

“An Investigation of The Simple Majority Presidential Electoral Process in Zambia And its Effects- 1995 -2015”

Felix Chibesa

Catholic Medical Mission Board, Plot 20, Msuzu Rd, Woodlands- Lusaka, Zambia
Corresponding Author: Felix Chibesa

Abstract: The president of Zambia recently commissioned a commission of inquiry into the voting patens in Zambia. This research investigated the effects of the electoral system on the voting pattern in Zambia and its effects. The research used the Historical research which is the systematic and objective location, evaluation and synthesis of evidence in order to establish facts and draw conclusions about past events. It took the systematic investigation in various studies of the election results in Zambia in order to establish facts on the effects of the simple majority presidential electoral system and reach new conclusions as well as correlate old facts. The results indicate the simple majority vote has led to the regional Voting. This regional voting has been leading to division of the country along ethnic groups. Regional voting pattern can be traced from 2001 to the elections in 2015. Simple majority vote electoral system has favored parties whose support is concentrated ethnically (geographically) and tends to discriminate against parties with support spread across the constituencies. It's also evident that it has led to having presidents with no national popularity but regionally popular who end up having a simple majority mandate. This led to the country being divided along the political parties the regions have been supporting. This is because the gap between the winning president and the second has been small. The closeness between the winner and the second usually causes tension not only among the candidates but also their support. Mostly it has led to dissatisfaction of the election results as others say we cannot have a president who is not given a majority mandate to rule the country.

Date of Submission: 02-11-2017

Date of acceptance: 23-11-2017

I. INTRODUCTION AND BACK GROUND

Elections are central to the very nature of contemporary democratic rule. They provide the primary means for ensuring that governments remain responsive and accountable to their citizens. Much though depends on the rules used in these elections (Powell, 2000). An election is the process by which citizens select the thousands of men and women they want to run their government--at all levels. In a democracy, government officials are chosen by the people and serve for a specific time called a term of office. (<http://www.uen.org/themepark/liberty/electoralprocess.shtml> retrieved 15/05/2016 time 11:20 AM)

Election have been held in Zambia since the pre-independence stage through post-independence to date using different form electoral processes An electoral process is the method and law for holding an election and explains laws and custom that must be followed by all partakers and must produce free and fair elections. A voting **system** or **electoral system** consists of the set of rules which must be followed for a vote to be considered valid, how votes are counted aggregated to yield a final result and the rules which consist how voting is done in a particular country. It is a method by which voters make a choice between candidates, often in an election or on a policy referendum. (<http://fodep.blogspot.com/p/elections-and-electoral-process.html> retrieved 15/05/16 time 11:25 AM)

Elections in Zambia since 1991 takes place within the framework of a multi-party democracy and a presidential system. All the presidential elections in Zambia have been held under the majoritarian approach since 1964 until the 1995 Constitutional Amendment which provided for the election of the Republican President by a simple majority, Articles 34(1), (8). rather than the absolute majority that was previously provided in the Constitution since 1964. Because of this change, all subsequent victories by Presidential candidates have been on a basis of simple minority votes. It appears Zambia's public opinion has been strongly of the view to change this system and adopt the majoritarian approach hence the need to investigate if the simple majority presidential electoral process (first past the post) had effects which necessitates the change.

The research provides a platform on which learning on the effects of various components electoral law and their effects and provides a platform for future legal reforms regarding the electoral laws in Zambia. It will further provide an insight as to whether the effects of the simple majority Presidential electoral system are undesirable which may justify the change that Zambia has been making in the electoral law from 2012 upwards or justify reverting back to the previous systems.

The research also contributes to the currently raging debate on the need for Zambia to have a Parliament that is representative of the votes cast and a President who is elected by the majority of voters to ensure that there is legitimacy in leadership as well as share some light on the president's quest to investigate the voting patterns in Zambia. The study will also enhance the knowledge base already existing on the electoral process in Zambia and the effects. The general objective of the research was to investigate the simple majority presidential electoral process in Zambia between 1995 to 2015 and its effects. The research had two specific objectives as follows:

- Establish if the simple majority presidential electoral process of 1995 to 2015 has had any effect in Zambia.
- Determine the effects of the simple majority presidential electoral process in Zambia.

