

Comprehensive Sexuality Education is 'Not for Us': Rethinking 'Cultural Relevance' through Young Tanzanians' Identifications with/against Intervention Knowledge

This is the Author's Accepted Manuscript version of the article: Coultas, C. Campbell, C. Mohamedi, R. and Sanga, U. (2020). Comprehensive Sexuality Education is 'Not for Us': Rethinking 'Cultural Relevance' through Young Tanzanians' Identifications with/against Intervention Knowledge. Social Science & Medicine. Accepted for publication on 20 July 2020.

Abstract

The need for comprehensive sexuality education (CSE) to be culturally relevant and inclusive is increasingly recognised as a fundamental aspect of supporting young people to live healthy sexual lives. Nevertheless questions remain about how to represent cultures and difference without subtly reinforcing inequalities. This paper makes a case for the need to explore this issue through analyses of how different gendered and demographic groups of young Tanzanian attendees of culturally relevant CSE, identify with (or against) intervention knowledge[s]. Grounded in dialogical social psychological theorising, we present a methodological approach for exploring how processes of belonging and Othering structure young people's negotiations of culturally relevant CSE amongst other knowledges. An adapted version of the 'story completion' method was used with university students and urban-poor young people (aged 18-34) to instigate dialogues about how a fictional protagonist might think, feel, and act in their relationship, looking to see if, and how, young people incorporated CSE knowledge. Twelve single-gendered focus-group discussions were held in September 2014 with 48 young people, and then findings from these were discussed further with 27 returning young people through three mixed-gendered workshops in August 2015. The analyses highlight how young Tanzanians explicitly Other CSE interventions, positioning their knowledge as 'not for us'. More implicitly, difference is also constructed around ideas about change and gendered development, along with trust and support in relationships. The devices used to Other shifted and differed across demographic groups, ranging from complete denials of intervention knowledge to viewing it as unrealistic, dangerous, or self-stigmatised for not being able to use it. We propose that these findings highlight the need to rethink how both 'culture' and 'relevance' are conceptualised in CSE, most specifically necessitating greater recognitions of poverty, transnationality, and the lasting legacies of colonialism and behaviour change interventions that communicated through fear and morality.

Keywords: Tanzania; sub-Saharan Africa; comprehensive sexuality education; culture; young people; agency; communication; dialogical theory.

1. Introduction

This paper looks to explore how different groups of young Tanzanians identify with (or against) 'culturally relevant' Comprehensive Sexuality Education (CSE). The importance of cultural 'relevance', 'sensitivity', 'competence' or 'responsivity' in education settings is premised on the understanding that learners thrive in inclusive pedagogical spaces where a sense of belonging is built (Ladson-Billings, 1995). In health interventions, culture is also recognised as constitutive of health experiences, beliefs, and opportunities for behaviour change. Yet there remains much variance and critique over how culture is incorporated into health promotion interventions ranging from viewing culture as compromising health meaning that interventions focus on changing cultures, to recognising it as a resource for health that interventions can use to inspire behaviour change (Taylor, 2007). There are also differences in how culture is used to inspire: 'culturally sensitive' approaches adapt curricula knowledge to the 'cultural markers' of 'target audiences'; whilst 'culture-centred' framings work with groups through participatory activities to co-create curricula grounded in 'subaltern knowledge' about health (Dutta, 2007). A fundamental issue that remains relates to the question of how to present cultural differences in interventions without subtly enforcing inequalities between 'Selves' and 'Others' through that difference (Taylor, 2007). Pon (2009) for instance, cautions against 'the rush' to master and apply the knowledge of Others, in that this can constitute 'new racism' when the mainstream and 'default standards' of whiteness are not interrogated. In this paper we seek to contribute to these discussions by taking a slightly different approach: beyond exploring how intervention designers manage differences, we propose that much can be learned from looking at the processes by which attendees of interventions understand and negotiate difference. In this framing, analyses of cultural relevance look at more than just how the knowledge of Others is incorporated into interventions, and explore the ways in which 'Others' relate to knowledge that has attempted to be inclusive. This is an area of study that remains largely unaddressed, but which we propose can offer crucial insights into the processes of Othering from both dominant and minoritized positions that can act as barriers to communication and supporting young people to live healthy sexual lives.

Struggles around 'difference' contribute to the contingency of CSE. Contestations between different value-systems remain ever present, reflected in how interventions broadly range from being abstinence-only, viewing sex-before-marriage as corrupting, to focussing on the pleasures of sex, identified as an important part of being human (Iyer and Aggleton, 2015). In sub-Saharan African

contexts, 'traditional values and norms' (e.g. resistance to open discussion about sex) are often identified as one of the most significant barriers to 'complete adoptions' of CSE, in that teachers skip or modify content, or the teaching of CSE might be banned outright (Mukoro, 2017; Vanwesenbeeck, Flink, van Reeuwijk and Westeneng, 2019). Making CSE curricula 'culturally relevant' is presented as a kind of middle-ground in this conflict, in that 'essential aspects' such as rights-based perspectives can be combined with localised understandings of sexuality. Yet Roodsaz (2018) stresses that rights-based framings of agency and subjectivity are not essential or universal, but rather are specific to Western secularism, making culturally-sensitive CSE paradoxical and exclusionary in non-Western contexts. The need to explicitly address the issue of difference in CSE is therefore increasingly called for. Mukoro (2019) proposes an 'open cultural stance' in which students are sensitised to differences and conflicts between [ethnic, religious, regional etc.] sexual cultures, and recognising young people's sexual cultures in their own right is also identified as important (Bell and Aggleton, 2012). Whilst Allen (2018) argues that representations of difference in CSE need to move beyond blanket categorisations of cultures, and instead focus on the unique 'radical plurality' of each individual. Ntarangwi (2009) certainly describes youth culture in East Africa as the 'culture of change' driven by globalisation, and empirical research in Tanzania stresses the importance of attending to the ways in which these changes are rendering complex youth sexualities and opportunities for development (Rwebangira and Liljestrom, 1998).

We aim to illustrate the contribution that dialogical social psychology can make to these discussions. Its theorising on culture as embodied and dynamic, produced through intersubjective relations that are historically and socially situated (Jovchelovitch, 2007; Howarth, 2011), reconciles the subtly different framings of culture found in CSE: as a variable that differentiates groups, seen in discussions about social norms and 'the clash of cultures' (Gillespie, Howarth, and Cornish, 2012); to more relational, socially constructed, and new materialist understandings in which culture is pluralistic and continually reworked and reformed. Through a dialogical social psychological framing the implications of the social categorisations in the former can be understood and interrogated through analyses of the latter. Namely, beyond identifying that there is difference, we can explore how that difference is experienced and made meaningful or denied (ibid). By studying how CSE knowledges are reconstituted amongst other knowledges (e.g. diverse ethnic and religious knowledges, peers' representations of sexuality, one's own sexual experiences etc.) by different demographic groups of young Tanzanians, we can gain insight into the specific 'processes that *Other*' (Howarth, 2011) or include: in what aspects and for whom is CSE experienced as exclusionary or inclusive, and how do different groups of young Tanzanians negotiate exclusions (do they *Other* back)? We propose that understanding these knowledge-based relational dynamics is essential for identifying how to communicate about culture

and cultural differences in CSE. In addition to outlining the analytic method used for exploring these dynamics, we also present a method of data collection that was developed to encourage discussions in which multiple knowledges are negotiated, and that importantly approached culturally relevant CSE knowledge through the framing and centring of these ‘other’ knowledges. Our [CCo, RM, US] experiences as practitioners working with young Tanzanians highlighted the need for this careful facilitation of discussions, as normative answers to direct questions about interventions are common. We propose that the various processes of Othering and belonging that are found to be used by different gendered groups of young Tanzanians attending university and living in urban-poor contexts, highlight the need to rethink cultural relevance in CSE.

2. Methodology

2.1 Theoretical Framework

Theorising on the relational nature of knowledge and ‘being’ is gaining traction across the social sciences. The distinct contribution of dialogical social psychology is its focus on the ‘double-sided nature’ (Jovchelovitch, 2007) of these relations: how Selves (both individual and collective) are constituted *through* the difference of Others (both real and imagined) in which dialogue – the mind-in-relation-to Others – is theorised as *the* world of meaning, a human ontology (Markova, 2003); yet how the uncertainty of these relations can also harden Selves’ “defences and narcissistic tendencies” (Jovchelovitch, 2007, p.129), with maintaining a sense of stability being a core function of self-esteem (Breakwell, 2010). How we produce such a sense of stability is preconditioned, yet not determined by the particularities of contexts: socioeconomic circumstance; relationships with the socially-positioned others that are physically present; and the plural and dynamic sociocultural and ideological contexts that each person is situated in, together with historicised relations between these different symbolic contexts (Duveen, 2001; Howarth, 2002; Billig, 2004; Cornish, 2004). Analyses therefore focus both on how, and to what extent, Other[s] and their perspectives are recognised and responded to, together with the contexts that situate these particular dynamics (Jovchelovitch, 2007; Markova, 2016). Yet there are different ways of studying this, ranging from looking at individuals’ identity-work in negotiating difference and [mis-/non-]recognitions (e.g. Amer, 2019), to the outcomes of interactions between ‘knowledge systems’ (e.g. Priego-Hernandez, 2017), or investigating the nuanced processes by which different knowledges are negotiated and rearticulated (e.g. Renedo, Komporozos-Athanasiou, and Marston, 2017). We adopt the latter analytical approach intentionally: we did not look

at identity-work or the outcomes of knowledge interactions in recognition of the first author's complicity (as a white European) in colonial legacies of foreign researchers '[mis-]naming' African sexualities, knowledges, and identities. Whilst this complicity cannot be reconciled, we propose that studying *processes* of CSE knowledge negotiations puts differences 'to work' (Fine, 1998), and enables analyses of how coloniality operates through knowledge, turning "the gaze back upon power" (Tuck and Yang, 2014, p.241).

