

## **Decision-Making for Prisoners Considered for Parole: A Case Study of Prisons In Dar es Salaam Region, Tanzania**

**Norbert Ndimumwo Mkisi**

PhD Student, Department of Sociology and Anthropology, University of Dar es Salaam  
[mkisinorbert@gmail.com](mailto:mkisinorbert@gmail.com)

**DOI:** 10.56279/tajoso.v8i2.100

### **Abstract**

*This article examines the decision-making of the parole system in Tanzania, and how such decisions grant some prisoners' parole but deny others. The study was conducted from June to August 2018. It used to examine the criteria used to deny parole to 691 out of 5773 prisoners who were considered for parole between August 1999 and March 2018. The study was conducted at Ukonga, Keko, and Segerea Prisons, Dar es Salaam Region. The study utilized structural functionalism and focal concern theories. The study employed a qualitative research approach and exploratory research design. The research participants included regional and national parole boards, secretariats to the parole boards, officers' in-charge of prisons, parole officers, and the prisoners who had been denied parole while still in prisons. The findings suggest that parole boards and decision makers used criteria other than those in legal instruments to deny parole to prisoners. The criteria included change of offenses contrary to court sentences, subjective perception, and negative attitude on some offenses as well as victims' opinions. It is recommended that there is a need for further studies to analyze parole needs, and the law should be amended to minimize powers given to certain levels of the system in making overriding decisions on parole.*

**Key words:** *decision- making, parole, prisoners*

### **Introduction**

This article examines the working of the Parole system in Tanzania and its implications for the chances of prisoners being granted parole. Using data from Parole Board sessions in Tanzania conducted between 1999 and March 2018, the study examined the experiences of granting and denial of parole including reasons associated with such decisions. This study was motivated by records on denial for parole from August 1999 to March 2016 - the paroling authority denied parole to 680 among 5,474 prisoners who were eligible and qualified for parole. Literature also illustrates that at Ukonga central prison until 2011, 36 prisoners were released on parole, while 13 prisoners were denied parole for unknown reasons (TPS, 2016; Lyimo, 2011). Without making assumptions about prisoners who were eligible or ineligible for parole, the number it raises curiosity in trying to know the factors that influenced the said decisions.

Studies on the parole system in the world show that such a system emerged from the earliest practices of ticket of leave for prisoners who had shown good behavior in prisons.<sup>12</sup>The concept of parole was pioneered around the mid-1800s, and it is associated with ideas propounded by Captain Alexander Maconochie of the Coast of Australia who developed the 'Mark system' based on three principles, namely, a labor sentence instead of a time sentence in prisons; taught self-denial and developed social responsibility by giving convicts an interest in each other's good conduct; and it prepared them for their return to society by gradually relaxing restraints imposed on them (Witmer, 1927). The Mark system referred to how a convict was credited by a mark for labor and one's good conduct performance that could earn his/her freedom from the number of marks he/she earned (Witmer, 1927). Comparably, the parole system became coined in the correction context for prisoners in 1847 by a Boston penal reformer, Dr. Samvel G. Howe (1801-1876).<sup>13</sup>Then the system evolved as a new model of handling criminals due to the civilization of societies and human rights.

---

<sup>12</sup> The 'ticket of leave' refers to a permit used first in the United Kingdom that allowed a convict to leave prison, under certain restrictions, and [go](#) to work before having [served](#) a full term, [somewhat](#) similar to a [certificate](#) of [parole](#) (Collins Online Dictionary). It later came to be used in the USA.

<sup>13</sup><https://socialwelfare.library.vcu.edu/issues/howe-samuel-gridley>. Samuel Gridley How, Romantic Reformer. VCU Libraries. Social Welfare, History Project. Accessed on January 5, 2022.