II. MATERIALS/ METHODS/DESIGN/METHODOLOGY

The main objective of this study was to investigate the effects of the simple majority presidential electoral process in Zambia from 1995 up to 2015 elections. In this study we used the Historical research which is the systematic and objective location, evaluation and synthesis of evidence in order to establish facts and draw conclusions about past events. It involved exploring the meaning and relationship of events, and as its resource using primary historical data in the form of historic artifacts, records and writings. The research attempted to find out what happened in the past and to reveal reasons for why and how things happened. Particular phenomena were studied such as the trends in the election results across to determine the voting patterns, the difference of the results, similarities and differences across the presidential results. The main data sources were articles; election results at national level with the view of looking at the final presidential results, per province and per candidate who stood to see if there are trends that can be established.

The articles on elections in Zambia and election results were analyzed to lead to the generalizations of the conclusions. Some conclusions were arrived at using the comparative methods between regions and places more as it relates to election results as well as election results between different times and different presidential electoral systems. The statistical data was entered using Microsoft Excel and was interpreted using statistical methods to find out the trends and patterns of phenomena's. The time span of review for election results and the electoral system was before 1973 to 2015 elections period. However conclusions are drawn from the period 1995 to 2015. It followed the historic facts during the period under review then provided an interpretation of the meaning and assessment of the significance of the events.

This research method was used because:

It enables solutions to contemporary problems to be sought in the past.

It throws light on past, present and future trends.

It stresses the relative importance and the effects of the interactions that are found within all cultures.

It allows for the reevaluation of data supporting selected hypotheses, theories and generalizations that are presently held about the past.

III. RESULTS

Zambia has one of the most comprehensive electoral legal framework. The election administration is undoubtedly full of openness and virtual transparency of the entire electoral process. Elections in Zambia are all inclusive. Any Zambian who has attained the age of eighteen may vote in any election as long as such person has registered to vote. However despite its strength the electoral process and laws have had gaps which have led to the following:

Regional Voting.

Such a pattern of voting can be traced from 2001 if a comparison is done between the best three contenders. Mazoka Anderson Mazoka coming from Southern Province he had 72.22% of the votes from Southern Province. Levy Mwanawasa seen to be coming from Central Province 15.12% of Southern Province, Christone Tembo an Easterner received 4.49% of Southern In 2008 HH received 72.98% of Southern province votes; Rupiah Banda had 20.79%, while Sata Michael had 4.78%. Luapula gave 70.47%, to Micheal Chilufya Sata, Banda from the Eastern received 27.83% and HH received 1.36%. Northern gave Sata

65.50% of votes from the region, Banda received 32.81% and HH received 1.30%. Eastern Province gave Rupiah Banda 74.46% Sata received 18.74% and Hakainde Hichilema 5.84%.

2011 HH coming from southern he got 72.31% of the total vote cast in southern province, Rupiah Banda got 19.39% while Micheal Chilufya Sata received 6.67% of Southern province votes. In Northern Province were Michael Chilufya Sata was coming from he received 65.07%, Rupiah Banda a tribal cousin received 32.60% while HH received 0.79% of total vote casts in the region. Eastern were Rupiah Banda was coming from in 2011 he received 74.28%, HH from the southern region 3.40% and Michael Chilufya Sata 18.89% of the total votes cast in the region. Luapula in the same year 2011 gave Michael Chilufya Sata 74.66%, Rupiah Banda 23.25% and Hakainde Hichilema 0.86%.

The 2015 elections are not giving us more votes ‘different picture from the above picture. They also show that in Southern Province HH got more votes together with western and north western provinces while Edger Lungu received more votes Eastern, Northern and Luapula with sing votes being copper belt, Lusaka and Central province. This voting pattern shows an inclination of voters voting along the regional affiliation of the Presidential Candidate.

Having Presidents winning with little margin.

In 1996 the constitution was changed to the Simple majority the winner FTJ Chiluba received 72.59% of the votes while the second Deam Mungomba received 12.27%. 2001 the winning president had 29.15 % of the total vote cast, the second had 27.20%.

In 2008 the winning president had 40.63% and the second had 38.64%

In 2011 the winning president had 42.85% and the one that followed had 36.15%.

In 2015 The ruling Patriotic Front candidate Edgar Lungu won by a narrow majority of just 27,757 votes (1.66%) against Hakainde Hichilema of the United Party for National Development.

The elections held in 1991 had a wide margin between the winner and the second best. F.T.J. Chiluba received 76% of the total votes while KK the second best received 24%. This was under the majoritarian vote.

IV. DISCUSSIONS OF THE RESULTS

Regional Voting as resulted Because of the Simple majority Presidential Vote.