The dialogical analytic concept 'semantic barriers and promoters' (Gillespie, 2008) enables processual analyses of the myriad ways in which the knowledge of Others is formative in Selves' knowledge production. Broadly, semantic barriers are devices that people use to protect the stability of their knowledge or semantic environment in the face of alternative knowledges, whilst semantic promoters, function in stimulating engagements and hybridisations with alternatives (ibid). Table 1 outlines examples of semantic barriers inclusive of 'rigid oppositions', 'prohibited thoughts', 'stigma', 'undermining the motive', and 'bracketing' (Gillespie, 2008). There has been much less theoretical focus on, or perhaps even empirical evidence of semantic promoters, however one semantic barrier – 'separation' – has been identified as also having the capacity to function as a promoter (Arthi, 2012). Semantic barriers have been used to illustrate how in post-Soviet Estonia rigid oppositions uphold polemics between (minority ethnic) Estonian Russians and (majority ethnic) Estonians, preventing tolerance of the other's version of history, which also works to preserve self-serving biases in (relative) identity positioning (Kus, Liu, and Ward, 2013). Whilst Kadianaki (2014) shows how the stigma device not only blocks interactions with alternatives, but also is transformative for the identities of African migrants in Greece, enabling them to cope with racist encounters by constructing Greeks who are racist towards them as 'crazy'. People's varying uses of semantic barriers/promoters for negotiating different knowledges have also been implicated as markers of agency (Coudin, 2012). We adopt a new materialist understanding of agency, therefore not as a quality or characteristic that belongs or is given to certain individuals, but rather as identifiable in "expressive and transformative qualities of action that emerge out of, but are not reducible to, multiple conditions of possibility [and we would add, constraint]" (Hutchings, 2013, p.23; Madhok, Philips, Wilson, and Hemmings, 2013). Accordingly, we suggest that the different semantic barriers/promoters used by young Tanzanians, provide insight into the shifting opportunities and constraints experienced by different demographic groups in negotiating culturally relevant CSE knowledge amongst other knowledge forms..

2.2 Setting, Interviewees, and Recruitment

Tanzania, the setting of this study, is an East African country that has maintained political stability and relatively stable economic growth since Independence in 1961 (World Bank, 2017). Out-of-school rates

for young people aged 14-19 are estimated at 56%, rising to 61% for girls, and only one-third of girls who enter secondary schools graduate; a disparity that is much discussed at present owing to the President's recent endorsement of banning young mothers from returning to school (EPDC, 2014; World Bank, 2015; HRW, 2020). Around 800,000 young people are estimated to enter the workforce each year, and with rapid urbanisation without concurrent industrialisation and urban-investment, unemployment rates are high (e.g. for youth reaching 28.8% in the largest city – World Bank, 2017). Whilst the incidence and prevalence rates of HIV have reduced, young people (aged 15-24) remain a 'key affected population', thought to account for about one-third of all new HIV infections, with young women making-up roughly two-thirds of these cases (THIS, 2016-17). This gendered disparity persists in prevalence rates, estimated at 2.1% for young women and 0.6% for young men (THIS, 2016-17), and is thought to be driven by transactional sex, particularly with older men (Wamoyi, Heise, Meiksin, Kyegombe, Nyato, and Buller, 2019); an issue that was tackled directly through the 'Fataki' nationwide health promotion campaign (Kaufman et al. 2016).

Urban-poor young people and university students were identified as a useful demographic comparative, in that international education literature associates greater agency and overall social development with higher education (Schuller, Preston, Hammond, Brassett-Grundy, and Bynner, 2004). Although it is important to recognise that many university students could also be considered 'urban-poor', having gained a place at university through scholarship and government funding initiatives. Three authors [CCo, RM, US] have experience working as practitioners for youth- and child-focused local and international non-governmental organisations (NGOs) in Tanzania, and purposively selected two CSE interventions operational in Tanzania's largest city: one working with the urban-poor; and the other with university students. Both were internationally funded, used the peer educator model, and developed curricula from international guidance documents, with 'cultural sensitivity' identifiable in discussions on transactional relationships and 'sugar daddies', gendered stereotypes and gender-based violence, 'harmful traditional cultures' such as FGM, and the integration of stories with young Tanzanian protagonists. Each of the interventions provided quiet and secluded rooms for data collection, and were asked to recruit young people who regularly attended the intervention and who were aged between 18-35 years (the upper bracket of 'youth' in Tanzania, DfID, 2018). After obtaining consent, it was discovered that some of the participants self-identified as peer educators, and because we were not evaluating these specific interventions but rather exploring how different demographic groups of young Tanzanians interpret and negotiate CSE knowledge, this added 'social position' was welcomed. Overall, 48 young people were recruited and twelve single-gendered focus group discussions (FGDs) were held in September 2014. In August 2015, 27 of these young people returned to participate in three mixed-gendered workshops (see Table 2 for FGD and workshop

stratifications). Whilst the presence of peer educators did not appear to compromise the FGD discussions, nor did they often express strikingly different views (instances when they did are indicated), we organised a separate workshop for university student peer educators as their numbers were significant.

Ethical approval was obtained from the ethics committee of the Department of Psychological and Behavioural Sciences at the London School of Economics and Political Science, as well as the National Institute for Medical Research in Tanzania.

2.3 Methods and Procedure

This study represents a phased and dialogical approach to the projective method of story completion that “provides an open-ended way of accessing participants’ meaning-making... the opening sentences of a story about a hypothetical scenario [the ‘stem’ story is provided]... and [participants] asked to complete it” (Clarke, Braun, and Wooles, 2015, p.154). The method was developed by Kitzinger and Powell (1995) in their study of partner infidelity, who described its usefulness for research topics where apprehensiveness in self-reporting is anticipated, as people can “ascribe their own motivations, feelings, and behaviours to other persons in the stimulus material, externalising their own anxieties, concerns, and actions through fantasy responses” (p.348). One important adaptation was rather than ask interviewees to complete the story individually and in writing, stories were completed as a group exercise to maximise potentials of different knowledges being brought-up and having to be negotiated. Through a dialogical framing, FGDs enable researchers “to examine dynamic interactions that take place during communication as well as the formation, maintenance, and change of socially shared knowledge” (Markova, Linell, Grossen, and Orvig, 2007, p.45). Another adaptation was the phased approach, in which five stem stories were created so that we could gain insight into different stages or aspects of relationships: 1) the protagonist *before* a relationship; 2) the protagonist *meeting* a person of attraction; 3) the protagonist meeting the person *on a date*; 4) the protagonist having *relationship difficulties*; 5) and the protagonist *going to a CSE seminar*. The CSE intervention was left to the end so that it could be seen if, and how, the young Tanzanians would naturally integrate (what would later be identified as) CSE knowledge before any specific mention of it. We also provided ‘completion’ questions for each of the stem story parts as a guide for discussions, aimed at exploring the protagonists’ feelings thoughts, [non-]actions, and perspective-taking.

We propose that this more guided approach to the story completion method was important for the purposes of this study. Namely, we were not looking to collect data on young people’s relationships per se (which would have necessitated a more open approach), but rather were looking to explore how different knowledges are used in discussing relationships and interactions with CSE. The stem

stories were nevertheless tailored to each gendered demographic group, based on narrative interviews from the first author's MSc project (Coultas, 2017), and developed in collaboration with co-authors [RM and US], both experienced Tanzanian youth practitioners who also facilitated the FGDs and workshops whilst the first author (who speaks Swahili fluently) sat to the side and took notes (see Appendix A for discussion on the process of stem story developments and the finalised topic guides). Of note, many of the participants spoke by interchanging protagonist and first-person perspectives, meaning that in some quotes there is an element of ambiguity as to what position the speaker is holding. In that we are looking at how knowledges interact, and not individual identity projects, we propose that this communicative dynamic is not of great significance.

The workshops were held because the young people expressed an interest in hearing the results from the FGDs in mixed-gender groupings, and informed consent was obtained anew so these discussions could be included as data. The workshops were used to gain further insight into three broad topics which were surprising or ambiguous in the FGDs: gendered roles, positions, and power; desire; and trust/support in relationships. The discussion materials were also projective, so interviewees did not have to speak from personal experience, this time designed using anonymised excerpts from the FGDs. Extra measures were taken to ensure that interviewees were protected from gendered dominance through incorporating small-group breakout discussions, some of which were single-gendered and integrated position-exchange exercises (e.g. where the young men were asked to discuss young women's quotes and vice versa), aimed at enhancing perspective-taking and diffusing any potential identity-based conflicts (Gillespie and Richardson, 2011).

All discussions were transcribed by a professional, and then translated collectively by authors CC, RM, and US, and two East African university students. Both English and Swahili versions were kept side-by-side for the initial analyses which involved coding for Others and alternative representations (e.g. parents, community, peers, NGO knowledge on etc.). Using the qualitative analytic software NVivo, segments which referred to each of these Others were then analysed for the semantic/barriers promoters used, and tagged according to their context (e.g. in response to an explicit question about that Other, or emergent from which stem story or stage of the workshop, and whether this was responding to another's comment or initiatory). Tables summarising the use of semantic barriers/promoters in each section of the FGDs and workshops were also created to enable analyses of differences and similarities both within and across each of the four gendered demographic groups: urban-poor young women (U-P_Women); urban-poor young men (U-P_Men); young women at university (Uni_Women); and young men at university (Uni_Men). Thematised interconnections between the different negotiations of difference were then identified through analyses of gender, educational attainment, and co-author discussions about relations between Others and alternative

knowledges (e.g. ideas about 'change' being constructed through the othering of schools, social mobility, and NGOs).

3. Results

When asked as part of the final stem story in the FGDs, what the NGO would say about how young people should act in their relationships, the ABC approach (i.e. abstain, be faithful, condomise), that was not promoted in either of the interventions, was commonly referenced first, indicating the endurance of prior exposures to knowledge. Additional points were then made on top of this, including the importance of testing for HIV regularly, how thinking about and making plans for the future is helpful for 'avoiding temptations', and that 'good/love' relationships are built on support, respect, trust, communication with partners, and in a few instances, also pleasure. Yet whilst the young Tanzanians were able to recite (what we from this point forward call) 'NGO/CSE knowledge', none used it in the FGD discussions prior to us asking about it. When asked about how Bahati/Rehema/Stella/Juma would relate to this NGO/CSE knowledge, many of the young Tanzanians, across demographic groups, Othered this knowledge together with the NGOs that promote it, viewing them as 'not for us'. The analyses of the semantic barriers/promoters used throughout the discussions provide insight into the more nuanced and sometimes implicit ways in which CSE knowledge is constructed as different and Other, specifically related to 'ideas about change and gendered development', and 'trust and support in relationships'. As indicated in Table 3, the particular devices used by the different groups of young Tanzanians in negotiating these differences, highlight the shifting salience of gender and educational attainment. Namely how gender and education level constitute different opportunities and constraints for expressive actions – agencies – in negotiating perceived differences with CSE knowledge. Each of these 'differences' will now be discussed in turn.