In practice, the system operates through different measures. From initial developments to date, many countries have adopted the system. Some countries select offenses eligible for parole, while other countries include all prisoners who have rehabilitated after serving a specific period prescribed by the parole law of a specific country. Essentially, parole provides a second chance for the prisoner to rehabilitate herself/himself and to serve sentences out of prison walls. Usually, after serving a portion of sentences and exhibiting good conduct in prison, inmates are granted parole under community supervision (Bohm & Halley, 2002; Futado, 2017).

### ***History of the Parole System in Tanzania***

Tanzania adopted the parole system in 1994 with the establishment of the Parole Board Act 25 of 1994 which came into operation in August 1999. One of the major aims is to reduce overcrowding in prisons as well as prison running costs; and to engage the community to participate in criminal rehabilitation (TPS, 2018). Nonetheless, experience in the country varied because from 1999 when the parole system started to operate to 2018, different outcomes have been evident, for example, about 5082 prisoners benefitted from the system. Despite instituted efforts, a total of 691 prisoners had not been granted parole during the stated period for reasons related to the nature of their offenses although they may have been eligible for parole according to Parole regulations (Semwanza, Mwansasu, Mbezi, & Mduda, 2010; TPS, 2018).

### ***Tanzania's Parole Board Act 25 of 1994***

Implementation of the parole system in Tanzania started after five years from the date the Parole Board Act was passed due to one of the conditions set in section 4 (a)-(g). The condition wanted prisoners who could qualify for parole to have sentenced for a period above eight years. Therefore, those who had served their sentences below this period were ineligible. In light of this condition, only five prisoners would have been eligible and qualified for parole among 36,000 prisoners who were serving their sentences in Tanzania prisons at that time (Lyimo, 2011).

Therefore, the Parole Board Act 25 of 1994 section four(a)-(g) was amended by Act 5 of 2002 which reduced eligibility for parole to persons who had been sentenced to four years from the initial eight years stipulated in the previous Act 25 of 1994. Otherwise, the prisoners should have served one-third of their sentence. According to Futado (2017), there are four most important factors for a prisoner to be considered for parole: the seriousness of the current offense, history of prior violent behavior, prior felony conviction, use of firearms in committing the current offense and disciplinary record in prison. The Act also excludes the eligibility for parole for prisoners who are serving life sentences, those sentenced for armed robbery, or those who dealt in dangerous drugs, murder, rape, or defilement[TPS, 2012; Lyimo, 2011; The Parole Boards Regulations, 1997; The Parole Board Act 25 of 1994 (RE 2002)].

The Act suggests that prisoners who are eligible for parole should be rehabilitated and maintains good conduct at all times when in prison. The law obliges the officer- in-charge of the prison to ensure that if the prisoner meets the conditions under section four (a) – (g) to be proposed to the regional parole board for parole. At the same time, regulations, particularly section six (2) gives an opportunity to a prisoner who meets the conditions to apply for release on parole to the regional parole board. Further steps are provided in the said regulations vide section six(3) (b),which gives power to regional parole boards, and when satisfied, forward with recommendations the prisoner's records to the national parole board for further actions. The Minister for Home Affairs, under section six (4), on receiving recommendations from the national parole board, evaluates and makes decision to refuse or grant parole.

Another important legal provision is within the Parole Board Regulations formulated in 1997. The regulations set principles and criteria governing the provision of parole. Section three (a) and (b) mentions criteria that the prisoner may be granted parole if he/she “will not by reoffending, present an under risk to the society before the expiration of his sentence” and (b) “the release of the prisoner will contribute to the protection of the society by facilitating the reintegration of the prisoner into the society as a law abiding

citizen.” Section four (a), under the principle guiding parole, it is explained that, “the protection of society is a paramount concern in the determination of any case in decision making for parole.”

