge to answer questions; do not presume that respondents follow the patterns of behaviour you wish to know about; avoid hypothetical questions; avoid personal questions; and do not assume respondents are liars (May, 2006; Zaller and Feldman, 1992; Achen, 1975).

Reporting

This is the final product of a poll. Since the findings of the poll are more likely to influence voting behaviour, all stakeholders keep their eyes close to the report. Apparently, those who discover to be approved by the poll tend to welcome it and vice versa. Hence, pollsters should be careful to report what they actually found in the field (Newport et al., 2009; Marsh, 1985). If there are pressing concerns either scientific or practical for not reporting some questions or the entire findings it should be stated so right from the beginning and the reasons to justify it.

There is no one way of reporting. However, consumers of research are keen to follow the methodological issues that were involved to yield the final report. For that case, pollsters are required to be as explicit as possible in presenting this technical aspect of the poll. It is here where poll results are tested to see if they really pass standards of science. It is widely observed that most pollsters would only like to present the positive side of their methodology. They skip to present the negative aspects of their methodology and possibly how they were mitigated to ensure quality results. Against this backdrop, therefore it is not uncommon to find that non-sampling factors (framing of questions, biased electoral system, poor administration of interviews, etc) which would probably affect the quality of the sample and the general findings are not reported.

On the other hand, in reporting, it is imperative to restate exactly the questions asked in the poll and provide their responses accordingly. This is important to ensure that what is reported is what actually was asked. In some cases, pollsters introduce completely new questions on reporting implying that the responses from the field would not be the ones reported hence down-sizing the credibility of the poll. For this reason, the issue of language is crucial so as to maintain reliability and validity. Thus observers caution that: Political polls achieve their results by sampling a small number of potential voters rather than the population as a whole. This leads to "sampling error" which most polling agencies dutifully report. But factors such as non-representative samples, question wording and non-response can produce non-sampling errors. While pollsters are aware of such errors, they are difficult to quantify and seldom reported. When a polling agency, whether by intention or not, produces results with non-sampling errors that systematically favour one candidate over another, then that agency's poll is biased (Adleman and Schilling, 2008).

Another important consideration in reporting is timing. As a general rule, polls produce immediate opinion of respondents on a certain issue. Though there is no any

[5] With probability p = 50%, significance α = 5%, and the asymptotic approximation of the t-distribution value $t_{n-1,1-\alpha/2} = 1.96$ (See Converse and Traugott 1986; Sinnott 2009; Sirkin 2006; May 2006).

specific requirement on the timing for releasing findings (that is, from the time the poll was conducted to the time of reporting), it is reasonable not to issue findings in a period of more than two weeks (Mokrzycki, 2009). This is especially in the Africa's context where data collection is done essentially based on face-to-face interviews. In Europe and America where technology is advanced and widespread, polls can be done on telephone, e-mail, and posting.

This ensures fast data gathering and processing. As such, in comparative terms, pollsters in developed nations are faster in releasing reports. When a pollster takes a long time, its findings can be overtaken by events and hence the projection becomes not important. However, in immature democracies where poll findings are perceived as a guarantee for a candidate or a party projected to actually win in an election, reporting when it is near to election (for example, a period of three weeks before the actual election) is problematic since it can potentially lead to chaos. As already stated, normally election is a power struggle and candidates or parties that are favourably projected to win would welcome the poll and those who seem not to perform well would dismiss the findings. Sometimes, poll findings would be a justification for protesting if those who are projected to win do not win in an election.

It should be emphasized that an individual pollster should not fear to report its findings if it uses science to produce them. Yet variations in terms of findings among pollsters are common. Pickup and Johnston (2005) contend that such differences among firms result due to sample design, question formulation, weighting, and screening. However, if individual firms exhibit bias, so may the polling industry as a whole. It is due to this fact that the polling industry is delicate.

Data

Data for this study were obtained through two main sources. The first source was through interviews and questionnaires with key stakeholders particularly the pollsters,[6] political parties,[7] and civil society organisations (CSOs).[8] For pollsters which are registered in Tanzania under the Companies Act. No. 12 of 2002 (that is, SYNOVATE and TCIB) information was also sought from the Business Registrations and Licensing Agency (BRELA).[9] The second source of information was document review. Reports published by the pollsters as well as their respective questionnaires for data collection were gathered to unpack the kind of questions asked in relation to what was reported.

These were easily accessed through websites, media houses, and physical visits to the pollsters themselves. Other documents included reports from election observers, reports from election management bodies, parliamentary Hansards, political parties' documents (manifestos, constitutions, and press releases), case law, statutes, and newspapers.[10] Data obtained from all these sources were analysed qualitatively to gain an in-depth understanding of pre-election polls from scientific point of view.

TANZANIA'S POLITICAL HISTORY: A BRIEF OVERVIEW

Tanzania (then Tanganyika) got its independence from the British colonial masters on 9 December, 1961 based on a multiparty system. The Tanganyika African National Union (TANU) became the ruling party of the time after winning all the pre-independence elections. However TANU and its government started a move to suffocate political space by limiting the activities of opposition political parties and civil societies. In 1964, for example trade unions were made affiliates of the ruling party. The climax was attained in 1965 when the political system was constitutionally made a single party order. All political activities were to be conducted by or under the auspicious of the party.

Yet, in 1967 Tanzania adopted *Ujamaa* a form of socialism. Under this system all the major means of life were under the state control. It has to be noted that the single party system as an official political order survived until 1992 when the country was forced by both internal groups and the donor community to re-introduce a multiparty system. However, it is important to note that the ruling party Chama Cha Mapinduzi

[6] I would like to thank Dr. Benson Bana from the Department of Political Science and Public Administration (University of Dar es Salaam) who was ready to participate in this study. Though he is the Co-Chairman for REDET, he participated in this study on an individual capacity as an independent analyst. I also extend my gratitude to Mr. Deus Kibamba from TCIB. He was ready to participate in this study by filling in a questionnaire via e-mail. Mr. Kibamba is the Executive Director of the TCIB. I have to state that SYNOVATE declined to participate in this study despite several visits to its offices and communication via e-mail and telephone. However, Mr. Ernest Sifuel, one of SYNOVATE officials gave me a report on Media Monitoring for the 2010 elections and a press release (dated 20.09.2010) which SYNOVATE issued to media to defend its credibility following accusation from CHADEMA that the pollster is pro-CCM. Surprisingly he said that there were no any reports for the past polls. For that matter all information related to SYNOVATE were obtained from its website as well as newspapers. I also thank Mr. Bashiru Ally from the Department of Political Science and Public Administration (University of Dar es Salaam). He was one of the principal researchers in Zanzibar during the REDET September 2010 opinion poll.

[7] I would thank the involvement of Mr. Wilson Mukama (CCM Secretary General); Dr. Willibroad Slaa (CHADEMA Secretary General and presidential candidate during the 2010 general elections); Mr. Hamad Tao (TLP) Deputy Secretary-General; Mr. Isaac Cheyo (UDP); Dr. Seng'ondo Mvungi (NCCR-Mageuzi Legal Advisor); Prof. Mwesiga Baregu (CHADEMA-member of Central Committee and Campaign Team Manager for Dr. Slaa during the 2010 elections); and Mr. Julius Mtatiro (CUF-Deputy Secretary General for mainland Tanzania).

[8] I would thank Mr. Kaiza Bubelwa, Executive Director for the Concern for Development Initiatives in Africa (ForDIA) and Ms. Ananilea Nkya, Executive Director for the Tanzania Media Women's Association (TAMWA).

[9] See Receipt No. 00079522 dated 01.07.2011 paid as mandatory search fees for SYNOVATE and TCIB.

[10] Newspapers were useful to get opinion of the key stakeholders to the polls.

(CCM)[11] con-trolled the entire process in its favour. The constitution remained in terms of its content and philosophy just like the one during the one party era. This is despite the fact that the Presidential Commission[12] recommended for a completely new constitution to take care of the new environment. Besides, the CCM government rejected the idea of providing civic education countrywide so as to de-indoctrinate the mindset of the previous authoritarian regime. Some scholars have described the Tanzanian citizen as an "uncritical".[13] It is also the fact that the party enjoys relatively strong support especially in rural areas where the majority people are still ignorant. Opposition parties have been limited to urban areas.

Indeed the fusion between the ruling party and state institutions has remained visible until to date. The president who at the same time is the chairperson of CCM is responsible for appointing all key personnel in the management of elections such as the electoral manage-ment body, the registrar of political parties, the heads of security organs and his/her powers are unlimited. With all these advantages, CCM has managed to remain in power.[14] During elections, the ruling party deploys state machinery and resources for its political advancements. For example, the Regional Commissioners (RCs), District Commissioners (DCs), Ward Executive Officers (WEOs), and Village Executive Officers (VEOs) who are supposed to be impartial with regard to party politics work in favour of the ruling party. It should be pointed out that the RCs, DCs, WEOs, and VEOs are members of CCM's executive committees in their respective jurisdictions.[15] Besides, they are a-ppointees of the president of the United Republic who at the same time is the chairperson of CCM.

This arrangement adversely affects their impartiality. To be sure, in the 2005 general elections, the DCs for Iringa, Nkasi, and Mpanda openly campaigned for the ruling party while at the same time prevented people from attending opposition parties' rallies.[16] In 2010, the same situation repeated itself.

TEMCO (2010) states "Regional and District Commissioners have placed state resources (vehicles, etc) in campaign processions of the presidential candidate defending his position."[17] These officials are a life blood of CCM as the United States Agency International Development (USAID) report of June 2010 summarises their duties: allowing CCM to use public facilities (stadiums, schools) for campaigning, but denying such use to opposition parties; having tax collectors target opposition supporters as well as business owners who fail to support or vote for CCM; threatening to revoke the licenses of business owners who do not support CCM; ordering police to shut down businesses during CCM rallies to boost attendance; telling public school teachers to encourage their students to attend CCM rallies and to discourage them from going to opposition gatherings; telling citizens that basic services are contingent on a ruling-party victory in their area; threatening civil servants with firing if they fail to mobilize the electorate for CCM; and placing civil servants on fundraising committees for CCM candidates.

CCM has also enjoyed the support of security forces. This is through their chairperson who is at the same time the Commander in Chief of all armed forces. He or she is vested with powers to command any force within the country and his or her order is final and should be respected [Article 148, subsections 1, 2 and 3 of the constitution of the URT (1977)].

This arrangement poses the danger of conflict of interests on the part of the president. Article 15(1) of the CCM constitution demands all its members to stand firm for party's interests. In one of his speech on 21 August 2008 to the members of the National Assembly, President Jakaya Mrisho Kikwete said that if he orders the Inspector General of Police (IGP), Said Mwema to arrest any person, it would be so. Exemplifying this, he said, if the president orders the IGP to arrest Dr. Slaa,[18] he would be arrested. This statement was a repetition of the first president of Tanzania, Mwalimu Nyerere who once said that constitutionally he had powers like a dictator.[19] This problem was also noted by the committee formed by the president in 1999 to review the constitution.[20] Yet, at lower levels, security matters are handled by the Security Committees[21] whose chairpersons are RCs and DCs in their respective areas. In the 2010 elections, the role of

[11] Note that CCM was formed on 5 February 1977 after the merger of TANU and the Afro-Shiraz Party (ASP).

[12] United Republic of Tanzania, The Presidential Commission on Single Party or Multiparty System in Tanzania: Report and Recommendations of the Commission on the Democratic System in Tanzania, Vol. 1, 1991, Dar es Salaam University Press.

[13] Amon Chaligha et al. "Uncritical Citizens or Patient Trustees? Tanzanians' views of Political and Economic Reform" Afrobarometer Paper No. 18, 2002.

[14] In 1995 opposition popular votes stood at 38.2% while the ruling party got 61.8%. In 2000, the ruling party gained up to 71.7% and the opposition dropped to 28.3%. In 2005 the ruling party gained further to 80.2% of support while opposition got 19.8%. In the 2010 elections, CCM dropped to 61.17% while opposition gained to 38.83% (See the National Electoral Commission's reports for 1995; 2000; 2005; 2010).

[15] CCM Constitution 1977

[16] TEMCO Election report 2006.

[17] TEMCO Interim statement 2010

[18] Dr. Slaa was a member of the National Assembly (2005-2010) via CHADEMA. He has always been very critical to the CCM government. He was also a presidential candidate for CHADEMA during the 2010 general elections. As can be seen, the statement by the president would portray the behaviour of CCM presidents towards the opposition parties.

[19] Quoted in I. G. Shivji "The Changing State: From an Extra-Legal to an Intra-Legal State in Tanzania". In: Fimbo, Mgongo. and Mvungi, Sengondo. (eds). *Constitutional Reforms for Democratisation in Tanzania*, Faculty of Law, University of Dar es Salaam, 1993, p. 1-14.

[20] Jamhuri ya Muungano wa Tanzania. 1999. Kamati ya Kuratibu Maoni Kuhusu Katiba, Kitabu cha Kwanza: Maoni ya Wananchi na Ushauri wa Kamati, Dar es Salaam.