Their seems to be a clear pattern of voting along regional voting which can be traced from 2001 to 2015 if the tread of who is voted by who of which region is perceived as having come from if comparison is done between the contenders and the regions from which they come from. For example 2001 Mazoka Anderson coming from Southern Province he had 72.22% of the votes from Southern Province while Levy Mwanawasa seen to be coming from Central Province 15.12% of southern Province votes , Christone Tembo an Easterner received 4.49% of Southern

In comparison with Eastern where Christon Tembo was perceived as coming from he got 28.72%, while Levy Mwanawasa got 16.45% and Mazaka coming from the South received 4.28%. The above Trend does not seem to be a onetime occurrence just for one election but continued in the years that follow .For example in 2008 HH perceived as from Southern received 72.98% of Southern province votes; Rupiah Banda had 20.79%, while Sata Michael had 4.78%. Luapula gave 70.47%, to Micheal Chilufya Sata who was perceived to be more associated with the region, Banda from the Eastern received 27.83% and HH received perceived as from Southern 1.36%. In the same year Northern gave Sata perceived as coming from their 65.50% of votes Banda perceived as Easterner received 32.81% and HH perceived as southerner received 1.30%. Eastern Province gave Rupiah Banda 74.46% Sata received 18.74% and Hakainde Hichilema 5.84%.

The 2015 elections map reveals a more deep sense of election pattern along regions which is traceable from about 2006 election to 2015. Further analysis shows that the voting pattern has been following the ethnicity lines and ethnicity friendliness depending on which candidate comes from which region. The pattern of regions voting the candidates that are associated with their region or coming from their region continues to be the same in elections that continue up to 2015. In our view we want to believe that the of Zambia Constitution 1996, Articles 34(1), (8) which provided for the president to be elected based on the simple majority may have been a motivation for the various regions looking forward to have a president from their areas.

This assentation seem to be in agreement with Mbita Chita who states that, “Generally, simple majority vote electoral system favors parties whose support is concentrated ethnically (geographically) and tends to discriminate against parties with support spread across the constituencies. In the 2008 Elections for instance, support for MMD was greatest in all rural areas other than in Southern, Luapula and half of Northern Province. The PF support was on the copper belt, Lusaka Urban, Kabwe Urban, Luapula and half of Northern Province. The UPND: support was in Southern Province and two constituencies in North Western” Province. (<http://mbitachitala.blogspot.com/2009/08/does-zambias-electoral-system-need.html>)

Understanding the benefits that are in simple majority voting system has been taken advantage of by politicians who have wanted to get the Majority votes from their regions. This is because they know with just little more support from their region they will go through coincidentally this is aligned to tribal lining. We may also think that when the political system is designed to channel benefits to certain people and leave out others – as much as it's the case of Zambia – an election is not just a civic exercise, it's a high-stakes venture that is almost like stepping into a time travel machine, as the benefits you get can instantly propel you years ahead of the national average. That's what politics of Zambia look like pay back for those that voted for you and coincidentally this is aligned to tribal lining. One of the implications of this system of presidential voting of simple Majority win is often most likely tempts candidates to look for financial and material resources to shower their voters and supporters from their regions in order to maximize the number of votes.

We do not conclusively say that our electoral process is solely responsible for the regional voting we see in Zambia but that it has contributed to it in away. Hence there is need to investigate other factors which have contributed to that if we are going to address such issues in totality. There are gaps which has been made difficult to do a comparative study between times of particular times of majoritarian presidential elections and simple majority presidential election because of the varying characteristics between times. Zambia has had only two elections under the multiparty majoritarian presidential voting system that's the 1968 election and the 1991. In the case of the 1968 elections the elections results clearly indicate that if Kaunda did not have the national support he could have not beaten Nkumbura with such a wide margin. KK received 82% of the votes while Nkumbula received 18%.

It's difficult to compare the elections which took place between 1973 and 1990 because while they were held under the majoritarian presidential election system the period was a one party state time. The 1991 presidential election results also do not show a bigger difference of how the election results looked like across provinces for the winning president. However we would want to believe that the voting pattern where not to regional like the ones under simple majority. This assumption is made because FTJ Chiluba received 76% of the total votes while KK the second best received 24% which could have not been for FTJ to get 76% of the votes if he was regionally concentrated. However we also understand that other factors may have contributed for this wide margin win of Chilubain 1991 elections one of them may have been the wind of change which was there at the time.

Having Presidents Winning With Small Margin.

