

THE DISCRETION OF STREET LEVEL BUREAUCRATS AND UNETHICAL CONDUCT IN THE PROVISION OF EDUCATION SERVICES IN MAINLAND TANZANIA

Rahel Nasoni Mkoma

Abstract

Citizens do expect quality public services from qualified service providers. In Tanzania, service providers including primary and secondary school teachers are required by the laws to provide services ethically adhering to laws guiding service provision. In primary and secondary schools, teachers are obliged to refrain from all unethical conducts such as to mete out unlawful corporal punishments, sexual abuse, unlawful suspension and striking. This paper examines and discusses conduct of teachers as street level bureaucrats. The researcher analysed secondary data from journal articles as well as unpublished master and PhD thesis and dissertations, government reports, and internet sources including online Newspapers and TVs, government and nongovernment webpages and other webpages. Results reveal some unethical conducts carried out by both primary and secondary school teachers. From 2018 to 2021 data reveal six death cases of students due to unlawful corporal punishments (beaten to death); 41 suspension cases of students and impregnation of three school girls by teachers. Data revealed that the pregnancy cases in secondary and primary schools and in Tanzania is high. In 2018 there were 6,237 secondary school pregnant cases, compared to 5,398 cases in 2019. In primary schools, data show 1,185 cases in 2018 and 1,135 cases in 2019. Reflecting the data, this paper recommends a close monitoring of teachers behaviour through regular 30 minutes morning sessions as a way to review and remind the rules and regulations guiding public servants. This is because studies show that teachers as well as students are not aware of the rules and guidelines.

Keywords: Discretion, Street Level Bureaucrats, Unethical Conduct, Primary and Secondary School teachers, Tanzania Mainland

1.0 Introduction

Efficient public service provision is the expectation of citizens. The latter expect quality services from both government and non-government service providers (Osborne et al., 2013 & Lufunyo, 2013). In order to serve people, the government recruits employees who in turn interact with citizens in a way of service provision. Lipsky (1969) termed these service providers as Street Level Bureaucrats. These

employees are trusted by both employers and clients to provide quality services without bending rules governing service provision (URT, 2005). The public service in Tanzania is guided by rules, regulations, codes of ethics and conduct and circulars. All public servants are obliged to adhere to the ethical standards such as respecting human rights, maintaining integrity, being diligent and avoiding sexual harassment in work places. The intention is to ensure that citizens are serviced with satisfaction, without blame to the government and to the service providers in particular.

The Code of Ethics and Conduct for the Public Service of 2005 and the Public Service Regulation of 2003, for example, stipulate that the behaviours of service providers that, all service providers are to refrain from sexual abuse practices like rape, sexual gesturing, joking and favouring on sexual bases, In inference, refraining from the unethical conduct covers both service providers as well as service recipients such as primary and secondary school teachers and students. In particular the Education (Corporal Punishment) Regulation G.N 294 of 2002 provides conditions for punishment in schools. The regulation stipulates that the responsible person to punish in schools is the head of school or any staff authorised in writings by the head. Additionally, the regulation insists that the punishment should not exceed four strokes based on the extent of the breach of the codes and the undisciplined manner shown in or out of the school. Moreover, the punishment should consider gender, age and health conditions of that student and that, no such punishment to nursery school up to class three children (URT, 2002). Furthermore, the Code of Ethics and Conduct for Teachers in Tanzania (n.d) emphasize that teachers are responsible to care for children intellectually, spiritually, socially and physically. It is also underscored in the regulation that teachers should ensure that all children in school are safe, and that no harm is directed to them including avoiding sexual harassment and unlawful corporal punishments.

Focusing on the safety of children in Tanzania, the amendment of the Education Act (CAP 353), Section 22 (1-4) prohibits any person (including teachers) to get married to or impregnating a primary school pupil. Besides, the Law of Child Act of 2009 prohibits any acts that dehumanize a child including punishing by striking.

Despite all these regulations, unethical conducts of service providers are still evidenced particularly towards few primary and secondary school students. Some children are being punished corporally beyond what is provided by the laws. Some of the students, for example, are reported to be ordered to hand up while holding stones, stand heads down on arms while legs up on a wall or frog jumping. Some students are sexually abused while some school going girls are reported to be married or

involved in sex acts with teachers. Meanwhile, some teachers are reported to strike, for example Mara region (one school), Rukwa region (one school), Coastal region (one school) and Kigoma region (one school) involved in strike. In Dar es Salaam region three schools involve while fifteen schools involved in strikes in Ruvuma region. In these regions, others decide not to teach for reasons which are not caused by students. All these unethical conducts are caused by the discretion of service providers.