[21] The committees were created during the single party era to advise the party on matters of peace and security in their respective areas. Although these committees were "de-linked" from the party and became government instruments after the introduction of multipartism, practically they remain fused to the party albeit in the "new" law The National Security Council Act. 2010.

RCs and DCs on security matters was done in favour of CCM.[22] As can be noted, the electoral system in Tanzania is systematically favorable to the ruling party. Hence it is extremely difficult to conclude that elections have been fair (Makulilo, 2011).

DISCUSSION

This discussion is about the three pollsters namely TCIB, SYNOVATE and REDET. For each pollster, the discussion begins with a brief profile of the organisation in order to situate its grand philosophy, affiliation, expertise in the field of political polls as well as experience. Thereafter, technical issues in undertaking poll activities are examine including sampling designs, questions and reporting.

As would be noted, the discussion starts with the youngest to the oldest pollster. It is by so doing that one can appreciate the issue of experience in the field. For that matter TCIB comes the first in the list followed by SYNOVATE and finally REDET.

TANZANIA CITIZENS' INFORMATION BUREAU (TCIB)

TCIB is a non-governmental, not-for-profit, civil society organisation. It was registered on 11 February, 2009 with registration number 69706. Its main objective is to empower citizens for the promotion, protection, and consolidation of democracy through the access to "appropriate and independently researched information about political, economic and social policies and issues". Although, TCIB is dedicated to empower all Tanzanians in general, its main focus is on young people. In implementing its objectives, TCIB uses advocacy or activism as its grand approach. Usually such an approach is not compatible with science since it places sentiments and intuition at the centre of its analysis.

Moreover, the objectivity of TCIB is called to question due to dual constituencies of its chairman. To be sure, the chairman for the period from 2010 to 2011 and one of the two subscribers is at the same time a member of CHADEMA Central Committee (CC).[23] During the 2010 elections, he also served as a member of campaign team for CHADEMA's presidential candidate. Based on his positions and roles in TCIB and CHADEMA, it is difficult by any account for him to avoid conflict of interests particularly when it comes to conduct a scientific research involving CHADEMA and TCIB.

It is also interesting and probably strange to note that when Dr. Slaa was interviewed if he was aware of TCIB's poll, he seemed not only to be unaware of this poll but also the existence of the organisation itself. His response was, "I don't know this organisation. And I have not even seen its findings. Hence I have no comments."[24] This is despite the fact that the Chairman of his campaign team, Prof. Mwesiga Baregu, was quite aware about the TCIB's findings[25] let alone Dr. Mkumbo who might probably be one of the architects of this poll.

Above all, TCIB's poll was broadcasted in local radios and television stations and published in newspapers including the *Tanzania Daima*[26] which is said to be owned by Mr. Freeman Mbowe (the national chairman for CHADEMA). Given the earlier circumstances, one would wonder as to why Dr. Slaa was aware of the REDET and SYNOVATE polls which found the CCM presidential candidate at the lead of CHADEMA and not TCIB's poll which was in his favour.

It is worth noting that this poll was the first to be done by TCIB. The poll was conducted between 27 September, and 10 October, 2010. It focused on the presidential post of the United Republic of Tanzania. In its questionnaire, TCIB asked one principle question: *"Katika wagombea waliotajwa hapo juu, ni mgombea yupi utamchagua katika Uchaguzi huu wa 31 Oktoba 2010?"*[27] The responses were as follows: Dr. Wilbroad Slaa of CHADEMA got 45%; Jakaya Mrisho Kikwete of CCM obtained 41%; Prof. Ibrahimu Lipumba of the CUF got 10%; Hashimu Rungwe of the NCCR-Mageuzi got 2%; Peter Mziray of the APPT-Maendeleo obtained 1% and Mgaywa Muttamwega of the Tanzania Labour Party (TLP) got 1%. In executing its study, TCIB used a probability multistage sampling. There were three levels. First, fifteen (15) regions were randomly selected. Second, at least one constituency was sampled from each region which resulted to at least 50 constituencies.

Third, two wards were selected in each constituency and from each ward two villages or streets were picked for the poll. From each constituency, between 60 and 100, respondents were interviewed. The total number of respondents was 3047. It is important to understand the characteristics of respondents who participated in this poll since it would give an indication of their responses as well as the quality of the sampling methodology used (Table 1).

As stated at the beginning, TCIB's poll is vital in the history of the country since, for the first time, it placed an opposition party ahead of the ruling party. For that matter, a thorough scrutiny of its methodology is needed to understand how this was possible. Before dwelling into the core of such methodological issues, I wish to point out one serious arithmetic problem related to accuracy of data. This has to do with computing simple and basic additional and subtraction functions.

[22] TEMCO 2010.
[23] The Chairman is Dr. Kitila Mkumbo (BRELA 2011).
[24] Interview with Dr. Willibroad Slaa (14.07.2011).
[25] Interview with Prof. Mwesiga Baregu (14.07.2011).
[26] Tanzania Daima, "Kura Mpya ya Maoni:Dr.Slaa ampiku JK" (16.10.2010) and Tanzania Daima, "UTAFITI WA TCIB:CCM yageuka bubu" (17.10.2010) at www.freemedia.co.tz/daima/habari.php?id=20245.
[27] Which from the above mentioned candidates will you vote during the 31 October, 2010 election? (Own Translation).

Table 1. TCIB respondents' characteristics.

No.	Parameter (s)	Total	Percentage
	Sex		
1	Males	1651	54.2
	Females	1394	45.8
	Education		
	Below standard VII	204	6.8
2	Standard VII	902	30.1
	Secondary education	1140	38.1
	Above secondary education	747	25
	Age		
	Below 25	497	15.6
3	25-35	1139	35.8
	36-45	896	28.2
	46-55	339	10.7
	Above 55	311	9.8
	Party affiliation		
	CCM	553	18.3
	CHADEMA	470	15.6
	CUF	360	12
4	NCCR	199	6.6
	TLP	206	6.8
	UPDP	184	6.1
	Others	91	3
	No party	951	31.6

Source: Tanzania citizens' information bureau 2010 report.

As can be noted, the total number of 3,047 respondents stated in the poll does not match to the total respondents as per characteristics of each parameter (Table 1). To be sure, the total number of respondents by sex gives 3,045 (a difference of 2); that by education is 2,993 (a difference of 54); that by age is 3,182 (an addition of 132); and that by party affiliation is 3,014 (a difference of 33).[28] Since the scientific foundation for survey methodology has its roots in mathematics, probability theory and statistics, problems concerning calculation distort entire findings (Biemer and Lyberg, 2003). I wish to emphasize that while this abnormality is significant to dismiss this poll as cooked and unprofessional, it is imperative to proceed dissecting its methodological underpinning in order to comprehend the nature and character of the polling industry in Tanzania.

Sampling techniques

The TCIB's sample was both unrealistic and vague to warrant a scientific analysis. As noted earlier, the poll was only limited to understand the presidency of the United Republic of Tanzania. Nonetheless, fifteen regions were selected from mainland Tanzania. This is problematic since the United Republic consists of mainland Tanzania and Zanzibar. The Republic has twenty six (26) regions of which five (5) are in Zanzibar. Moreover, all 26 regions are further subdivided into 239 constituencies. Fifty (50) constituencies are in Zanzibar. Given that TCIB dealt with the presidential post of the United Republic, it was erroneous to exclude Zanzibar from its sample. There

[28] It was commented by Prof. Baregu that the TCIB is the newest pollster and as of now it has no capacity to carry out a serious scientific study. He furthered that being an activist organization, its methodology is potentially compromised (Interview with Prof. Mwesiga Baregu 14.07.2011). In contrast, the Executive Director of TCIB, Mr. Deus Kibamba said that polling is not a field of every opinion as he states "Opinion polls are not part of astrology. We do not predict results but we project voter choices and preference using the tally of voter inclination scored in the opinion poll. The main challenges are two-fold. First, there is misrepresentation of opinion polls as prediction. This makes everybody think they can do the prediction. Opinion polling is not as simple. Secondly, there is a problem associated with trusting the results. Since the opinion poll industry is a new field in Africa, it takes time for the public to develop trust on the findings and results from the polls. This is especially two opinion polls may give differing results at different times on same poll questions and subjects" (Questionnaire Response 17.06.2011). No one can dispute that polls are new in Africa. However, this does not suggest that poll findings should be taken for granted. If a pollster fails to compute simple mathematics how can it be trusted? Can't it be argued that pollsters themselves are also new in the field and Africa? I tend to believe that lack of professionalism on the part of the TCIB as well as its activism and partisanship can be used to explain this mathematical abnormality.

were no scientific grounds for this omission. Arguably, this fault demonstrates either the ignorance of TCIB on the Tanzania's electoral system or deliberate bias in favour of a certain candidate and his/her respective political party.

Understandably, Zanzibar has remained a stronghold for CCM and CUF since the introduction of multipartism in 1992. CHADEMA which is relatively the strongest opposition party in the mainland. Tanzania is insignificantly present in Zanzibar. This simply means that had Zanzibar been included in the sample, it would have worked in favour of CCM and CUF. In turn, it suggests that Mr. Kikwete of CCM would still be the leading candidate in the TCIB's poll while the gap between CHADEMA and CUF would have been narrowed. Since constitutionally there is no such a thing like a president for "mainland Tanzania" as TCIB did, it should be maintained that the TCIB's sample was not representative enough to merit a fair and objective polling outcome.

On the other hand, the vagueness of the TCIB's sample is associated with randomisation. Ideally, sampling takes place from a frame and hence it should be definite. TCIB was not certain in sampling both constituencies and respondents. With regard to selecting constituencies, TCIB stated that "at least one constituency was sampled from each region" which resulted to "at least 50 constituencies." Given that the total number of constituencies in the United Republic is 239, the "at least" language used by the pollster is vague and potentially subject to manoeuvring. Since a "constituency" was the unit of analysis for TCIB, failing to provide the exact number and names of the selected constituencies for the study makes it difficult to replicate the poll and hence pose the problem of reliability. To an extreme case it raises doubt on whether the poll was really conducted or simply crafted.

Yet, TCIB selected two wards in each constituency. From each ward two villages or streets were picked for the poll. As can be noticed, the poll was silent on how many people were sampled from each village/street. Surprisingly, it simply stated that from each constituency, "between 60 and 100 respondents" were interviewed. Given that TCIB claimed to have interviewed 3,047 respondents, the "between. and…" language is not clear and hence unscientific. Similarly, the criteria used to determine variations of respondents in each constituency were not specified, making it difficult to assess the quality of the sample. If a simple formula is operated alongside the unspecified figures as provided by TCIB, it would not match to the total number of respondents. That is to say, if the total number of respondents is divided by the total number of constituencies, it should give the number of respondents in each constituency. Assuming the minimum number of respondents in a constituency be 61 (note the pollster sampled between 60 and 100 respondents in each constituency) and multiply it by the minimum number of constituency 51 (note the pollster sampled at least 50 constituencies), the result is 3,111 respondents. This minimum figure exceeds 3,047 respondents that participated in the poll. Arguably, this reasoning does not work with the TCIB sample, implying that its poll remains controversial.

Another weakness of the TCIB's poll is linked to the representativeness of the sample. As a matter of principle, a randomly selected sample should represent typical characteristics of the population from which it is derived. For that reason, sampling is always a careful exercise. It presupposes that a researcher knows well characteristics of the population. I have to state that the TCIB's poll did not consider characteristics of Tanzania's population. However, it should be acknowledged that although TCIB appreciated the rural-urban residencies by simply saying that from each ward, two streets (urban areas) or two villages (rural areas) were selected for the study. It did not indicate any proportionality in sampling the urban-rural population. It has to be noted that the rural-urban residencies significantly matters in the context of Tanzania. Tanzania is typically an agrarian society. About 80% of its population are found in the rural areas. Such population depends much on farming for its livelihood. Besides, the majority of them are not educated and they are not exposed to information. In contrast, the urban population depends much on businesses and formal employment for their survival. The majority of them are educated and more exposed to information. It is also a fact that rural regions are the strongholds for the ruling party. Opposition parties are localised in some urban areas (Chaligha, 2005; Kaya, 2004; Kiragu and Mukandala, 2005; Makulilo, 2008, 2011).

As already stated, the rural/urban dimension also affects the level of education. It is well established that in rural areas, the majority people are not educated. This ignorance is favourable to the ruling party and some observers have referred to it as a "political capital" of CCM.[29] It is interesting to note that the REDET poll No. 14 of October 2007 observed that those respondents who were satisfied with president Jakaya Kikwete's performance and hence supported him were less educated or ignorant. The poll found that those with education from secondary school to college and university levels were highly against his performance. As can be seen from the education criterion, the TCIB sample favoured more the educated ones particularly those with secondary school (38.1%) and beyond secondary education (25%). This constitutes the population that question the ruling party, implying therefore that the TCIB sample inclined in favour of opposition parties. It should be noted that in recent years, CHADEMA has become the most popular party among university students partly because the CCM government has failed to provide equitably funding opportunities to students so as to access higher education. It is common to observe protests across

[29] Interview with Prof. Mwesiga Baregu (14.07.2011).

universities these days. CHADEMA has taken the funding problem as its capital thereby attracting most students to its support (*Mwananchi* 20.09.2010).[30] It is alleged that during the 2010 general elections, the CCM government delayed to release funds to students so much so that they should not get an opportunity to vote. This means that universities were opened after the 31 October 2010 elections. It is estimated that about 60,000 students whose voting centres were located at their respective universities could not vote (*Nipashe* 04.10.2010). CHADEMA threatened to institute a case at the court of law but this could not help. It ended up mobilising students to use their own resources to go to their universities and vote. CCM which used to mobilise students and in fact it has many branches in most universities is losing ground to the extent that its Chairman, President Jakaya Mrisho Kikwete has from time to time warned students not to involve themselves in politics so that they could pass exams and attain their life objective (*Habari Leo* 27.12.2010). This is despite the fact that it was Jakaya Kikwete who used university students particularly from Dodoma during his 2010 campaigns. Thus, avoiding to state the rural-urban dimension as TCIB is problematic for it distorts significantly both the representativeness of the sample as well as the nature of responses.