A close look at the elections results seems to be showing a trend and pattern of the elections results between the presidential winners and the run-up. The trend is that the winning presidents of the elections during the simple majority presidential election system seem to be winning by a small margin as the time progresses. The gap has been reducing as the time from the Majoritarian presidential election system was changed to 2015. For example In 1996 the constitution was changed to the Simple majority the winner FTJ Chiluba received 72.59% of the votes while the second Dean Mungomba received 12.27%, the next election in 2001 the winning president had 29.15 % of the total vote cast, the second had 27.20%. As seen above the pattern continued up to 2015 when the ruling Patriotic Front candidate won by a narrow majority 1.66% against Hakainde Hichilama of the United Party for National Development.

The small margin wins were legalized by Article 34 (8) of the constitution of Zambia at the time which stated that, "the returning officer shall declare the candidate who gets the highest number of votes cast to have been duly elected as president"

The implication of the closeness between the winner and the second usually causes tension not only among the candidates but also their supporters of the candidates. As observed on the above chapter on voting patterns if the voting was along region lines and ethnicity this is likely to result into rivalry between regions and ethnic groups. It's evident that during the majoritarian the gap between the winning president and the second run-up used to be of big margins. For example General elections in 1968 held under majoritarian Kaunda defeated Zambian African National Congress (a renamed NRANC) leader Harry Nkumbula with 82% of the vote, giving Harry Nkumbula 18% of the votes. The elections held in 1991 had a wide margin between the winner and the second best. FTJ Chiluba received 76% of the total votes while KK the second best received 24%.

Limitations of the Study

While the research achieved its objective the following limitations applied to the research. It was difficult of obtaining dependable data on some data sets as well as Inadequacy in evidence in some cases, and gaps in primary sources. Admittedly the research methods used the interpretation of some events may be

subjective in interpretations of the significance of the event. Difficult of evaluation in terms of authenticity and validity

V. CONCLUSIONS

The study finds strong evidence that elections conducted during the simple majority presidential voting system has a pattern of voting along regional voting. The evidence shows that the pattern of regional voting the presidential candidates is associated with each candidate being voted by the region they are perceived as coming from. In our view we want to believe that the of Zambia Constitution 1996, Articles 34(1), (8) which provided for the president to be elected based on the simple majority may have been a motivation for the various regions looking forward to have a president from their areas.

The study finds evidence that during the period when the simple majority presidential election has been used the winning presidents have won with small margins against the second run-up. It's evident that *the small margin wins are as a result of Article 34 (8) of the constitution of Zambia at the time which stated that, "the returning officer shall declare the candidate who gets the highest number of votes cast to have been duly elected as president"*

The implication of the closeness between the winner and the second usually causes tension not only among the candidates but also their supporters of the candidates. As observed on the above chapter on voting patterns if the voting was along region lines and ethnicity this is likely to result into rivalry between regions and ethnic groups

Future Research Questions:

- What are the comprehensive factors which have led to regional voting in Zambia?
- What parts of the electoral law is likely to have a negative effect on the elections in Zambia?
- What has been the effect of having the winning presidents who marginally win an election?

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

My wife Carol Musukwa for many sacrifices she made during my time of study, she endured many days, months to be without her husband nearby and when I became discouraged she encouraged me. I acknowledge my children who are the source of inspiration to work hard and be an example to them.

REFERENCING

CONSTITUTION OF ZAMBIA 1996, [www] http://aceproject.org/ero-en/regions/africa/ZM/Constitution%20of%20Zambia%201996.pdf/at_download/file [PDF document, opens new window] (accessed 9 December 2015).

Clark, W.R., Golder, M., Golder, S.N., 2012. Principles of Comparative Politics, second ed. CQ Press, Washington, DC.

Duverger, M., 1963. Political Parties. Methuen, London.

ELECTORAL ACT 2006, [www] <http://aceproject.org/regions-en/eisa/ZM/Electoral%20%20Act%202006.pdf> [PDF document, opens new window] (accessed 13 MAY 2016).

"2008 Presidential Election: National Results Totals for 150 Constituencies" (PDF). Electoral Commission of Zambia. 2 November 2008. Retrieved 4 November 2008.

Rokkan, S. (with A. Campell, P. Torsvik and H. Valen) (1970): *Citizens, Elections, Parties: Approaches to the Comparative Study of the Processes of Development*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.