The purpose of this paper is to examine unethical conduct carried out by Street Level Bureaucrats such as primary and secondary school teachers over their students. It focuses on cases of unlawful corporal punishments, sexual abuse and impregnating students, unlawfully suspension and striking of teachers particularly between 2002 and 2021. This period of time is selected because at this time, many laws guiding the public service provision were enacted. The guidelines and legislations include regulations regarding corporal punishments of 2002, the Amendment of Education Act CAP 353 of 2016, the Law of Child Act of 2009, the Public Service Act of 2002 and its regulation of 2003/2007, the Codes of Ethics for the Public Service of 2005 and the Codes of Ethics for Teachers. The following section reviews literature, present the key concepts and the theoretical foundations that guide the discussion of the paper. The third part is a methodology; the fourth part presents the results and discussion while the fifth part is conclusion and recommendations.

2.0 Literature Review

2.1 Conceptualizing Street-Level Bureaucrats

Michael Lipsky is the scholar who founded the theory of political behaviour of Street-Level Bureaucrats and the relationship with citizens (Lipsky, 1969). Initially, Lipsky (ibid) identified the magnitude of interactions between bureaucrats who provide public services and clients who receive those services. Lipsky (ibid) then coined the concept of Street-Level Bureaucrats which was published in 1980. Later on, this concept was assigned wider meaning by other scholars. Gilson (2015) added the meaning of Street-Level Bureaucrats to mean citizen agents who work in the interests of their clients when implementing public policies. Elsewhere, other authors term Street-Level Bureaucrats as front-line worker implementers, operating in low level of government agencies like schools, hospitals police centres, courts and social welfare centers (Evans & Haris, 2004; Mayers & Vorsanger, 2007; Savi, 2014; Tummers & Bakkers, 2014; Musa, 2016; Zedekia, 2017; Lima & D'Ascenzi, 2017). Evans and Haris (ibid) and Savi (ibid) extend the meaning of Street-Level Bureaucrats to include

teachers, police officers, nurses and doctors, social workers, low court officers like judges and public lawyers, and other government employees who are at the level of policy delivery.

2.2 The Discretion of Street-Level Bureaucrats and its Sources

Discretion is the degree of freedom that street-level bureaucrat can use in a particular setting (Tummers & Bakkers, 2014). Government employees have discretion at any time if responsible top authorities leave them free to choose among possible ways of accomplishing or not accomplishing policy programs (Tummers, 2012) including in teaching and learning environments. On the sources of discretion powers, authors present several sources. Lipsky (1969) points that the way working environment is set are a source of power. According to Lipsky (ibid), settings such as the arrangement of courtroom chairs, bars and robes and the rituals of the courtroom provide a situation where court officers could work undeniably. Similarly, settings works in hospitals, schools and police centres. Settings in the said area are good source of power (ibid). In service provision, work setting helps service provider to be respected and valued while clients are alarmed that the work setting restricts certain behaviours (Lipsky, 2010; Lima & D'Ascenzi, 2017).

Lipsky (1969) also adds that professional uniforms are a source of power as uniforms signifies authoritative symbols of Street-Level Bureaucrats and yield permissive environment to discretion. In the provision of public services in general, a worker who is in uniform is more valued and respected by citizens than the one without. Uniforms can be in terms of dresses or identity cards and are very important when executing duties as they communicate to the service recipients the identity of service provider (Fussell, 2002; England, 2015).

Another source of power is professionalism itself. Professionals do judge and choose when it comes to issues related to their fields of specialization (Lipsky, 1980). Savi (2014) and Lima and D'Ascenzi (2017) assert that professionalism opens a door for Street-Level Bureaucrats to choose what to do and not to do, when to do, in which ways to do it and to whom. Relying upon their professionals, recipients of a service do listen to Street-Level Bureaucrats and do what they are directed to do as Street-Level Bureaucrats stand as government agencies (Gilson, 2015).

In addition, rules that regularly change and the fairly high freedom from direct organization control and authority is reported to be another source of power that Street-Level Bureaucrats are granted (Zedekia, 2017). Zedekia (ibid) reports that if rules and regulations change regularly and if the controlling authority is far away from service provision setting, Street-Level Bureaucrats do gain more power and freedom to exercise their power over their areas of jurisdictions when providing services. Gilson (2015) also asserts that, the valued status and trust Street-Level Bureaucrats get from the

society for using their skill, knowledge, and experience in decision-making in changing and complicated situations that are hidden from public view, is another Street-Level Bureaucrats' source of power. Lipsky (2010) stresses that the society trusts what Street-Level Bureaucrats communicate to them; citizens do believe that communication is from the government. Gilson (ibid) further asserts that the language used by street-level bureaucrats give them more power to explain and approve the hidden deals and support professionalism and stirring the hutch of the rule-bounded bureaucrats. Lipsky (op. cit) reveals that Street-Level Bureaucrats when communicating to the community use bureaucratic language which is unclear to the society. That language gives bureaucrats freedom to interpret policy programs and gain public attention when providing public services including education. Lipsky illustrates that legal language used by court officers is not clear to their clients while doctors' clinical language is also not clear to their clients. Thus the use of professional language gives Street-Level Bureaucrats the opportunity to exercise their power when providing service.