### ***Methodology***

This study was conducted between June and August 2018. It used an exploratory research design to examine the workings of the parole system in Tanzania, which is an area that has not been well studied before. Using this design, the study explored various stages of the parole system, including actors involved in the system, eligibility criteria, the prisoners subjected to parole considerations, and the outcome of parole decisions on prisoners who were not paroled. Using qualitative data collection methods, in-depth interviews were conducted with parole officers and prisoners who were considered for parole, but were not granted parole and remained in prisons of, Ukonga in Ilala Municipal; Segerea and Keko in Temeke Municipal, Dar es Salaam. Interviews were held with twelve national and regional parole board members, three parole officers of the prisons, three officers - in-charge of the prisons, secretariats to the parole boards, and 25 prisoners who were not granted parole. All the participants were purposively selected.

In addition, an in-depth documentary review was conducted whereby prisons’ parole records were examined. Such data included records of the parole board sessions on records of 100 prisoners. The study sought to examine eligibility criteria used for decision-making on parole and reasons that influenced exclusion for parole to eligible prisoners.

### ***Theoretical Approach***

A critique of the structural functionalist perspective was used for examining how it works to generate different outcomes as functions of the parole system. The structural functionalist perspective focuses on explaining social institutions as collective means to meet social needs and focuses on ways social structures work to accomplish common goals. Proponents of structural functionalism argue that each part of the society has a role to play and if one part does not work properly, it affects the whole system (Merton,1996). The

view point was used for examining the universal functions of the parole system and the unity functions of each party.

*The Functionalist perspective was used to examine the unity function of each part of the parole system and the criteria applied to deny parole to some prisoners, while other prisoners of the same qualification were paroled. The theory was also used for examining the universal function of the Parole Board Act 25 of 1994 objectives. Structural functionalism believes that in a system, parts depend on each other. If one part does not work accordingly, it affects the other parts: example prisoners were affected due to unfair decisions. Structural functionalism helped to identify that parole as a system of parts did not work by following guidelines governing parole process. Structural functionalism justified that each part in parole system practiced superiority in recommendations and decisions. For example, sometimes decision makers used criteria out of parole law to deny parole to some prisoners who qualified due to subjection perceptions. For example, on the parole board session 33 of 2015, the decision maker denied parole to four prisoners who had been recommended by parole boards on the argument statement that they had committed rape. The prisoners were sentenced for offenses of insult and sexual harassment: unless otherwise, the prisoners could not have been selected for parole.*

Merton introduced the idea of manifest and latent functions. Manifest function refers to the intended purpose of an action, while latent function refers to implicit or unintended purposes. Merton (1996, 1994) believed that deviance results when there is a disconnection between culture and social reality for achieving success. Denial of parole to prisoners is in line with leading functionalist Merton (1996, 1994, & 1968) who argued that some members of society with unstable and unbalanced behavior have a tendency to reject rules and regulations and they strive for success by any available means. Findings unveiled that some prisoners were denied parole due to negative attitudes, irrational assessment information of prisoners applying for parole, and change in their offenses. For example, manslaughter was changed to murder, which the law prohibits granting parole.

Based on such viewpoints, the study critically explored the whole process of parole-making by examining the functions of the different officers who were linked together in their responsibilities as stipulated by the Parole Board Act 25 of 1994. This Act also lays procedures for the selection and release of prisoners who qualify for parole. In executing their duties, those responsible in the system are related to each other through responsibilities at different stages in a system like the chain of commands. Procedures followed by prisons to identify and select prisoners for parole were examined as part of the manifest functions of the parole system. Also, the examination included criteria used by the ultimate decision maker on granting or denying parole, irrespective of whether or not the prisoners were recommended for parole.

### ***Functions of the Parole system***

Findings from the study illustrated that the parole system begins its operations in consideration of the Parole Board Act 25 of 1994, which outlines offenses for prisoners who are eligible and qualify for parole and prisoners who are ineligible. Parole Board Regulations of 1997 set criteria, which parole boards and decision-makers should consider. The process follows a regiment-like schedule.