<http://www.uen.org/themepark/liberty/electoralprocess.shtml> retrieved 15/05/2016 time 11:20 AM

<http://fodep.blogspot.com/p/elections-and-electoral-process.html> retrieved 15/05/16 time 11:25 AM

(<http://mbitachitala.blogspot.com/2009/08/does-zambias-electoral-system-need.html>)

http://africanelections.tripod.com/zm_detail.html#2011_Presidential_Election. 12/05/2016

(http://www.elections.org.zm/media/2007_to_2011_parliamentary_and_local_government_by-elections_results.pdf) retrieved 16/05/2016

10. Tables and Figures

Election Results Data Sets

Historical presidential Election Results per Province

20 SEPTEMBER 2011 PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION										
Candidate (Party)	Province									National Total
	Central	Copper belt	Eastern	Luapula	Lusaka	Northern	North-Western	Southern	Western	

Michael Sata (PF)	63,890 (28.72 %)	341,505 (68.76 %)	59,391 (18.89%)	151,822 (74.66 %)	224,925 (56.32 %)	242,455 (65.07 %)	18,790 (11.09 %)	24,609 (6.67%)	43,579 (23.51 %)	1,170,966 (42.85 %)
Rupiah Banda (MMD)	108,912 (48.95 %)	131,897 (26.56 %)	233,528 (74.28%)	47,289 (23.25 %)	123,653 (30.96 %)	121,482 (32.60 %)	86,994 (51.33 %)	71,519 (19.39 %)	62,592 (33.76 %)	987,866 (36.15 %)
Hakainde Hichilema (UPND)	47,037 (21.14 %)	17,948 (3.61 %)	10,704 (3.40 %)	1,758 (0.86 %)	45,397 (11.37 %)	2,935 (0.79%)	61,054 (36.03 %)	266,754 (72.31 %)	53,176 (28.68 %)	506,763 (18.54 %)
Charles Milupi (ADD)	352 (0.16 %)	658 (0.13 %)	914 (0.29 %)	248 (0.12 %)	533 (0.13 %)	654 (0.18%)	316 (0.19 %)	955 (0.26%)	21,640 (11.67 %)	26,270 (0.96 %)
Elias Chipimo (NAREP)	547 (0.25 %)	1,008 (0.20 %)	1,987 (0.63 %)	596 (0.29 %)	2,002 (0.50 %)	1,458 (0.39%)	528 (0.31 %)	1,338 (0.36%)	1,208 (0.65 %)	10,672 (0.39 %)
Tilyenji Kaunda (UNIP)	464 (0.21 %)	570 (0.11 %)	3,885 (1.24 %)	417 (0.21 %)	921 (0.23 %)	910 (0.24%)	584 (0.34 %)	1,245 (0.34%)	954 (0.51 %)	9,950 (0.36 %)
Edith Nawakwi (FDD)	469 (0.21 %)	1,538 (0.31 %)	1,589 (0.51 %)	356 (0.18 %)	660 (0.17 %)	1,031 (0.28%)	301 (0.18 %)	432 (0.12%)	457 (0.25 %)	6,833 (0.25 %)
Ng'anduMagande (NMP)	414 (0.19 %)	738 (0.15 %)	1,070 (0.34 %)	512 (0.25 %)	566 (0.14 %)	886 (0.24%)	527 (0.31 %)	988 (0.27%)	643 (0.35 %)	6,344 (0.23 %)
Godfrey Miyanda (HP)	313 (0.14 %)	632 (0.13 %)	700 (0.22 %)	167 (0.08 %)	479 (0.12 %)	420 (0.11%)	241 (0.14 %)	833 (0.23%)	945 (0.51 %)	4,730 (0.17 %)
Fredrick Mutesa (ZED)	85 (0.04 %)	176 (0.04 %)	625 (0.20 %)	196 (0.10 %)	214 (0.05 %)	390 (0.10%)	133 (0.08 %)	240 (0.07%)	209 (0.11 %)	2,268 (0.08 %)
Total Valid Votes	222,483	496,670	314,393	203,361	399,350	372,621	169,468	368,913	185,403	2,732,662
Invalid/Blank Votes	5,200	7,881	10,775	4,484	4,319	8,122	4,291	6,762	4,844	56,678
Total Votes	227,683	504,551	325,168	207,845	403,669	380,743	173,759	375,675	190,247	2,789,340
Registered Voters	482,013	845,569	644,725	408,937	772,458	659,534	315,670	643,588	394,660	5,167,154
Voter Turnout	47.2%	59.7%	50.4%	50.8%	52.3%	57.7%	55.0%	58.4%	48.2%	54.0%