Finally, the level and areas of service beneficiaries as well as the types of worthiness of services are other sources of power of Street-Level Bureaucrats (Van Leeuwen et al., 2017). From the discussion above, most of the beneficiaries of public services are the citizens who are at low level of the society. If one takes an example of primary and secondary school students, these are at the low level of education programs and far from the authority that controls or regulate Street-Level Bureaucrats. So the levels give more discretion to Street-Level Bureaucrats in deciding on how to provide education services. The following section presents theories guiding the discussion of the topic.

2.3 The Person-Centered Approach

Apart from the theory of Street Level Bureaucrats, there are other theories and approaches that can be used to explain the relationship between service providers and service recipients. Amongst them is the Person-Centered Approach (Association of the Development of the Person-centred Approach (2021) developed by the clinical psychologist Carl L. Rogers in 1940's. This approach explains the relationships between primary and secondary school teachers and their students. This approach emphasizes that, during service provision, clients is to be the focus of the service and valued as a human being (NSW Government, 2020). Apart from other conditions: gender, age, culture, life experiences, language, heritage and identity and beliefs have to be considered when providing services. Hence the Person-Centered Approach is suitable to explain unethical conducts such as unlawful corporal punishment, sexual abuse, strikes and suspension in primary and secondary schools in Tanzania.

2.4 Organizational Behavior Theory-The Hawthorne Effect Theory

In explaining unethical conduct of service providers, The Hawthorne Effect Theory is applicable because it relates to the tendency that people's behaviors do change when actors recognize someone is watching them. In contrast, when they recognize that they are alone, they expose their inner behaviors of being real what they are (Smith et al., 2013). In examining unethical conduct of service providers in primary and secondary schools in Tanzania, this theory supports the Street Level Bureaucrats theory of Lipsky that, when service providers are far from their supervisors, they can misuse their discretion as perform behavioural misconduct such as sexually abuse, corporal punishment, strike or suspend students.

3.0 Methodology

This is a case study paper examining most similar cases on unethical conduct such as unlawful corporal punishments, sexual abuse, strikes and unlawful suspensions in primary and secondary schools in Mainland Tanzania (Gerring, 2007, 2016). The researcher collected both qualitative and quantitative data from secondary sources such as unpublished master thesis and PhD dissertations, government and non-government reports, from News and the Internet Content analysis was applied to discuss the relationship between the discretion of Street Level Bureaucrats and unethical cases available between 2002 and 2021. This period of time was selected because many laws and Codes of Conducts guiding the public service provision were enacted.

4.0 Unethical Conduct of Service Providers

4.1 Unlawful Corporal Punishment, Suspension and Strike Cases in Primary and Secondary Schools

This section examines and discusses unethical conducts mostly focusing on unlawful corporal punishments, sexual abuse, and unlawful suspension directed to primary and secondary school students. It further examines and discusses teachers' strike in both primary and secondary schools. Evidences were gathered from different secondary sources and discussed, given more interpretation regarding other empirical evidences, and complemented with author's experiences.

Most international organizations such as the United Nations International Children's Fund (UNICEF), End Corporal Punishment and End Violence against Children prohibit corporal punishments for all children, either in schools or at home (End Violence & End Corporal Punishment, 2020). In Tanzania punishment is legal and that at home parents are allowed to correct bad manners by light punishment and that parents are to ensure protection of children from unlawful corporal punishment (URT, 2009).

In schools, the Corporal punishment Act of 1979 and its Amendment of 2002 do not allow punishing by hitting or physical contact of a child's body at any part by any instrument except punishing only four strikes on the hand or on the buttocks while dressed by either the head of school or any staff authorized in writings by the head (URT, 1979 & 2002).

In our context, any other act done apart from what is provided in the laws over a student is unlawful. In Tanzania, the freedom that teachers enjoy gives power to brutally punish students as some teachers based on their work environments and the distance from supervisors are reportedly suspending pupils while some teachers are reportedly punishing students to death (Henga, 2018; Mwananchi, 2018; Njaji, 2018). Moreover, using their discretion, some teachers in primary and secondary schools decide not to teach effectively which can lead to poor performance of pupils in their final examinations (Mosha, 2017). The following section examines and discusses unethical cases done by teachers over students.