Also, the characteristics of respondents by age groups reveal the weakness of the TCIB's sampling methodology. As can be observed in Table 1, the TCIB's respondents composed of mainly youths and hence a "youth sample." It constituted of the following age groups: below 25 (15.6%),[31] between 25 to 35 (35.8%) and between 36 to 45 (28.2%). It should be kept forth that in Africa opposition parties are being supported mainly by youths. This is owing to the fact that this is the group that is massively unemployed and would therefore push for change of the governing regimes. This is also the case with Tanzania. In the 2010 elections, youths were behind opposition parties. It can be argued that this selection was by design since TCIB is an organisation that seeks empowerment of the population especially the youths.

Question design and reporting

TCIB asked seven (7) questions. The first two questions were specific to the presidential candidate and the rest focused on the bio-data. The first one inquired the beliefs of respondents on who would be the winner of the 2010 general elections. The second question concerned with a candidate whom would be voted in office on 31 October, 2010. To be sure, the TCIB's instrument of data collection (question number 2) read *"Katika wagombea waliotajwa hapo juu, ni mgombea yupi utamchagua katika Uchaguzi huu wa 31 Oktoba 2010?"*[32] This question has two problems. Firstly, it presupposed that a respondent was a registered voter something which was not specified in the sample. Secondly, though the poll took place between 27 September, and 10 October, 2010 it asked a question of future voting. It implies that the conditions that influence voters are stable. Surprisingly, in its report, TCIB redesigned the question as *"Katika wagombea wa urais, ni mgombea yupi ungemchagua kama Uchaguzi ungefanyika leo?"*[33] As can be seen, this question is different from the one found on the TCIB's questionnaire in terms of timing. It acknowledges the dynamism of elections and hence the preference is restricted to the present time. From this discrepancy there is no doubt that the gathered information was not the same. The other five (5) questions focused on characteristics of respondents: gender, age, education, religion, and party affiliation. Overall, TCIB's questions were objective and bias free. Although, TCIB was able to report findings for every question, it was silent on the issue of religion. Unfortunately, the pollster did not advance any ground for such an omission. Since the issue of religion was critical during the 2010 elections, it was imperative that the findings be reported.

It should be noted that Tanzania is a secular state [Article 3(1) of the URT constitution 1977]. Article 19 of the constitution leaves the profession of religion, worship and propagation of religion to be free and private affair of an individual. It means that the affairs and management of religious bodies are not part of the activities of the state authority. Moreover, Section 9(2) (a) (i) of the Political Parties Act. No.5 of 1992 provides that "Without prejudice to subsection (1) of this section, no political party shall qualify for provisional registration if by its constitution or policy aims to advocate or further the interests of any religious belief or group." These laws are black and white on the line between religion and state. It should also be understood that the Christian belief is founded on the idea that state and religion are two separated roles while Islam does fuse them. Surprisingly, section 108(b) of CCM's Manifesto for 2005 states clearly to work on establishing a Kadhi's Court in mainland Tanzania.[34] By this section,

[30] See also Bunge la Tanzania, Majadiliano ya Bunge Mkutano wa Tatu Kikao cha Pili-Tarehe 6 Aprili, 2011. Mr. Joseph O. Mbilinyi, the CHADEMA Member of Parliament asked question number 20 on protests by students across universities. The Minister for Education admitted on the problems of funding and other infrastructures as the source of this persistent problem.

[31] It is not clear as to why the TCIB did not specify its sampling taking into account the minimum voting age in Tanzania which is 18 years old. To state "below 25" of age would suggest that the pollster interviewed even children.

[32] Which from the above mentioned candidates will you vote during the 31 October, 2010 election? (Own Translation).

[33] From the list of presidential candidates, whom would you choose if the election is held today? (Own Translation).

[34] This process had started in 2003 where the government did discussions with some leaders from Muslims and Christians. See Jamhuri ya Muungano wa Tanzania, Bunge la Tanzania, Majadiliano ya Bunge, Taarifa Rasmi (Hansard) Kamati ya Katiba, Sheria na Utawala. Uanzishwaji wa Mahakama ya Kadhi Tanzania Bara (Sehemu ya Kwanza), Kikao Cha Kwanza-Kikao Cha Nane-Tarehe 19 -23 Novemba 2003. Kimetayarishwa na Kupigwa Chapa na Idara ya Taarifa Rasmi za Bunge, Ofisi ya Bunge, Dodoma. See also Jamhuri ya Muungano wa Tanzania, Taarifa kwa Umma kuhusu kuanzishwa kwa Mahakama ya Kadhi Nchini (Uhuru 21 Septemba 2006, uk. 16). See also

it is beyond any doubt that CCM attempted to further the interests of Muslims by making the court part of the government structure.[35] Similarly, the CCM government was taking steps to make Tanzania join the OIC.[36] In all elections before 2010, it was CCM which accused CUF to be a religious party for furthering interests of Muslims. In my view I find CCM assigning itself the role of bringing different religious groups into conflicts. It may be its strategy to divide and rule especially after it has perceived facing the legitimacy crisis. In his monthly speech,[37] President Kikwete tried to divert the OIC agenda. He linked it to the Zanzibar government and hence to be one of the critical issues of the Union. This was just an exit strategy. The party in power in both mainland Tanzania and Zanzibar is CCM and therefore it is difficult to escape the fact that OIC is one of CCM agendas. The statement made by 21 Bishops[38] saying if CCM and its government would implement these two agendas that they could rethink and redefine their relations with the party, leaves a lot to be desired. *Baraza Kuu la Waislamu Tanzania* (BAKWATA)[39] responded to the Bishop's statement that the plans were good and the government should proceed. As of then, the government decided to escape these two agendas ahead of the October 2010 elections.

Similarly, since polls are conducted to inform key stakeholders on the status and direction of elections, to fail to design a poll to account for respondents' preferences is a serious oversight. TCIB did not ask a follow-up question to provide audience with reasons towards their preferences. This undermined the usefulness of the poll to citizens, candidates and parties. It is difficult to ascertain why for example people preferred Dr. Slaa of CHADEMA to Mr. Jakaya Kikwete of CCM. Despite this omission, TCIB was able to do cross-tabulation between respondents' characteristics and candidate's preferences. This would tell the groups which supported candidates though without any reasoning.

SYNOVATE TANZANIA LIMITED

SYNOVATE came officially into existence in Tanzania in 2010. Before this latest development, there existed the Steadman and Associates (T) Limited which was incorporated in Kenya on 3rd October, 1994 but operated in Tanzania under the Certificate of Compliance No. 26192. On 23rd September, 1997, Steadman was registered in Tanzania under the Company Ordinance Cap. 212 with its principal business as media monitoring services.[40] On 14th November, 2005 Steadman Associates (T) Limited transferred to Steadman Group (T) Limited with registration No. 32692. It was on 24th August, 2010 that the Steadman Group (T) Limited transferred to SYNOVATE Tanzania Limited. However, it should be noted that SYNOVATE Tanzania is just a branch of SYNOVATE international market research firm. To be sure "SYNOVATE is a global market research firm…A truly borderless company with offices in over 60 countries, our approach combines best in class global research capabilities with personalised service, local knowledge and the flexibility to create teams and processes that meet clients' specific requirements. At SYNOVATE**,** our clients sit at the top of our organisational chart, driving us to continually develop more innovative research solutions that predict actual business outcomes."[41]

From the earlier backdrop, the following remarks can be made: First, SYNOVATE is a specialized company that deals with business consultancies and research and hence its grand approach is market analysis. This is to say that it is best placed to understand market behaviour. Second, it does its research basically for profit making. It is due to this fact that SYNOVATE allows its clients to be at the top of its organisation so as they can feel the value for money. Contrary to its area of expertise, SYNOVATE has involved in political research which are premised on a totally different philosophical outlook. Political research and more particularly political behaviour need the knowledge of political science.

Since such research touches a very critical issue in politics that is "power", it requires a very different method from the marketers. While competition in the world of market is for profit maximization, in politics competition

Jamhuri ya Muungano wa Tanzania, Bunge la Tanzania, Majadiliano ya Bunge, Taarifa Rasmi (Hansard) Mkutano wa Kumi na Sita, Kikao Cha Kumi na Tatu-Tarehe 25 Juni 2009. Kimetayarishwa na Kupigwa Chapa na Idara ya Taarifa Rasmi za Bunge, Ofisi ya Bunge, Dodoma.

[35] In his speech to the NEC of CCM in 2005, Mr. Mkapa emphasized that leadership which is founded on religious support is dangerous to peace and security of the country. In contrast, as I have already shown in the preceding sections, in 2005 elections, CCM included the Kadhi's Court agenda in its Manifesto to attract and promote the interests of Muslims. See Hotuba ya Mwenyekiti wa Chama Cha Mapinduzi, Rais wa Jamhuri ya Muungano wa Tanzania, Mheshimiwa Benjamin William Mkapa, kwenye Mkutano wa Halmashauri Kuu ya Taifa ya Chama Cha Mapinduzi, Dodoma, 15 Februari 2005 http://www.ccmtz.org/ (Accessed: 08.03. 2011).

[36] See Jamhuri ya Muungano wa Tanzania, Bunge la Tanzania, Majadiliano ya Bunge, Taarifa Rasmi (Hansard) Mkutano wa Kumi, Sehemu ya Pili-Tarehe 22-24 Februari 1993. Kimetayarishwa na Bunge Press na Kimepigwa Chapa na Mpiga Chapa wa Serikali, Dar es Salaam. See also Jamhuri ya Muungano wa Tanzania, Bunge la Tanzania, Majadiliano ya Bunge, Taarifa Rasmi (Hansard) Mkutano wa Kumi na Mbili, Sehemu ya Nane-Tarehe 11-17 Agosti 1994. Kimetayarishwa na Bunge Press na Kimepigwa Chapa na Mpiga Chapa wa Serikali, Dar es Salaam.

[37] See Jamhuri ya Muungano wa Tanzania, Hotuba ya mwisho wa Mwezi ya Rais wa Jamhuri ya Muungano wa Tanzania, Mheshimiwa Jakaya Mrisho Kikwete, kwa Wananchi- Tarehe 31 October 2008.

[38] See Tamko la Maaskofu wa Kanisa la Anglikana Tanzania Kuhusu Hoja ya Mahakama ya Kadhi Tanzania Bara, Uhuru, 21 Septemba 2006 uk. 14. In 2008, 58 Bishops from the Christian Council of Tanzania (CCT) issued a statement against CCM government on its move to join the OIC and establish the Kadhi's Court. See Gaudence, Massati "Jinamizi la OIC: Maaskofu wambana Membe" Majira 25 Agosti 2008 http://majira.co.tz/ (Accessed: 05.08. 2011).

[39] See Said, Mwishehe "Sakata la OIC na Membe: BAKWATA yajibu mapigo" Majira 26 Agosti 2008 http://majira.co.tz/ (Accessed: 05.08. 2011).

[40] Business Licences No. B. 01100483.

[41] http://www.synovate.com/

can lead to conflicts.[42] If political research is being exchanged in business context there is a danger for the researcher to craft findings to fit the interests of the client. For example, in a context where a political candidate or a political party has much money, researches which are regarded as commodities for market exchange are dangerous and could be abused to prepare leaders. I should state from the outset that since business research cannot be a substitute for political research as SYNOVATE did, it is not surprising that the pollster entered into a professional crisis as will be shown in due course.

SYNOVATE conducted its poll between 5 and 16 September 2010. Unlike TCIB, SYNOVATE concentrated to evaluate the government performance. There were very few questions which were relevant to the 2010 elections. One key question related to such elections include: "*Je katika uchaguzi utakaofanyika Oktoba utamchagua nani kuwa rais wa Jamhuri ya Muungano ya Tanzania?"*[43] Results were as follows: Jakaya Mrisho Kikwete (61%), Dr. Wilbroad Slaa (16%), Prof. Ibrahim Lipumba (5%), No response (13%), and others (5%).

