

## **Institutionalization of Political Parties in Tanzania: A Managerial Approach**

*Mohammed A. Bakari* \*

### **Abstract**

*The issue of party management and institutionalization is now topical in the democratization discourse in Africa. The initial euphoria of multiparty politics now seems to have been replaced by disillusionment. Reviewing the experience of Tanzania, the paper argues that political parties, institutions which are considered indispensable for democratization and popular representation are generally poorly organized and managed. For political parties to become credible institutions of democratic governance in modern times, this paper, despite the recognition that political parties are first and foremost 'political' institutions with distinct principles and strategies aimed at attracting and maintaining supporters for electoral performance, it argues a case for the increasing importance of the application of key managerial principles. These principles include reorganization, decentralization and delegation of authority, adherence to rules and regulations and the adoption of the various techniques in the exercise of power and influence by party leaders.*

### **Introduction**

It is now two decades since most African countries conceded to domestic and external demands to adopt multiparty politics. Twenty years down the road one would expect considerable progress to have been made in institutionalization of political parties as popular institutions of representation in terms of application of modern organizational and managerial principles in the era when public and private sectors are increasingly being managed by professionals. The role of professionals in party management is becoming critical not only to bureaucratic efficiency and economic management but also in the political game involving

---

\* Senior Lecturer, Department of Political Science and Public Administration, University of Dar es Salaam.

“manipulation of symbols that reinforce political legitimacy” (Martz and Myers, 1994:1). However, a review of literature on the subject and empirical observation seem to suggest otherwise. Most political parties in Africa are still managed under traditional principles of management, one of the factors which are believed to account for limited party institutionalization in Africa.

Political parties are not among the oldest political institutions to exist in political systems. Conventional political parties as we know them today are hardly a century old. Ostrogorski (1964, originally, 1902) attributed the rise of parties to the industrial revolution and the extension of the franchise (Janda, 1993:164). This political development in most Western countries was essentially a feature of the late 19<sup>th</sup> century and the first half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. In fact, classical discourses on political parties started to appear in the first half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century (Ostrogorski 1902; Michels 1911; and later, Duverger, 1951; Neumann, 1956; Sartori, 1976; Janda, 1980).

This relative young age of political parties compared to other institutions like legislature and bureaucracy could be probably one of the reasons why management of political parties is lagging behind in management sciences. Whereas management principles and skills are usually applied to government and private institutions, political parties have generally been relegated to unsophisticated and less rigorous principles and techniques of management. Although organization theory literature is highly developed, its application to political parties is very limited (Janda, 1993: 170). It was discovered, for example, from ‘a computer search of the Sociological Abstracts file in the DIALOG™ online information services found 905 abstracts that mentioned ‘political party’ or ‘parties’ in articles and conference papers from 1980 to 1991, but only also mentioned ‘organization theory’ or ‘some variant’ of it (Janda, 1993: 170).

Very few scholars (eg., Wellhofer, 1979; Janda, 1980b; Panebianco, 1980) have sought to apply organization concepts and principles to the study of political parties. Wellhofer (1979), for example devised measures of broad organizational concept for application to parties across nations. Wellhofer proposed the concept of ‘organizational encapsulation’ which meant the ‘elaboration of party sub-units to envelop as many day-to-day life activities of the membership as possible (Janda, 1993: 171). Wellhofer sought to demonstrate how organizational inputs could be linked to vote outputs. Panebianco’s conceptualization (1988) of party organization was quite

informed of the organization theory in the discussion of such concepts as dominant coalition, institutionalization and organizational complexity (Janda, 1993: 171).

In spite of the seemingly fair application of organization theory and principles to the study and analysis of political parties in the recent times, it is generally acknowledged by scholars that most of the empirical research on party organization draws inspiration from Duverger. Duverger's propositions applied such concepts as direct/indirect structure, basic elements, organizational articulation, and centralization of power (Janda, 1993:171).

Inspired by Duverger, Janda (1980b) differentiated two major dimensions of organizational structure of political parties, namely: a) degree of organization which is similar to Duverger's concept of complexity of structural differentiation; b) centralization of power, following Duverger's location and distribution of authority. Sartori (1986: 76 -81) came up with the categorization of parties structures into three categories: *organized*, *organizationless*, and *half and half*.

Thus, the problem of limited application of organization theory and principles to political parties is common even among the developed democracies of the West, but more so in the newly democratizing countries of the Third World. This raises the need for the mainstreaming of managerial sciences within political parties. If government institutions and private firms are increasingly adopting managerial sciences in their organization and management practices, the same imperative applies to political parties.

Governments are now increasingly applying principles and techniques of New Public Management (NPM) which were traditionally largely applied by private firms - efficiency and effectiveness, competition and value for money, which according to critics, are often at the expense of representation (Barberis, 1998:461). This is also a major challenge to political parties. Instead of exclusively relying on politicians and largely political strategies such as propaganda, patronage, favouratism, collegiality, and the like - there is an increasing need to have a dedicated cadre of highly trained and experienced managers and professionals who are employed on a full time basis and who are expected to apply their professional managerial knowledge and skills in managing political organizations. This full time cadre of officials are in charge of running daily activities of political parties such as implementation

of party resolutions, strategic planning and fund-raising activities, campaigning, and the like. This is not meant to bureaucratize parties and make them detached from their membership, but rather to create a machinery that will effectively manage and supervise party activities on a daily basis.