30 OCTOBER 2008 PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION										
Candidate (Party)	Province									National Total
	Central	Copper belt	Eastern	Luapula	Lusaka	Northern	North-Western	Southern	Western	
Rupiah Banda (MMD)	82,178 (53.80%)	105,225 (32.26%)	148,197 (74.46%)	32,552 (27.83%)	90,057 (30.28%)	67,237 (32.81%)	59,370 (57.59%)	51,550 (20.79%)	81,993 (68.38%)	718,359 (40.63%)
Michael Sata (PF)	37,656 (24.65%)	201,087 (61.65%)	37,295 (18.74%)	82,418 (70.47%)	162,107 (54.51%)	134,244 (65.50%)	4,586 (4.45%)	11,866 (4.78%)	11,891 (9.92%)	683,150 (38.64%)
Hakainde Hichilema (UPND)	31,821 (20.83%)	17,846 (5.47%)	11,624 (5.84%)	1,588 (1.36%)	43,515 (14.63%)	2,660 (1.30%)	38,265 (37.12%)	180,976 (72.98%)	24,723 (20.62%)	353,018 (19.96%)
Godfrey Miyanda (HP)	1,080 (0.71%)	2,022 (0.62%)	1,926 (0.97%)	389 (0.33%)	1,697 (0.57%)	801 (0.39%)	876 (0.85%)	3,593 (1.45%)	1,299 (1.08%)	13,683 (0.77%)
Total Valid Votes	152,735	326,180	199,042	116,947	297,376	204,942	103,097	247,985	119,906	1,768,210
Invalid/Blank Votes	2,544	4,016	3,464	1,393	3,472	2,572	1,527	2,863	1,745	23,596
Total Votes	155,279	330,196	202,506	118,340	300,848	207,514	104,624	250,848	121,651	1,791,806
Registered Voters	382,349	625,848	499,984	312,857	592,868	465,172	244,815	503,801	316,441	3,944,135
Voter Turnout	40.6%	52.8%	40.5%	37.8%	50.7%	44.6%	42.7%	49.8%	38.4%	45.4%

27 DECEMBER 2001 PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION										
Candidate (Party)	Province									National Total
	Central	Copper belt	Eastern	Luapula	Lusaka	Northern	North-Western	Southern	Western	
Levy Mwanawasa (MMD)	43,117 (32.08%)	125,064 (38.44%)	35,889 (16.45%)	71,509 (53.91%)	40,225 (15.91%)	82,867 (42.82%)	37,336 (32.81%)	36,068 (15.12%)	34,619 (26.90%)	506,694 (29.15%)
Anderson Mazoka (UPND)	39,039 (29.04%)	39,329 (12.09%)	9,341 (4.28%)	5,674 (4.28%)	79,419 (31.41%)	8,888 (4.59%)	55,816 (49.05%)	172,253 (72.22%)	62,938 (48.90%)	472,697 (27.20%)
Christon Tembo (FDD)	12,472 (9.28%)	27,791 (8.54%)	62,662 (28.72%)	11,162 (8.42%)	60,929 (24.10%)	24,823 (12.83%)	6,650 (5.84%)	10,703 (4.49%)	11,669 (9.07%)	228,861 (13.17%)
Tilyenji Kaunda (UNIP)	12,029 (8.95%)	14,101 (4.33%)	79,340 (36.36%)	10,486 (7.91%)	16,768 (6.63%)	25,954 (13.41%)	4,482 (3.94%)	4,588 (1.92%)	8,150 (6.33%)	175,898 (10.12%)
Godfrey Miyanda (HP)	15,406 (11.46%)	63,645 (19.56%)	14,885 (6.82%)	3,133 (2.36%)	22,032 (8.71%)	8,399 (4.34%)	5,077 (4.46%)	5,284 (2.22%)	2,817 (2.19%)	140,678 (8.09%)
Benjamin Mwila (ZRP)	6,004 (4.47%)	19,749 (6.07%)	6,257 (2.87%)	20,998 (15.83%)	7,092 (2.81%)	18,424 (9.52%)	1,642 (1.44%)	2,784 (1.17%)	2,522 (1.96%)	85,472 (4.92%)
Michael Sata (PF)	1,930 (1.44%)	23,619 (7.26%)	1,623 (0.74%)	4,832 (3.64%)	9,484 (3.75%)	15,781 (8.15%)	275 (0.24%)	790 (0.33%)	838 (0.65%)	59,172 (3.40%)
Nevera Mumba (NCC)	2,276 (1.69%)	8,747 (2.69%)	2,144 (0.98%)	3,020 (2.28%)	13,765 (5.44%)	4,423 (2.29%)	743 (0.65%)	2,227 (0.93%)	1,515 (1.18%)	38,860 (2.24%)
Gwendoline Konde (SDP)	716 (0.53%)	829 (0.25%)	2,750 (1.26%)	666 (0.50%)	913 (0.36%)	1,351 (0.70%)	730 (0.64%)	1,375 (0.58%)	923 (0.72%)	10,253 (0.59%)
Inonge Mbikusitanga-Lewanika (AZ)	676 (0.50%)	1,046 (0.32%)	1,669 (0.76%)	407 (0.31%)	1,242 (0.49%)	939 (0.49%)	508 (0.45%)	1,440 (0.60%)	1,955 (1.52%)	9,882 (0.57%)
Yobert Shamapande (NLD)	748 (0.56%)	1,426 (0.44%)	1,653 (0.76%)	746 (0.56%)	944 (0.37%)	1,681 (0.87%)	534 (0.47%)	995 (0.42%)	754 (0.59%)	9,481 (0.55%)
Total Valid Votes	134,413	325,346	218,213	132,633	252,813	193,530	113,793	238,507	128,700	1,737,948
Invalid/Blank Votes	3,497	3,690	3,412	1,348	5,705	3,739	1,967	4,341	709	28,408
Total Votes	137,910	329,036	221,625	133,981	258,518	197,269	115,760	242,848	129,409	1,766,356
Registered Voters	205,616	453,240	337,533	202,258	399,247	296,811	163,663	339,765	206,628	2,604,761
Voter Turnout	67.1%	72.6%	65.7%	66.2%	64.8%	66.5%	70.7%	71.5%	62.6%	67.8%