3.1 Us—Them Othering: The ‘Swahili Streets’ against CSE

Across the different demographic groups of young Tanzanians, the realities of ‘the Swahili streets’ were commonly described as the reason for not being able to use and apply CSE knowledge, Othering it as ‘not for us’. Only one participant, a young male peer educator at university, expressed that moving out of ‘these [bad] realities’ was a matter of choice, also indicating how those who do not ‘choose’ this, could be stigmatised and blamed by peer educators: *“We’ll tell you to not do this or the other but the final decision is yours. If you want to have a good life and live well with people you will do it”* (Uni_Man-PE_FGD12). In contrast, the remaining young people described this as an issue of spatiality, for instance one of the urban-poor male peer educators described how whilst NGOs can create supportive spaces, this care and guidance does not extend out into the Swahili streets: *“Here is where us peer educators are failing... We can give someone counselling but then when they return home [to the Swahili streets] they are met with a different environment”* (U-P_Man-PE_FGD4). Nevertheless, the force of this distancing from CSE differed broadly by educational attainment. Many of the university students rejected CSE knowledge outright using the ‘bracketing’ semantic barrier to set it apart from reality:

“[Sex education] is empty words. It’s like giving someone a hoe with no place to dig. Of what use will that hoe be?” (Uni_Woman_FGD8).

“we know how to have good relationships... but in the reality of our lives right now, in short, you cannot have real love” (Uni_Man_FGD10).

The ‘reality’ that these university students speak of relates to poverty, and how sexual relations are the main source of survival for young women but also increasingly young men:

“if these [NGO] seminars worked our sisters who sell their bodies wouldn’t still be out there. It has even increased whilst I have been at university and now even boys are selling themselves” (Uni_Woman_Workshop2).

“It’s much easier for us [boys] to sustain ourselves in this [university] environment than it is for girls... people are less likely to cooperate with them in business. The most simple ways on offer [for making money] are to sell themselves or find a man.” (Uni_Man_FGD11).

The realities of relationships described by the urban-poor young people held similarities, in that sexual relations were identified as essential for the survival of young women. However, unlike the university students, the urban-poor young people did not reject CSE knowledge outright, but self-stigmatised as a semantic barrier against CSE knowledge, positioning ‘the good’ as only for Others – for Europeans

(perhaps brought-up owing to the first author's presence), along with those privileged to not have to rely on relationships for survival:

"For Tanzanians, for Africans, relationships mean something different than what it does to Europeans... If only people could build-up relationships that weren't about sex, I think there would be more development/progress in our communities" (U-P_Man_FGD4).

"When I meet someone I will never be able to show true/sincere love... I'll stay because I'm gaining [financially] from him and he's gaining [social status] from me.. nowadays it's about gaining from each other... sincerely love won't exist" (U-P_Woman_Workshop1).

We propose that self-stigma as a semantic barrier is connected to internalised stigma but also different, in that it reflects how young people are internalising CSE knowledge which is intended to inspire rather than stigmatise. We emphasise the importance of recognising the agency inherent to this expressive act of distancing. For the self-stigma device enables young Tanzanians to protect themselves against CSE's non-recognition of the realities of 'the Swahili streets': by situating this exclusion at a group or cultural level, individuals maintain self-esteem in that not applying CSE knowledge is not seen as the fault of the individual. There were also indications that this collective identity positioned in opposition to CSE, was also supported through the stigma device, used against young people who tried to apply CSE knowledge to their lives, for instance, by being faithful to a partner:

"W11: You're a peasant, you're not with it [if you're faithful to one man] / W9:... the 'three cooking rocks', you can't cook on one rock [you need three to balance the pot]. One to satisfy your needs, another to give you money, and another that you love... If you have only one man you stay quiet because people will think you're stupid" (U-P_Women_FGD3).

The bracketing semantic barrier used by the university students could perhaps be seen as reflecting a greater sense of agency, in that the non-recognition in CSE of young people's lived realities is rejected outright as opposed to being internalised. Nevertheless the following two sections illustrate how the self-stigma device is used by all groups in constructing more specific differences between us-them – 'the Swahili streets' versus CSE.

3.2 Ideas about Change and Gendered Development

A fundamental point of difference that ran throughout the focus group discussions and was explored further in the mixed-gender workshops, was ideas about change and gendered development. Across all groups, a striking majority of young Tanzanians rejected the very notion of 'behaviour change',

identifying CSE interventions as useless for people who are already sexually active, as desires and sexual habits are perceived as unchangeable and even uncontrollable once experienced:

“however he started having sex, that is the way he will continue... [only] unsafe sex [because that’s how it is in the Swahili streets]... Juma is controlled by his emotions... He might get the education, but his emotions will get him back to doing what he used to do” (Uni_Man_FGD10).

“if you have more than one man, you can’t change because one man won’t be enough” (Uni_Woman_FGD7).

This perception of fixity remained prominent throughout the discussions, and the analyses of semantic barriers/promoters illustrate connections to the young Tanzanians’ ideas about gendered development, predominantly understood to be achieved through marriage. For the urban-poor young people this not only constructed NGO-based change as different, but also development through formal schooling. In two of the three FGDs with urban-poor young men, the phrase *“the baby of a snake is snake”* (U-P_Man_FGD5+6) was used as a self-stigma device to indicate why Bahati was excluded from education-based development and social mobility: *“because [his Mum] works as a cleaner... her son doesn’t know the importance of education”* (U-P_Man_FGD5). More generally, many of the urban-poor young people positioned schools and education as rigidly opposed to ‘these streets’ where opportunities for development are grounded in marriage, also upheld for women by the stigmatisation of those who do not marry:

“W12: If we take the example of the streets around here then she is already likely having sex and has got a man and so she has stopped going to school and is waiting to be married... / W11: If she reaches twenty and isn’t married then people will... laugh at her and so marrying at seventeen is a good thing” (U-P_Women_FGD-3).

The few who held onto the hope that NGO-based change might be possible also illustrated this association of fixity with ‘place’ in their use of the separation device to indicate that change could only be achieved by leaving these streets: *“slowly he might be able to change but he would have to leave his whole life and friends behind him to do this”* (U-P_Man_FGD5).

Many of the university students described university as providing a ‘way out’ of the Swahili streets. The young women expressed how Stella would *“be free [at university]... [different from] home [where] her parents will command her on what to do and what not to do and watch her to make sure she obeys”* (Uni_Woman_FGD9), and a number of the young men described how for Juma, education *“can lift him and his family [out of poverty]”* (Uni_Man_FGD12). Nevertheless, this opposition between

development through formal education versus marriage clearly still pervaded higher education spaces for young women, with many describing university as enabling Stella *“to look for a man who will treat her well”* (Uni_Woman_FGD7), as opposed to social mobility through education. Furthermore, the prohibited thoughts device was used by both genders to indicate the dangers when young women aspire to develop through education: in two separate FGDs, the same story about a young woman who had been kicked out of university for repeatedly refusing the advances of a teacher was brought up; and the young men expressed how, *“They [teachers] can fail both of you... For them to get what they want [i.e. have sex with your girlfriend]”* (Uni_Man_FGD12).

Yet across the different groups of young people, the increasing rarity of marriage was discussed, owing, for most, to the difficulty of raising dowries in poverty. The semantic barriers/promoters highlighted the gendered implications of this ‘change’. For many of the young men, the provider role (along with its pressures and status), was transferred to relationships outside-of-marriage, and some of the young men at university even described an increasing stigmatisation of ‘old’ expectations of marriage and the provider role:

“[Your friends] don’t know how much you’re hustling to make her look good in front of their eyes... you are poor and have lots of problems so you have to work hard to provide for her and even when you can’t take care of her anymore and you want to dump her because it’s too much for you, you will keep providing for her so she looks good every day and so your CV will be good to your friends” (U-P_Man_FGD4).

“She has her [government loan] allowance... And you have yours... Why then, should we only spend my money?” (Uni_Man_FGD12).

“MS6: long ago marriage had its importance but these days.. if I get married it becomes an obstacle to meeting other girls, so now young people are [not] doing it [getting married] as a fashion... / MS5:... they call each other ‘real man’ for these behaviours, it gives them status... / MS10: There are people who ridicule me for sticking with one woman year after year” (Uni_Men_Workshop3).

Nevertheless all the young men identified gaining status and gendered development through sexual relationships as morally wrong, understood through a rigid opposition between ‘good’ (married) and ‘bad’ (outside-of-marriage) relationships that is simultaneously self-stigmatising in that the majority of these young men aligned themselves with ‘the bad’. Through the framing of fixity this was viewed as unchangeable:

“There is a Swahili proverb that says ‘if you eat human flesh, you will always eat human flesh and can’t stop doing it’... [So] he can’t stop himself from his desires... and only bad things can come from that” (U-P_Man_FGD6).

In contrast, the young women’s use of the prohibited thoughts device highlights the very real dangers of these relationships outside-of-marriage owing to collectivised presumptions of fixity. For the university students this related to the social exclusion that would follow if a young woman was not able to maintain the same fixed ‘level’ of fashion and beauty as her peers, as well as her own former self, that in its expense is only achievable through sexual relationships:

“she finds herself in the wrong groups [who have sex for money] because she wants to look good like her colleagues so she remains on the same ‘level’ with them” (Uni_Woman_FGD8).

“when they see that Stella’s situation has changed [that she is not looking good anymore], they will start to disassociate themselves from her” (Uni_Woman_FGD9).

Whilst for the urban-poor young women, even the ‘positive’ changes associated with sexual relationships (e.g. looking fashionable) were identified as dangerous in the Swahili streets, often resulting in social exclusion that would be absolute if a young unmarried woman became pregnant:

“[The community] will assume that you look good because you have started seeing a man” (U-P_Woman_FGD3).

“[people] will say bad things about her, say that she has a bad character, that she is a prostitute and that ‘it’s not suitable for our children to hang out with her’” (U-P_Woman_FGD2).

“W1: She knows if she gets pregnant that... / W1: ... her parents will kick her out on the streets / [Spoken almost inaudibly] W3: “She will die”” (U-P_Women_FGD1).

Therefore young people’s rejection of the very notion of behaviour change is intrinsically tied-up with broader socialised experiences of widespread poverty-related precarity, high HIV exposure, and societal change. In such conditions it is understandable that individualised change and mobility might seem an impossibility, and too that ‘the bad’ holds permanence. Therefore understandings of fixity, whilst perhaps grounded in the symbolic (i.e. role-based conceptualisations of gendered development), also go beyond it, holding very real material consequences that the majority of young people are entangled in; how, for many, sexual relationships remain the only available pathway for positive social recognition, gendered

development, and survival. The final ‘difference’ with understandings of CSE knowledge illustrates how young Tanzanians feel excluded from all Others in these struggles.