Actors included the parole board members, parole officers, officers' in-charge of prisons, and secretariats to the parole boards. Specifically, the parole process involves the following officials and levels:

- a) Parole officers of prisons, whose basic duties are to identify eligible prisoners who qualify for parole; to collect documents, pre-parole information and ups; select prisoners who completed one-third of their sentences; and submit a report to the officer in-charge of prison
- b) Officers' in-charge of prisons as managers of parole activities ensure that all prisoners who qualify for parole are not neglected. The Parole Board Act 25 of 1994 section 6 (1) directs the officer in-charge of the prison to select prisoners who qualified for parole to apply to the regional parole board. Prisons reports are supposed to be considered properly during recommendations and decision-making.

- c) Secretariats to the parole board members, whose duty is to coordinate all parole activities in their respective areas, and notify parole meeting to parole board members
- d) Regional and national parole board members and those who directly assess prisoners' records and recommend them to the decision-makers. The regional parole board makes recommendations to the national parole board for further consideration, which forwards recommendations to the decision maker for action.
- e) The decision-makers are in this study referred to as persons with topmost powers in deciding for or against a parole recommendation. According to the Parole Act, the decision maker is the Minister for Home Affairs of Tanzania.

### ***The Process of Parole***

The parole process, as established, begins at the prisons level. At this level, parole officers examine the records and the conduct of prisoners who are eligible for parole and thus, could be recommended. Decisions are supposed to be followed unless Tanzania Prisons Services confirmed such prisoners were not rehabilitated. One of the parole board members stated,

“All prisoners who were eligible, qualified for parole and rehabilitated should be paroled without any prejudice instead of selecting some offenses for parole” (Parole Board member, 19/7/2018, Dar es Salaam).

Thus, the initial step is to establish whether a prisoner had been rehabilitated because prisons are understood as institutions for the rehabilitation of offenders, and not strictly as punishment institutions. Consideration for rehabilitation is to evaluate prisoners' conduct in the prison and whether or not a prisoner illustrates good behavior, and one would assess that there is no possibility of the prisoner committing another offence if paroled.

The findings of the study revealed that a prisoner should not be paroled if his reports proved he was not rehabilitated in prison. Another consideration was on the nature of offence committed by the person. The parole regulations

define offences to be considered or not to be considered for parole. The whole system is supposed to make decisions based on these regulations.

In addition, it was established that prisoners had the right to be allowed to be heard by parole boards before a decision is taken. This is in accordance with the Parole Board Regulations of 1997 section 4 (f) which holds that:

“The parole board shall take into account principles in granting parole giving the prisoner the opportunity to be heard before a decision of granting or not granting parole” (Parole Board Regulations, 1997).

Once seen to fulfill parole requirements, the recommendations are then forwarded to the next level. At such a level, trust is placed in the officers' in-charge at the prison level and parole officers ensure that all prisoners are treated fairly and that this part of the system works diligently. This study unveiled that there was no opportunity for the secretariats or parole boards to inspect prisons physically and possibly identify prisoners eligible for parole for each prison contributed to the negligence of parole to some prisoners qualified for parole by officer-in-charge of prisons. Thus, operations of the parole system were based on a strictly functionalist commitment.

Another important observation was the role of the victim in related offences since the victim was a stakeholder in offences such as robbery with violence; personal violation or injury to the person). Thus, the victim's statement was a key sub-component in the functioning of the parole system. However, the victim's statement is simply for consideration to granting parole but not to be used as a criterion to deny parole of a person. In some cases, it was seen to be used to make convictions for parole or not. Prisons reports were not considered properly during recommendations and decision-making.

### ***The Parole Board Part of the System***

On similar understandings of the structure supposed to function according to its set roles, the Parole Board was also entrusted as such. The board serves as a key level in submitting recommendations of parole to the Decision maker. Additionally, the Parole Board evaluates recommendations from the lower

levels and recommends or does not recommend prisoners for parole based on the same criteria given in the Regulations. According to section 3(8) the Parole Law schedule, parole boards are to meet four times a year at three months' intervals. However, on examination of Parole Board records between 2009 and March 2018, it was established that there were no parole sessions for three years from 2000 to 2012, only one session was performed each in a year for 1999, 2009, 2011 and 2012 instead of four sessions (TPS, 2016; Lyimo 2011). Nonetheless, it was explained that the Parole Board has been facing resource shortages that limit its proper functioning, such as maintaining the required sittings per year. Besides, there is inadequate funding for the parole program, for example, in the financial year of 2017/18, the parole boards needed Tanzanian shillings (TZS.) 372,480,000/= but TPS was allocated only TZS 116,518,000/= and the deficit was TZS 255,962,000/= (NPB, 2017).