Political parties have to strengthen not only the political aspect of the party structure, but also the professional aspect which helps to maintain the structure of the party and preserve its credibility as a well-managed political institution (Martz and Myers, 1994). Modern political parties need to have a core staff of professionals in various fields such as lawyers, accountants, political scientists, sociologists, economists, journalists, IT experts and the like. This could constitute a pool of managers as well as researchers who could help collect and analyze information, and design appropriate strategies for political purposes.

This paper seeks to present an overview of the organizational and managerial attributes of political parties in Tanzania. It traces the development of political parties and the reasons which led to the lagging behind of management sciences in the management of political parties; and provides the rationale of applying managerial principles in the management of modern political parties. It also suggests some of the ways that could be adopted to strengthen party management including reorganization, decentralization and delegation of authority, and the various methods of exercising the art of delegation. Finally, it presents an overview of management of Tanzania's political parties as an illustration of party management experience in the African context.

### **The Rationale of Strengthening Managerial Elements within Political Parties**

Virtually all African nationalist political parties adopted the dominant European model of party systems which relied very much on mass membership, organizational sophistication from the centre to the grassroots, cohesion and ideological or issue orientation as aptly represented by the British experience. Those organizational features quite substantially informed and influenced party organization in Africa during the nationalist struggles and thereafter in post-independence era under both single party regimes and subsequently multiparty politics since 1990s. For those countries that have uninterruptedly sustained multipartism since independence, namely Botswana and Mauritius, the European model of party organization

has been continuously at play. On the other hand, “[f]or the last generation or two”, Epstein (2000:7) observes, “political scientists who specialize in the study of political parties in the United States and elsewhere, have tended to regard the mass membership, cohesive, and issue-oriented party of Western Europe and especially in Britain as a superior, because of a more highly developed form of political life”. In congruence with that assertion, some American party specialists have explicitly wished parties in the United States to progress in a similar way (ibid: 7).

Astonishingly, however, as a worldwide phenomenon the popular legitimacy of parties seems to be declining and party organizations generally may appear to be weaker than they were a generation ago at the local level (Web, 1995). In other words, whereas in the past some party analysts were arguing of the need for the Europeanization of American parties, today there seems to be a greater currency toward the Americanization of European parties (Web, 1995; Epstein, 2000; Smith, 2009). The American model of party system that was considered by Duverger (1954) and most European political scientists as backward both organizationally and ideologically is now gradually seen as a viable alternative form of party organization in the context of the phenomenal decline in mass membership, cohesion and ideological orientation of political parties in the West and elsewhere.

Notwithstanding the above developments in party systems, the need for developing managerial and organizational attributes for political parties in Africa is still relevant. Whichever direction African political parties will be moving in this generation – whether the European way, the American way or the African way, if any, if they are to survive and continue to perform some of their basic functions, they cannot ignore the significance of improving their organizational and managerial attributes. It has been strongly argued that for the realization of effective functioning and sustainability of multiparty democracy in Africa it is imperative to strengthen the institutional arrangements that may make political parties more effective actors in the political system. The findings from a comparative study by the International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance (International IDEA, 2007:5), for example, which covered thirty countries in sub-Saharan Africa including Tanzania demonstrate that political parties in Africa and beyond: “...find themselves in crisis, unpopular and increasingly distrusted. They are suffering from declining membership, internal management practices that are often weak and not sufficiently democratic, and party system regulations that often set far-reaching limits to the way parties are allowed to operate.”

There are different forms and models of party organizations. Some are highly centralized organizations like that of the former Communist bloc, and others are highly loose organizations like that of the United States. Along the continuum of the two extreme dimensions there are a host of divergent patterns including the various organizational patterns in Africa. At the formative stages one perhaps may favour more organizational attributes, but as society develops loose kind of organizations may also be relevant depending on the nature of society and ideological predisposition. By European standards, for example, American political parties are often regarded as undeveloped although in reality as Epstein (2000:6) would argue they are in response to peculiar American conditions which cannot be "regarded as the marks of a backward nation". Many contemporary party theorists seem to suggest that there are currently two probable tendencies in terms of patterns of party organization in the developed democracies, notably, "Americanization of Europe in some respects, and Europeanization of America in others" (Epstein, 2000:6-7). Developing countries including those in Africa are therefore invariably affected by the same tendencies.

For the last generation or two most political scientists specializing in the study of political parties in the United States and elsewhere tended to regard the West European model of party organization which involved mass membership, cohesiveness and issue orientation as a superior model of party organization compared to the American model of a loose and highly decentralized organization. Apparently, such scholars were inspired by Duverger who characterized American political parties as "backward both organizationally and ideologically" (Epstein, 2000:7). But, as pointed out earlier, based on the historical experience of party evolution in Europe and in the United States of the two parallel tendencies of party organization, i.e., Americanization and Europeanization of party organizations the assertion that the European model is superior to the American model has not yet been proved by historical realities. The decline in party activism and grassroots party membership in Europe, for example, is now a rising phenomenon (Katz et al. 1992; Mair, 1994; Web, 1995; van Biezen, 2001; Dalton, 2005; Whiteley, 2009). Web (1995:299), for example, aptly observes that "popular legitimacy of parties may be dwindling" and that party organizations generally may "appear weaker than they were a generation ago at the local level" in spite of the emergence of the "electoral-professional model". Explaining the process of party transformation in Britain, Smith (2009:555), for instance, argues that in the area of election campaigning, parties

including catch-all-parties are increasingly compelled to approach the electorate “with “persuasive” rather than more traditional mobilizing appeals.”