3.3 Trust and Support in Relationships

Across the different groups of young Tanzanians, the trust and support identified as essential for having the ‘good’ and loving relationships promoted by CSE, were represented as ‘not for us’ owing to the adversarial nature of sexual relationships borne out of opposing gendered needs – survival for many young women, and status for young men:

“no-one is trustworthy... and it’s all because of the need for money and the desire [for status] to be seen as better than others” (UP_Man_Workshop1).

“MS1: He will show off to give the impression that he has money ... / MS4: If you are honest with girls you don’t get them but if you lie you do” (Uni_Men_FGD12).

“girls these days we are so much after money. I have a boyfriend but at the same time I have a sugar daddy that can give me money and can provide me with my other [survival] needs... I feel bad about that” (Uni_Woman_Workshop3).

A small number of urban-poor young men specified the Other in this self-stigmatisation as Europeans and white people, forming a protective collectivised identity around the ‘difference’ of relationships in the Swahili streets:

“Different to white people... we don’t trust each other... we are supposed to... but even living as husband and wife we don’t trust each other” (U-P_Man_Workshop1).

“For the European this [friendship and building of trust before sex] is very easy but for us it’s sexual, never such a friendship first, there is no love story... this is not our culture” (U-P_Man_FGD6).

Many of the young people also used the prohibited thoughts device to emphasise the dangers of trying to have ‘love’ relationships in this context:

“Some of them [people who secretly have HIV] are our girlfriends [Laughs]... Because many have sex with people just to get money... [and] they get it [HIV] too... It is very dangerous if you love a person” (Uni_Man_FGD12).

More broadly, support was identified as ‘not for us’, with ‘trusted adults’ often being represented as insincere, and this was explored further in the workshops. Most specifically to CSE, young women across demographic groups used the ‘undermining the motive’ semantic barrier to indicate how many

people reject intervention knowledge owing to the disingenuousness of the NGO workers that promote it. Although in one of the workshops this was again connected back to how many NGO workers are themselves constrained by living in poverty:

"I come to a seminar to be educated but then after you [the facilitator] approach me and ask to have unprotected sex so why shouldn't I ignore you... these NGOs and what they teach it's all talk... the community just ignores what these [NGOs] say" (U-P_Woman_FGD2).

"many people go into these NGO jobs, not because they want to change their community, but because life is hard and attending seminars can lead to employment. So many NGO workers don't care about their work, they themselves haven't been changed by the education so how can they change other people?!" (U-P_Man_Workshop1).

The university students described how teachers were actively unsupportive: *"a student might complain that a certain teacher did this [sexual harassment] to me, but who do they report to? [Teachers]. So, the system doesn't allow her to find the solutions to her problems. If anything, it threatens her and only adds to her suffering"* (Uni_Woman_Workshop2). Whilst the urban-poor groups spoke extensively about how poverty constrained parental support and contributed to the exploitation of young women:

"any money that she gets [from NGOs] will go to her family, she will be used by her parents so she will basically end up working for free and what kind of future can come from that?" (U-P_Woman_FGD2).

"these days there are families where even if you are wearing new clothes, they won't ask you, because they know that they didn't buy those clothes... 'ok Mum I'm going out with my guy', 'ok, you just go ahead', and maybe she is out all night but the Mother doesn't worry, if she [the Mother] is given 10,000TSH herself, she just thanks God" (U-P_Woman_FGD3).

In the context of these perceptions of absence of care and support from adults and peers, a number of young people's identifications of 'Sugar Daddies and Mummies' as the safest and most secure sexual partners (owing to their financial stability) was striking, reflecting an absolute non-recognition of the 'culturally relevant' CSE knowledge that has been widely promoted on this topic (e.g. through the 'Fataki' campaign):

“without doubt Stella [after being hurt by a young man not providing for her as promised] will find, or her friends will find, an older person to give her the things that she wants” (Uni_Woman_FGD9).

“Truly us men hate to be asked for money that’s why you see lots of men going out with older women” (U-P_Man_Workshop1).

When asked in the workshops about how young Tanzanians can be supported, the building of trust between genders was the answer across all groups. However questions remained over whether this change was possible for themselves and about how solidarity might be built in the context of poverty:

“having friendships [when we’re young between] boys and girls, like how you do in Europe [Clara], would help a lot. Then.. [in] relationships we will know one another more and not expect one to be the wallet” (U-P_Man_Workshop1).

“we need to get smart; we have to talk.. and know what we need.. find our truth. These people [parents, NGOs, teachers] have captured our minds and we are trapped... we need quick money... and that’s how we are being fooled” (Uni_Man_Workshop3).

4. Concluding Discussion

In this study we have looked at the processes by which different groups of young Tanzanians identify with/against ‘culturally relevant’ CSE knowledge. The analyses highlight how across demographic groups, young Tanzanians align CSE knowledge with privileged [Western] Others, and as ‘not for us’ in the poor ‘Swahili streets’. The devices used in structuring this exclusion differed however, ranging from a complete absence/denial of CSE knowledge, to rejecting it as inappropriate and dangerous, or self-stigmatising for not being able to use it. These positionings of CSE knowledge present the ‘barriers to behaviour change’ quite differently from the interpretations commonly found in the literature on CSE in sub-Saharan Africa. Young people’s processes of Othering CSE are not formed through a centring of local traditions, norms, or values, but rather reflect complex and dynamic constructions of multiple knowledges through shifting identifications with place (e.g. ‘the Swahili streets’), gender, and even a resistance to local norms. The young Tanzanians’ constructions of CSE are similarly layered, formed through amalgamations of knowledges exposed to over the life course, inclusive of ‘ABC’ messaging, and fear- and morality-based approaches. In this concluding discussion we consider the implications of these knowledge-based complexities for the inclusivity of CSE and argue for a rethinking of how both culture and relevance are conceptualised and approached.

Firstly, regarding the need to reconceptualise understandings of culture, we propose that the findings highlight the importance of moving beyond “the assumed ‘natural’ isomorphism of space, nations, and cultures” (Bhatia, 2008, p.301). The young Tanzanians knowledge negotiations illustrate how they inhabit a ‘world of flows’ (Appadurai, 2001), connected to Global Others through objects, images, and discourses, in which NGOs certainly play a role. Yet this transnationality is experienced as inherently unequal by these young Tanzanians and the findings illustrate how ‘CSE’ factors into this: Global Others are imagined as living ‘the good’ CSE life (an understandable distortion, in that if this ‘good life’ is being taught, one might presume that it is being lived somewhere); whilst local Selves are violently mis-/non-recognised (Fanon, 1952/2008), ‘culturally marked’ according to certain practices (e.g. FGM, ‘sugar daddies’ and transactional sex, unequal gendered norms) represented as ‘bad’ and ‘harmful’. The coloniality inherent to these representations of ‘African’ traditions, values, and sexualities, commonly found in global health literatures, has been widely written about (e.g. Chilisa, 2005; Tamale, 2008). One example relevant to the present case, is how the loving aspects of relationships in Africa (clearly demonstrable in songs, poems, and love medicines) were overlooked by colonisers and anthropologists who instead focussed solely on values of kinship and exchange in marriage (Cole and Thomas, 2009); ideas that can be seen to persist today in identifications of transactional sex as a marker of ‘African culture’, and love as a modern phenomenon that can be taught. This coloniality holds implications for both ‘culturally-sensitive’ and ‘culture-centred’ approaches (Dutta, 2007) to CSE design/delivery, as it highlights the need for reparative work. Namely, the importance of *recontextualising* any discussions about culture in CSE against this colonial backdrop, so that the distortions of the us-them polemics (that can be found in both the young Tanzanians’ and CSE constructions of cultures) can be disassembled and reformed.

Understanding cultures within a ‘world of flows’ also holds implications for how ‘relevance’ is conceptualised. It calls for moves beyond identifying relevance as a matter of adapting curriculum content (e.g. incorporating essentialist cultural markers such as behaviours/practices), to implicating cultural relevance as an ongoing and essential aspect of pedagogical practice, that engages with the situated nature of actions, extending to the transnational (Bhatia, 2008). In such a framing, the complexities of *interculturality* are foregrounded, necessitating self-reflexions from curriculum designers and implementors as much as learning about Others (Szlachta and Champion, 2019). This centring of relationalities would also contribute towards anticipating and addressing young people’s ‘discontinuity in experiences’ when interacting with CSE, together with the identity-based and self-esteem issues often related to this (Mejía-Arauz, 2019). The processes of Othering identified in the present study reflect young Tanzanians’ own efforts at maintaining self-esteem in the face of knowledge that sets-up local Selves as different from Global Others, and which violently dehumanises

by failing to acknowledge how endemic poverty coupled with high HIV exposure (not ['traditional'] culture) situate relationship opportunities and practices. Embedded within these knowledge negotiations “we find the practical and symbolic resources developed by [Selves and] communities as they engage in the process of being... [expressing] ways of life and strategies for survival” (Campbell and Jovchelovitch, 2000, p.265), which indicate aspects of culture beyond ‘behaviours/practices’. For example, the slow and uneven societal shifts in opportunities for gendered development are understood through tensions between experiences of fixity and [Western cultural] ideas about [individualised] change/mobility, and discussions on transactional relationships are grounded in questions over how to trust, feel safe, and both receive and provide support in contexts of endemic poverty. In comparison, the provision of content on the dangers of ‘cultural’ gendered norms and ‘sugar daddies / (and importantly also) mummies’, is strikingly inadequate and impractical.

Young people’s negotiations of knowledge pluralities need to be centred in understandings of cultural relevance. Such an approach would incorporate acknowledgements of the difficulties of reconciling historically contentious, violently entangled, and dynamic cultural knowledge forms. It would support questionings of how (and by whom) culturally relevant curricula knowledge is produced (Chilisa, 2005; Roodsaz, 2018), and also highlights the need for evaluations of CSE interventions to expand beyond assessing knowledges as distinct systems (e.g. measurements of [intervention] knowledge, attitudes, and behaviours). The present rethinking of ‘cultural relevance’ aligns with broader calls for CSE to shift away from instructing individuals on ‘right choices’ and ‘responsible behaviours’, and instead support young people to critically analyse the social and material injustices that structure young people's lives (Bay-Cheng, 2017), but also implicates CSE-providing institutions in these unjust structures. Whilst tackling poverty might be beyond the scope of CSE interventions, more can be done to recognise the precarity caused by it, along with the shame and internalisations of inequitable differences that are attached to young Tanzanians’ relationship experiences and interactions with NGOs; all of which threaten to foreclose potentials for dialogue and support in NGO settings.