Evidences show that, in Kibeta Primary School, Kagera Region, a primary school boy (13 years old) suspected to steal a handbag was beaten by a teacher to death in 2018 (BBC, 2018). This act is unethical and unlawfully because it is against the Corporal Punishment Act Regulation and against the human right to live (URT, 2002, 2009; African Union, 1990). Moreover, the teacher who punished the boy was not authorised by the head of school as stipulated in the Regulation of 2002 regarding corporal punishments. Since it is obvious that no one is allowed to kill anybody, punishing to death is unlawful and unethical.

Moreover, MPEKUZU (2015) reports that in Matui Secondary School, a boy aged 15 years old was bitten to death by his teacher. Not only that, but also ITV Tanzania (2021) reports that in Mbinga Secondary School, a boy aged 15 years old was bitten to death by his teachers. ITV (ibid) adds that three teachers were liable and were detained by police force for further investigations. Moreover, Muungwana Blog (2016) reports that, another school pupil died after being punished by a teacher. In addition, the Nocomped Community Media (2017) reports a death of boy in Matwiga Primary School (located in Chunya District-Mbeya Region) following torture. The Nocompel Community Media adds that, two boys were detained in a small room for two hours. The reason of such punishment is being absent from school for two days. This act of detaining is unlawful and unethical conduct; it proves the discretion of Teachers as Street Level Bureaucrats. Even though punishments are legalised in Tanzania, it is prohibited by the Government Notes 294 of 2002 (Education [Corporal Punishment] Regulations), to harm any part of the body, not causing wounds or brakeage of body parts. Also the act of punishing to death is unethical and unlawfully. It is against the Law of Child Act of 2009 which

promotes living and prohibits killing; it is also against Article 5 of the African Charter on the Rights and Welfare of the Child of 1990. Despite all these laws, unethical conducts are still evidenced in both primary and secondary schools in Tanzania mainland. These cases prove the misuse of discretionary power of teachers as Street Level Bureaucrats when providing public services such as primary and secondary school services.

Apart from that, The Human Right Watch (2017) reports that about 1.5 million of school aged youth in Mwanza region are not in schools. A boy in Mwanza Region was quoted by the Human Rights Watch saying that he abandoned school because they are bitten by teachers. In Tanzania, it can happen that several teachers punish a pupil at a time. It is evidenced by MPEKUZU that, in Matui Secondary School in Kiteto-Manyara Region, three teachers were reported to punish a secondary school boy to death. Even though corporal punishments are legalized in Tanzania, but punishing to death is criminal, not allowed.

In case of students' breach of regulation, the laws require a teacher to report a breach to the school committees where proper punishments would be taken including temporal suspension and summary dismissal (URT, 2002). In Namtumbo, Ruvuma Region, a 15 years secondary school student was reported to die after being punished by a teacher for failing a Mock examination (IPPMedia, 2021). Even though Lema and Gwando (2018) and Kambuga et al., (2018) report that most interviewed primary and secondary school students and teachers in Kinondoni and Dodoma Municipal Council said corporal punishments help to shape students' behaviours and help them achieve their academic performance, still one insists that torturing children is unlawful. The Law of Child Act of 2009, section 13 (1) prohibits any kind of torture, no punishment beyond humanity. The Act reminds the community to ensure that all children are safe mentally and physically. In that manner, punishing a child to death is against this Law. Section 9 (1) provides right to life, that is no one is allowed to punish somebody to death.

Besides killing, there are more evidenced on unethical conducts in Tanzania regarding service provisions in primary and secondary schools. These include unlawfully suspending pupils and teachers striking. Muungwana Blog (2016) reports that, 21 students from Kilambo cha Mkoleni Primary School (in Nkasi-Rukwa Region) were suspended from school, the reason behind is wearing sandals known as "Yeboyebo" in Kiswahili. The teachers are reported to even burn the sandals. The Government Notes Number 294 of 2002 provides that, when students refuse to be punished or when parents refuse punishments over their children as provided by the laws, the students should be temporary suspended for further arrangement of punishments. From the Kalambo cha Mkoleni case, it

is not reported if parents were informed and refused to respond accordingly. Moreover, in Katumba Secondary School located in Mpanda District- (Katavi Region), about 20 students were suspended from school (Dodoma News, 2020). The said students failed to pay food contribution as prescribed by the school that all students living in school had to contribute for food.

Despite the authorised free fee basic education in Tanzania (URT, 2015 (a) & (b) & 2016), some heads of school as Street Level Bureaucrats are using their discretion unethically. It is reported by the Dodoma News (ibid) that, the act of forcing students to contribute continued even after the Prime Ministers' visit to Katavi and (the PM) ordered all heads of secondary school to stop suspending students, because basic education (primary and secondary schools ordinary levels form one to form four) is free. Interpreting these two cases more have to be said. Firstly, the teacher was against Article 11 of the African Charter on the Right and Welfare of the Child and against Government's intention to develop, encourages an education system which is affordable and accessible to all. Secondly, being smart is a prerequisite to all school pupils, and having food is a right to every human being. However, it is not a responsibility of a child to buy shoes and other school attires and to pay for food and other school contributions; these are parents' responsibilities.