18 NOVEMBER 1996 PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION*										
Candidate (Party)	Province									National Total
	Central	Copper belt	Eastern	Luapula	Lusaka	Northern	North-Western	Southern	Western	
Frederick Chiluba (MMD)	73,718 (73.15%)	234,580 (86.35%)	69,897 (64.04%)	91,414 (85.42%)	121,734 (74.42%)	120,392 (80.48%)	46,933 (52.20%)	111,560 (67.13%)	43,542 (43.14%)	913,770 (72.59%)
Dean Mung'omba	14,370	20,900	21,364	6,397	27,915	17,840	5,685	30,466	15,502	160,439

(ZDC)	(14.2 6%)	(7.69 %)	(19.5 7%)	(%)	(17.0 7%)	(11.93 %)	(%)	(18.33 %)	(15.3 6%)	(12.74 %)
Humphrey Mulemba (NP)	5,212 (5.17 %)	8,947 (3.29 %)	7,477 (6.85 %)	1,786 (1.67 %)	6,047 (3.70 %)	3,686 (2.46 %)	33,883 (37.6 8%)	8,638 (5.20 %)	8,199 (8.12 %)	83,875 (6.66 %)
Akashamba twaMbikusi taLewanika (AZ)	2,185 (2.17 %)	2,636 (0.97 %)	3,788 (3.47 %)	5,272 (4.93 %)	4,612 (2.82 %)	1,851 (1.24 %)	1,362 (1.51 %)	7,780 (4.68 %)	29,764 (29.4 9%)	59,250 (4.70 %)
Chama Chakomboka (MDP)	5,291 (5.25 %)	4,601 (1.69 %)	6,616 (6.06 %)	2,153 (2.01 %)	3,267 (2.00 %)	5,831 (3.90 %)	2,049 (2.28 %)	7,747 (4.66 %)	3,916 (3.88 %)	41,471 (3.29 %)
Total Valid Votes	100,776	271,664	109,142	107,022	163,575	149,600	89,912	166,191	100,923	1,258,805
Invalid/Blank Votes	5,117	14,612	6,806	3,867	10,452	5,976	3,600	9,225	6,593	66,248
Total Votes	105,893	286,276	115,948	110,889	174,027	155,576	93,512	175,416	107,516	1,325,053
Registered Voters	186,917	401,273	314,390	170,685	296,919	240,280	139,020	302,810	215,088	2,267,382
Voter Turnout	56.7%	71.3%	36.9%	65.0%	58.6%	64.7%	67.3%	57.9%	50.0%	58.4%

*The main opposition United National Independence Party (UNIP) boycotted the election.