Funding

This research was undertaken as part of Clare Coultas' PhD research which was funded by a London School of Economics Scholarship. Clare Coultas is now supported by the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR) Applied Research Collaboration South London (NIHR ARC South London) at King's College Hospital NHS Foundation Trust. The views expressed are those of the author[s] and not necessarily those of the NIHR or the Department of Health and Social Care.

Acknowledgements

Colleagues and friends in Tanzania made this research possible: Professors Joseph Lugalla and Richard Sambaiga provided institutional support and mentorship; Sylvia Daulinge, Samwel Ndandala, and Kwame Otiende supported in transcription and translation; and Ludigo Bishota helped with audio-recording. We would also like to thank the anonymous reviewers for their constructive comments, Petra Boynton for her inspiring supervision of the MSc work that led into this study, Peter Aggleton and Alex Gillespie, and colleagues at KCL and LSE. Lastly, a special thank you to the anonymised NGOs and young people who have been so committed in engaging with this research, *pamoja*.

References

- Allen, L. (2018). *Sexuality and Education and New Materialisms: Queer Things*. USA: Palgrave.
- Amer, A. (2019). Between Recognition and Mis/Nonrecognition: Strategies of Negotiating and Performing Identities Among White Muslims in the United Kingdom. *Political Psychology* [online first].
- Appadurai, A. (2001). *Globalization*. USA: Duke University Press.
- Arthi (2012). Representing Mental Illness: A Case of Cognitive Polyphasia. *Papers on Social Representations*, 21:5.1-5.26.
- Bay-Cheng, L.Y. (2017). Critically Sex/Ed: Asking Critical Questions of Neoliberal Truths in Sexuality Education. In L. Allen and M.L. Rasmussen. (Eds), *Handbook of Sexuality Education* (p.343-376). UK:Palgrave.
- Bell, S.A. and Aggleton, P. (2012). Time to Invest in a 'Counterpublic Health' Approach: Promoting Sexual Health Amongst Sexually Active Young People in Rural Uganda. *Children's Geographies*, 10(4):385-397.
- Bhatia, S. (2008). Rethinking Culture and Identity in Psychology: Towards a Transnational Cultural Psychology. *Journal of Theoretical and Philosophical Psychology*, 28(1):301-321.
- Billig, M. (2004). Studying the thinking society: social representations, rhetoric, and attitudes. In G.M. Breakwell and D.V. Canter (Eds), *Empirical approaches to social representations*. Oxford, UK: Clarendon Press.

- Breakwell, G.M. (2010). Resisting Representations and Identity Processes. *Papers on Social Representations*, 19:6.1-6.11.
- Campbell, C. and Jovchelovitch, S. (2000). Health, community and development: towards a social psychology of participation. *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology*, 10(4):255-270.
- Clarke, V., Braun, V. and Wooles, K. (2015). Thou Shalt Not Covet Another Man? Exploring Construction of Same-Sex and Different-Sex Infidelity Using Story Completion. *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology*, 25(2):153-166.
- Chilisa, B. (2005). Educational research within postcolonial Africa: a critique of HIV/AIDS research in Botswana. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 18(6):659-684.
- Cole, J. and Thomas, LM. (2009). *Love in Africa*. USA: University Chicago Press.
- Cornish, F. (2004). Making 'Context' Concrete: A Dialogical Approach to the Society-Health Relation. *Journal of Health Psychology*, 9(2):281-294.
- Coudin, G. (2012). The Breakdown of the Hegemonic Representation of Madness in Africa. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour*, 43(1):23-44.
- Coultas, C. (2017). Sexual Health Promotion in Tanzania: Narratives on Young People's Intimate Relationships. In J. Bennett and S. Tamale (Eds), *Research on Gender and Sexuality in Africa*. Senegal: CODESRIA.
- DfID – UK Department for International Development (2018). East African Regional Analysis of Youth Demographics. The African Institute for Development Policy and University of Southampton. Sourced at: <https://www.gov.uk/dfid-research-outputs/regional-analysis-of-youth-demographics> (Date of Access, 02/04/2020).
- Dutta, MJ. (2007). Communicating about Culture and Health: Theorizing Culture-Centered and Cultural Sensitivity Approaches. *Communication Theory*, 17(3):304-328.
- Duveen, G (2001). Representations, identities, resistance. In K. Deaux and G. Philogène (Eds), *Representations of the Social: Bridging Theoretical Traditions*(p.257–270). Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- EPDC – Education Policy and Data Centre (2014). Tanzania: National Education Profile 2014 Update. Sourced at: https://www.epdc.org/sites/default/files/documents/EPDC%20NEP_Tanzania.pdf (Date of Access 03/06/16).
- Fanon, F. (1952/2008). *Black Skin, White Masks*. UK: Pluto Press.

- Fine, M. (1998). Working the Hyphens: Reinventing Self and Other in Qualitative Research. In N.K. Denzin and Y.S. Lincoln (Eds), *The Landscape of Qualitative Research: Theories and Issues*. UK: SAGE.
- Gillespie, A. (2008). Social Representations, Alternative Representations and Semantic Barriers. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour*, 38(4):375-391.
- Gillespie, A. and Richardson, B. (2011). Exchanging Social Positions: Enhancing Perspective Taking within a Cooperative Problem Solving Task. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 41(5):608-616.
- Gillespie, A., Howarth, C., and Cornish, F. (2012). Four Problems for Researchers Using Social Categories. *Culture and Psychology*, 18(3):391-402.
- Howarth C (2002). Identity in whose eyes? The role of representations in identity construction. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour*, 32(2): 145–162.
- Howarth, C. (2011). Representations, Identity, and Resistance in Communication. In D. Hook, B. Franks and M. Bauer (Eds), *The Social Psychology of Communication*. UK: Palgrave.
- HRW – Human Rights Watch (2020). Tanzania: World Bank Okays Discriminatory Education Loan. Sourced at: <https://www.hrw.org/news/2020/04/02/tanzania-world-bank-okays-discriminatory-education-loan> (Date of Access 29/04/20).
- Hutchings, K. (2013). Choosers or Losers? Feminist Ethical and Political Agency in a Plural and Unequal World. In S. Madhok, A. Phillips, K. Wilson and C. Hemmings (Eds), *Gender, Agency, and Coercion*. UK: Palgrave Macmillan Publishing.
- Iyer, P. and Aggleton, P. (2015). Seventy Years of Sex Education in Health Education Journal: A Critical Review. *Health Education Journal*, 74(1):3-15.
- Jovchelovitch, S. (2007). *Knowledge in Context: Representations, Community, and Culture*. New York, USA: Routledge Publishers.
- Kadianaki, I. (2014). The Transformative Effects of Stigma: Coping Strategies as Meaning-Making Efforts for Immigrants Living in Greece. *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology*, 24:125-138.
- Kaufman, M.R., Tsang, S.W., Mooney, A., McCartney-Melstad, A., Mushi, A.K. and Kamala, B. (2016). 'Protect Your Loved Ones from Fataki': Discouraging Cross-Generational Sex in Tanzania. *Qualitative Health Research*, 26(7):994:1004.
- Kitzinger, C. and Powell, D. (1995). Engendering Infidelity: Essentialist and Social Constructionist Readings of a Story Completion Task. *Feminism & Psychology*, 5(3):345-372.

- Kus, L., Liu, J. and Ward, C. (2013). Relative Deprivation Versus System Justification: Polemical Social Representations and Identity Positioning in a Post-Soviet Society. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 43:423-437.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (1995). Toward a theory of culturally relevant pedagogy. *American Educational Research Journal*, 32(3):465–491.
- Madhok, S., Phillips, A., Wilson, K. & Hemmings, C. (2013). *Gender, Agency, and Coercion*. UK: Palgrave Macmillan Publishing.
- Markova, I. (2003). *Dialogicality and Social Representations: The Dynamics of Mind*. UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Markova, I. (2016). *The Dialogical Mind: Common Sense and Ethics*. UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Markova, I., Linell, P., Grossen, M. and Orvig, A.S. (2007). *Dialogue in Focus Groups: Exploring Socially Shared Knowledge*. UK: Equinox Publishing.
- Mejía-Arauz, R. (2019). Commentary to Part II: Constructing Culturally Responsive Education. In P. Hviid and M. Marsin (Eds), *Culture in Education and Education in Culture*. Switzerland: Springer.
- Mukoro, J. (2017). Sex Education in Nigeria: When Knowledge Conflicts with Cultural Values. *American Journal of Educational Research*, 5(1):69-75.
- Mukoro, J. (2019). The Need for Culturally Sensitive Sexuality Education in a Pluralised Nigeria: But Which Kind? *Sex Education*, 17(5):498-511.
- Ntarangwi, M. (2009). *East African hip hop: Youth culture and globalization*. USA: University of Illinois Press.
- Pon, G. (2009). Cultural Competency as New Racism: An Ontology of Forgetting. *Journal of Progressive Human Services*, 20:59-71.
- Priego-Hernandez, J. (2017). Sexual Health in Transition: A Social Representations Study with Indigenous Mexican Young Women. *Journal of Health Psychology*, 22(5):661-673.
- Renedo, A., Komporozos-Athanasiou, A. and Marston, C. (2018). Experience as Evidence: The Dialogic Construction of Health Professional Knowledge through Patient Involvement. *Sociology*, 52(4):778-795.
- Roodsaz, R. (2018). Probing the Politics of Comprehensive Sexuality Education: ‘Universality’ versus ‘Cultural Sensitivity’: a Dutch-Bangladeshi Collaboration on Adolescent Sexuality Education. *Sex Education*, 18(1):107-121.

Rwebangira, MK. and Liljestrom, R. (1998). *Haraka, Haraka... Look Before You Leap: Youth at the Crossroads of Custom and Modernity*. Stockholm, Sweden: Elanders Gotab.

Schuller, T., Preston, J., Hammond, C., Brassett-Grundy, A. and Bynner, J. (2004). *Benefits of Learning: The Impact of Education on Health, Family Life, and Social Capital*. UK: RoutledgeFalmer and Taylor and Francis.

Szlachta, A. and Champion, J. (2019). Working toward culturally responsive sexuality education: Recommendations for becoming a culturally responsive teacher. *Journal of Prevention & Intervention in the Community*. [Online first].