Sampling techniques

The poll used quantitative research based on random sampling. It covered sixty three districts of the twenty one (21) regions of mainland Tanzania. The poll involved two thousands people. The sample was drawn based on the population characteristics and their respective residencies. SYNOVATE therefore sampled 53% males and 47% females. Moreover, these were distributed based on the rural-urban factor. Hence, 40% respondents were from urban and 60% from rural areas. The SYNOVATE sample had two critical weaknesses. One, like TCIB, SYNOVATE while concerned with the elections of the United Republic of Tanzania, its sample was drawn from the regions of mainland Tanzania. This is quite contrary to the political landscape of the Republic which is the Union of Tanganyika and Zanzibar. To disregard Zanzibar made SYNOVATE poll ineffectual to yield scientific outcome. Although its findings were close to what CCM obtained in the actual polling, this was rather by design.[44] Indeed, some stakeholders have raised concerns as to whether pollsters negotiate their findings with candidates and their respective political parties before they issue their findings.[45] To be sure, at one time, it was alleged by CHADEMA that SYNOVATE conducted its poll which indicated that CHADEMA was ahead of CCM. The party further claimed that SYNOVATE was afraid to release such results until it cooked them to favour CCM (*Mwananchi* 20.09. 2010).

As a reaction to CHADEMA, SYNOVATE issued a press release and defended its polls as scientific and impartial. The pollster furthered that every member of the public was invited to its offices to verify its polls in line with the used methodology. To be sure, SYNOVATE stated: As a company we are not affiliated to any political organisation and have no partisan interests in the politics. This company has its own procedures of engaging the Media. Our work, process and procedure are open to scrutiny and we invite any interested people/institutions to audit our work. This company is ISO 90012000 certified and we endeavour to maintain these standards in all operations. Our Opinion Polls are a professional undertaking that must meet these very high internationally acceptable standards.[46]

Contrary to what has been detailed in the previous paragraph, SYNOVATE is a highly confidential institution. This is despite its claims of possessing certificates on internationally accepted standards as I shall point out in due course. To be sure, at the time of doing this research, I visited SYNOVATE office three times; I called them several times; I left my questionnaire with the company and emailed the pollster twice; but finally they did not give me any audience nor did they respond to my questionnaire. It was strange to find out that while SYNOVATE knows well the usefulness of research just as it claims to ask respondents in the field, the pollster itself was reluctant to respond to questions. While, as any respondents SYNOVATE had the right to decline its parti-cipation in this study, it leaves a lot to be desired. What makes more doubt is the fact that SYNOVATE was the only pollster which claims to have conducted a post-general election poll. This poll can be used to discern SYNOVATE capacity to do research. In this poll (which was conducted from 2nd to 29th May 2011, a period less than one year since the October 2010 elections), SYNOVATE failed to even indicate where exactly this research was conducted in the United Republic implying that its sample was drawn by means other than science. Surprisingly, its findings show that the same Dr. Slaa from CHADEMA who was behind Jakaya Kikwete in the 2010 polls, is now the leading candidate by 48% ahead of a would be CCM candidate Mizengo Pinda who obtained 10%.[47]

[42] See the Registrar of Political Parties, Mr. John Tendwa "Tendwa awavaa viongozi wa dini" Nipashe 03.10.2010 http://www.ippmedia.com/frontend/?l=21644 (Accessed: 10.08.2011).

[43] Who will you most likely vote for as the Union President in October current election? (SYNOVATE Translation).

[44] For example Election observers' reports for the 2010 elections by the TEMCO and the European Union noted that party agents and observers were not allowed to witness the central tallying of presidential votes. This lack of transparency shows that results announced by the National Electoral Commission are doubtful.

[45] CUF Deputy Secretary General-mainland Tanzania Mr. Julius Mtatiro (Questionnaire 23.06.2011); Dr. Slaa (Interview 14.07.2011); and Isaac Cheyo (Interview 23.07.2011).

[46] See Aggrey Oriwo "SYNOVATE Tanzania Press Release 20.09.2010" Dar es Salaam.

[47] See SPEC BAROMETER (TANZANIA), SYNOVATE Tanzania 24.07.2011. Note that Kikwete was not made part of this poll probably because this is his last term. Interestingly, there were no comments against this poll from CHADEMA.

The second problem with sampling design by SYNOVATE is on the gender where it sampled 53% males and 47% females. Gender is critical in Tanzania's context where women constitute the majority[48] of the population as well as the voting population.[49] This is owing to the fact that if they are united and well mobilised they would be able to determine elected leaders. It is also known that women are more likely to vote for CCM than opposition. This is due to the fact that historically, CCM has co-opted women to its networks as party wings through *Umoja wa Wanawake wa Tanzania* (UWT). This was so even after the introduction of multipartism (Makulilo, 2009; Meena, 2003). Moreover, during elections, CCM distributes *Khangas*, food, and clothes to poor women in the rural regions thereby attracting them to the party.

Another strategy by the ruling party is to intimidate voters particularly women that opposition parties stand for violence and that when wars occur it is women and children who suffer the severe burden. In contrast, CCM portrays itself as a party of peace (Raphael, 2010, 2011; Mhina, 2001; Makulilo, 2008; Mmuya, 1998; Hyden and Mmuya, 2008). To be sure, during the 2010 elections, REDET noted a difference among respondents on a candidate they would vote based on gender as follows: 52% of all respondents who opined that they would vote a CCM candidate in office were females and 47.8% were males. In contrast, the majority of those who said they would vote CUF and CHADEMA were males. To be precise, 58% of who said they would vote a CHADEMA candidate were males, and 42% were females. Similarly, 56% of respondents who opined to vote a CUF's candidate were males and 46% females.[50] Furthermore, in the same elections, TEMCO (2011) observed women to be more in campaigns than men. It is due to this disregard that the composition of the sample by SYNOVATE ended up having 53% males against 47 females as opposed to the reality. Unless the choice of this proportionality is justified, SYNOVATE was on this point ignorant of Tanzania's politics.

Question design and reporting

Most questions by SYNOVATE were designed to assess performance of the government and its related institutions. As a matter of fact the government in question was the one formed by the ruling party CCM. This means that if such evaluation approved the government it would most likely be positive to the ruling party. In this case opposition parties would be disapproved. Likewise, if the assessment disapproved the government it would most likely work against the ruling party. The foregoing two scenarios indicate that the questionnaire design was embedded with potential bias. However, the same very questions would be appropriate to assess the government at most a year before the general elections or after elections. This means that all pre-election polls during the election year itself should not attempt to provide such an assessment for the sake of impartiality. For avoidance of doubt, this question is picked as an example of bias: "I am going to read to you a number of people and institutions. Please tell me how much you trust them?" These were the responses: Jakaya Mrisho Kikwete (84%), Cabinet (68%), police (45%), the National Examination Council (50%), Judiciary (47%), financial institutions (52%), health institutions (50%), Prevention and Combating of Corruption Bureau (46%), opposition parties (48%), SUMATRA (44%), and TUCTA (47%).[51] As can be noticed, "a number of people" mentioned in this question is only Kikwete who was the CCM presidential candidate. The simple question is where were other candidates? This question would have made sense during the single party era (1965 to 1992). However, in a multiparty context, if a pollster restricts the choice to only one candidate as the SYNOVATE did, it can be concluded that a pollster is biased. There is no doubt that since the choice of candidates was restrictive to the CCM's candidate the credibility of the poll was on spot. Interestingly, SYNOVATE put a choice of "opposition parties" to mask its bias. It can further be asked, if opposition parties were there, where was the ruling party? Or does SYNOVATE want to imply that the mentioned government institutions are structures of the ruling party?

Yet, the question which was supposed to project the outcome of the October 2010 elections was entirely flawed. It read *"Je katika uchaguzi utakaofanyika Oktoba utamchagua nani kuwa rais wa Jamhuri ya Muungano wa Tanzania?"*[52] This question had three problems. First, it asked about the president of the United Republic of Tanzania as opposed to the president of mainland Tanzania which was congruent with SYNOVATE sample. It is problematic because there is no such a thing like a president of "mainland Tanzania." As already shown at the beginning, the pollster completely missed a point. Secondly, the element of timing in this question was wrongly set. Scientifically the pollster should ask on the present conditions at the time the poll was conducted. This simply means that conditions might change between the time the poll was conducted and the election day. Hence by asking "who will you most likely vote for as the Union President in October current election?" implied that such conditions on the ground were static. That

[48] According to the last National Census of 2002 women constituted 17,658,911 and male 16,910,321 out of the total population of 34,569,232 (Tanzania mainland and Zanzibar). See the United Republic of Tanzania, 2002 National Census, Government Printer.

[49] For example, Women registered voters in the 1995 elections were 48 percent, in 2000 were 49 percent and in 2005 were 51percent (National Election Commission Reports 1996, 2001, 2006).

[50] REDET poll No. 16 of 2010.

[51] SYNOVATE Report 2010 p. 4

[52] Who will you most likely vote for as the Union President in October current election? (SYNOVATE translation: Report p.4).

demonstrates misunderstanding of political behaviour of voters. Thirdly, SYNOVATE assumed that it interviewed a registered voter while this was not always the case.

Last but not least, SYNOVATE reports were not edited to ensure smooth reading. In the July 2011 report, for example, the pollster demonstrated a critical problem of language. Some few questions are taken to verify this problem: "Which herbalists medicine have u ever taken (Page 4)?"; "Do you want Tanzania to a new constitution (Page 15)?"; "Who do you will be the next CCM flag bearer come 2015? (Page 2).[53] The identified language shortcomings in SYNOVATE reports indicate deficiency in professionalism.

RESEARCH AND EDUCATION FOR DEMOCRACY IN TANZANIA (REDET)

REDET is a programme hosted in the Department of Political Science and Public Administration of the University of Dar es Salaam. It was founded in 1992 with the coming of multiparty democracy. Its grand goal is to promote democracy in Tanzania. It has a number of events and activities such as the annual state of politics conferences whose participants are political key players drawn countrywide; civic education programmes through newspapers, television and radios; discussion fora to facilitate good governance; conduct opinion polls on democracy related issues and politics in general; and publication of books on politics. REDET used to get its financial support mainly from the government of Denmark through the Danish International Development Agency (DANIDA). Other resources come from the University of Dar es Salaam (for example, offices) and Human Resources (for example, research and education experts). As a matter of fact, REDET is essentially an academic programme with most of its experts from the University. Observers agree that in terms of expertise and experience on political research REDET is the best and the relevant site for opinion polls.[54]

Understandably, REDET conducted its polls in March and September 2010. The polls covered the entire United Republic of Tanzania (which consists of the mainland Tanzania and Zanzibar). It should be noted that due to the nature of the Union, the mainlanders have the opportunity to vote in specific three types of elections, that is the president of the United Republic, members of the Union parliament, and councillors. On the other hand Zanzibar has five levels of elections that is the president of the United Republic of Tanzania, the president of Zanzibar, members of the Union parliament, members of the Zanzibar House of Representatives, and councillors. Unlike TCIB and SYNOVATE, REDET conducted its polls taking into account the political landscape of the Union. I have to state from the outset that although two separate but related research instruments were administered to capture the preferences of respondents for the Union and Zanzibar elections as has always been the case with REDET past polls, REDET did not report the findings on Zanzibar's five elections for both the March and September 2010 polls. What I find strange is the fact that the pollster did not advance any practical or scientific reasons for this serious omission. One of REDET principal researchers for the Zanzibar September poll (Urban West Region) said "the failure to report in itself is not fatal but rather the problem is related to accountability and ethics. A pollster should say why it cannot report the findings. Being silent leaves a lot to be desired especially in the context where findings for Zanzibar did not come out. The public has the right to be informed of the outcome of a research. It is interesting to note that Zanzibaris did not demand for the findings despite the fact that Zanzibar authorities require researchers not only to abide with the laws but also submit their reports once they complete their research works."[55] In defence of REDET, it was opined that "it is always the choice of a pollster to report or not to report its findings for some good reasons such as political climate of the time."[56] It is emphasized here that while the reports for both polls were not made public the "good reasons" for this omission were not stated at all. It is against this backdrop that I proceed to discuss REDET polls in the context of the observed shortcoming.

In both polls, REDET asked the following principle question "*Mwezi Oktoba mwaka huu utafanyika uchaguzi mkuu. Kama uchaguzi huo ungefanyika leo, je wewe ungemchagua mgombea wa chama gani?*"[57] The March poll found that CCM and its candidates were in the lead by a wide margin. 77.2% of respondents said that they would vote for CCM presidential candidate; 9.2% preferred the CUF's candidate; 4.2% opined that they would vote for CHADEMA. Other parties got less than 1% while 8.7% were still undecided. CCM was also the leading party in other leadership posts such as parliamentary and councillorship. However, the September poll indicated a slight fall of support. 71.2% of respondents said that they would vote for CCM presidential candidate; 12.3% opined that they would vote for CHADEMA; 10.1% said that they would vote for the CUF's candidate; other parties got less than 1% while 5.6% were undecided. This fall for CCM was also noted in the posts of parliamentary as well as councillorship.

Interestingly, opposition parties indicated signs of gains. Since these two polls used almost the same methodology

[53] SYNOVATE Social political and economic survey (Tanzania) 24.07.2011.