Presidential Election National Statistics
October 1991 Presidential Election

Registered Voters	2,931,909
Total Votes (Voter Turnout)	Not Available (approx. 45%)
Candidate (Party)	% of Votes
Frederick Chiluba (MMD)	75.8%
Kenneth Kaunda (UNIP)	24.2%

18 November 1996 Presidential Election*

Registered Voters	2,267,382	
Total Votes (Voter Turnout)	1,325,053 (58.4%)	
Invalid/Blank Votes	66,248	
Total Valid Votes	1,285,805	
Candidate (Party)	Number of Votes	% of Votes
Frederick Chiluba (MMD)	913,770	72.59%
Dean Mung'omba (ZDC)	160,439	12.74%
Humphrey Mulemba (NP)	83,875	6.66%
AkashambatwaMbikusitaLewanika (AZ)	59,250	4.70%
Chama Chakomboka (MDP)	41,471	3.29%

*The main opposition United National Independence Party (UNIP) boycotted the election.

27 December 2001 Presidential Election

Registered Voters	2,604,761	
Total Votes (Voter Turnout)	1,766,356 (67.8%)	
Invalid/Blank Votes	28,408	
Total Valid Votes	1,737,948	
Candidate (Party)	Number of Votes	% of Votes
Levy Mwanawasa (MMD)	506,694	29.15%
Anderson Mazoka (UPND)	472,697	27.20%
Christon Tembo (FDD)	228,861	13.17%
Tilyenji Kaunda (UNIP)	175,898	10.12%
Godfrey Miyanda (HP)	140,678	8.09%
Benjamin Mwila (ZRP)	85,472	4.92%
Michael Sata (PF)	59,172	3.40%
Nevers Mumba (NCC)	38,860	2.24%
Gwendoline Konie (SDP)	10,253	0.59%
Inonge Mbikusita-Lewanika (AZ)	9,882	0.57%
Yobert Shamapande (NLD)	9,481	0.55%

28 September 2006 Presidential Election

Registered Voters	3,941,229	
Total Votes (Voter Turnout)	2,789,114 (70.8%)	
Invalid/Blank Votes	48,936	
Total Valid Votes	2,740,178	
Candidate (Party) [Coalition]	Number of Votes	% of Votes
Levy Mwanawasa (MMD)	1,177,846	42.98%
Michael Sata (PF)	804,748	29.37%
Hakainde Hichilema (UPND) [UDA]	693,772	25.32%
Godfrey Miyanda (HP)	42,891	1.57%
Winright Ngondo (APC)	20,921	0.76%

30 October 2008 Presidential Election

Registered Voters	3,944,135	
Total Votes (Voter Turnout)	1,791,806 (45.4%)	
Invalid/Blank Votes	23,596	
Total Valid Votes	1,768,210	
Candidate (Party)	Number of Votes	% of Votes
Rupiah Banda (MMD)	718,359	40.63%
Michael Sata (PF)	683,150	38.64%
Hakainde Hichilema (UPND)	353,018	19.96%
Godfrey Miyanda (HP)	13,683	0.77%

20 September 2011 Presidential Election

Registered Voters	5,167,154
-------------------	-----------

Total Votes (Voter Turnout)	2,789,340 (54.0%)	
Invalid/Blank Votes	56,678	
Total Valid Votes	2,732,662	
Candidate (Party)	Number of Votes	% of Votes
Michael Sata (PF)	1,170,966	42.85%
Rupiah Banda (MMD)	987,866	36.15%
Hakainde Hichilema (UPND)	506,763	18.54%
Charles Milupi (ADD)	26,270	0.96%
Elias Chipimo (NAREP)	10,672	0.39%
Tilyenji Kaunda (UNIP)	9,950	0.36%
Edith Nawakwi (FDD)	6,833	0.25%
Ng'andu Magande (NMP)	6,344	0.23%
Godfrey Miyanda (HP)	4,730	0.17%
Fredrick Mutesa (ZED)	2,268	0.08%



Figure 1: 2015 Electoral Maps yellow areas for UPND, Dark blue area for PF and light blue sing vote

Felix Chibesa “An Investigation of The Simple Majority Presidential Electoral Process in Zambia And its Effects- 1995 -2015” IOSR Journal Of Humanities And Social Science (IOSR-JHSS), vol. 22, no. 11, 2017, pp. 75-84.