Failure of maintaining the required sittings by the board indicates that many supposedly eligible prisoners lost the chance of being considered for parole, which is a shortcoming in the whole well-intended process. Table 1 gives a summary of parole board outcomes of decisions for parole taken between the selected sessions in various years between 2012 and 2018.

**Table 1: Decisions for parole in selected Parole Board sessions 2012-2018**

Session number & date	The national parole verdict			The Decision maker verdict					
	Number of Prisoners discussed	Not recommended By Parole Board	Recommended	Accepted recommended	Not accepted	Not recommended by parole boards	Not granted	Reasons given	Reasons Not given
Sess. 21 of 24/02/2012	200	31	169	142	27	31	58	52	6
Sess. 33 of 18/12/2015	91	-	91	87	4	-	4	1	3
Sess. 34 of 22/3/2016	93	1	92	92	1	1	1	1	-

Sess. 35 of 22/3/2017	104	7	97	100	4	7	7	7	-
Sess. 38 of 19/01/2018	79	2	77	77	2	2	2	2	-

**Source:** Tanzania Prisons Headquarters Records (2018)

Based on records on denial for parole, 67 parole records out of 100 prisoners recommended for parole who were denied parole by decision-makers were examined. The reasons given by the decision maker for not granting parole for the selected five board sessions are summarized as follows:

- Session Number 21: In this session held in 2012, 200 prisoners were assessed by the parole board out of which 31 prisoners were not recommended for parole, while forwarding 169 to be considered for parole. However, the decision-makers granted 142 prisoners parole, and denied a total of 58 prisoners. Explanations for denial that were given were that 12 of these 58 prisoners received unfavorable recommendations by victims; 17 prisoners who had been accused of manslaughter were seen to be accused of a grave crime, similar to killing; 7 were seen as habitual criminals, not worthy for parole; three prisoners committed robbery with violence; two prisoners were not accepted by relatives, and: out of 11 prisoners sentenced for causing injury. 6 prisoners were denied parole without further statement.
- Session Number 33: 4 prisoners were denied parole. The reason for one prisoner was given that the prisoner committed rape, but the reasons for the other three were not given. Further investigation revealed that the prisoner was sentenced for an offence of insult.
- Session Number 34. Of the 93 prisoners discussed by the Parole board, one was not recommended for parole because of the offense of manslaughter. The Decision maker accepted the parole board's recommendations in full.
- Session Number 35: In this session, 104 prisoners were discussed and seven were not recommended for parole. However, the decision maker granted parole to 100 prisoners; while denying four on grounds that they committed robbery with violence.

- Session Number 38: In this session, the decision maker agreed to all recommendations made by the parole board.

As shown in Table 1, denial for parole of prisoners is done at two levels, the parole board and then at the Decision maker's level. The decision maker is shown to have some arbitrary powers to make final decisions on granting or not granting parole and as seen, sometimes the recommendations for parole by the board were not always accepted by the decision maker.

The functioning of the parole board also needs deeper interrogations. From the study, it was observed that there were cases where a police report was also used for denial of parole if it stated prisoners were habitual criminals even without any evidence from the forensic bureau. Functionalism theory believes that each part should work to contribute to the achievement of a common goal. In this case, the study revealed that there was a lack of working relationships among parole levels and courts for not furnishing judgment copies, while police never provided fingerprints results. This dysfunction contributed to some prisoners not being paroled. In other cases, parole records indicated that 33 prisoners out of 100 prisoners were not recommended for parole by parole boards with the statement that their offenses were not accepted, while the law allows them like corruptions and embezzlement (TPS, 2018). Such decisions based on the said convictions sometimes did not rhyme with what the Parole Board had recommended for parole.

