



WORKING PAPER SEPTEMBER 2022

**IMPLEMENTING POLICY AGAINST SEXTORTION
IN TANZANIA: A FOLLOW-UP STUDY**

Åsa Eldén and Elin Bjarnegård

Implementing Policy Against Sextortion in Tanzania: A Follow-Up Study

Åsa Eldén
Elin Bjarnegård

Working Paper, September 2022

to

The Expert Group for Aid Studies (EBA)

The EBA Working Paper Series constitutes shorter overviews, surveys, mappings and analyses that have been undertaken to bring about discussion and advance knowledge of a particular topic. Working Papers are not subject to any formal approval process by the Expert Group. Just as in the EBA reports, authors are solely responsible for the content, conclusions and recommendations.

Please refer to the present report as: Eldén, Åsa and Elin Bjarnegård, *Implementing Policy Against Sextortion in Tanzania: A Follow-Up Study*, Working Paper, September 2022.
The Expert Group for Aid Studies (EBA), Sweden.

This report can be downloaded free of charge at www.eba.se

Cover design by Julia Demchenko

Åsa Eldén holds a PhD in sociology and is a researcher at the Department of Government, Uppsala University and an independent consultant and researcher collaborating with agencies and civil society organizations in Sweden, Turkey and internationally. Her work focuses on gender-based violence, honour violence, media, the women's movement, gender equality in development, the shrinking democratic space and sextortion. She is co-author of two EBA reports: *Swedish Aid in the Era of Shrinking Space – The Case of Turkey* (2018) and *Sextortion: Corruption and Gender-Based Violence* (2020) and is currently a researcher in a project on sexual corruption and sextortion in Tanzania, headed by Elin Bjarnegård.

Elin Bjarnegård is Associate Professor of Political Science and Senior Lecturer in Development Studies at the Department of Government, Uppsala University. Her research interests are at the intersection of comparative politics and gender studies. Her publications have appeared in journals such as *American Political Science Review*, *Journal of Democracy* and *Journal of Peace Research*. She is the author of the book *Gender, Informal Institutions and Political Recruitment* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2013) and editor of the forthcoming book *Gender and Violence against Political Actors* (Temple University Press, 2023). She is co-author of the EBA report *Sextortion: Corruption and Gender-Based Violence* (2020) and is leading a Swedish Research Council project on sexual corruption and sextortion in Tanzania.

Acknowledgements

Our warmest thanks go to Karibu Tanzania Organization (KTO) for a collaboration of true mutual learning, and to our respondents who generously shared their knowledge and experiences of working with policy against sextortion. We also want to thank our colleagues Dolores Calvo and Silje Lundgren for excellent comments and never-ending discussions that always give new insights (and dilemmas!), and Helena Hede Skagerlind and Sara Johansson de Silva at EBA for careful readings, creative and constructive feedback and for support throughout the process.

Table of Contents

Foreword by EBA	1
Sammanfattning	2
Summary	5
Introduction	8
Part 1: The study.....	10
Context	10
Aim.....	12
Material and method.....	13
Sextortion: corruption and gender-based violence.....	14
Part 2: Developing, introducing and implementing sextortion policy.....	17
Developing and introducing policy against sextortion: KTO and the PCCB	18
First steps of implementing policy against sextortion: principals and teachers	29
Part 3: Conclusions and recommendations	43
Conclusions.....	43
Recommendations.....	45
References.....	47
Appendix	49

Foreword by EBA

In 2020, EBA published the report “Sextortion: Corruption and Gender-Based Violence” (2020:06), which developed the definition of sextortion, summarized existing knowledge, and presented case studies of sextortion in Tanzania and Colombia. Since then, the recognition of the prevalence of sextortion – the abuse of power and position in exchange for sex – as well as of the need to address it in and through development cooperation have increased. Yet, knowledge of how to adequately link agendas on anti-corruption and gender-based violence, increase awareness, and promote and successfully implement sextortion policy remains limited.

Against this background, EBA decided to publish this working paper, written by Åsa Eldén and Elin Bjarnegård, which follows up the implementation of recent policy against sextortion in Tanzania. Tanzania is one of few countries where the concept of sextortion is well-known and sexual corruption is criminalized. Through a case study of the work of one of Sida’s partner organizations, Karibu Tanzania Organization (KTO), and its collaboration with state authorities to combat sextortion in Tanzanian folk development colleges, the working paper contributes with new insights regarding sextortion policy implementation. Importantly, it highlights challenges with regard to reporting and allocation of responsibility and provides recommendations to organizations working against sextortion.