Whatever the tendency of party evolution in Africa – whether towards Europeanization or Americanization of party organizations, whether towards centralization or decentralization, the case of strengthening organizational and managerial attributes remains compelling. Most of the studies on political parties in Africa have been very much informed of conventional theories and models of studying political parties (van de Wale, 2003; Carbone, 2007). These theories and models are extensively based on political variables at the expense of organizational and managerial variables. Although the paper recognizes the significance of examining the socio-political and economic environment within which the parties operate, and the role of the legal framework governing the operation of political parties, the main focus will be on organizational and managerial variables.

As to why researchers and analysts are now so concerned with party managerial elements within political parties, there are various possible explanations. The main rationale of strengthening party organization is the *complexity* of the activities to be performed: interest articulation, interest aggregation, policy-making, entrepreneurship, marketing and investment, lobbying, accounts keeping, legal defense, charting political strategies, making and combating political propaganda, etc – all these require not only amateur and career politicians but also professionals trained in various fields. The other reason is the need to combat *oligarchy* or the iron law of oligarchy as hypothesized by Robert Michels (1911). In order to prevent the party to degenerate into an oligarchy, it is imperative to have in place institutional safeguards instead of relying on individuals and their personal wisdom.

### **Some of Ways to Strengthen Party Organization**

#### ***Style of Management***

Basically, there are three styles that one can find across all parties if we can distinguish them using leadership styles based on authority along the continuum as suggested by Kast and Rosenzweig (1987: 337). There is the *autocratic leader* – the one who wishes to command others and expects compliance from them largely by awarding rewards or effecting punishment. The second one is the *democratic* or participative leader – the one who consults widely with followers and encourages them to participate in

decision-making. The last style of leadership is referred to as *laissez-faire* (free-rein leader) who uses his/her power very little and expects subordinates to use their own discretion in attaining the goals of their party. This style of leadership is rarely used and if used, there is a vacuum in leadership that needs to be replaced.

Fred Fiedler (1967) suggested another leadership style of which he called *contingency model*. In that model Fiedler suggested that effective group performance relies much on the leader's style and the extent to which the situation is under the control of the leader. There is no school of management that is universally superior that could be effectively and efficiently applied in every form of organization. There is, however, almost a broad consensus in modern times that '*participative management theory*' is the most suitable in governing political institutions like political parties. The main proposition of this theory is that organizational effectiveness is enhanced by increasing participation of organizational members, including those at the lowest ranks. It is generally agreed that 'participation' has a motivating effect, which in turn may improve organizational performance. The style of management is very much related to the management principles and the way they are applied as discussed in the following sections.

### ***Reorganization***

Reorganization is a broad term which may involve a broad range of issues including changing rules and regulations, creating new structures or abolishing old ones, streamlining lines of authority and span of control, increasing or reducing responsibilities, decentralization and devolution of authority and responsibilities, and the like.

Reorganization is considered as one of the most important strategies for the vitality and growth of organizations. Periodic reorganization is called for due to a number of reasons including the need to bring in new blood to prevent stagnation and inertia. Reorganization may sometimes produce miracles: eliminate waste and reduce costs. Reorganization may help tackle a number of contentious issues – ranging from efficiency and effectiveness to issues of representation and responsiveness. Reorganization may provide a convenient way of dumping unwanted officials particularly those with strong constituencies. This however may sometimes backfire and inflict heavy damage on organization. It has therefore to be carried out with utmost caution.



### ***Decentralization and Delegation of Authority***

Decentralization is allowing others make decision about the party without necessary referring back to the party bosses. It is one of the basic ways of delegation of authority. Authority is either delegated or centralized. The degree of authority dispersed throughout the party depends on the level of understanding of subordinates – but as matter of principle, there cannot be absolute decentralization.

Delegation of authority is a necessary technique if any party wants to exist. Nobody can do all functions of the party by her/himself and expect the party to win as one of its fundamental goal. Delegation to followers who will make decisions within the boundary of their assigned duties is inevitable if a party is to be effective in realizing its key objectives. The process of delegation requires that: (i) one has to have the expected results expected from him/her. It implies that one cannot delegate authority without first knowing what she/he expects. (ii) A leader or manager has to assign the tasks to the position. One can be held responsible within the scope of assigned duties. (iii) One has to delegate authority for accomplishing those tasks. (iv) A person in that position must be held responsible for the accomplishment of the assigned tasks. One important thing is that once one has delegated authority he/she does not dispose of it. He/she can recall it if the person fails to observe the required directives. For example, one can delegate authority but during reorganization of the party one can recall back his/her authority.

### ***The Art of Delegation***

Managers or leaders have to be receptive. They should be willing to let other people's ideas have a chance of being tested. Since it involves letting others making decisions instead of expecting that decisions will be like the ones that would be made by those who have delegated authority to the lower organs. One of the basic requirements here is that leaders should refrain from making decisions for the posts they once occupied before taking higher positions within the party structure. They should allow their subordinates to assume the right to make decisions.

Since one of the objectives of delegation of duties is to allow individuals to grow, there is no need for constant check up for mistakes done by subordinates. Leaders have to assume some responsibilities for mistakes done by their subordinates in their course of learning. Nobody suggests that one will have to sit idle and watch juniors make mistakes. What is meant here is that there should be a reasonable degree of tolerance by superiors.