THIS – Tanzania HIV Impact Survey 2016-17. Sourced at: <https://www.nbs.go.tz/index.php/en/census-surveys/health-statistics/hiv-and-malaria-survey/382-the-tanzania-hiv-impact-survey-2016-2017-this-final-report> (Date of Access: 15/04/20).

Tamale, S. (2011). *African Sexualities: A Reader*. South Africa: Pambazuka Press.

Taylor, J.J. (2007). Assisting or Compromising Intervention? The Concept of 'Culture' in Biomedical and Social Research on HIV/AIDS. *Social Science and Medicine*, 64(4):965-75.

Tuck, E., Yang, K.W., 2014. R-Words: Refusing Research. In: Paris, D., Winn, M.T. (Eds.), *Humanizing Research: Decolonizing Qualitative Inquiry with Youth and Communities*. SAGE Publications, USA, pp. 223–247.

Vanwesenbeeck, I., Flink, I., van Reeuwijk, M. and Westeneng, J. (2019). Not by CSE Alone... Furthering Reflections on International Cooperation in Sex Education. *Sex Education*, 19(3):297-312.

Wamoyi, J., Heise, L., Meiksin, R., Kyegombe, N., Nyato, D. and Buller, AM. (2019). Is Transactional Sex Exploitative? A Social Norms Perspective with Implications for Interventions with Adolescent Girls and Young Women in Tanzania. *PLOS ONE*, 14(4).

World Bank (2015). *Preparing the Next Generation in Tanzania: Challenges and Opportunities in Education*. USA: Washington.

World Bank (2017). Tanzania Country Overview. Sourced at: <http://www.worldbank.org/en/country/tanzania/overview> (Date of Access: 04/05/17).

Table 1: Semantic Barriers/Promoters (based on Gillespie, 2008 and Arthi, 2012)

Device	Function	Explanation	Example
Rigid Opposition	Barrier	Demands total rejection/support.	Capitalism .v. Communism; Good .v. Bad
Prohibited Thoughts	Barrier	Alternate knowledges are dangerous.	'Communism is a danger to society'
Stigma	Barrier	People who ascribe to alternate knowledges are positioned as groups the Self does not want to be a part of.	'Communists are ignorant'
Undermining the Motive	Barrier	Attacks alternate knowledge by questioning the sincerity of those who ascribe to it.	'Communist leaders are greedy conmen'
Bracketing	Barrier	Alternate knowledges are held as unrealistic / set apart from reality	'Communism could never work'
Separation	Barrier / Promoter	Alternate knowledges are represented as different but not in competition to core knowledge.	'Communism is just one of many steps in socio-political evolution'

Table 2: Focus Group and Workshop Stratifications

Urban-Poor Youth						
Young Women (U-P_Women)			Young Men (U-P_Men)			Mixed Gender Workshop 1
FGD1	FGD2	FGD3	FGD4	FGD5	FGD6	
4 people 18-24 yrs 1 x PE	4 people 19-26 yrs	5 people 18-29 yrs	4 people 23-29 yrs	4 people 24-28 yrs 1 x PE	4 people 22-29 yrs	4 women / 6 men 19-29 yrs 1 x Male PE
TOTAL: 13			TOTAL: 12			TOTAL: 10
University Students						
Young Women (Uni_Women)			Young Men (Uni_Men)			Workshop 2
FGD7	FGD8	FGD9	FGD10	FGD11	FGD12	
3 people 22-25 yrs	4 people 20-24 yrs	4 people 19-25 yrs	4 people 3x22-28yrs 1x34yrs	4 people 22-25 yrs	4 people 3x24-29yrs 1x30yrs	4 women / 3 men 22-25 yrs (All PEs)
2 x PEs	1 x PE	1 x PE		3 x PEs		Workshop 3 4 women / 6 men 19-30 yrs
TOTAL: 11			TOTAL: 12			TOTAL: 17

Table 3 –Semantic Barriers/Promoters used in Negotiation CSE Knowledges

Differences	'Self'	Device	'Other/Alt. Rep'	Description
The 'Swahili Streets' Against CSE	Uni. Students excl. 1 <i>1 x Uni. Peer Ed.</i>	Bracketing <i>Stigmatise</i>	CSE knowledge Peers	It is unrealistic in the Swahili lived context <i>Those who do not 'choose' the CSE 'good life'</i>
	Urban-Poor Youth	Self-Stigma Stigmatise	CSE 'good life' Peers(/CSE)	It's not for us (<i>by some youth: 'it's for Europeans'</i>) Those who try to use CSE knowledge in poverty
Ideas about Change and Gendered Development	All Groups	Rigid Opp.	NGO-based Change	Desires viewed as fixed after sex making CSE interventions 'useless'
	Urban-Poor Youth / 'Swahili Streets'	Rigid Opp.	Schools	Schools are apart/different from 'these streets' where marriage is the desired change/future
	U-P Young Men	Self-Stigma	Social Mobility/Education	It's 'not for us'
	U-P Young Women	Stigma	Women Peers	Those who do not marry young
	<i>Some U-P Youth</i>	<i>Separation</i>	<i>NGO-based Change</i>	<i>Change might be possible if a person left 'the Swahili streets'</i>
	<i>Some Uni. Y.Men</i>	<i>Stigmatise</i>	<i>Peers(/marriage norms)</i>	<i>Those who aspire to marriage / provider role.</i>
	All Young Men (status via sex)	Rigid Opp./ Self-Stigma	Development & Status via Marriage	Good .v. Bad – the Self's status through sex outside-of-marriage is morally bad and 'fixed'
	Uni. Young Women	Prohibited thoughts	Change/Development via Education	Dangerous to aspire for development other than meeting a 'good man'
	All Young Women	Prohibited thoughts	Change/Dev via Sexual Relations	Changes in appearance can lead to social exclusion.
Trust and Support in Relationships	All Groups	Prohibited Thoughts & Self-Stigma	CSE Knowledge / Love and Trust in Relationships	It's 'not for us' and is dangerous in the Swahili streets / poverty (<i>some U-P men: 'it's for Europeans'</i>)

	All Groups <i>Some Young People</i>	Undermine Motive <i>Absolute Non-Recognition</i>	'Trusted adults' <i>CSE Knowledge on Sugar Daddies/Mummies</i>	Support from parents, teachers, and NGO workers is insincere / untrustworthy <i>Sugar Daddies/Mummies are the 'safest' sexual partners</i>
--	--	---	---	---

Appendix: Stem Stories, Prompt Questions, and Notes on Design and Adaptation

Introductory Guidance to Participants

The study was introduced to participants as looking to understand more about how young people experience intimate and sexual relationships and relate with NGOs that are trying to support young Tanzanians. Participants were told that rather than talking through questions and answers as they might be used to doing, that we would create a story together about a person called Bahati/Rehema/Stella/Juma who lives in the same area / goes to the same university. In making this story, participants were told that we would ask some questions about how Bahati/Rehema/Stella/Juma might feel, think, act, but that they were free to also ask questions or add information that they think is relevant. The facilitators were trained in how to support and facilitate different viewpoints being expressed, as the participants were also told that it's highly likely that they might not agree about how Bahati/Rehema/Stella/Juma might feel, think, and act, and that there was no right answer.

Notes on Design and Adaptation

The stem stories were based on narrative interviews undertaken with each of the four groups (i.e. urban-poor young women; urban-poor young men; young women university students, young men university students), that looked broadly at relationships, love, and marriage and children through both open-ended questions and more open/standardised story-completion tasks (e.g. Prisca/Benja told a boy/girl that they loved them yesterday. Can you make up a story about what you think the situation was like for Prisca/Benja to say this, and how they feel, what happens?). In that we were looking to see the different knowledge forms that young people draw on in making sense of relationship opportunities and difficulties, rather than collect further stories on how young peoples' relationships are like, our focus in designing the stem stories was centred on ensuring that they hold verisimilitude, and that they present a problem or an aspect of complexity (as identified in the narrative interviews) in which multiple viewpoints might be ascertained for how to address this. Specifically, this meant that:

- The starting stem story – ‘the protagonist before the relationship’ – was unique to each group. For instance, from the narrative interviews we found that young siblings were an important factor in how urban-poor young people viewed their life opportunities and responsibilities, and that for the urban-poor young men, their relationships with ‘housegirls’ were complex. With the university students we found that for young women, staying in hostels held the most complexity/life dilemmas, whereas for the young men, this was experienced more when staying at home whilst studying.
- Similarly, the ways in which each protagonist ‘meets a person of attraction’ (stem story 2) is different, based on the narrative interviews (e.g. on a bus, in the market, in the canteen, in a corridor), although in all but one group (excepting the young men at university), the conversations start the same way – with someone saying ‘I love you’ to the young woman. This was because saying ‘I love you / *nakupenda*’ as a ‘chat-up’ line was a surprisingly common feature in the narrative interviews of these three groups, and we wanted to understand more about this. In three FGDs, participants challenged this aspect of the ‘stem’ story, in two cases (both in urban-poor young men FGDs) refusing that a young man would approach a young woman saying ‘nakupenda’ (‘I love you’), and that only an old man or a young man who ‘didn’t know what he was doing’ would use this pick-up line. Whilst in the third case (in one of the university women FGDs), it was decided that only a teacher or older man would use this language. Considering that the narrative interviews were undertaken in 2010, and the FGDs in 2014, it’s possible that the culture of young men approaching young women had changed during this period, or was still at that moment changing, in that other groups saw it as normal, even in one FGD making urban-poor young men burst out laughing at how ‘realistic’ this ‘nakupenda’ detail made the ‘stem’ story.

Also we would like to add that we recognise the hetero- and gender-normativity of these stem stories. This would be a problem if we were looking to find out about what youth relationships are like. However, because the analytical focus of this project was to look at the knowledges that young people draw on in making sense of the five different stages / ‘stem stories’ of a relationship, and the need for verisimilitude in this, we were limited by the stories that we collected through the narrative interviews. For instance, no stories of homosexuality were collected, and only one account of a young woman approaching a man was told in the narrative interviews, but this was unique in that she had known the young man for over ten years, having been in school together.

- ‘Relationship difficulties’ (stem story 4) were different. For the young women, this always revolved around needing money, but the young women at university also had the added stress of failing their courses. Whilst for the young men, the pressures of ‘provider role’ expectations were the most common cause.
- And lastly, the third stem story – meeting the person on a date – is different for young women at university, in that coercion is involved. This was because in all of the narrative interviews with young women at university, coercion from both young male peers and older men and teachers was prominent, and therefore we considered it important to include. As it happens, coercion also came-up naturally in the FGDs with urban-poor young women, despite it not being in the stem story.