Differences in decisions between the Parole Board's recommendations and the Decision-maker were also found to be the case. The regional parole board makes recommendations to the national parole board for further consideration, which forwards recommendations to the decision maker for action. For example, the national parole board session 24 that sat on the 19<sup>th</sup> - 20<sup>th</sup> of December 2013 recommended all prisoners for parole. However, at the decision-maker level, one prisoner among them was denied parole on the argument that the prisoner committed a murder offence while the prisoner was charged with the offence of manslaughter.

Incidences of either the parole board or the decision maker reaching conclusions that multiply the gravity of offence were seen to occur now and then. For example, one of the prisoners who participated in this study claimed that he was sentenced to thirty years on 25/02/2004 by Temeke District court for the offense of robbery with violence. Under sections 285 and 286 of Chapter 16 of the law, he deserved parole on 24/02/2014. A report from the police station that arrested the prisoner and fingerprints report confirmed that the prisoner was not a habitual criminal. All stakeholders accepted him except the national parole board and decision maker who denied parole with the statement that the prisoner used a pistol in committing the offense. There were no grounds on how the gravity of the offence was added (Prisoner 22, 15/8/2018).

At the same time, there was also a lack of consensus between the parole board's recommendations and the decision maker in some of the positive recommendations for parole. In some cases, some prisoners recommended for parole were not paroled while some prisoners not recommended were paroled. For example, in 2003, 2005, 2007, 2009, and 2014-2015, the national parole board did not recommend 357 prisoners for parole based on their perception of the offense but the decision maker paroled them (TPS, 2016).

Altogether, from August 1999 to March 2018, the parole boards discussed a total of 5,773 prisoners, 5,070 prisoners were recommended for parole and 703 were not recommended. The decision maker granted parole to 5,082 prisoners but 691 prisoners were denied parole. This was because the national parole board and the decision maker used a mixture of criteria to recommend and make decisions on who to be paroled. For example, and especially at the decision-maker level, there were instances where offenses were given a different interpretation contrary to the court that heard the case of a particular prisoner. The outcome was that sometimes such prisoners denied parole developed deviant behavior (TPS, 2018).

However, denial from parole was also a result of victims not consenting or giving approval for parole of offenders, which in a few cases, was taken as a criterion for denial, and it is not stipulated in the regulations to be considered

as a major criterion. Of the 100 reviewed parole records, it was observed that 25 prisoners were recommended for parole by all stakeholders, although they committed manslaughter, while 16 prisoners were not recommended by victims, the community, and the national parole board (TPS, 2018). One of the Parole Board members gave a reason for communities or victims not giving consent for parole because the prisoner was seen “to be a habitual offender, and thus a risk to be sent back to the community” (Parole Board member, August 5, 2018).

From unveiled experiences, it was observed that; the parole system generated unintended consequences on the part of prisoners. This system is supposed to result in the proper handling of prisoners’ rights, but because of its complicated functioning, it generated negative outcomes. It was observed that some of the prisoners with hope for parole viewed their denial of parole as exploitation and humiliation of their rights because there was no one to advocate for them. One of the study participants claimed as follows;

“The decision maker changed and selected offenses for parole contrary to parole law. He used discretionary power to deny our rights and exploitation, which is unfair. The denial affects us psychologically and loss of hope of life in prisons” (Prisoner, Ukonga Central Prison, 14/08/2018, Dar es Salaam).

This prisoners’ claims are supported by scholars who argue that “prisoners’ continued loss of freedom to go outside is limiting their life; the circumstances create intense feelings of marginalization, frustration and hopelessness” (Pogrebin, M.R., Stretesky, P.B., Walker, A., and Opsal, T.2015). This can be taken to be a result of a system; whose operations do not abide by the set line of functioning to reach its desired objectives.