This helps in building a sense of trust among subordinates. A sense of trust and confidence among subordinates is an incentive for creative thinking. Relatedly, it is important that leaders train their subordinates who will assume responsibilities after they are gone. Besides, it is important to give appropriate rewards to successful people who have assumed authority. Leaders should promote subordinates to higher positions and give them posts of top leadership whenever they deserve. It is however important to ensure that leaders only delegate authority after being assured that there is an effective means of getting feedback for performance accomplished.

### *The Need for Committees*

Committees are found in every party or organization. Generally, a committee is a group of persons who have been assigned a special responsibility or task. If committees are properly utilized they can be of great benefit to the organization or party. A committee may be established to make decisions about some problem or problems. It can simply deliberate on problems and leave the burden of decision to the authority. Other committees make recommendations to a leader or manager who is supposed to agree or disagree with the committee's recommendations. Some committees are rather permanent in nature and these are said to be formal ones in the sense that they are established as part of the organizational structure of authority and defined duties. On the other hand, there are informal or ad-hoc committees that are set up by the leader of a certain section to give advice to the leader or manager.

The use of committees is a prudent way of running organizations including political parties. It is widely believed that group deliberations and judgment tend to result in more rational and legitimate decisions. First, because of varying experiences, a group reaches a solution after many of its individuals have pooled together their ideas and judgments. It should however not imply that group decisions could only be reached by committees. Second, the establishment and functioning of a committee system helps to remove fear of the likelihood of a single individual holding too much power and authority. Third, a committee may be established simply because the individual leader does not like to take full responsibility of the decision reached. Forth, a committee may reduce the possibility of inaction by a leader. Fifth, in some instances, committees are established because leaders fear or do not like to take action. A leader may also establish a committee where he/she can always postpone reaching decisions because he/she will tell the concerned that he/she is still waiting for the deliberations from a certain committee or

possibly postpone the matter indefinitely. Sixth, a committee represents various groups and individuals who have an interest in the party because it is difficult for everyone to be present when making a decision. In other words, it is one of the strategies of legitimizing institutional decisions because of broad representation of interests.

There is no standard menu on how to succeed with committees. The following requirements however may immensely contribute to the success of committees within political parties or other organizations: (i) clarity of its authority; (ii) appropriate size and representation of different interest groups; (iii) cost effectiveness in terms of money and time; (iv) the selection of a competent chairperson; and (v) proper recording keeping.

#### ***Rules and Regulations in the Management of Political Parties***

Most of the problems confronting political parties in the aspect of rules and regulations result from the ignorance of rules and regulations or lack of predisposition to obey them. Rule and regulations governing the conduct of political parties can be categorised into internal and external to the parties. Internal rules and regulations are of two types, notably those specified in the Constitution and those found in other documents containing, for example, rules and regulations governing financial accountability, rules and procedures of reaching decisions, etc.

An elaborate party constitution is supposed to be a basic document which specifies the structure of the party, power distribution, accountability, rules and procedures of making decisions, how to effect amendments to the constitution or rules and regulations, and how internal conflicts should be resolved or managed. Adherence to the constitution and other rules of the party by the party leadership as well as membership is partly a function of the type of the party – whether it is a *mass party* or *patron party*, i.e., whether it is an *institutionalised* or *personalised party*. If a party is not well institutionalised, its leadership as well as membership can hardly respect the constitution, the rules and regulations. Consequently, when there is a crisis or conflict, instead of resorting to democratic means through the party organs, the conflict is managed through informal channels using personal influence of the leaders concerned.

Indeed, some times, informal means do work effectively, and even in the well established and institutionalised parties often make use of such means.

However, there are times when they do not work. Since decisions and compromises reached informally do not have strict legal sanctions, they are very difficult to be respected and enforced. There is a tendency for individuals to respect *institutional decisions* or decisions arrived at through a *procedural due process* or (even if they are not happy with the content), rather than *personal decisions*. That is to say, the procedure itself (without regard to the content) may render credibility and legitimacy to the decisions.

### ***Planning***

Modern management sciences demand that everything in organization is well-planned, i.e., not done on an ad-hoc basis. Planning involves determining what is to be done? How and When? A plan is a tool for evaluation and self-appraisal. An institution measures itself against the objectives set, the strategies spelled out and adopted, resources involved as well as and the time span taken to accomplish such objectives.

Most political parties in Tanzania seem to have some elements of planning at the national level, but the lower levels often operate without proper planning. To plan is to choose. Planning involves selecting objectives that will carry one farther than where one is and determining actions to achieve them. It involves making decisions in advance and choosing an alternative from many that will lead one to achieve the selected objectives. Election manifestos of political parties are an example of planning at least at the level of policies since they may not contain detailed plans for their execution.

### ***Organizing***

Organizing in its essence requires basically four things. The first is to align with what and party would like to achieve. That is the party objectives. What is that the party aims at? Knowing the party objectives makes it easier to organize. It is known for example, that every party may see itself fit to take the leadership of the nation from the ruling one. That said, it does not prevent other objectives from being attended to. That is why every party needs organization as the primary instrument of running party affairs. So every party must know important activities required to reach the objectives of the party.