Stem Stories for Each Group in English

	STEM STORY SECTIONS				
	1. Protagonist before a relationship	2. Meeting a person of attraction	3. Meeting the person on a date	4. Relationship difficulties	5. Going to a CSE seminar
Urban-Poor Young Men	Bahati is 17 years old. He lives in --- with his mother who works as a cleaner in a guest house, his two	One day Bahati takes a ride on the daladala bus to go into town to see his uncle’s friend who might have	Before the girl gets off the bus she gives Bahati her phone number and her name- Pendo. He doesn’t have any money on his phone so	Some time passes and Bahati tries to see Pendo whenever he has money.	In the community there is a local youth centre run by an NGO and he decides to go. - Why do you think Bahati decides to go?

	<p>younger siblings who both go to primary school and a young girl relative from the village who helps at home with all the housework and cooking. Bahati no longer goes to school.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Why is this? - How do you think Bahati feels about his life? - What do you think other people think about Bahati not being in school? - What do you think his relationship is like with the housegirl? - What do you think Bahati wants for his future? 	<p>some work for him to do. He sees a pretty girl sitting by herself and he sits down next to her. He tells her that he loves her and she just turns her head away.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - What do you think this girl is thinking/feeling? - What happens next? - What kind of a relationship do you think Bahati is looking for with this girl? - What kind of relationship do you think this girl wants? 	<p>calls her from his friend's phone a few times and when he finally gets some money from somewhere he calls and asks her to meet him.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - What do you think happens on this date (where do they meet / what do they do?) - What kind of physical contact do they have? - What about sex? (e.g. do they have it, how does it start, what does Bahati like and not like about it, how do you think Pendo is feeling, do they use a condom, how does it finish?) - Where did Bahati learn about how to have sex? - How does the date end? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - How do you think Bahati feels about his relationship with Pendo? - How do you think Pendo feels about their relationship? - What do you think Bahati's friends are saying to him about his relationship? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - What do you think happens at the youth centre? - How do you think Bahati feels about being there? - What would the NGO say about how young people should act in their relationships? - How do you think it makes Bahati feel to hear about this? - What do you think makes it difficult for Bahati to have a relationship like how the NGO describes? - What do you think can help Bahati to have a relationship like how the NGO describes? <p>How do you think the story of Bahati and Pendo ends?</p>
Urban-Poor Young Women	<p>Rehema is 17 years old. She lives in --- with her parents and two younger siblings who both go to primary school. Rehema doesn't go to school.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Why is this? - How do you think Rehema feels about her life? - What do you think other people think about Rehema not being in school? - What do you think Rehema wants for her future? 	<p>One day when Rehema is walking to the market to buy some vegetables she hears a voice behind her say "I love you beautiful".</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Who do you think said this to Rehema? - What does she do? - What kind of relationship do you think this man called Simon is looking for with Rehema? - What kind of relationship is Rehema looking for? - What does Simon have to do to get Rehema to be interested in him? - How does Rehema show that she's interested in Simon? 	<p>So when Simon and Rehema next meet:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Where do they meet and what do they do? - What kind of physical contact do they have? - What about sex? (e.g. do they have it, how does it start, what does Rehema like and not like about it, do they use a condom, how does it finish?) - Where did Rehema learn about how to have sex? - What do you think Simon thinks/feels about Rehema? - How does the date end? 	<p>Some time passes and Rehema needs money to buy sanitary pads but whenever she calls Simon he says that he loves her but that he's too busy to meet her.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - What do you think Rehema thinks about this? - What does Rehema do to get the money for the sanitary pads? - What does Rehema do when other men are interested in her? - What do you think Rehema's friends are saying to her about her relationship with Simon? 	<p>In the community there is a local youth centre run by an NGO and she decides to go.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Why do you think Rehema decides to go? - What do you think happens at the youth centre? - How do you think Rehema feels about being there? - What would the NGO say about how young people should act in their relationships? - How do you think it makes Rehema feel to hear about this? - What do you think makes it difficult for Rehema to have a relationship like how the NGO describes? - What do you think can help Rehema to have a relationship like how the NGO describes? <p>How do you think the story of Rehema and Simon ends?</p>

Young Women at University	<p>Stella is 22 years old and is about to go into her second year of university, studying in ---. She receives a government loan for studying and because her family stays in --- she stays in the university hostels during term time.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - How do you think Stella feels about her life when she is at home? - How do you think Stella feels about her life when she is at university? - What is her life like staying in the hostels? - What do you think Stella wants for her future? 	<p>One day when Stella is walking through the university corridors she hears a voice behind her say "I love you beautiful".</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Who do you think said this to Stella? - What does she do? - What kind of relationship do you think this man called Simon is looking for with Stella? - What kind of a relationship is Stella looking for? - What does Simon have to do to get Stella to be interested in him? - How does Stella show that she's interested in Simon? 	<p>Simon invites Stella to come meet some of his friends but when they arrive at the house nobody else is there:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - How do you think Stella feels? - What do you think happens next? - What kind of physical contact do they have? - What about sex? (e.g. do they have it, how does it start, what does Stella like and not like about it, do they use a condom, how does it finish?) - Where did Stella learn about how to have sex? - What do you think Simon thinks/feels about Stella? - How does the date end? 	<p>The end of term approaches and Stella is very stressed out. She is failing most of her courses and her loan money has run out and when she calls Simon he says that he loves her but that he's busy and can't come see her.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - What do you think Stella's friends advise her to do? - What do you think Stella ends up doing and why? - What do you think people in the university say about Stella being in this situation? - What does Simon say? 	<p>Stella hears about a seminar in the university run by an NGO and decides to go.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Why do you think Stella decides to go? - What do you think the NGO says about how young people should act in their relationships? - Knowing how Stella's relationship is, how do you think it makes Stella feel to hear about this? - What do you think makes it difficult for Stella to have a relationship like how the NGO describes? - What do you think can help Stella to have a relationship like how the NGO describes? <p>How do you think this story about Stella and Simon's relationship ends?</p>
Young Man at University	<p>Juma is 22 years old and is about to go into his second year of university, studying in ---. He receives a loan from the government for studying and stays with his family in ---.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - How do you think Juma feels about his life? - What do you think Juma's life is like at university? - What do you think Juma wants for his future? 	<p>There is a pretty girl called Pendo that Juma sees in the lunchroom every day.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - How does Juma start talking to this girl? - What do you think this girl thinks about Juma? - What does Juma have to do to get this girl to meet him outside of university? - What kind of a relationship do you think Juma is looking for with this girl? - What kind of relationship do you think this Pendo wants? 	<p>When they meet...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - What do you think happens? (e.g. where do they meet, what do they do?) - What kind of physical contact do they have? - What about sex? (e.g. do they have it, how does it start, what does Juma like and not like about it, how do you think Pendo is feeling, do they use a condom, how does it finish?) - Where did Juma learn about how to have sex? - How does the date end? 	<p>Some time passes and Juma tries to see Pendo when he can. But she is having a very difficult time: she is failing her courses and her loan money has run out.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - How do you think Juma feels about his relationship with Pendo? - How do you think Pendo feels about their relationship? - What do you think Juma's friends are saying to him about his relationship? 	<p>Juma hears about a seminar in the university run by an NGO and decides to go.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Why do you think Juma decides to go? - What do you think the NGO says about how young people should act in their relationships? - Knowing how Juma's relationship is, how do you think it makes Juma feel to hear about this? - What do you think makes it difficult for Juma to have a relationship like how the NGO describes? - What do you think can help Juma to have a relationship like how the NGO describes? <p>How do you think this story about Juma and Pendo's relationship ends?</p>

Stem Stories for Each Group in Swahili

STEM STORY SECTIONS					
	1. Protagonist before a relationship	2. Meeting a person of attraction	3. Meeting the person on a date	4. Relationship difficulties	5. Going to a CSE seminar
Urban-Poor Young Men	<p>Bahati ni mvulana wa miaka 17 na anaishi maeneo ya Temeke jijini Dar es Salaam pamoja na mama yake ambaye anafanya kazi ya usafi katika nyumba ya kulala wageni, wadogo zake wawili ambao wote ni wanafunzi wa shule ya msingi na msichana wa kutoka kijijini kwao ambaye hufanya shughuli za ndani. Bahati amecha kwenda shule.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Kwanini hali hii? - Je unafikiri Bahati anawaza nini kuhusu maisha yake? - Unafikiri watu wengine wanafikiri kuona Bahati haendi shuleni? - Unafikiri unafikiri kuna aina gani ya mahusiano kati ya bahati na msichana wa kazi? - Unafikiri Bahati anafikiri nini kwa maisha yake baadaye? 	<p>Siku moja bahati alipanda daladala na kuelekea mjini kukutana na rafiki wa mjomba wake ambaye angeweza kumtafutia kazi bahati. Ndani ya daladala alimuona msichana mrembo aliekuwa amekaa peke yake hivyo akaamua kukaa karibu nae. Alimwambia kuwa anampenda lakini yule msichana aligeuza kichwa na kuangalia upande mwingine.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Unafikiri huyu msichana anafikiri/anawaza nini? - Nini kinatokea? - Je ni aina gani ya mahusiano unafikiri Bahati anatafuta kwa huyu msichana? - Je ni aina gani ya mahusiano unafikiri huyu msichana anataka? 	<p>Kabla yule msichana hajashuka kwenye daladala alimpatia Bahati namba ya simu na jina lake pia-Pendo. Bahati hakuwa na hela kwa simu yake hivyo alimpigia kutumia simu ya rafiki yake na alipofanikiwa kupata pesa aliweza kumpigia kwa simu yake na kumuomba wakutane.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Unafikiri nini kinatokea siku wanao kutana? (mfano: wapi wanakutana, nini wanafanya?) - Aina gani ya mahusiano ya kimwili walionayo? - Vipi kuhusu ngono? (mfano: je wanafanya ngono, wanaanzaje, Bahati anapenda na hapendi nini ya ngono, unafikiri Pendo anafikiri nini, wanatumia kinga, wanamalizaje?) - Ni wapi Bahati alijifunza kuhusu kufanya ngono? - Wanaagana vipi baada ya kumaliza kuwa pamoja? 	<p>Muda kidogo ulipita na Bahati alikuwa akikutana na Pendo wakati akiwa na pesa.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Je unafikiri Bahati anafikiri nini kuhusu mahusiano yake na Pendo? - Je unafikiri Pendo anafikiri nini kuhusu mahusiano yao? - Je, unafikiri rafiki zake Bahati wanamwambia nini kuhusu mahusiano yake na Pendo? 	<p>Katika jamii kuna kituo cha vijana kinachosimamiwa na ngo na anaamua kuenda.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Je, unafikiri kwa nini Bahati amekubali kwenda kituoni hapo? - Je unafikiri nini ilitokea kituoni hapo? - Je unafikiri Bahati anasikiaje kuwa pale? - Je, unafikiri shirika hili lisilo la kiserikali [ngo] litasema/kushauri nini kwa vijana kuhusiana na nini wanatakiwa kufanya kwenye mahusiano yao ya kimapenzi? - Je, unafikiri Bahati anawaza nini kuhusu alichokisikia? - Unafikiri ni mambo gani yanasababisha Bahati kutokuwa na aina ya mahusiano ambayo ngo inazungumzia/kushauri? - Unafikiri ni vitu gani vinaweza kumsaidia Bahati kutokuwa na aina ya mahusiano ambayo NGO inazungumzia/kushauri? <p>Unafikiri hadithi hii inayo husu mahusiano ya Bahati na pendo iliishaje?</p>
Urban-Poor Young Women	<p>Rehema ni msichana wa miaka 17. Anaishi Temeke Dar es Salaam na wazazi wake pamoja na wadogo zake wawili ambao ni wanafunzi wa shule ya</p>	<p>Siku moja Rehema alikuwa akitembea kuelekea sokoni alisikia sauti ikikisika kutoka nyuma yake ikisema "mrembo nakupenda".</p>	<p>Rehema na Simon wanapokutana tena:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Wanakutania wapi na wanafanya nini? - Ni aina gani ya mahusiano ya kimwili walio kuwa nayo? 	<p>Muda ukapita Rehema akawa anahitaji pesa kununua mahitaji ya kike lakini kila akimpigia simu Simon alikuwa akisema anampenda lakini</p>	<p>Katika jamii kuna kituo cha vijana kinacho simamiwa na ngo na anaamua kuenda.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Kwanini unafikiri Rehema ameamua kwenda? - Unafikiri ni nini kimetokea kituoni hapo? - Je unafikiri Rehema anasikiaje kuwa pale?