[54] Interview with Prof. Mwesiga Baregu (14.07.2011); Interview with Mr. Bashiru Ally (18.07.2011); Questionnaire by Mr. Kaiza Bubelwa (10.07.2011). However, these observers wondered as to why the quality of its products is in a state of decline.

[55] Interview with Mr. Bashiru Ally (18.07.2011).

[56] Interview with Dr. Benson Bana (24.06.2011).

[57] In October this year there will be a general election. If such election was to be held today, which political party-candidate would you vote for? (Own Translation).

Table 2. REDET September 2010 poll results on candidates and parties.

Political party	President (%)	Member of parliament (%)	Councillors (%)
CCM	1849 (71.2)	1733 (66.7)	1715 (66.0)
CUF	263 (10.1)	304 (11.7)	298 (11.5)
CHADEMA	319 (12.3)	299 (11.5)	268 (10.3)
TLP	11 (0.4)	25 (1.0)	18 (0.7)
NCCR-M	8 (0.3)	28 (1.1)	26 (1.0)
CCJ	-	-	1 (0.0)
UDP	1 (0.0)	1 (0.0)	2 (0.1)
Jahazi Asilia	-	-	1 (0.0)
D' Makini	1 (0.0)	1 (0.0)	1 (0.0)
AFP	-	2 (0.1)	-
UPDP	1 (0.0)	-	-
Undecided	146 (5.6)	204 (7.8)	269 (10.4)
TOTAL	2598 (100)	2598 (100)	2599 (100)

Source: REDET poll 2010 No. 17.

except with regard to the urban-rural ration, I will discuss them jointly. The polls for this research were conducted in all 26 regions of Tanzania and Zanzibar isles. Like TCIB, REDET had some arithmetic problems with regard to its computations. Table 2 is relevant to this point. It presents opinion of respondents on their preferences in selecting a president, Member of Parliament, and a councillor.

The previous figure has a problem. If added carefully, the total respondents for the president is 2599 and not 2598; similarly for the members of parliament is 2597 instead of 2598.[58] It is not clear why the same questionnaire administered to the same respondents on the president, members of parliament, and councillors to result into these variations (that is, there were no separate questionnaires for president, members of parliament, and councillors). Though the differences between these figures are small, it implies that a careful additional arithmetic was not performed.

Sampling techniques

A sample was chosen by using 3-level multi-stage sampling. These stages were the district level, villages/ streets level, and the interviewees' level. At every level, a sample was obtained using the system of random sampling. In each district, the interviewers were required to choose two villages each (for rural areas) or two streets each (for urban areas). A total of 50 interviewees were chosen in each district, 25 from each village/street. Twenty five of the fifty interviewees from each district had to be women and the other twenty five were men. The selection of the interviewees was also done through random sampling.

The sample that was chosen took into account the division of the total number of people living in towns and villages in Tanzania. Though rural residents are the majority compared to the urban ones, REDET did not give estimated figures for these people. However, in its March poll, the pollster proceeded to sample at the ratio of '60%' rural residents and '40%' urban residents.[59] This had been the practice by REDET in its previous polls. In contrast, in its September poll, while considering the same rural-urban population ratios, REDET sampled '70%' rural residents and '30%' urban residents.[60] It is a matter of fact that rural regions are the strongholds for the ruling party. Hence, the September poll inflated results in favour of CCM. It is surprising for REDET to change the urban-rural population ration so drastically without any reasons in just a period of six months. This would suggest that the urban-rural migration in Tanzania is extremely high, which is not the case. A further weakness is that REDET, unlike in its past polls (for example, Polls No. 11 and No. 12 of 2006) where it analysed results by political party affiliation, ignored this important parameter in both the March and September 2010 polls, making it difficult to ascertain the results on a partisan basis. This is despite the fact that the last question in each questionnaire asked respondents about their party affiliation.[61] By failing to report on this variable, REDET found itself in a serious technical problem since this would have helped to indicate the preferences along party lines. It has been revealed that party affiliation is one of the key factors that influence voting behaviour in Tanzania (Ndumbaro, 2002; Mgasa, 2011).

[58] In the past REDET used to have a sample size of 1,300 respondents. As can be noticed, the 2010 polls saw an addition of 1,300 respondents implying that the sampling error could be minimized.

[59] REDET poll No. 16 of 2010.

[60] REDET poll No. 17 of 2010.

[61] REDET questionnaires (March and September Polls 2010). *urais katika uchaguzi ujao?*"[61]

Table 3. Leadership Qualities for March and September 2010 Polls.

S/N	March poll	%	S/N	September poll	%
1	Pro-poor people	24.1	1	Job experience	14.8
2	Ethical/anti-corruption	20.8	2	Pro-poor people	14.1
3	Job experience	13.9	3	Party affiliation	12.5
4	Party affiliation	10.8	4	Ethical/anti-corruption	9.9
5	High education	3.7	5	High education	1.9
6	My region	0.6	6	Undecided	4.2
7	My gender	0.5	7	Others	35.8
8	My religion	0.5	8	Don't know	6.8
9	Others	20.0			
10	Don't know	5.1			
	TOTAL	**100**		**TOTAL**	**100**

Source: adapted from REDET Polls No. 16 and No. 17 of 2010.

Another related problem with REDET is the unit of analysis. In all its past polls including the pre-election polls for 2010 REDET used a district as its unit of analysis. However, in its March and September Polls,*urais katika uchaguzi ujao?*"

REDET while relying on a district as the unit of analysis proceeded to report on the turning level of parliamentarians. This was problematic since a member of parliament is elected from a constituency. Yet, some administrative districts have more than one electoral constituency. To be sure, Unguja North "A" district has five constituencies. This makes it difficult to ascertain a specific member of parliament who was likely to return into the Parliament or otherwise.

Question design and reporting

In its questionnaires REDET asked the following question "*Je ni sifa gani zitakufanya wewe mpigie kura mgombea* This question is very important since it sought to provide qualities considered by respondents in choosing their president. In fact it was only REDET which inquired about it. Nonetheless it was wrongly reported. Item 3.2 of the March and September reports which focused on the responses to this question has the following subtitle "*Jina la Mgombea Urais na Sifa Zake*."[62] This is misleading and problematic. As can be noticed this title is about the specific name of a presidential candidate and his/her qualities something which was not asked in the questionnaires. It was Jakaya Kikwete of CCM who was an outstanding candidate. However, it is important to revisit the qualities in order to unfold the objectivity related to this question (Table 3).

The previous table is instructive. It can be noted that there were significant shifts in terms of rankings by respondents in the March and September polls. For example, the first consideration in the March poll became the second in the September poll. Likewise, the second criterion in the March poll dropped to the fourth in the September poll. Interestingly, the third criterion in the March poll ranked the first in the September poll. And lastly, the fourth factor in the March poll became the third one in the September poll. If REDET claims to have used the same methodology, these shifts need some explanations.

In the 2010 elections, the pollster asked about the reasons as to why respondents preferred one candidate to another. It is important to note however that in all REDET polls, this question appeared only when there was a candidate seeking for the second presidential term (that is, re-election). For example, in 2000 when Benjamin Mkapa was seeking for the re-election, the question of leadership emerged. In that poll, Mkapa was an outstanding candidate. REDET asked further for the reasons of preferences by respondents. The following factors were ranked as the most important ones: candidate's personal leadership qualities (23%); belonging to the same party (22%); candidate's last achievement in leadership (20%); candidate who seemed to strengthen peace and harmony (14.7%); and the candidate's party policies ranked the least by 11.7%. REDET concluded that "This shows that to a majority of the respondents, personality factors rather than party policies do matter more in determining candidate's popularity.[63] Interestingly, the question on qualities for leadership was not asked in the 2005 pre-election polls when Jakaya Kikwete from the ruling party contested for the first time. Instead, it was asked in the 2010 polls when Kikwete was seeking for the re-election. As can be noticed, the timing of the question on leadership qualities seems to have favoured the second term candidates.

[62] The name of a presidential candidate and his/her qualities (Own Translation).

[63] REDET poll No. 3 of 2000.

Since CCM has all along been the ruling party, it follows that its candidates were the beneficiaries of the responses as will be explained in due course.

In the 2010 polls, there were no explanations for the rankings of leadership qualities by REDET except for the March poll. Yet, it was awkward to note that REDET provided some explanations to only one item of the rankings by respondents. This was where 24.1% of respondents favoured a pro-poor candidate. The pollster stated *"Matokeo haya yanaashiria kuwa wengi wa wahojiwa bado wangependa rais awe ni yule anayejali maskini, kuashiria mabaki ya mfumo wa ujamaa uliotilia mkazo wakulima na wafanyakazi."*[64] This analysis has two problems. One is that REDET did not ask any question related to preferences of respondents towards party ideologies. Surprisingly, it simply picked "*Ujamaa*" which is the ideology of CCM.[65] The failure to subject the "pro-poor factor" along ideologies of other parties raises doubt on impartiality. It should be underlined that there is no political party in Tanzania which does not claim to stand for the poor. In fact the Democratic Party (DP) was the one which came out so clearly during the 1990s to coin the term "*walala hoi*" to mean poor people and to stand for them. Of course, the supremacy of the CCM ideology is historical. During the single party era (1965 to 1992) CCM unilaterally put its ideology in the state constitution.[66] On the eve of democratic transition, the Presidential Commission recommended that in the multiparty context CCM should de-link its ideology from the state constitution but this was not implemented.[67] In 1999, the Presidential Committee[68] observed that about 88.8% of Tanzanians wanted the word *Ujamaa* to remain in the constitution. It was also noted that despite the privatization of state enterprises, most Tanzanians are still encroached with the *Ujamaa* mindset (Chaligha, 2002). I suspect that REDET was taken by this constitutional dominance of the CCM ideology. Nonetheless, to be pro-poor does not necessarily mean to be pro-*Ujamaa* and CCM for that matter. In Tanzania, *Ujamaa* has only remained on paper. The country practises market economy. It should be capitalised that CCM and its government are the ones which set Tanzania to economic liberalisation. Under liberalisation the gap between the rich and the poor is being accentuated. Hence the term *Ujamaa* is normally used to camouflage sympathy of the poor during elections. Two is that peasants and workers are not always the poor as suggested by REDET. *Ujamaa* values equality among all people and hence equal distribution of resources. It follows therefore that *Ujamaa* is not synonymous with poverty. It is not surprising that by inflating the sample population from rural areas (where most poor people live and where most CCM supporters come from) in its September 2010 poll, REDET still favoured CCM's *Ujamaa* ideology which presumably is pro-poor. Another doubt is related to the "Job experience factor." As noted in Table 3, job experience was ranked from being the third criterion in March to the first one in the September poll 2010. REDET did not explain why that was the case. Yet, unlike the March poll, the September poll took place after nomination of candidates and hence it involved different political parties and their respective candidates. A deeper examination of this factor shows that there is one president at a time. For that matter, experience discussed here is that related to being a president. Admittedly, in 2010, it was only Jakaya Kikwete from CCM that had the relevant experience for the presidential post. Other contesters had not held this post before. As such, this question was favourable to the incumbent president. The poll came out amid debate on whether experience of being a president matters or otherwise. It was argued by some stakeholders that Jakaya Kikwete had no any experience of the presidential post in 2005 when he contested for the first time (*Mwananchi* 27.09.2011). It should be recalled that in that election Kikwete obtained the historical victory of 80.28% as opposed to his 61% victory in the 2010 elections. This observation leaves problems on the rankings of the criteria for selection by the REDET poll.

Similarly, ethical/anti-corruption consideration is also intriguing. This factor ranked from the second in the March poll to the fourth in the September poll 2010. Understandably, it is CCM which is highly accused of being a corrupt party.[69] The first president of Tanzania and the founder of CCM, Mwalimu Julius Nyerere contended "In 1990 the Chama Cha Mapinduzi (CCM) abandoned the one-party state for a multi-party system. But we do not have an opposition. The point I was making when I made the statement was that any party that stays in power too long becomes corrupt. The Communist Party in the Soviet Union, the CCM of Tanzania and the Conservative Party of Britain all stayed in power too long

[64] These responses show that the majority respondents still would like to see that the president be the one who is pro-poor; and it implies the legacy of *Ujamaa* (a form of Socialism) which emphasized on peasants and workers (Own translation).

[65] See Articles 4(3) and 5(3) of the CCM Constitution 1977.

[66] See Article 3(1) and Article 9 of the constitution of the URT 1977.

[67] See the United Republic of Tanzania .1991. The Presidential Commission on Single Party or Multiparty System in Tanzania: Report and Recommendations of the Commission on the Democratic System in Tanzania, (Volume I), Dar es Salaam University Press, p. 143.

[68] Jamhuri ya Muungano wa Tanzania .1999. Kamati ya Kuratibu Maoni Kuhusu Katiba, Kitabu cha Kwanza: Maoni ya Wananchi na Ushauri wa Kamati, Dar es Salaam.