Second, in organizing what is needed is to group all activities that are sought essential in attaining the party objectives together. Each of the grouped activities needs to be assigned a leader or manager to be in charge of the

different roles. For example, one might be interested in putting a person who will be in charge of say party propaganda, one may be assigned to be in control of the party's accounts, etc. But only assigning activities to a leader is not sufficient. The individual assigned must be given authority necessary to accomplish what the party needs. However, in order to permit the individual to perform, he must be able to coordinate horizontally (on the similar party level) as well as vertically (that he/she is able to coordinate party's activities at every party level).

#### ***The Need for Accurate Data***

Data is needed for various purposes. The party needs to keep up to date database of its resources, members, electoral support, database of its competitors, etc. It also needs exchange of information – eg., from its MPs, grassroots information, information from government institutions, etc. Without relevant information a party cannot plan or lay down strategies. Collection of information may be somewhat easier, but processing and analysis require expertise and skills in various areas. The party has to make sure that both functions are performed effectively and timely. In modern times, political parties ought to have an elaborate and systematic structure of data collection and processing that involves the use of both formal and informal channels of data gathering. Bits of information should not be despised as useless, several bits put together may constitute valuable information. The kind of data to be collected and analyzed is of two types. The first type is data internal to the organization itself: data on membership, financial resources available, areas that have been visited for party activities, a pool of resource person, consultants, advisors, etc. The second type is data external to the organization, for example, information derived from national budget, scandals involving the government or individual officials, etc.

#### **An Overview of Tanzania's Experience in Party Management Practices**

In this section we present a general overview of Tanzania's experience in party management since the introduction of multipartism in 1992. The purpose is not to present a detailed account of organizational and managerial attributes of individual parties in Tanzania based on empirical findings. Rather, we intend to present a general picture in an attempt to show the research gap that exists in the study of political parties in Tanzania and Africa as a whole.

Tanzania inherited the British tradition and subsequently learned from the models of party organization of the former Communist bloc. Both traditions are in favour of centralized party organizations with clear structures. At the beginning parties were largely organized along the British tradition, but since 1967 following the pursuit of a socialist path under a single party regime the communist model was increasingly becoming more prominent.

*Chama Cha Mapinduzi* (CCM) which was a merger of the Tanganyika African National Union (TANU) and the Afro-Shirazi Party (ASP) of Zanzibar was and still is one of the most highly organized political parties in Africa (Basedau and Stroh, 2008). Part of the reason for that success may be in terms of its sophistication in organizational attributes. Admittedly, even political parties which were highly organized in Eastern Europe have collapsed. This suggests that there are several factors at play, beyond the purview of this paper, but one factor which cannot be simply ignored is that of organizational attributes in terms of reorganization, decentralization, grassroots networking, planning, committee system, professionalization of the cadre, and the like.

The lack of managerial and organizational attributes within political parties in Tanzania has had negative consequences. It has been well established by various studies that besides the constraining political and legal environment within which opposition parties operate in Tanzania, internal factors significantly undermine the growth and performance of opposition parties in Tanzania (Mmuya, 1998; Bashiru, 2002; Sansa 2004; Bakari and Mushi, 2005; Makulilo, 2008).

There are several indicators portraying poor organization within political parties in Tanzania. Some of the political parties particularly the minor ones, for example, do not have elaborate structures in operation. Although their constitutions are generally well drawn to meet the requirements for registration, their practices are usually not in line with the formal organizational set-up. Informal authority is often elevated to subdue formal authority, personality subdues impersonality, most of these parties have weak penetration into the society, they lack of resources – material, financial and human and therefore cannot perform most of the key activities of parties – socialization, interest articulation, interest aggregation, policy making influence, leadership recruitment, effective opposition or governing competence. Most of the minor parties such including those with some parliamentary representation like the United Democratic Party (UDP),

Tanzania Labour Party (TLP) and NCCR-Mageuzi belong to that category. Some parties, particularly the major ones, like *Chama cha Demokrasia na Maendeleo* (CHADEMA) and the Civic United Front are quite active virtually all the time but more so during election times, others particularly the minor ones are dormant even during election times.

Like in most African countries, in Tanzania most opposition parties started as *patron parties*. These would include the United Democratic Party (UDP), Democratic Party (DP), Union for Multiparty Democracy (UMD), Tanzania Democratic Alliance (TADEA) or *caucus parties* such as CHADEMA. Patron parties are those centered around a single not influential but overriding figure - who sets the mission of the party, rules, regulations, who acts as a chief executive and as a judge. In other words, in effect he/she is a chief legislator, chief executive and a judge of the highest court. Caucus parties are slightly different from patron parties in that power is not monopolized by a single individual but rests in a select group of the few who consider themselves as colleagues and work in a more or less collegial manner - i.e., through friendly bargaining and compromising processes. The fact that most opposition parties in Tanzania started as patron or caucus parties should not be necessarily seen as inherently futile development from the very beginning. History proves that most of the current highly institutionalized parties in the world started as caucus or even patron parties, but with time, they were able to adapt themselves to changing circumstances to become institutionalized parties. CHADEMA, for example, has been displaying this tendency - when it started it was more of a caucus party. Initially it largely consisted of the business people and middle class people. Over time, however, it has been able to extend its outreach programmes in society to become the strongest opposition party on the mainland, although it still faces formidable challenges to counteract the power of the ruling party which still enjoys a broad organizational network from the centre to the grassroots. What could be learned from this experience is that the founders of patron and caucus parties and members of the newly created parties should not be haunted by their history, rather they should take stock of the party dynamics and changing environment to develop and institutionalize their parties.