### ***Conclusions:***

Several issues arise from the examination of the functioning of the Tanzania’s parole system, and the outcomes of this process. There are cases where decisions are seen to have been taken from a limited perspective, based on

one part of the system, either the national Parole Board or the decision maker. The powers bestowed on the decision maker allow this part of the system to have influence on all outcomes.

From this study, there is reason to suggest that sometimes parole boards, decision makers and prisons performed their duties contrary to the assumptions of the structural functionalism theory, which insists cooperation among parties within the organization line as a machinery system generating desired outcomes. The parole system sets criteria and regulations to be followed in the different levels of the system. However, the assumed rigid functioning of the process was seen not to be the case because of personalized elements that get in between the process. Some noted observations like the decision makers viewing an offense differently. For example, the offence of manslaughter termed as murder was contrary to the parole law and served as a block to parole consideration of an otherwise eligible prisoner. The same was the case for the denial of certain offences such as corruption or embezzlement as eligible for parole although they are accepted by the Parole law.

There were several factors that may have influenced the way in which decisions were taken in the parole process. Sometimes it was seen as if the decision makers did not abide by the parole guidelines. However, the parole regulations also show that decision-making has certain obligations to ensure that the granting of parole does not contravene the law. For example, in all cases of denial, the decision maker gave explanations related to perceived gravity of the offence committed, or, the assumed delicateness of sending such a person back to the community after being punished for such the offence. In some cases, the assumed gravity of an offence took a different angle, which according to the law, worsens the case against the prisoner. In one case, for example, the conviction of manslaughter was termed murder contrary to parole law.

All together, among key factors seen to influence the manner decisions to grant or not to grant parole included decision-making power; resource situation of Parole Boards and selectivity in consideration of gravity of some offences. In regards to decision-making powers, section six of the Parole

Board Act 25 of 1994 gives much power to the Minister for Home Affairs to make final decisions for the parole of prisoners. Although the Parole Board Regulations of 1997 section three (a) and (b) sets criteria for the decision maker to consider during decision-making, it was observed that sometimes the decision maker fell short of considering the cited criteria, and made decisions out of some convictions on gravity of a particular offence warranting parole. Similar experiences were with the parole boards, but to a lesser extent. Nonetheless, it was one of the critiques of the structural functionalist perspective, which holds that one does not take into consideration the human element in any social process, and there is the flexibility that human made decisions normally assume.

From the study, it is recommended that the Parole Board Act of 1994 needs to be reviewed to consider the sharing of final decisions on the parole decisions of a prisoner. Besides, there should be a review and reformulation of Parole Board regulations on the violation of the procedures set to allow the system to function as required.

## **References**

- Ahuja, R. (2013). *Research Methods*, New Delhi, India: Rawat Publications.
- Bierschbach, R. A. (2012). *Proportionality and Parole*. Law review, United States of America: University of Pennsylvania (Master's Dissertation).
- Bohm, R., M.& Halley, K., N. (2002). *Introduction to Criminal Justice*, New York United States of America: Glencoe McGraw Hill.
- Futado, A. (2017). *Examination of the Parole Revocation, Decision Making Policy, Through the Organization Theory: Qualitative Analysis: Massachusetts, United State of America Bridge Water State University, (A Theses Submitted for Master's Degree)*.
- Huebner, B., M. & Bynum, T., S. (2006). *An Analysis of Parole, Decision Making Using Sample of Sex Offenders: A focal Concern*

Perspectives. *Criminology*, Vol.44, No.4, PP 963-5 St Louis, United States of America

Koschman, M., A. & Peterson, B., L. (2013). Rethinking Recidivism: A Communication Approach to Prisoner Reentry, *Journal of Applied Social Science* vol. 7 No. 2, PP 190 University of Colorado, United States of America, SAGE Publications, Inc.

Kothari, C. R., & Garg, G. (2014). *the Research Methodology: Methods and Techniques*, (3<sup>rd</sup> Ed) New Delhi, India: New Age International Publishers.