The Law of Child Act, section 8 (1) (c) provides that it is a duty of a parent, guardian or any person living with a child to ensure that children are provided with clothes and food. In this case, parents are to be held accountable not children. Therefore teachers as Street Level Bureaucrats used their discretion to do what they thought are proper but in fact it was against the laws. As a matter of fact when a child is found with such outfit like having not contributed for food, it is not their fault. Hence, being suspended from school on the said grounds is against the right to education. The Law of Child Act of 2009 section 8 (1) (e), the African Charter on the Rights and Welfare of the Child, Article 11 provide, that all school aged children have right to education. Teachers as Street level Bureaucrats have to adhere to the rules and regulations when fulfilling their duties not only using their discretions.

Moreover, other unethical conducts are evidenced when teachers strike, refusing to teach for some reasons. Muungwana Blog (2016) reports that, teachers at Kianda Primary School (in Rukwa Region) were on strike as a reaction from an education officer punishing their fellow teacher. The Code of Ethics and conduct for Public Servants in Tanzania (2005) prohibits any kind of fighting in work places. Striking by refusing to teach is also not proper and unlawful. The teachers in this context were punishing students (by striking and not teaching) while actually it was the education officer to be punished.

Apart from that reason of striking, in 2012 teacher's strike covered almost all areas of the country for several reasons. JamiiForums (2012) reports widespread strikes in Kasulu (Kigoma Region) and Rufiji (Coastal Region). Again, in 15 schools in Songea primary and secondary schools (Ruvuma Region), teachers reported not to teach as a means to push the government to pay various arrears and salary increments. Additionally, some schools in Dar es Salaam regions were reported to have no teachers at all while others were reported to have teachers around but not teaching in classrooms. The information included Makuburi, Mabibo and Temeke primary schools evidence; other schools were situated in Mara Region. Actually, what the teachers did was also against the codes of Ethics for Teachers in Tanzania. Boycotting for teachers is not allowed because it causes harm to children. Following teachers' strike in 2012, many primary school pupils protested forcing the government to listen to their teachers in order for the pupils to be taught (STRAIKA, 2012). In our view, a protest of teachers is extremely dangerous to school children. If the school children are not protected; they can be endangered in any way like falling down, pushing each other's and being wounded. From this section, the data have revealed some unethical conducts done by teachers in both primary and secondary schools. The findings show a big relationship between the discretion of teachers as Street Level Bureaucrats and unethical conducts such as unlawfully corporal punishments, unlawful suspension of students and strikes.

4.2 Sexual Abuse, Pregnancy and Drop Out

Sexual abuse has been widely interpreted. For the sake of this paper sexual abuse is any unwanted sexual activity, with perpetrators using force, making threats or taking advantage of victims not able to give consent. In Tanzania sexual abuse in form of teacher having sex affairs with schoolgirl reported in both primary and secondary school (Felix et al., 2011; Msangi, 2017 & Mangi et al., 2017). As this paper examines cases of sexual abuse done by teachers in primary and secondary schools, evidences gathered reflect the purpose. Punishing Pregnancy (2010) reports that a 13 years old primary school girl was found being impregnated by a teacher's son. In Inference, this paper argues that, the teacher was indirectly responsible as he protected his son by bribing the girl's mother. Punishing Pregnancy (ibid) reports many cases of school dropout due to pregnancy. In Sumbawanga, a head of school was suspected to impregnated two school girls (YouTube, 2019). In this Region, about 390 school girls found pregnant between 2018 and 2019. Evidences reveal more unethical conduct as teachers were helping a student to make an abortion (Mzalendo, 2021). The teacher involved in this incidence was suspected to have sexual affairs with a 17 years old pupil. Again, the Human Rights Watch (2017) reports a student who witnessed girls being forced to have sexual relations with teachers while UNICEF (2009) reports that one schoolgirl out of ten face sexual

harassment from teachers. Moreover, HakiElimu (2020) reports that about 4.1 per cent of secondary school students reported to be sexually abused by their teachers while 8.7 per cent of parents report on the same. Impregnating a school girl is unlawful in Tanzania as it is prohibited by the Laws. The Law of Child Act, section 83 (1) and (2) provide that nobody is allowed to exploit a child sexually. Moreover, section 9 (3) (a) states that every parent is ought to protect the child from sexual abuse. Additionally, the Education Act, cap 353 section 60A (1a-b), (2-4), prohibit any person to marry or impregnate a primary or secondary school pupil. Therefore, teachers who have been reported to impregnate school going pupil, are liable to fines as provided by the Education Act Cap 353 section 60A (4) and (5). Reflecting the Codes of Ethics for Teachers in Tanzania, a teacher is a parent as he/she stays with a child for long time compared to blood parent or guardian. These evidences reveal unethical conduct of teachers, who are Street Level Bureaucrats.