Although there are host of alternatives, hypothesis on party performance, it is plausible to assume that an effective structure leads to effective performance and vice versa. This assumption does not negate an episodic scenario whereby effective performance of a party, say during an election,

may not be a function of structural attributes, but largely due to an individual personality. The relatively impressive electoral performance of NCCR-Mageuzi in the 1995 general election in Tanzania, for instance, is a case in point. The remarkable electoral performance of the party was basically not because of the structural strengths of the party, but individual personality and the anti-CCM sentiments that had prevailed then. This scenario could to some extent resemble the case of Solidarity Party in the 1989 Polish elections. In the same vein, the National Rainbow Coalition (NARC) in Kenya did not constitute a well-organized party in the real sense of the term - it was basically the anti-KANU sentiments that galvanized the otherwise discrete political groupings with diverse political orientations and agenda (Musambayi, 2006). One of the major challenges of NARC was to structurally organize a unified and stable political party in the aftermath of the electoral victory, a challenge which became extremely difficult to resolve.

The structural strength of the party should be attested beyond the incumbent leadership. If the change of leadership drastically impairs the functioning of the organization, it could be assumed that such an organization is not structurally developed. A well-established structure provides some assurance of continuity and change as dictated by the vision of the organization, the leadership initiatives and environmental imperatives. A structurally developed organization is expected to be able to timely adjust itself to the changing environment.

Based on that assumption, one can hardly conceive the existing parties in Tanzania without their founding fathers, towering figures or accessing state resources in the case of the ruling party, CCM. Let us, for instance, think of a scenario of CCM being out of power for a while (i.e., being in the opposition side). How will it be able to survive? Can it financially and in terms of manpower requirements sustain itself in its present structure? In spite of the fact that it has a nationwide network, it has a large pool of qualified personnel and activists, its strength could be largely due to the fact that it has been the ruling party since independence and it has continued to enjoy unproportionally state resources. Undoubtedly, a large chunk of its resources are directly or indirectly from the government - directly, for example, in the form of using government resources and equipment for party activities including electoral campaigns (TEMCO, 1996; 2001; 2006), and indirectly, for example, in the form of donations from businessmen who donate essentially not because of their party loyalty, but in anticipation of political favours that could be granted to them by government officials such



tax exemption or reduction, or preferential treatment in government tendering (TEMCO 2001:88, Makulilo 2008:92-94). Issa Shivji (1991), a prominent Tanzanian lawyer, characterized CCM as a state-party (i.e., a party deriving its authority and legitimacy as well as resources largely from the state coercion) as opposed to a conventional political party, which is supposed to derive its legitimacy from the civil society on voluntary basis.

Organizational needs and financial capability to pay the employees both full time and part time are among the factors determining the size of the party bureaucracy. It could be recalled that during the single party era CCM had an extensive bureaucracy from the national to district levels parallel to that of the government. It had eight departments and two commissions which formed the secretariat of the party. Each department and commission was staffed with a chairperson, secretary, assistants and a number of low level officials and station functionaries – all these were paid employees (Mmuya, 1998:46). When the resource base of the party narrowed as a result of multipartism, the party had to scale down its bureaucratic structure. The CCM secretariat now consists of only three departments namely: Publicity, Planning and Finance. As a way of reducing management costs, CCM now extensively rely on the service of its members with regular employment elsewhere whose positions were obtained on the party's ticket including MPs. Some of these serve as heads of departments at regional or district levels (Mmuya, 1998: 47).

As for the other parties, whose formal organizational structures at least on paper are not fundamentally different from that of CCM, the general picture is that they are not well organized. Most opposition parties have not been able to create permanent bureaucratic structures that could operate all over the country. It has to be noted that in all past multiparty elections, the ruling party, CCM has been winning overwhelmingly, and some contestants for parliament and councilors for local governments have passed unopposed due to the non-existence of opposition parties in some areas, particularly in rural areas. In 1995, for example, CCM won 80.2% of the total parliamentary seats; in 2000 the number of seats rose to 87.4%, in 2005 it won 88.7% and in 2010 it received 70% of the total parliamentary seats (NEC 1995; 2000; 2005; 2010).

Likewise, when it comes to application of rules and procedures, there is an invariable degree of application. Generally, the major parties tend to adhere to them whereas the minor or residual parties (those without parliamentary

representation) tend to be disorganized and usually conduct their business on ad-hoc basis without resort to rules of impersonality and other bureaucratic principles. It is quite apparent that most political parties in Tanzania are run as personal clubs. The “strongman syndrome” invariably affecting the African states is equally affecting political parties in Africa. Rather than viewing political parties as formal institutions governed by formal rules they are much more influenced by personal decisions and informal rules. In terms of theoretical insights therefore one could see the relevance the Riggsian theory of public administration and bureaucracy (Riggs 1964) in the Third World context to explain the behavior of political parties which seems to be more or less like that of the African state characterized by personal rule (Jackson and Rosberg 1982) which has apparently endured even with the introduction of multiparty politics.