The EBA Working Paper Series constitutes shorter overviews, surveys, mappings, and analyses that have been undertaken to bring about discussion and advance knowledge of a particular topic. Working Papers are not subject to any formal approval process by the Expert Group. Just as in the EBA reports, authors are solely responsible for the content, conclusions, and recommendations.

Stockholm, September 2022

Jan Pettersson, Managing Director

Sammanfattning

Sextortion sker när en person missbrukar sin maktposition för att tvinga till sig en sexuell tjänst i utbyte mot en tjänst eller förmån som hen har möjlighet att bevilja eller undanhålla i kraft av sin position (Eldén et al. 2020). En lärare gör sig exempelvis skyldig till sextortion om han ber en elev att utföra en sexuell handling i utbyte mot betyg, eller om han ger en elev godkänt i en examination bara om hon har sex med honom. Under de senaste åren har sextortion rönt stigande uppmärksamhet i forskning och i policydiskussioner inom utvecklings-samarbete. Samtidigt är den empiriska kunskapen fortfarande knapp.

År 2020 publicerade Expertgruppen för biståndsanalys rapporten *Sextortion: Corruption and Gender-Based Violence* (Eldén et al 2020). Denna rapport utvecklade en definition av sextortion som delvis byggde på en fallstudie i Tanzania. Tanzania är ett av få länder där sextortion – eller på swahili *rushwa ya ngono*, ordagrant sexuell korruption – formellt och juridiskt erkänns som ett samhällsproblem.

Denna uppföljningsstudie, som genomförts av två av de fem författarna till EBA-rapporten från 2020, söker bidra till en ökad förståelse för implementering av policy mot sextortion. Detta genom en fallstudie av en av Sidas partnerorganisationer – Karibu Tanzania Organization (KTO) – som är en paraplyorganisation för statliga folkhögskolor. KTO har använt den definition som utvecklades i EBA-rapporten från 2020 i utformandet av egna interna riktlinjer i arbetet mot sextortion. Uppföljningsstudien följer KTO:s arbete med att omsätta definitionen i praktiken: först genom att i samarbete med statliga myndigheter formulera sina egna skriftliga riktlinjer, sedan genom att implementera dessa riktlinjer i skolorna.

Studien visar att KTO:s ansträngningar för att rikta strålkastarljuset mot sextortion har burit frukt. Det finns en gemensam förståelse för vad sextortion är och hur det är kopplat till andra former av korruption och av sexuella trakasserier och övergrepp. En specifik policy mot sextortion anses viktig inte bara för ett erkännande av fenomenet, utan också för möjligheten att agera eftersom det banar väg för konkreta åtgärder, rapporteringsmekanismer och strategier för att öka medvetenheten om sextortion.

KTO:s implementeringsprocess visar i praktiken en medvetenhet om vikten av tydliga och trygga rapporteringsmekanismer nära eleverna, och av att länka samman olika nivåer när fall av sextortion hanteras. Fokus i

KTO:s och folkhögskolornas arbete mot sextortion ligger på förebyggande och medvetandehöjande insatser, och informationen och kommunikationen riktar sig främst till eleverna. Kommunikationen går till stor del ut på att understryka varför sextortion är ett felaktigt och omoraliskt beteende, varför eleverna inte ska vara delaktiga i sextortion och hur det skadar både dem och samhället. Här finns en problematisk spänning eftersom det samtidigt betonas att det är elevens ansvar att rapportera om de utsatts för sextortion.

Studien visar att denna trefaldiga kombination – ett fokus på prevention, information som riktas till elever och elevens ansvar att rapportera – i själva verket kan motverka ambitionerna att synliggöra sextortion. Om ett fall av sextortion blir känt på en skola kan det uppfattas som ett misslyckande. Om de huvudsakliga mottagarna av information om sextortion är studenterna, och om denna information beskriver sextortion som ett opassande beteende också från elevens sida, är det troligt att detta ytterligare spär på de hinder för att rapportera som redan finns inneboende i sextortion: skam, rädsla, stigma och uppfattad medskyldighet.