Apart from teachers' involvement in sexual affairs with school girls, pregnancy cases were reported among both primary and secondary school girls. AllAfrica & DailyNews (2018) report that in Kagera region, about 41 Primary school students were found pregnant and dropped school between the year 2014 and 2018. UNICEF (2021) reports that, in 2006 about 3,700 school girls dropped school on pregnancy issues all over the country. Mwananchi (2018) reports more dropouts on pregnancy cases in 2018 as there were 6,237 secondary school cases and 1,185 primary school cases. For secondary school girls, in 2019, Mwananchi (2021) reports and increased pregnancy cases in Dodoma (381 cases), Morogoro (389 cases) and Mwanza (491 cases); while for primary schools the cases were 1,135 respectively. Mwananchi (ibid) reports a decrease in number of pregnancies in 2019 compared to 2018. Although the education Act Cap 353 section 35 (1) and (3) provide that, any registered school pupil in primary or secondary schools should finish his or her studies. In practice, these reported pregnancy case means no school any more. Even though the sources do not mention teachers as the cause of these pregnancies cases, it is quite likely that a good number of teachers are involved as they stay most of the time with the students. Generally, the situation is alarming and more interventions by the government is needed to overcome the situation.

5.0 Conclusion

This paper has examined and discussed unethical conduct of primary and secondary school teachers as Street Level Bureaucrats in Mainland Tanzania. It shows how teachers have used their discretion to unlawfully admit corporal punishments that caused death to some students, having sexual relations with students, unlawful suspending students and striking. Punishing to the level of causing death seems alarming. These happened in Kibeta, Mbinga, Matwiga, Magu and Matui. At the same time, 21

students from Kilambo cha Mkoleni primary school and 20 from Katumba secondary school were suspended from school. On the side of striking, evidences show that, in 2012, almost all over the country teachers' stroke causing students to miss classes. Related to sexual abuse and impregnating students, evidences reveal that about 55,000 students became pregnant between 2003 and 2011; about 390 students were pregnant in Sumbawanga between 2018 and 2019, and about 41 students became pregnant between 2014 and 2018 in Kagera only. In these pregnant cases, one case in Morogoro and two cases in Sumbawanga are reported to be caused by teachers. Since the studies by Lema and Gwando (2018) and Kambuga et al., (2018) prove that most teachers in both primary and secondary schools are not aware of the laws guiding punishments,

Recommendations

After examining and discussing the discretion of Street Level Bureaucrats and unethical conducts, this paper recommends the following actions. There should be a close monitoring of teachers in their work places. Also, heads of schools should often remind their subordinates about rules and regulations guiding service provisions. Again, heads of schools have to regularly take not less than *30 minutes every morning* reminding staff members the Corporal Punishment Regulation, the Law of Child Act, and the Codes of ethics and Conduct for Public Servants and for Teachers, the Public Service Act of 2002 and its regulations of 2003 and 2007 and any other guidelines pertaining service provisions that can improve the situation.