In spite of the various obstacles they face, some parties in Tanzania seem to grow in terms of some organizational attributes including research capacity and investigation. A striking example is the growing popularity enjoyed by CHADEMA. The rising popularity is in part due to the capacity of the party to acquire and strategically exploit the information collected, for example, relating to the various scandals perpetrated by incumbent politicians and government functionaries. CHADEMA has been steadily rising in its popularity since the publicity by its Secretary General, Dr. Wilbrod Slaa what he referred to as a list of shame (a list of 11 corrupt leaders) on September 15, 2007 (*Tanzania Daima*, 16/9/2007). Since then, the government in power and the ruling party has been in defensive - it has never recovered ever since. Scandals after scandals have been exposed largely by the CHADEMA leadership, a factor which has immensely increased their credibility in the eyes of the public as clearly demonstrated by their impressive electoral returns in the 2010 general elections. This underscores the significance of research and publicity of information as one of the key managerial functions of political parties.

### **Conclusion**

The history of political party development in Tanzania is mixed to the extent that it is very difficult to draw a definite conclusion. Whereas some parties have shown some signs of growth and institutional development, many have performed badly in both respects. The argument however that party growth and institutionalization would require a deliberate measure of promoting managerial attributes to party management can hardly be contested. This

article has demonstrated that research on managerial attributes of political parties in Africa and Tanzania in particular is lagging behind. Therefore part of the purpose of this article is to encourage researchers to pay more attention to organizational and managerial variables of political parties which in spite of seemingly declining trends of mass membership and ideological divisions among parties, they are still relevant. In other words, as Gentili (2005:15) puts it : “ [f]urther research should go beyond the formal rules of organization and investigate the concrete nature of the functions of linkages between parties, citizens, groups and collectivities at the central and local levels.”

Most political parties in Africa are still managed under more or less traditional principles of management. Modern management principles have been very slow to be applied in the management of political parties in Africa and elsewhere in the developing world. Tanzania is one of the striking examples demonstrating the sluggishness of party management. Political parties in Tanzania, and particularly the opposition parties, are generally weak in terms of organizational and managerial capacities. Most of them now are almost two decades old since their inception in 1992, but they have not been able to institutionalize themselves by adopting modern managerial principles of political parties. Most of them have remained highly centralized and opaque clubs which serve as platforms of founding leaders who tend to dispense favours on the basis of patronage and neo-patrimonial patterns of leadership. From the above sketch of the organizational features and managerial challenges of political parties in Tanzania a set of suggestions could be advanced.

First, all political parties including the major ones need to constantly pursue initiatives aimed at institutionalization of the organizational structures. Rules, regulations and procedures have to be accorded primacy over individual charisma and wisdom. Relatedly, basic knowledge of the constitution and other laws may help political parties to reduce their internal conflicts and as well as conflict with the state. Some of the internal conflicts within the parties may be simply because of lack of proper understanding of the legal context of the issues to the dispute among the leadership as well as the membership. It should be incumbent upon political parties to ensure that civic education which includes some knowledge of the constitution and other laws is imparted to both leadership and membership. To facilitate this endeavour, political parties and those providing assistance to

democratization projects should assist in the provision of intensive training in party management to party leaders at all levels.

Second, just like in the private organizations and government institutions issues of strategic planning and financial management should be given a top priority by political parties in their training and management practices. Connected to that, political parties should adopt periodic expert auditing and review of their programmes and activities with the view to suggesting remedial measures such as reorganization, decentralization, creating new structures both formal and informal. Lastly, party leaders and managers should extensively rely on participative management style in their conduct so as to promote a sense of attachment to both leadership and membership and reduce the propensity for intra-party conflicts.

### References

- Bakari, M. and Mushi, S. S., 2005, "Prerequisites for Democratic Consolidation in Tanzania", in *Democratic Transition in East Africa*. REDET Publications. Dar es Salaam: E&D Limited.
- Barberis, P., 1998, "The New Public Management And A New Public Accountability", *Public Administration* 76 (3) 451-470.
- Basedau, M. and Stroh, A., 2008, *Measuring Party Institutionalization in Developing Countries: A New Research Instrument Applied to 28 African Political Parties*. GIGA Working Paper Series, No. 69. Hamburg.
- Bashiru, A., 2002, "The Politics of Election Administration in Tanzania under Multipartism: The Case of 2000 General Elections," (M. A. Diss. University of Dar es Salaam.
- Carbone, G. M., 2007, "Political Parties and Party Systems in Africa: Themes and Perspectives," *World Political Science Review* 3(3) : 1-29.
- Dalton, R. J., 2005, *Citizen Politics*. Washington, DC: Congressional Quarterly Press.
- Duverger, M., 1951, *Political Parties*, New York: Wiley.

- Epstein, L. D., 2000, *Parties in Western Democracies*. New Jersey: Transaction Publishers.
- Gentili, A.M., 2005, "Party, Party Systems and Democratization in Sub-Saharan Africa." Paper presented at the 6<sup>th</sup> Global Forum on Reinventing Government, Seoul, Republic of Korea, 24-27 May (2005). Accessed 29 January 2012, from <http://unpan1/un.org/intradoc/groups/public/documents/un/unpan020460.pdf>
- International IDEA, 2007, *Political Parties in Southern Africa. The State of Parties and their Role in Democratization*. Stockholm, Sweden: International IDEA.
- Jackson, R. and Rosberg, C., 1982, *Personal Rule in Africa*. Berkeley: Berkeley University Press.
- Janda, K., 1993, "Comparative Political Parties. Research and Theory," in A. W. Finister, *Political Science: The State of the Discipline*, New Hampshire: American Political Science Association.
- Janda, K., 1980, "Comparative Analysis of Party Organization: The US, Europe, and the World," in W. J. Crotty (ed.), *The Party Symbol: Readings on Political Parties*, San Francisco: W. H. Freeman.
- , 1980b. *Political Parties: A Cross-National Survey*, New York: The Free Press.
- Harmel, R. & Janda, K., 1994, "An Integrated Theory of Party Goals and Party Change", *Journal of Theoretical Politics* 6: 259-287.
- Kast, F. E. and Rosenzweig, J. E., 1985, *Organization & Management*, (Fourth Edition), New York: McGrill Hill Book Company,
- Katz, R. S. and Mair, P. et al., 1992, "The Membership of Political Parties in European Democracies, 1960-1990", *European Journal of Political Research*, 22: 329-45.