	<p>msingi. Rehema haendi shule.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Kwanini hali hii? - Je unafikiri Rehema anawaza nini kuhusu maisha yake? - Unafikiri watu wengine wanafikiri kuona Rehema haendi shuleni? - Unafikiri Rehema anafikiri nini kwa maisha yake baadaye? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Je, unafikiri ni nani aliyesema maneno haya kwa Rehema? - Anafanya nini? - Unafiiri ni aina gani ya mahusiano huyu mtu anaitwa Simon anataka kwa Rehema? - Ni aina gani ya mahusiano Rehema anatafuta? - Je Simon anatakiwa kufanya nini ili kumshawishi Rehema amkubali? - Rehema anamwonyeshaje Simon kwamba anamkubali? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Je vipi kuhusu ngono? (mfano: wanafanya ngono, wanaanzaje, Rehema anapenda na hapendi nini ya ngono, wanatumia kinga, na wanamalizaje?) - Ni wapi Rehema alijifunza kuhusu kufanya ngono? - Je unafikiri Simon anafikiri kuhusu Rehema? - Wanaagana vipi baada ya kumaliza kuwa pamoja? 	<p>ametingwa na kazi kwa hiyo hawezi kuonana na rehema.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Unafikiri Rehema anawaza nini kuhusu suala hili? - Rehema anafanyaje ili kupata pesa ya kununulia mahitaji yake? - Rehema anafanyaje wanaume wengine wanapomtongoza? - Unafikiri rafiki wa Rehema wanamwambiaje Rehema kuhusu mahusiano yake na Simon? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Je, unafikiri shirika hili lisilo la kiserikali [ngo] litasema/kushauri nini kwa vijana kuhusiana na nini wanatakiwa kufanya kwenye mahusiano yao ya kimapenzi? - Je, unafikiri Rehema anawaza nini kuhusu alichosikia kituoni hapo? - Unafikiri ni mambo gani yanasababisha Rehema kutokuwa na aina ya mahusiano ambayo ngo inazungumzia/kushauri? - Unafikiri ni vitu gani vinaweza kumsaidia Rehema kutokuwa na aina ya mahusiano ambayo NGO inazungumzia/kushauri? <p>Je, unafikiri hadithi hii inayo husu mahusiano ya Rehema na Simon iliishaje?</p>
Young Women at University	<p>Stella ni msichana wa miaka 22 na anaingia mwaka wa pili chuoni hapa ---. Anpokea mkopo toka serikali kwa kusoma chuoni na kwa sababu familia yake wapo ---- anakaa hosteli.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Je unafikiri Stella anafikiri nini kuhusu maisha yake anapokaa nyumbani? - Je, unafikiri Stella anafikiri nini kuhusu maisha yake anapokaa university? - Maisha yake yanakuwaje kwenye hosteli? - Unafikiri Stella anafikiri nini kwa maisha yake baadaye? 	<p>Siku moja Stella alikuwa akitembea kuelekea sokoni alisikia sauti ikikisika kutoka nyuma yake ikisema "mrembo nakupenda".</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Je, unafikiri ni nani aliyesema maneno haya kwa Stella? - Anafanya nini? - Unafikiri ni aina gani ya mahusiano huyu mtu anaitwa Simon anataka kwa Stella? - Ni aina gani ya mahusiano Stella anatafuta? - Je Simon anatakiwa kufanya nini ili kumshawishi Stella amkubali? - Stella anamwonyeshaje Simon kwamba anamkubali? 	<p>Simon anaalika Stella kukutana marafiki zake lakini wanapofika nyumbani anaona hakuna mtu:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Je, unafikiri Stella anajisikiaje? - Unafikiri nini kinatokea? - Ni aina gani ya mahusiano ya kimwili walio kuwa nayo? - Je vipi kuhusu ngono? (mfano: wanafanya ngono, wanaanzaje, Stella anapenda na hapendi nini ya ngono, wanatumia kinga, na wanamalizaje?) - Ni wapi Stella alijifunza kuhusu kufanya ngono? - Je unafikiri Simon anafikiri kuhusu Rehema? - Wanaagana vipi baada ya kumaliza kuwa pamoja? 	<p>Kipindi kinakaribia kumaliza na Stella ana mawazo sana. Ana supplementary kwenye masomo na boom yake imekwisha. Kila mara anampigia Simon anasema anampenda lakini ametingwa na hana mda kumwona kwa sasa.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Unafikiri marafiki ya Stella wanamshauri afanye nini? - Unafikiri Stella kwa mwisho anafanyaje na kwa nini? - Unafikiri wengine chuoni wanasema nini kuhusu Stella kuwa kwenye hali hii? - Simon anasemaje? 	<p>Stella anasikia kuhusu semina kinachosimamiwa na ngo na anaamua kwenda.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Kwanini unafikiri Stella ameamua kwenda? - Je unafikiri shirika hili lisilo la kiserikali [ngo] litasema/kushauri nini kwa vijana kuhusiana na nini wanatakiwa kufanya kwenye mahusiano yao ya kimapenzi? - Je unafikiri Stella anawaza nini kuhusu alichosikia kituoni hapo? - Unafikiri ni mambo gani yanasababisha Stella kutokuwa na aina ya mahusiano ambayo ngo inazungumzia/kushauri? - Unafikiri ni vitu gani vinaweza kumsaidia Stella kutokuwa na aina ya mahusiano ambayo NGO inazungumzia/kushauri? <p>Je, unafikiri hadithi hii inayo husu mahusiano ya Stella na Simon iliishaje?</p>

<p>Young Man at University</p>	<p>Juma ni mvulana wa miaka 22 na anaingia mwaka wa pili chuoni hapa ---. Anpokea mkopo toka serikali kwa kusoma chuoni na anakaa pamoja na familia yake ---.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Je unafikiri Juma anafikiria nini kuhusu maisha yake? - Je, unafikiri maisha ya Juma chuoni yanakuwaje? - Unafikiri Juma anafikiria nini kwa maisha yake baadaye? 	<p>Juma anamwona msichana mrembo mmoja, anaitwa Pendo, kwenye canteen kila siku.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Juma anaanzaje kuongea na huyu msichana, anaitwa Pendo? - Unafikiri huyu msichana anafikiri nini kuhusu Juma? - Juma anahitaji kufanya nini kumshiwishi huyu msichana kumkutana nje ya chuo? - Je ni aina gani ya mahusiano unafikiri Juma anatafuta kwa huyu msichana? - Je ni aina gani ya mahusiano unafikiri Pendo anataka? 	<p>Wanapokutana...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Unafikiri nini kinatokea? (mfano: wapi wanakutana, nini wanafanya?) - Aina gani ya mahusiano ya kimwili walionayo? - Vipi kuhusu ngono? (mfano: je wanafanya ngono, wanaanzaje, unafikiri Pendo anasikiaje wanapofanya ngono, wanatumia kinga, wanamalizaje?) - Ni wapi Juma alijifunza kuhusu kufanya ngono? - Wanaagana vipi baada ya kumaliza kuwa pamoja? 	<p>Muda kidogo unapita na Juma alikuwa akikutana na Pendo anapoweza. Lakini maisha yake ni magumu sana kwa sasa. Ana supplementary kwenye masomo na boom yake imekwisha.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Je, unafikiri Juma anafikiria nini kuhusu mahusiano yake na Pendo? - Je unafikiri Pendo anafikiria nini kuhusu mahusiano yao? - Je unafikiri rafiki zake Juma wanasema nini kuhusu mahusiano yake na Pendo? 	<p>Juma anasikia kuhusu semina kinachosimamiwa na ngo na anaamua kwenda.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Kwanini unafikiri Juma ameamua kwenda? - Je unafikiri shirika hili lisilo la kiserikali [ngo] litasema/kushauri nini kwa vijana kuhusiana na nini wanatakiwa kufanya kwenye mahusiano yao ya kimapenzi? - Je, unafikiri Juma anawaza nini kuhusu alichokisia kituoni hapo? - Unafikiri ni mambo gani yanasababisha Juma kutokuwa na aina ya mahusiano ambayo ngo inazungumzia/kushauri? - Unafikiri ni vitu gani vinaweza kumsaidia Juma kutokuwa na aina ya mahusiano ambayo NGO inazungumzia/kushauri? <p>Unafikiri hadithi hii inayo husu mahusiano ya Juma na Pendo iliishaje?</p>
---------------------------------------	---	--	--	--	---