[69] The Court of Appeal of Tanzania ruled that the maintenance work of the Kigoma-Ujiji road during the election campaign constituted non-compliance with the prohibition against electoral bribery, and was executed with the corrupt motive of influencing voters to vote for the CCM candidate and accordingly affected the results of the election. This is the normal practice by the ruling party when it approaches election or during the election process. See Attorney-General v. Aman Walid Kabourou, [1996] T.L.R 156 following the Kigoma by-election. Yet in all previous elections, CCM would distribute T-shirts, Khangas and in some cases food and drinks in order to get voted in office. See also Kamata, Ng'wanza .2006. Campaign for the 2005 General Elections, A Paper presented at a conference on 2005 General Election in Tanzania, Ubungo Plaza Conference Centre, Dar es Salaam, 20-21 February, p.16.

Table 4. Opinion of Respondents on level of Corruption by Political Parties (by region in Tanzania) in %.

Region	CCM	CUF	CHADEMA	NCCR	TLP	Do not know	No response
Manyara	57.1	11.4	5.7	0.0	0.0	8.6	17.1
Arusha	48.6	0.0	13.5	0.0	0.0	10.8	27.0
Dares salaam	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Tanga	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0
Kilimanjaro	31.0	0.0	3.4	3.4	0.0	20.7	41.1
Morogoro	50.0	3.8	11.5	0.0	0.0	11.5	23.1
Dodoma	48.0	0.0	8.0	0.0	4.0	4.0	36.0
Mean	49.5	2.7	7.0	0.5	0.5	9.1	30.6

Source: Adapted from the University of Dares Salaam, Institute of Development Studies (2010).

and became corrupt. This is especially so if the opposition is too weak or non-existent."[70] Nyerere's position is strengthened by results of the survey that was conducted by the Institute of Development Studies (IDS) of the University of Dar es Salaam in collaboration with the Prevention and combating of Corruption Bureau (PCCB) to understand corruption in the previous civic elections particularly those of 2004 and 2009. It was opined that CCM involved itself in corrupting electorates by 49.5% in order to solicit votes Table 4 summarizes the opinion of a sample of respondents from seven regions in Tanzania on the level of involvement in corruption by political parties. As can be seen from the Table 4, CCM is invariably the most corrupt of the political parties among those who gave a response. It must be noted that the findings outlined in this report are significantly congruent to responses provided by Pinkney (1997) to the question "why do Tanzanians vote CCM against opposition parties?" He observes that CCM engages in a systematic vote buying exercise which targets the opposition to the extent of 38%, CCM members themselves at the level of 14%, and non-party members at 35%. Corruption gives the ruling party undue leverage over its competitors.[71]

It should be understood that grand corruption was one of the most critical issues in the 2010 elections. It was at this time where the ruling party and its government were linked to the grand corruption scandals such as the RICHMOND-LLC[72] and EPA.[73] Indeed, opposition parties used the scandals popularly known as "*ufisadi*" to capitalise on their mobilisation strategies. For example the CUF and CHADEMA manifestos were very clear and aggressive in not only exposing this problem but also suggesting how to solve the problem if elected. CCM itself believes that one of the factors for its declining support was corruption (*Habari* Leo 11.08. 2011). Against that backdrop, it is difficult to understand how "ethical/anti-corruption factor" dropped from being the second in the REDET March Poll to the fourth in the September Poll. One of the possible explanations isrelated to REDET's sampling design. As already explained in this work, the September Poll drastically changed the urban/rural ratio which was 70% from rural areas and 30% from urban areas. By adding 10 to 60% population ration for the rural regions in the March Poll, REDET included most people from CCM strongholds. These people are less exposed to information; are less educated; are outside the huge bureaucracy of the government the factors which undermine their capacity to understand corruption adequately and associate it with their daily existence. Above all, most of them are supporters of the ruling party who sometimes do not acknowledge corruption as a problem. Arguably, by its drastic change of the rural/urban population sampling criterion in the September Poll, REDET either by design or default made the four important factors (job experience, pro-poor people, party affiliation and an ethical/anti-corruption) to be favourable to the ruling party.

Yet some REDET questions carry potential bias. In March and September Polls, for example REDET asked questions related to the performance of the government. This implies that if respondents answered in affirmative the chances are that they would also indorse the leaders in power. This means that those who did not have an opportunity to be in the government were discriminated. Similarly, if the responses were in negative, then the leaders in power could be in trouble. For ease of reference, REDET polls reported that respondents were asked to mention the most critical problem which the elected government should address first.[74] For the March poll, for example, 52.2% of respondents said education was the most critical problem; 44.7% opined the problem

[70] See the Heart of Africa. Interview with Julius Nyerere on Anti-Colonialism, New Internationalist Magazine, issue 309, January-February 1999 http://www.oneworld.org/ (Accessed: 03.05.2011). votes.[70]

[71] See the University of Dar es Salaam, Institute of Development Studies .2010. Grappling with Corruption in Local Government Elections, p. 63-64.

[72] It was about electric power supply in 2007/2008 which made the then Prime Minister Edward Lowasa to resign and so did the entire cabinet.

[73] External Payments Arrears (EPA) was a scandal that concerned the central Bank of Tanzania in paying about TSh133 billion ($116 million) to 22 companies in the financial year 2005/06 involving the repayment of the country's external.

[74] REDET polls No. 16 & 17 of 2010.

[74] Note that 2.6% of votes were spoilt.

Table 5. Presidential Election Results by Candidates.

Name of candidate	Party	Votes (%)
Mziray, Kuga Peter	APPT-Maendeleo	1.12
Kikwete, Jakaya Mrisho	CCM	61.17
Dr. Slaa, Wilbroad Peter	CHADEMA	26.34
Prof. Lipumba, Ibrahim Haruna	CUF	8.06
Rungwe, Hashim Spunda	NCCR-Mageuzi	0.31
Mgaywa, Muttamwega Bhatt	TLP	0.20
Dovutwa, Yahmi Nassoro Dovutwa	UPDP	0.15
Total		97.35

Source: National Electoral Commission 2011.

to be provision of health services; 36.8% said agriculture; road construction 31.6%; water 24.3%; employment 19.5%; corruption 12.3%; loans 11.8%; electricity 10.7%. A quick glance to the mentioned issues indicates that the ruling party has not been able to address them. Indeed challenges CCM's claim that it has done the best to improve all the mentioned issues. This failure while downsizing the ruling party seems favourable to opposition parties. As can be noted, this question was not proper in terms of its timing. It would be appropriate to ask it once a new government has already come into power.

REDET reports for the 2010 elections had a problem of cross tabulation. Though the pollster used the usual criteria such as age, gender, education, religion, party affiliation, as well as the rural-urban residencies in its questionnaires, it failed to cross-tabulate its results in relation to these parameters at the reporting stage. This makes it difficult for political parties and candidates to appreciate the level of support from various groups. This problem undermined REDET's objective of conducting these polls to inform political parties and other stakeholders in election so as to streamline their practices and manifestos in response to the needs of citizens.

PROJECTION AND SOURCES OF ERRORS

As is well shown, Table 5 indicates that of all the three pollsters, it was only SYNOVATE which seemed to have projected "correctly" the 2010 elections. Nonetheless, based on science all pollsters got it wrong. This is owing to the fact that samples for each pollster were seriously flawed. As a result their projection was either over-estimated or under-estimated.

It was observed that samples by TCIB and SYNOVATE were drawn from mainland Tanzania though projected the electoral outcome for the president of the United Republic of Tanzania. The other side of the Republic namely Zanzibar did not form part of their projection. This was totally wrong both scientifically and constitutionally. The very same SYNOVATE poll could not be able to capture the unprecedented low voter turnout of about 40% in the 2010 general elections. The pollster found that 83% of respondents said "I will most likely vote"; 16% opined that "I will not vote at all"; and 1% for "Don't know/Refused to answer." In my view, it is not possible to project correctly 61% support for the ruling party but fail to foresee 40% low voter turnout. On the other hand, TCIB did not consider factors such as rural/urban residencies as well as gender which are most critical in Tanzania. Worse still, the pollster was not able to compute simple mathematics as shown elsewhere in this work. REDET while managed to sample from the entire Republic, it missed the point by inflating its sample to include 70% of the population from rural regions (CCM strongholds) and 30% from urban (see the September 2010 Poll).

Similarly, framing of questions was problematic especially for SYNOVATE and REDET. Some questions were leading and potentially biased. It was noted that the pollsters asked some questions to evaluate the per-formance of the government and its leaders something which would either approve or disapprove the ruling party. In such context when the government and its leaders are approved the chance is that the opposition is disapproved and vice-versa. Questions related to evaluation of the government and its leaders are most appropriate after elections. It was only TCIB which asked objective questions. The only problem with this pollster is that it did not inquire for the reasons for a particular response making it difficult to assess the grounds held by respondents.

Reporting was also controversial. In some cases pollsters reported what they did not ask during fieldwork. This was a critical problem especially with TCIB and SYNOVATE. In contrast, REDET did not report some questions related to Zanzibar elections for both March and September 2010 polls. There were no grounds for this serious omission. Yet, SYNOVATE has a critical problem with its language. It reduces English to pidgin. Sometimes constructions of sentences are not easily understood hence distorting the meaning of what is

reported. This is despite the fact that SYNOVATE claims to be an international firm. Related to the foregoing, is the timing for releasing results. It was observed that all pollsters released their results very close to elections something which was most likely to amount into political conflicts. Moreover, it was noted that reports especially for SYNOVATE and REDET took too long (a month or two) from the time of fieldwork and release of findings.

The foregoing errors are a function of multiple sources. The first concerns with the professional capacity by pollsters. Capacity in this sense is restricted to doing political behaviour studies such as pre-opinion polls. This study has shown that three pollsters (TCIB-activists, SYNOVATE-marketers and REDET-academics) have different perspectives. It was observed that activism is deficient of science as it places emotion at its analysis. As such, by its very approach TCIB could not assure an impartial stand. Besides, its failure to perform simple subtraction and additional arithmetic functions suggests that TCIB lacks competent expertise for the opinion poll work. Yet, its sample was drawn from mainland Tanzania instead of the whole of the United Republic. Similarly, SYNOVATE was unqualified to undertake a study on political behaviour. Given that the pollster is specialized in business research, its market analysis approach could not warrant a scientific study on politics. Perhaps this is why it substituted the president of the United Republic of Tanzania for that of "mainland Tanzania" the post that does not exist constitutionally. Again, to conduct political research for profits in a country like Tanzania is dangerous since the richer are likely to be favoured and for that case the pollster would be used to impose leaders on the justification of science. On the other hand, REDET being under the public University with most of its actors (professors, lecturers and students) drawn from almost all fields of social sciences was regarded as the best place for studies on political behaviour. Moreover, the pollster has conducted opinion polls since 1990s. Hence it is the most experienced in the field. Surprisingly, its 2010 polls, unlike in the past were highly disputed by stakeholders.

It was perceived that such deficiencies in its polls as already discussed in this work could not only be by default. For example, while REDET was able to sample from the United Republic of Tanzania and carry out a study in both mainland Tanzania and Zanzibar, the findings for Zanzibar were not reported in March and September 2010. Yet, it was not understood why REDET which used to sample by considering the rural-urban ratios at 60% rural and 40% urban in its entire previous polls until March 2010, drastically inflated the rural ration to 70% and reduced the urban ratio to 30%. Although in 2010 REDET increased its sample sizes from 1,300 to 2,600 respondents, the sampling error could not be minimised. As such, the sample alteration (i.e. for rural and urban population ratios) was one of the basic reasons as to why REDET poll missed the point in September 2010.

The second source of error is based on perceived allegations that the pollsters have some networks with certain political parties or their candidates. To be sure, it has been shown that TCIB has some indirect connections with CHADEMA. Its main subscriber and chairman (for 2010-2011) is at the same time a member of the Central Committee of CHADEMA. In 2010 elections, the same was a member of campaign team for CHADEMA presidential candidate. As a matter of principle, the findings of TCIB cannot escape some association with CHADEMA. Though CCM dismissed the poll as partisan and in favour of CHADEMA, the party could not advance any bases for its claim.[75] SYNOVATE is controversial and plays a chameleon game. In its September 2010 poll it observed that CCM's candidate was ahead of CHADEMA by a far margin. CHADEMA accused SYNOVATE so bitterly. Surprisingly, SYNOVATE released its post-general elections, in just a period of less than eight months indicating that CHADEMA's presidential candidate for 2010 was leading the poll. This is the second time to hear a pollster in Tanzania issuing findings favourable to opposition parties. Perhaps this was to clear its tarnished image. Nonetheless, as pointed earlier, most of its questions were tailored to assist the ruling party.

As I pointed elsewhere (Makulilo, 2011) that there are serious allegations that some of REDET actors have some connections with the ruling party or some individual leaders in the party, this research also observed the same. All respondents from opposition parties were generally against REDET.[76] There is one ground advanced by these parties that some actors in REDET are political advisors to the current President. One respondent from civil society organizations went so far to say that "REDET is an academic wing" of CCM.[77] Because of this affiliation, it is argued that the pollster cannot issue polls which are against the interests of the president including his political party. In my view, this claim is not absolute unless qualified.

Notwithstanding such allegations, it is not clear how it was possible for REDET to conduct polls from 2006 to 2008 and publish its findings indicating that the popularity of Kikwete (who obtained 80.28% victory in October 2005 elections) was sharply declining from 80 to 67.4% in October 2006; to 44.4% in October, 2007 and to 39.5% in November 2008.[78] Interestingly, the reaction of the president has been publically positive to such findings.