- Koontz H. and Weihrich, H., 1990, *Essentials of Management* (5<sup>TH</sup> Edition), Mcgraw-Hill International Editions.
- Mair, P., 1994, "Party Organization: From Civil Society to the State," in *How Parties Organize*, eds. R. Katz and P. Mair. London: Sage.
- Martz, J. D. and Myers, D. J, 1994, "Technological Elites and Political Parties: The Venezuelan Professional Community", *Latin America Research Review* 29 (1) : 7-27.
- Makulilo, A. B., 2008, *Tanzania: A De Facto One Party State?* Saarbrucken: VDM Verlag Dr. Muller.
- Michels, R., 1911, [repr.1962]. *Political Parties: A Sociological Study of Oligarchical Tendencies of Modern Democracy*, New York: Free Press.
- Mmuya, M., 1998, *Tanzania Political Reform in Eclipse: Crises and Cleavages in Political Parties*, Dar es Salaam: Friedrich Ebert Stiftung.
- Musambayi, K., 2006, "After the Floods-The Rainbow: Contextualizing NARC's Election Victory," in *Political Succession in East Africa: In Search of A Limited Leadership*, eds. C. Peter and F. Kopsieker. Nairobi: Friedrich Ebert Stiftung.
- Neumann, S. (ed)., 1956, *Modern Political Parties: Approaches to Comparative Politics*, Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- NEC. , 1995, *The National Electoral Commission Report of the 1995 General Elections*. United Republic of Tanzania. Dar es Salaam.
- 2000, *The National Electoral Commission Report of the 2000 General Elections*. United Republic of Tanzania. Dar es Salaam.

-----2005, *The National Electoral Commission Report of the 2005 General Elections*. United Republic of Tanzania. Dar es Salaam.

-----2010, *The National Electoral Commission Report of the 2010 General Elections*. United Republic of Tanzania. Dar es Salaam.

Ostrogorski, M., 1902. [repr.1964], *Democracy and Organization of Political Parties*, Vol. II of the United States, New York: Anchor Books.

Panebianco, A., 1988, *Political Parties: Organization and Power*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Riggs, F. W., 1964, *Administration in Developing Countries: The Theory of Prismatic Society*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co.

Sansa, G., 2004, "The Mode of Transition to Democracy and its Impact on Multiparty Politics in Tanzania", M. A. diss. University of Dar es Salaam.

Sartori, G., 1976, *Parties and Party Systems*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Smith, J.K., 2009, "Campaigning and the Catch-all-Party: The Process of Party Transformation in Britain," *Party Politics*, 15(5):555-572.

Shivji, I.G., 1991, "Towards a New Democratic Politics", *UDASA Bulletin*, No. 12, January.

Tannebaum, R. and Schmidt, H., 1958, "How to Choose a Leadership Pattern," *Harvard Business Review* 36: 95-101.

*Tanzania Daima*, 2007, Dar es Salaam, September 16.

TEMCO., 1996, *The 1995 General Elections in Tanzania*. Report of the Tanzania Election Monitoring Committee. Dar es Salaam.

TEMCO., 2000, *The 2000 General Elections in Tanzania*. Report of the Tanzania Election Monitoring Committee. Dar es Salaam.

- TEMCO. 2006, *The 2005 General Elections in Tanzania*. Report of the Tanzania Election Monitoring Committee. Dar es Salaam.
- Thomas, A., 1996, *An Introduction to Financial Accounting*, 2<sup>nd</sup> Ed., New York: McGraw- Hill Book Company.
- van Biezen, I., 2004, "Political Parties as Utilities", *Party Politics* 10: 701-22.
- van de Wale, N., 2003, "Presidentialism and Clientelism in Africa's Emerging Party Systems", *Journal of Modern African Studies* 41 (2) 297-321.
- von Beyme, K., 1985, *Political Parties in Western Democracies*, Aldershot: Gower.
- Ware, A., 1996, *Political Parties and Party Systems*, Oxford University Press.
- Web, P. D., 1995, "Are British Political Parties in Decline", *Party Politics*, 1(3) 299-322.
- Wehrich, H. and Koontz, H., 1993, *Management A Global Perspective*, Tenth Edition, New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc.
- Wellhofer, E. S., 1979, "The Effectiveness of Party Organization: A Cross-National Time Series Analysis," *European Journal of Political Research*, 7: 205 – 224.
- Whiteley, P. 2009, "Is the Party Over? The Decline of Party Activism and Membership Across the Democratic World". Accessed 26 November 2010, from <http://www.psa.ac.uk/2009/pps/whiteley.pdf>
- Wilson, F. L., 1980, "Sources of Party Transformation: The Case of France", in *Western European Party Systems*, ed. P. E. Merkl. New York: Free Press.