References

- African Union (1990). African Charter on the Rights and Welfare of the Child. Addis Ababa: Ethiopia
- Allafrica (2018) Accessed on 9th September 2021 from <https://allafrica.com/stories/201807270>
- Association of the Development of the Person-Centered Approach (2021). The History of the Person-Centered Approach. Accessed on 8th September 2021 from <https://adpca.org/the-history-of-the-pca/>
- Dodoma News (2020). Accessed on 10th September 2021 from <https://dodomanewz.blogspot.com>
- End Violence & End Corporal Punishment (2020). Corporal Punishment of Children in the United Republic of Tanzania. Accessed on 8th September 2021 from www.endcorporalpunishment.org
- England, D. (2015). The essential guide to handling workplace harassment and discrimination (3rd ed.). USA. NOLO.
- Evans, T. and Haris. J. (2004). Street-level Bureaucrats, social work and (exaggerated) death of discretion. *British journal of social work*, vol.34, 871-895.
- Felix K., Lennarth N., H & Maria E. (2011) Child sexual abuse: Community concerns in urban Tanzania. *Journal of Child Sexual Abuse*, 20(2), 196-217, DOI: 10.1080/10538712.2011.555356
- Fussell, P. (2002). *Uniforms. Why we are what we wear*. New York: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Gerring, J. (2007). *Case Study Research: Principles and Practices*. Cambridge; Cambridge University Press
- Gerring, J. (2016). *Case Study Research: Principles and Practices*. Cambridge; Cambridge University Press
- Gilson, L. (2015). Lipsky's Street Level Bureaucrats. In Page, E., Lodge, M. and Balla, S. (eds.). *Oxford handbook of classics of public policy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Haki Elimu (2020). The State of Violence against School Children in Tanzania Mainland: An Exploratory Study. Unpublished Report: Haki ELimu
- Henga, A. (2018). Tamko kupinga adhabu za kikatili shuleni. Legal and Human Right Center. Available at <https://www.humanrights.or.tz/posts/b/News/tamko-kupinga-adhabu-za-ki-katili-shuleni>. Accessed on 23rd January, 2019.
- IPPMedia (20 July, 2021). Mwanafunzi afariki kwa kipigo cha kufeli mtihani wa "Mock." Accessed on 15th September, 2021 from <https://www.ippmedia.com/sw/habari/mwanafunzi-afariki-kwa-kichapo-cha-kufeli-mtihani-wa-%E2%80%98mock%E2%80%99>
- ITV (19 July, 2021). Mwanafunzi afariki baada ya kucharazwa bakora na mwalimu. Accessed on 7th September 2021 from <https://www.itv.co.tz/news/mwanafunzi-afariki-baada-kucharazwa-bakora-na-mwalimu-ruvuma>
- JamiiForum (2012). <https://www.jamiiforums.com/threads/mgomo-wa-walimu-tanzania-ripoti-toka-maeneo-mbalimbali-ya-nchi.300026/page-18>
- Kambuga, Y. M., Manyengo, P. R., & Mbalamula, Y. S. (2018). Corporal punishment as a strategic reprimand used by teachers to curb students' misbehaviors in secondary schools: Tanzania Case. *International Journal of Education and Research*. Vol. 6(4), 183-194. Accessed from <https://www.ijern.com/journal/2018/April-2018/15.pdf> on 29th September 2021.
- Lema, V. I. & Gwando, R. H. (2018). Corporal Punishment in Tanzania Primary Schools: Pupil's Perception on its Influence in Enhancing Discipline. *IORS Journal of Research & Methods in Education*, 8(1), 41-50 DOI: 10.9790/7388-0801024150
- Lima, L. L. and D' Ascenzi, L. (2017). The role of Street-Level Bureaucrats in the implementation and (re)formation of the health service humanization policy in Porto Alegre (RS). *Journal of public Administration*, vol. 51 (1), 46-63.
- Lipsky, M. (1969). *Toward a theory of street level bureaucracy: Discussion papers*. University of Wisconsin.
- Lipsky, M. (1980). *Street level bureaucracy: Dilemmas of the individual in public service*. New York: Rensselaer Sage Foundation
- Lufunyo, H. (2013). Impact of Public Sector Reforms on Service Delivery in Tanzania. *Journal of Public Administration and Policy Research*, 5(2), 26-49. doi.org/10.5897/jpap12.014