[75] Interview with Mr. Wilson Mukama (28.07.2011). Interestingly, Mr. Mukama saw SYNOVATE as the one which projected close to the reality. He was also relatively comfortable with REDET findings.

[76] For example, Mr. Hamad Tao went far to say "REDET is a branch of ruling party CCM" (Interview 23.06.2011). It was also noted that the same observation was made by Mr. Julius Mtatiro (Questionnaire 23.06.2011) and Isaac Cheyo (Interview 23.06.2011).

[77] Mr. Kaiza Bubelwa, Executive Secretary General for ForDIA (Questionnaire 10.07.2011).

[78] See REDET Poll No. 15 April, 2009.

For example, in reaction to the 2007 poll, Kikwete said "*Ripoti ya REDET ni nzuri. Hiyo ni njia bora inayotumika dunia nzima,…kitu cha muhimu ni kuwa, ripoti imetoa fikra za watu kuhusu utendaji wa Serikali katika sekta mbalimbali. Nimeisoma. Ripoti hiyo itaisaidia Serikali."*[79]It is doubtful, if Kikwete instructed REDET to conduct polls of such nature and specifically to undermine his popularity. One of the founders of REDET but a critic to its polls, Prof. Mwesiga Baregu commented "*Katika hili, naona rais anatakiwa kufikiria kwa umakini sana na ajipange upya, kwa sababu kweli yeye na serikali yake wamepoteza mwelekeo… Hebu tazama ndani ya miezi 12 wananchi, hasa wasomi wenye upeo wa kuchambua mambo wamemchoka.*"[80]

If examined closely the claim that some of REDET's actors are political advisors to the president may influence its findings alone does not suffice to conclude that REDET is unable to conduct polls which are not favourable to the president and his party. Hence it is not surprising to note that if the findings are favourable to a certain candidate or party (however scientific or unscientific they are) they would be welcomed and the reverse is the case. For that matter the debate on partisanship should not be restricted to pollsters themselves but be extended to consumers of polls.

The third source of error is the electoral system itself. It is well studied and established that the electoral field in Tanzania is not level to ensure fair competition. Indeed, it is biased to favour the ruling party (Baregu, 2003; Bakari, 2002; Bashiru, 2002; Erdimann 2007; Hoffman and Lindsay, 2009; Hyden, 1999; Killian, 2001;, Liviga 2009; Kamata 2006; Mallya 2006; Mmuya 1998, 2003; Mushi, 1995; Ruotsalainen 2009; Whitehead, 2009; Shivji 2006; Mhina, 2001). The party enjoys beyond the incumbency advantages (TEMCO 1997; 2001; 2006; 2011). This advantage is the product of history as well as deliberate efforts by the ruling party to suffocate political space.

The party, through its chairman who is the president of the United Republic appoints all key decision makers in managing elections such as election commission, the registrar of political parties, etc.

These can be dismissed on his/her description (Makulilo, 2009). At an extreme case, the ruling party uses open rigging. This happened, for example, in the 2000 elections in Zanzibar and TEMCO described that election as an aborted one (TEMCO, 2001). What is challenging is the fact that while polls are fundamentally based on probability sampling the electoral field is systematically skewed to favour the ruling party. The question is that, how can it be possible to project outcome of the skewed electoral field using polls which are assumed to generate data without undue influence? In other words, pollsters have not been able to calculate the systematic bias which might be posed by the electoral system in favour of the ruling party. Other respondents wondered that it is more likely that the pollsters are used to prepare the psychological mindset of the electorates on the level of rigging by the ruling party.[81]

The fourth limitation to polls is about civic education. Civic education is important for democracy as it raises the ability of the citizens to nature the system properly. Participation in a political system is dependent on the level of education (Almond and Verba, 1963; Mushi et al., 2001; Riutta, 2001). It was due to this fact that civic education was considered important especially for a country like Tanzania which had been under the one party system from 1965 to 1992 (URT, 1991). However, the government has been reluctant to provide civic education. It is said that the ruling party benefits from incompetent citizenry and the situation is described by some analysts as "ignorance is the political capital of the ruling party." The fifth limitation is unreliable source of official statistics. As is well known Tanzania conducted its last census in 2002. It is difficult to use this data for polling purposes. Besides, the other data found in the wards/villages/streets is sometimes not updated. The situation is complicated by the fact that most parts of Tanzania are unplanned settlements.

The sixth critical problem specific to the 2010 elections was the unprecedented low voter turnout of about 40%. No pollster was able to foresee this situation. Of course it was only SYNOVATE that asked this question "If elections were called today would you vote?" The responses were as follows: "I will most likely vote 83%"; "I will not vote at all 16%"; and "DNK/RTA 1%." As can be noted it appears that SYNOVATE poll was totally misplaced. As a general rule, low voter turnout affects adversely the findings as well as effective samples as noted.

Whenever voters' preferences are significantly different from those of non-voters, the inability to correctly distinguish between them leads to biased estimates, a bias that becomes bigger in low turnout elections, where the gap between actual turnout and the reported intention to vote is likely to become larger. On the other hand, even if likely voters are correctly identified, low turnout elections tend to result in lower effective samples of actual voting intentions, and thus more error (Magalhães, 2005).

Given the fact that in the past, voter turnout was above 70%, in 2010 elections it was extremely low. So far there are no systematic studies to explore how this was the case. Hence, by any accounts, the projection by pollsters must have been affected by this drastic fall of turnout.

[79] REDET report is good. I have read it and indeed it will be useful to the government (Own translation). Flora Wingia "Tutafanyia kazi ripoti ya REDET-JK" Nipashe http://www.bongo5.com/ (Accessed: 10.08.2011).

[80] The president has to rethink since he and his government have lost a sense of direction to lead. It is surprising that in a period of only 12 months citizens and especially the educated who are able to do analysis are tired (Own translation). Irene Mark na Schola Athanas "REDET yamkaanga JK" http://www.habaritanzania.com/ (Accessed: 10.08.2011).

[81] Interview with Mr. Hamad Tao (23.06.2011).

CONCLUDING REMARKS

The purpose of this research was to engage the science of pre-election opinion polls in Tanzania. It focused on three key issues namely sampling design, framing of questions as well as reporting the findings. Although the study was limited to understand the 2010 opinion polls, in some occasions it went beyond that year. The idea was to unveil consistence by pollsters in relation to their practices with the changing circumstances. The study observed that all the pre-election polls for the 2010 elections were problematic in sampling design, framing of questions and reporting leading to either over-estimation or under-estimation. Indeed they were by default or design biased. Yet, the reluctance of pollsters to disclose fully their details of methodological designs used to conduct polls remains a major concern. Surprisingly, they continue to defend their findings as scientific by inviting members of the general public to visit their offices to verify their "scientific methodologies."

It was further observed that SYNOVATE and TCIB had no adequate expertise to carry out political behavioural studies. They failed even to appreciate that the president of the United Republic of Tanzania is for both mainland Tanzania and Zanzibar. Since pre-election polls are concerned with power contestation it is imperative that any organisation which does polls must have relevant expertise and should above all exercise total impartiality. It must be stated that as of now, polls are not trusted in Tanzania as used to be in the past. By limiting their sample to mainland Tanzania, these pollsters missed the point. However, REDET which seemed to have the relevant expertise and vast experience did not perform better. Its sample for the September poll inflated (70% rural/30% urban) the rural population by 10% of the March poll which stood at 60%. The implication of this was to include more respondents from CCM strongholds so drastically without any explanations. Yet, REDET did not report its findings specific to Zanzibar for both the March and September polls.

The study noted that framing of questions was also problematic. For example, TCIB and SYNOVATE asked questions of future instead of the ones at the time the polls were taken. This means that the pollsters assumed the conditions on the ground to be static and so did the political behaviour of voters. Moreover, other questions for the SYNOVATE and REDET were leading. This study recommends four major things. One is that a specific law should be enacted to regulate the polling industry. Similarly, a specialised regulatory authority for quality assurance should be put in place to regularly review the workings of pollsters. As noted elsewhere in this work, TCIB for example, was unable even to perform simple arithmetic on subtraction and additional functions. Had there been an authority to check quality, this would not be allowed for public consumption. Second is that pollsters should develop the culture of declaring conflict of interests. This is particularly for those who have dual membership, that is, political parties and polling organisations; or/and for those pollsters who appear to have friendships with a certain candidate/political party. Third, pollsters should abide with high professional standards in their areas of competencies. Finally, the study recommends that to improve the polling industry the electoral system should be reformed to allow a levelled playing field by all stakeholders. This should also include the provision of civic education to the general public so as to raise their level of political awareness and participation in democratic processes as dully informed citizens.

REFERENCES

Achen CH (1975). "Mass Political Attitudes and the Survey Response", American Pol. Sci. Rev., 69 (4): 1218-1231.

Adleman L, Schilling M (2008). "Evidence of Systematic Bias in 2008 Presidential Polling http://www.stat.columbia.edu/ (Accessed: 10.08.2011).

Almond GA, Verba S (1963). The Civil Culture: Political Attitudes and Democracy in Five Nations. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Althaus S (1996) "Internet Resources for American Politics and Public Opinion," Votes Opin., 2(2): 14-8.

Bakari MA (2002). "Vyombo vya Ulinzi na Usalama Vinavyokuza au Kudumaza Demokrasia". In: Madumulla, Joshua S. (ed). Uimarishaji wa Demokrasia na Utawala wa Kidemokrasia Tanzania. Department of Political Science and Public Administration, University of Dar es Salaam, pp. 51-66.

Baregu M (2003). "The State of Political Parties in Tanzania", The African Review: J. Afr. Pol., Dev. Int. Affairs, 29(1/2): 19-35.

Bashiru A (2002). The Politics of Election Administration in Tanzania under Multipartisim: The Case of 2000 General Elections, M.A Dissertation: University of Dar es Salaam.

Berinsky AJ (2004) Silent Voices: Public Opinion and Political Participation in America. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Berinsky AJ, Tucker JA (2006). "'Don't knows' and public opinion towards economic reform: Evidence from Russia", Communist Post-Communist Stud., 39: 73-99.

Biemer PP (2010). "Total Survey Error Design, Implementation, and Evaluation", Public Opin. Quart., 74(5): 817-848.

Biemer PP, Lyberg L (2003) Introduction to Survey Quality of Wiley Series in Survey Methodology, Vol. 329.

Chaligha AE (2002) "Uncritical Citizens or Patient Trustees? Tanzanians' views of Political and Economic Reform" Afrobarometer Paper No. 18.

Chaligha AE (2005). 'The state of political parties in Tanzania' in Research and Education for Democracy in Tanzania (REDET): democratic transition in East Africa. Dar es Salaam: E and D Limited, pp. 120-136.

Converse PE, Traugott MW (1986) "Assessing the Accuracy of Polls and Surveys," Sci., 234(4780):1094-1098.

Crewe I (1992). "A Nation of Liars? Opinion Polls and the 1992 Election", Parliamentary Affairs, 45(4): 466-474.

Curtice J (1995). "What Future for the Opinion Polls? The Lessons of The MRS Inquiry", Scottish Affairs, p. 10.

Erdmann G (2007). Party Research: Western European Bias and the 'African Labyrinth'. In: Basedau, Matthias. et al. (eds). Votes, Money and Violence: Political Parties and Elections in Sub-Saharan Africa. Sweden: Nordiska Afrikainstitutet, pp. 34-64.

Gelman A, King G (1993). "Why Are American Presidential Election Campaign Polls so Variable When Votes are so Predictable?", British J. Pol. Sci., 23(4): 409-451.

Golay M (1997) Where America Stands on Today's Most Critical Issues (2nd edition) John Wiley & Sons Inc.

Groves RM, Lyberg L (2010). "Total Survey Error: Past, Present, and Future", Public Opin. Q., 74(5): 849-879.

Heckman JJ (1979). "Sample Selection Bias as a Specification Error", Econometrica, 47(1): 153-161.