Lyimo, L. E. (2011). The Parole System and Overcrowding in Prisons at Ukonga Central Prison. Dar es Salaam: (M. A Dissertation).

Merton, R.K. (1996). On Social Structure and Science, Chicago, United States of America, University of Chicago Press

Merton, R. K. (1994). A Life Learning Process, New York, United States of America, by the Free Press

Miller, W. B. (1996). Focal Concern Analysis Theory on Prisoners Granting Parole System, New York, United States of America, McGraw Hill

Mkisi, N. N. (2012). “Assessment of Conditions that Helps and Hinders the Successful Release of Convicts Under Parole System in Tanzania Prisons: A Case study of Tanga Region, Tanzania. (M A dissertation)

Morash, M., Kashy, D., A., Smith, S., W., & Cobbina, J., E. (2014). The Effects of Probation or Parole, Agent Relationship Style and Women Offenders Criminogenic Needs on Offenders’ Responses to Supervision. *Interaction Criminal Justice and Behavior 201X Vol. XX No X, pp. 17-20* United States of America; International Association for Correctional and Forensic Psychology Michigan State University.

- Mumtaz, P.; Murthy, N., S., S., R., & Srinivas, M., S., V., (2015). "Indian Parole System: A review of Judicial Stand and Critical Issues" *International Journal of Innovative Research and Development*, Vol. No. 4 Issue 9 PP 301- 302 Hyderabad, India
- National Parole Board. (2017). Paper on Strategy towards improvement of the Parole Boards Act 25 of 1994 Dar es Salaam, Tanzania.
- Panneerselvam, R., (2012). *Research Methodology*, New Delhi, India; PHI Learning Private Limited
- Ramamurthy, E. L. (2013). the Iron Curtain: The Alabama Practice of Excluded Inmates from the Parole Release, Hearing and its Flawed Underpinnings. *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology Vol. 3 Issue No. 4 PP 1204- 1205 United States of America North Western University School of Law.*
- Rhine, E.E. Petersilia, J. & Reitz, K.R. (2015). Improving the Parole Release in the America Federal Sentencing *Reporter.* " *Vol. 28 No. 2 PP 98-103 United States of America*
- Ritzer, G. and Goodman, D.J. (2004). *Sociological Theory*, 6<sup>th</sup> Edition. Toronto Canada: McGraw Hill Companies.
- Semwanza, M., Mwansasu, B., Mbezi, E. & Mduda, A. (2010). An Assessment of the Effectiveness of the Parole in Tanzania Prisons Services, Dar es Salaam, Tanzania: A research to Evaluate the Development of the Parole.
- The Parole Board Act 25 of 1994 Dares Salaam, Tanzania. Dar es Salaam: Government Printer
- The Parole Board Regulations of 1997 Dar es Salaam, Tanzania, Government Printer,
- The Prisons Act 34 of 1967 United Republic of Tanzania, Dar es Salaam, Government Printer,

The Prisons (Offenses Management) Regulations of 1968: Dar es Salaam, Tanzania, Government Printer.

The Written Laws 5 of 2002: Miscellaneous Amendments Dar es Salaam, Government Printer

Tanzania Prisons Services (1982) the annual report paper on the administration of prisons in Tanzania Mainland; Dar es Salaam, Tanzania

Tanzania Prisons Services (1998) Paper on Information on the parole system in Tanzania Prisons Services; Dar es Salaam, Tanzania: A paper presented on seminar of parole officers

Tanzania Prisons Services (2001) Annual report performance of the parole system, Dar es Salaam, Tanzania

Tanzania Prisons Services (2016) Report paper on the progress of the parole system, Dar es Salaam, Tanzania.

Tanzania Prisons Services (2018) Report paper on parolees violated the parole conditions. Dar es Salaam, Tanzania, Secretariat of National Parole Board

Witmer, H., L., (1927) History Theory and Results of Parole in New York, United State of America. The Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology, Article 4. Volume 18, Issue 1, May, 192