Samtidigt pekar denna studie på att de kommande stegen i implementeringen av denna policy potentiellt kan leda in på en annan väg. Lärare har efterfrågat mer lärarspecifik information. En av anledningarna till att KTO aktivt valde att arbeta med den definition av sextortion som utvecklades i EBA-studien från 2020 var att denna underströk att ansvaret för sextortion alltid ligger hos den som missbrukar sin maktposition, i detta fall anställda på skolorna. Studien visar att det fortfarande finns ett behov av att stärka detta förhållningssätt till var ansvaret ligger i KTO:s implementering av policy mot sextortion. Idag betonas denna aspekt mer i teorin än i praktiken. Det faktum att sextortion innebär missbruk av maktposition, och därmed är oförenligt med professionalism, förbises.

Följande rekommendationer är relevanta för organisationer som arbetar för att bekämpa sextortion inom sitt arbetsområde samt för Sida och andra biståndsaktörer:

- Benäm n sextortion i policy, och använd en tydlig och ändamålsenlig definition som understryker att ansvaret ligger hos individen i maktposition.
- Se till att denna definition är förankrad i den organisation som ska använda den.

- Diskutera kontinuerligt i vilken grad förståelsen för ansvaret för sextortion som knutet till personen i maktposition förhåller sig till värderingar i det omgivande samhället, könsnormer, existerande lagstiftning och organisationens struktur.
- Säkerställ att information och utbildning som riktar sig till potentiella offer för sextortion inte motverkar viljan att rapportera, och att säkra rapporteringsmekanismer som ligger nära potentiellt utsatta utvecklas.
- Betona att sextortion är oförenligt med professionalism när uppförandekoder för relevanta professioner formuleras.

Summary

Sextortion occurs when a person with entrusted authority abuses this authority to extort sexual favors in exchange for a service or benefit which is within his power to grant or withhold (Eldén et al. 2020). For example, a teacher is guilty of sextortion if he asks a pupil to perform a sexual service in exchange for grades, or if he lets a student pass an exam only if she has sex with him. In recent years, sextortion has gained growing attention in research and in development cooperation policy discussions. At the same time, empirical knowledge is still scarce.

In 2020, the Expert Group for Aid Studies (EBA) published the report *Sextortion: Corruption and Gender-Based Violence* (Eldén et al 2020). This report developed a definition of sextortion that partly was based on a case study in Tanzania. Tanzania is one of few countries where sextortion – or, in Swahili, *rushma ya ngono*, literally sexual corruption – is formally and legally recognized as a societal problem.

This follow-up study, conducted by two of the five authors of the 2020 EBA report, seeks to contribute to the understanding of the implementation of sextortion policy. It does so by focusing on one of Sida's partner organizations – Karibu Tanzania Organization (KTO) – an umbrella organization for state folk development colleges (FDCs). KTO has used the definition put forward in the 2020 EBA report to outline internal guidelines for work against sextortion. This follow-up study follows the work of KTO as it applies this definition in practice: first, by collaborating with state authorities to formulate their own written guidelines against sextortion, and second, by putting these guidelines into practice in the colleges.

The study shows that KTO's work to put the spotlight on sextortion has borne fruit. There is largely a shared understanding of what sextortion is and how it relates to other forms of corruption as well as to other forms of sexual harassment and abuse. A specific policy against sextortion is considered important not only for acknowledging the phenomenon, but also for taking action as it paves the way for concrete measures, reporting mechanisms, awareness-raising and communication strategies.

In practical terms, KTO's implementation process demonstrates an awareness of the importance of clear and safe reporting mechanisms close to the students and of establishing links between different levels in the handling of sextortion cases. The focus of KTO's and the FDCs' work on

sextortion is on prevention and awareness-raising, and information and communication are primarily directed to the students. The information highlights the importance of students understanding why sextortion constitutes wrong and improper behaviour, why they should not engage in it, and how it is harmful to them as well as to society. A problematic tension is introduced as there is a simultaneous emphasis on students' responsibility to report sextortion when it happens.

The study suggests that this three-fold combination – the focus on prevention, on information directed to the students and on the responsibility of students to report – might in fact counteract the ambitions of the policy to make sextortion visible. If a sextortion case occurs in a college, it may be seen as a failure. And if the main recipients of information about sextortion are the students, and the information describes sextortion as improper behaviour also on the part of the victim, it likely adds to the deterrents for reporting already inherent in sextortion – shame, fear, stigma, and perceived complicity.