Hoffman B, Robinson L (2009) “Tanzania’s Missing Opposition”, J. Democracy, 20(4): 122-136.
Hyden G, Mmuya M (2008). Power and Policy Slippage in Tanzania-Discussing National Ownership of Development. Sweden: Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (SIDA) Stud., p. 21.
Hyden, G. (1999). “Top-Down Democratization in Tanzania”, J. Democracy, 10(4): 142-155.
Kamata N (2006). Jeshi la Polisi na Ujenzi wa Demokrasia Tanzania. Paper presented in REDET’s Training Workshop for Senior Police Officers, Bwawani Hotel, Zanzibar, 13-14 February.
Kaya HO (2004). ‘Electoral violence, political stability and the union in Tanzania’, Afr. J. Conflict Resolution, 4(2): 145-69.
Killian B (2001) Pluralist Democracy and Transformation of Democratic Attitudes in Tanzania. PhD Dissertation: University of California.
Kiragu K, Mukandala RS (2005). Politics and tactics in public sector reforms: the dynamics of public service pay in Africa. Dar es Salaam: Dar es Salaam University Press.
Liviga AJ (2009). “Tanzania: A Bumpy Road to Consolidated Democracy”, Eastern Afr. Soc. Sci. Res. Rev., 25(1): 1-42.
Magalhães PC (2005). “Pre-Election Polls in Portugal: Accuracy, Bias, and Sources of Error, 1991-2004”, Int. J. Public Opinion, 17(4): 399-421.
Majira 25.08.2008 http://majira.co.tz/ (Accessed: 05.08. 2011).
Majira 26. 08. 2008 http://majira.co.tz/ (Accessed: 05.08. 2011).
Makulilo AB (2008). Tanzania: A De Facto One Party State?, VDM Verlag Dr. Muller Aktiengesellschaft & Co. Kg, Germany.
Makulilo AB (2009). “Independent Electoral Commission in Tanzania: A False Debate?” Representation, 45(4): 435-453.
Makulilo AB (2009). “Whose Affirmative Action is Affirmative? Lessons from Tanzania”, The Central European University J. Pol. Sci., 4(4): 606-637.
Makulilo AB (2010). “Join the Party or I cannot elect you”: the Independent Candidate Question in Tanzania, Pol. Sci. J.,, 6(1): 111-137.
Makulilo AB (2010). State-Party and Democracy: Tanzania and Zambia in Comparative Perspective: PhD Thesis, Leipzig University (Unpublished).
Makulilo AB (2011) “The Zanzibar Electoral Commission and Its Feckless Independence”, J. Third World Studies, 28(1): 263-283.
Makulilo AB (2011). “Watching the watcher”: An evaluation of local election observers in Tanzania,” J. Modern Afr. Stud., 49(2): 241-262.
Mallya E (2006). Jeshi la Polisi Kwenye Mfumo wa Vyama Vingi: Mtazamo Kutoka Nje ya Jeshi. Paper presented in REDET’s Training Workshop for Senior Police Officers, Bwawani Hotel, Zanzibar, 13-14 February.
Mark P, Richard J (2005). “Measurement Error and House Bias in 2004 Presidential Campaign Polls” http://www.nuffield.ox.ac.uk/politics/ (Accessed: 13.08.2011).
Marsh C (1985). “Back on the Bandwagon: The Effect of Opinion Polls on Public Opinion”, British J. Pol. Sci., 15(1): 51-74.
May T (2006). Social Research: Issues, Methods and Process 3rd Edition Open University Press, United Kingdom.
Meena R (2003). “The Politics of Quotas in Tanzania” A paper presented at the International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance (IDEA)/Electoral Institute of Southern Africa (EISA)/Southern African Development Community (SADC) Parliamentary Forum Conference; The Implementation of Quotas: African Experiences, Pretoria, South Africa, 11–12 November 2003.
Mgasa G (2011). How Do Citizens Vote? The Experience Of Multipartism in Tanzania M.A Dissertation: University of Dar es Salaam (Unpublished).
Mhina A (2001). “Partisanship, Organization Membership and Orientations Towards Political Change” in Mushi, S, Mkandala, R, Mwesiga, B (eds) Tanzania’s Political Culture: A Baseline Survey; Department of Political Science and Public Administration, University of Dar es salaam, Dar es Salaam, Tanzania.
Mmuya M (1998). Tanzania Political Reform in Eclipse: Crises and Cleavages in Political Parties. Dar es Salaam: Friedrick Ebert Stiftung.
Mmuya M (2003). “Elections and Prospects of Democratic Consolidation in Tanzania” The African Review: A J. Afr. Pol. Dev. Int. Affairs, 29(1/2): 36-66.
Mokrzycki M, Scott K, Courtney K (2009). “Cell-Phone-Only Voters In The 2008 Exit Poll and Implications for Future Non-coverage Bias”, Public Opin. Quart., 73 (5): 845-865.
Mushi SS (1995). “The Structure and Culture of Politics Inherited from Tanzania’s One Party Rule”. In: Research and Education for Democracy in Tanzania (REDET), Reflections on the Transition to Democracy in Tanzania, Publication No. 1. Dar es Salaam: Dar es Salaam University Press, pp. 15-30.
Namba 15, Idara ya Sayansi ya Siasa na Utawala, University of Dar es Salaam.
Ndumbaro L (2002). “Voter Choices and Electoral Decisions in the 2000 General Elections in Tanzania”, The African Review: Department of Political Science and Public Administration, Dar es salaam University Press, Dar es Salaam. A J. Afr. Pol.,
NEC (1996). The Report of the National Electoral Commission (Tanzania) on the 1995 Presidential, Parliamentary and Councillors’ Elections, Dar es Salaam, Tanzania.
NEC (2006). The Report of the National Electoral Commission (Tanzania) on the 2005 Presidential, Parliamentary and Councillors’ Elections, Dar es salaam, Tanzania.
NEC (2011). The Report of the National Electoral Commission on the 2010 Presidential, Parliamentary and Councillors’ Elections. Dar es Salaam.
NEC (National Electoral Commission) (2001). The Report of the National Electoral Commission (Tanzania) on the 2000 Presidential, Parliamentary and Councillors’ Elections, Dar es Salaam, Tanzania.
Newport F, (Provide other authors) (2009). Winning the White House 2008: The Gallup Poll, Public Opinion and the Presidency, Info-base Publishing, New York.
Newport F, Lydia S, David M (1997). How are polls conducted? http://media.gallup.com/PDF/FAQ/HowArePolls.pdf (Accessed: 09.08.2011).
Nipashe 03.10.2010 http://www.ippmedia.com/ (Accessed: 10.08.2011).
Nyirabu M (2003) “Conflicts and Constitutional Issues in Tanzania”, African Review: J. Afr. Pol. Dev. Int. Affairs, 30(1/2): pp. 1-18.
Pickup MA, Johnston R (2005). “Measurement Error and House Bias in 2004 Presidential Campaign Polls.” Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, Washington, DC, September 2-5.
Pinkney R (1997). Democracy and Dictatorship in Ghana and Tanzania. London: Macmillan Press Limited.
Raphael C (2010). “Tanzanie : contestations sociales « sous contrôle »” in Alternatives Sud: Etat des résistances dans le Sud-Afrique Centre Tricontinental. 17(4).
Raphael C (2011). “Party Institutionalisation in Tanzania: A State Project?” Saarbrücken: VDM Verlag Dr. Muller Aktiengesellschaft and Co. Kg.
REDET (2000). Maoni ya wananchi kuhusu Uchaguzi Mkuu wa Oktoba 2000, namba 3, Idara ya Sayansi ya Siasa na Utawala, University of Dar es Salaam.
REDET (2006). Maoni ya Wananchi Kuhusu Utendaji Kazi wa Serikali, Namba 11, Idara ya Sayansi ya Siasa na Utawala, University of Dar es Salaam.
REDET (2006). Maoni ya Wananchi Kuhusu Utendaji Kazi wa Serikali, Namba 12, Idara ya Sayansi ya Siasa na Utawala, University of Dar es Salaam.
REDET (2007). Maoni ya Wananchi Kuhusu Utendaji Kazi wa Serikali, Namba 14, Idara ya Sayansi ya Siasa na Utawala, University of Dar es Salaam.
REDET (2007). Maoni ya Wananchi Kuhusu Utendaji Kazi wa Vyama vya Siasa, Namba 13, Idara ya Sayansi ya Siasa na Utawala, University of Dar es Salaam.
REDET (2009). Maoni ya Wananchi Kuhusu Utendaji Kazi wa Serikali,
REDET (2010). Maoni ya wananchi kuhusu Uchaguzi Mkuu wa oktoba 2000, namba 17, Idara ya Sayansi ya Siasa na Utawala, University of Dar es Salaam.
REDET (2010). Maoni ya wananchi kuhusu Uchaguzi Mkuu wa oktoba 2010, namba 16, Idara ya Sayansi ya Siasa na Utawala, University of Dar es Salaam.
REDET (2005). REDET Opinion Poll Report No. 8 November, 2004. People’s Opinion and Preferences for the 2005 General Elections. Dar es Salaam: University of Dar es Salaam.

Riutta S (2007) Empowering the poor?: Civic Education and Local level participation in rural Tanzania and Zambia. PhD Dissertation: Georgia State University.
Rothschild D (2009) "Forecasting Elections: Comparing Prediction Markets, Polls, and their Biases", Public Opin. Q., 73 (5): 895-916.
Ruotsalainen PJ (2009). Under the Same Shade: Popular Perceptions of Political Change and the Challenges of Consolidating Multiparty Democracy in Tanzania. PhD Dissertation: University of Gothenburg.
Sakshaug JW, Ting Y, Roger T (2010). "Non-response Error, Measurement Error, and Mode of Data Collection Tradeoffs in a Multi-Mode Survey of Sensitive and Non-Sensitive Items", Public Opinion Quart., 74 (5) : 907-933.
Sansa, G. (2004) The Mode of Transition to Democracy and its Impacts on Multiparty Politics in Tanzania, M.A Dissertation: University of Dar es Salaam.
Shivji IG (1993) "The Changing State: From an Extra-Legal to an Intra-Legal State in Tanzania". In: Fimbo M, Mvungi S, (eds) *Constitutional Reforms for Democratisation in Tanzania*, Faculty of Law, University of Dar es Salaam, pp. 1-14.
Shivji IG (2006). Let the People Speak: Tanzania Down the Road to Neo-Liberalism. Dakar: Council for the Development of Economic and Social Research in Africa (CODESRIA).
Shura ya Maimamu Tanzania, Kamati Kuu ya Siasa Kuelekea Uchaguzi Mkuu 2010: Muongozo kwa Waislamu, Dar es Salaam.
Sinnott RW (2009). Presidential Election Polls: Should We Pay Attention? Feature Statistics Corner, p. 8.
Sirkin MR (2006). Statistics for the Social Sciences 3rd Edition, SAGE Publications United Kingdom.
Sonck N, Loosveldt G (2010). "Impact of Poll Results on Personal Opinions and Perceptions of Collective Opinion", Int. J. Public Opin. Res., 22 (2).
SYNOVATE (2010). Matokeo ya Kura ya Maoni 10-10-2010, Dar es Salaam, Tanzania.
SYNOVATE (2011). Social political and economic BAROMETER (TANZANIA), Tanzania.
Tanzania Daima 16.10.2010 www.freemedia.co.tz/ (Accessed: 10.07.2011).
TCIB (2010). Matokeo ya Kura ya maoni Kuhusu Wagombea Uraisi 2010, Dar es Salaam, Tanzania.
TEMCO (2001). The Report of the 2000 General Elections in Tanzania. Dar es Salaam: University of Dar es Salaam.
TEMCO (2006). The Report of the 2005 General Elections in Tanzania. Dar es Salaam: University of Dar es Salaam.
TEMCO (2011). The Report of the 2010 General Elections in Tanzania. Dar es Salaam: University of Dar es Salaam.
TEMCO (1997). The Report of the 1995 General Elections in Tanzania. Dar es Salaam: University of Dar es Salaam.
Traugott MW, Wlezien C (2009). "The Dynamics of Poll Performance during the 2008 Presidential Nomination Contest", Public Opin. Quart., 73 (5): 866-894.
Traugott MW. Price V (1992). "A Review: Exit Polls in the 1989 Virginia Gubernatorial Race: Where Did They Go Wrong?", Public Opin. Quart., 56 (2): 245-253.
UDSM (2010). Institute of Development Studies: Grappling with Corruption in Local Government Elections: A Focus of Arusha, Dar es Salaam, Morogoro, Dodoma, Kilimanjaro, Tanga, and Manyara Regions. A Research Report Submitted to the Prevention and Combating Corruption Bureau (PCCB) Headquarters, Dar es Salaam,
United Republic of Tanzania (1977). The Constitution of the United Republic of Tanzania, Government Printer, Dar es Salaam, Tanzania.
United Republic of Tanzania (1991). The Presidential Commission on Single Party or Multiparty System in Tanzania: Report and Recommendations of the Commission on the Democratic System in Tanzania, (Volume I), Dar es Salaam: Dar es Salaam University Press.
United Republic of Tanzania (2002). National Census, Government Printer.
Verba S (1996). "The Citizen as Respondent: Sample Surveys and American Democracy Presidential Address", Am. Pol. Sci. Assoc., 90(1): 1-7.
Walker DA (2006). "Predicting presidential election Results", Appl. Econ., (38): 483–490.
West BT, Olson K (2010). "How much of Interviewer Variance is Really Non-response Error Variance?", Public Opin. Q., 74(5): 1004-1026.
Whitehead RL (2009). Single-party rule in a Multiparty Age: Tanzania in Comparative Perspective, PhD Dissertation: Temple University.
Wlezien C (2003). "Presidential Election Polls in 2000: A Study in Dynamics", Presidential Stud. Q., 33(1): 172-186.
Wlezien C, Erikson RS (2006). "Research Notes the Horse Race: What Polls Reveal as the Election Campaign Unfolds", Int. J. Public Opin. Res., 19(1): 74-88.
Zaller J, Feldman S (1992). "A Simple Theory of the Survey Response: Answering Questions versus Revealing Preferences", Am. J. Pol. Sci., 36(3): 579-616.