- Mangi, J. E., Idda, H. & Felix, K. et al. (2017). Factors Associated with Child Sexual Abuse in Tanzania: A Qualitative Study. *Tanzania Journal of Health Research*, 19(2), 1-10. DOI.10.4314/thrb.v19i2.9
- Mosha, M. A. (2017). Challenges of teacher's education in Tanzania. *Fahamu Networks for social studies*. Available at <http://www.fahamu.org/challenges-of-teacher-education-in-tanzania/>. Accessed on 23rd, January, 2019.
- MPEKUZU (Friday April 2015). Mwili wa mwanafunzi aliyefariki kwa kuchapwa viboko na waalimu wafikishwa Dodoma. Accessed on 12th September 2021 from <https://www.mpekuzihuru.com/2015/04/mwili-wa-mwanafunzi-kiteto-aliyefariki.html>
- Musa, M. (2016). Implementation of the National aging policy in Tanzania: What do Street-Level Bureaucrats and clients say about access to free health services by the elderly population in Morogoro Municipality? (Unpublished Master Dissertation). Mzumbe University. Morogoro. Accessed on 8th September 2021 from http://scholar.mzumbe.ac.tz/bitstream/handle/11192/2087/MRPP_Malalika%2C%20Musa_2016.pdf?sequence=1
- Muungwana Blog (2016). <http://www.muungwana.co.tz/2016/02/wanafunzi-21-wafukuzwa-shulekwa-muda.html>
- Mwananchi (Tuesday September 4th, 2018). Adhabu hizi ni ishara ya tatizo kubwa zaidi shuleni. Accessed on 7th September 2021 from <https://www.mwananchi.co.tz/mw/habari/makala/maarifa/adhabu-hizi-ni-ishara-ya-tatizo-kubwa-zaidi-shuleni-2928108>
- Mwananchi (Sunday December 30 2018). Wanafunzi 212 Wabebeshwa Mimba ndani ya Miezi 11. Accessed on 15th September 2021 from <https://www.mwananchi.co.tz/mw/habari/kitaifa/-wanafunzi-212-wabebeshwa-mimba-ndani-ya-miezi-11-2946548>
- Mwananchi (Sunday April 25, 2021). Mimba Mashuleni Zaongezeka: Mwanza Moro Dodoma Vinara. Accessed on 16th September, 2021 from <https://www.mwananchi.co.tz/mw/habari/kitaifa/mimba-shuleni-zaongezeka-mwanza-moro-dodoma-vinara-3376326>
- Mzalendo (Friday 22nd January 2021). Waalimu Wamtoa Mwanafunzi Mimba, Wakamatwa na Polisi. Accessed on 10th September, 2021 from <https://mwanaharakatimzalendo.co.tz/2021/01/walimu-wamtoa-mimba-mwanafunzi-wakamatwa-na-polisi.html>
- Njoji, A. (2018). Mwalimu aliyempiga mwanafunzi ang'ang'aniwa. *IPP Media*, 30th August, 2018. Available at <https://www.ippmedia.com/sw/habari/mwalimualiyempiga-mwanafunzi-hadi-Noncompel>
- Noncompel (2017). <https://nocompcommunitymedia.blogspot.com/2017/05/mwanafunzi-afariki-dunia-kwa-adhabu.html>
- NSW Government (2020). What is a Person-Centered Approach? Accessed on 8th September 2021 from <https://www.health.nsw.gov.au/mentalhealth/psychosocial/principles/pages/person-centred.aspx>
- Osborne, S. P., Radnor, Z., & Nasi, G. (2013). A New Theory for public service management? Toward a (Public) service-dominant approach. *American Review of Public Administration*, 43(2), 135–158. doi.org/10.1177/0275074012466935
- Punishing Pregnancy (2021). The Expulsion, Forced Drop Out and Exclusion of Pregnant Students. Accessed on 9th September 2021 from https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/Treaties/CEDAW/Shared%20Documents/tza/int_cedaw_ngo_tza_20782_e.pdf611.html
- Savi, R. (2014). Public policy making in a time of cutbacks: The roles of the street-level bureaucrats in Estonia. *Administrative Culture*, vol. 15 (1), 100-119.
- Smith, P., Farmer, M. & Yelloeley, W. (2013). *Organizational Behaviour*. New York: Routledge
- STRAIKA (2012). Accessed on 10th September 2021 from <https://straikamkali.blogspot.com/2012/07/wanafunzi-jijini-dar-es-salaam.html>
- The Human Right Watch (2015). Tanzania: Vijana Milioni 1.5 Hawapo Shuleni. Accessed on 6th September 2021 from <https://www.hrw.org/sw/news/2017/02/14/299702>
- Tummers, L. G. and Bakkens, V. J. J. M. (2014). Policy implementation, Street-level Bureaucrats and the importance of discretion. *Public Management Review*, vol. 16 (14), 527-547,

UNICEF (2021). Education. Accessed on 5th September 2021 from <https://www.unicef.org/tanzania/what-we-do/education>

UNICEF (2009). Violence against Children in Tanzania: Findings from a National Survey 2009. Accessed on 15th September 2021 from https://www.unicef.org/media/files/violence_against_children_in_tanzania_report.pdf

URT (2002). The Education (Corporal Punishment) Regulation. Dar es Salaam: Government Printers

URT (2002). The Public Service Act. Dar es Salaam: Government Printers

URT (2003 & 2007). The Public Service Regulations. Dar es Salaam: Government Printers

URT (2005). Code of Ethics and Conduct for the Public Service. Dar es Salaam: Government Printers

URT (2016). Waraka wa elimu namba 3 wa mwaka 2016 kuhusu utekelazaji wa elimumsingi bila malipo. Dar es Salaam: Wizara ya elimu, sayansi na teknolojia.

URT (n.d). Teachers Code of Ethics. Dodoma: Government Printers

URT (1979). The Education Act, CAP 353. Dar es Salaam: Government Printers

URT (2009) The Law of Child Act. Dar es Salaam: Government Printers

URT (1979). The Corporal Punishment Act. Dar es Salaam: Government Printers

Van Leeuwen, M., Tummers, L. G. and Van De Wale, S. (2017). Street level bureaucrat discretion: A systematic literature review. Working paper in the preparation of PMRC.

YouTube (2019). Accessed on 10th September 2021 from [yuoTubehttps://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vqmc0yEbaTo](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vqmc0yEbaTo)

Zedekia, S. (2017). Street Level Bureaucrats as the ultimate makers. Journal of Political Science and Public Affairs, vol. 5 (4). DOI: 10.4172/2332-076.1000306.