However, the findings of this study also point to a potential different path in the next steps in implementing the sextortion policy. The teachers have requested more teacher-specific information. One reason why KTO decided to use and actively work with the definition of sextortion developed in the 2020 EBA study was its emphasis on that the fact that the responsibility for sextortion always lies with the person with entrusted authority, i.e. college staff in the case of FDCs. This study concludes that there is still ample room for strengthening this stance on responsibility in KTO's implementation of sextortion policy. At present, this aspect is emphasized in theory more than in practice. The essence of the abuse of entrusted power, namely the irreconcilability of sextortion and professionalism, is absent.

The following recommendations, based on the conclusions from this follow-up study, are relevant for organizations that work to combat sextortion in their fields of work as well as for Sida and other development actors.

- Label sextortion in policy and use a clear and efficient definition that stresses that the responsibility lies with the person with entrusted authority.
- Ensure that this definition is embraced by the organization that is going to use it.

- The responsibility of the person in a position of entrusted authority should be discussed in relation to the understanding/lack of understanding of sextortion in society as well as in relation to existing gender norms and legislation, and the relevant organizational context.
- Make sure that information and education targeting potential victims of sextortion does not create disincentives to report and that safe reporting mechanisms close to potential victims are developed.
- When formulating codes of conduct for relevant professions, highlight the irreconcilability of sextortion and professionalism.

Introduction

In 2020, the Expert Group for Aid Studies (EBA) published the report *Sextortion: Corruption and Gender-Based Violence* (Eldén et al., 2020). The report sheds light on the phenomenon of sextortion: a corrupt practice where the currency is sex, and a sexual act where the exchange is coercive. Sextortion occurs when a person with entrusted authority abuses this authority to extort sexual favors in exchange for a service or benefit which is within his/her power to grant or withhold (Eldén et al. 2020). For example, a teacher is guilty of sextortion if he asks a pupil to perform a sexual service in exchange for grades, or if he lets a student pass an exam only if she has sex with him.

In recent years, sextortion has gained growing attention in research and in development cooperation policy discussions. At the same time, empirical knowledge is still scarce, and sextortion tends to fall between lines of responsibility as it does not necessarily fit definitions of and working methods against either corruption or gender-based violence.

The 2020 EBA report launched a definition of sextortion and recommendations for working against sextortion in Swedish development cooperation. It also included case studies from Colombia and Tanzania, countries that are important to Swedish development cooperation, with well-established and long-standing partnerships. The study showed that in both these contexts, sextortion occurs across sectors and at different levels. In many ways, it is normalized – a taken for granted part of everyday life – in both Colombia and Tanzania. But the study also pointed at a substantial difference in these two case studies: sextortion as a concept was absent in Colombia but present in Tanzania.

Tanzania is one of few countries where sextortion – or, in Swahili, *rushwaya ngono*, literally sexual corruption¹ – is formally and legally recognized as a societal problem. This awareness of the problem has come about as a result of persistent work from women’s organizations, as well as from UN agencies, donors, and government authorities. The 2020 EBA report demonstrated that this awareness and recognition provides beneficial preconditions for policy work around sextortion, but also that large gaps between policy and implementation remain.

¹ There is an ongoing debate about whether the phenomenon should be called sexual corruption (i.e. UNODC, 2020) or sextortion (i.e. IAWJ, 2012). In this report, we do not take sides but use the two concepts interchangeably.

This follow-up study, conducted by two of the five authors of the 2020 EBA report, seeks to contribute to the understanding of policy implementation concerning sextortion. In doing so it focuses on one of Sida's partner organizations – Karibu Tanzania Organization (KTO) – an umbrella organization for state folk development colleges. KTO has cooperated with the Ministry of Education, Science and Technology as well as with the Tanzanian anti-corruption authority, the Prevention and Combating of Corruption Bureau (PCCB), and developed their own internal guidelines for how to work against sextortion in the colleges, by providing information and training to principals and teachers. Their work has just started, but as it is pioneering in an area where there is little knowledge and experience, it can provide useful information about opportunities and challenges in implementing sextortion policy in Tanzania and beyond.

This report follows the work of KTO as the organization applies academic definitions in practice and collaborates with state authorities to first formulate their own guidelines against sextortion in writing, and then move on to start putting them to practice. It should be seen as an explorative case study of the implementation work in a most-likely case, where the conditions for implementation are relatively favorable. Initial implementation challenges faced by this organization are thus also likely to be found elsewhere, and we think that this study will be of relevance for other organizations as they embark on the implementation of policy against sextortion. That said, the study is small and explorative, and builds on the analysis of available but limited public and internal documentation, and on interviews with KTO, the PCCB and with principals and teachers in folk development colleges.

Part 1: The study

Context

The recognition of sextortion as a phenomenon in Tanzania can be traced back to the mobilization of women's rights actors in broad coalitions with other actors, including the United Nations (UN) institutions, development actors and the government in the mid 2010's. The Tanzanian branch of the International Association of Women Judges (IAWJA) was early in bringing attention to sextortion, and high-level cases in the public administration, universities and in the judicial system helped putting the issue on the agenda (Eldén et al., 2020). Party representatives interviewed at the time talked about sexual corruption occurring in candidate selection processes; sexual services in exchange for a position on the list (Bjarnegård & Zetterberg, 2016).

Sextortion has also been highlighted in the Tanzanian education sector, in particular in higher-level education. For example, a study from 2011 showed that sex for grades was the most common form of harassment that female students talked about how male lecturers saw themselves as entitled to sexual favors from female students (Morley, 2011, see also Yusup 2016). In 2018, a whistleblower at one of the Tanzanian universities published a tweet about sextortion and thereby sparked wide media attention and forced the university management to recognize the problem (Eldén et al., 2020).

The 2020 EBA study showed that this recognition and the relatively broad awareness provide important tools to work against sextortion in the Tanzanian society. However, it also showed that even if sextortion is known and criminalized, it is not necessarily, in practice, perceived as a crime or even a problem. The study identified substantial gaps between, on the one hand, policy and legislation and, on the other hand, the everyday life where sextortion occurs. Respondents in Tanzania talked about a well-grounded fear among victims and several risks and obstacles in connection to reporting, and about the lack of and need for safe and reliable reporting mechanisms.

Since the publication of the study in 2020, the efforts and initiatives against sextortion in Tanzania have intensified in different ways and at different levels. This is particularly visible in the education sector. For example, the PCCB recently published a report addressing corruption at universities,

and the Ministry of Education, Science and Technology is currently involved in a process of discussing the inclusion of sextortion in guidelines.

In 2021, Samia Suluhu Hassan was, as the first woman, sworn in as President of Tanzania, which has helped raise women's rights on the political agenda. In December 2021, a college principal formulated these new ambitions in the following words:

You know now in our country we have our mama, our president. She is very, very strict in this. Women's rights, equal rights, opportunity for all is the main issue. So we want to be better in combating this kind of problem and to raise awareness for all. (P2)

KTO has been very active in these new developments. KTO is an umbrella civil society organization (CSO) for state owned Folk Development Colleges (FDCs) all over Tanzania. The first FDCs were established in 1975, and they have a long history of support from and collaboration with Sweden and Sida (Rogers, 2019). This long-term support created a stability that made it possible for the FDCs to tie links with the local government administration and become embedded in the local communities. It has also contributed to the identity and distinctiveness of the FDCs in relation to other educational institutions in Tanzania, which in turn has provided space for innovative and flexible ways of working (ibid). Today, the FDCs lie under the vocational training wing of the Tanzanian Ministry of Education, Science and Technology. A majority of the FDCs are located in rural areas, with the primary goal of providing education of relevance for the local community. They work with folk education and adult learning, vocational training, and community development, targeting marginalized groups in society (KTO, 2021a). Since 1990, KTO, as an umbrella organization, has coordinated work with the Ministry of Education, Science and Technology and with the FDC principals and teachers. The strategic objectives of KTO's work are to strengthen the FDCs as training institutions, including as promoters of gender equality, platforms for citizen engagement and alternative pathways to further education, and as institutions providing folk and adult education, vocational training and community engagement. Furthermore, KTO aims at nationally and internationally spearheading the work of folk and adult education, and to strengthen young adults, focusing on young women's rights, opportunities, citizen engagement and possibilities to continue their education and acquire employment (KTO, 2021a).

During the last couple of years, KTO has worked hard to put the spotlight on sextortion, both internally and in relation to – and in collaboration with – authorities, the FDCs and the FDC communities. In their newly established policy on sextortion, KTO uses the definition of sextortion that was developed in the 2020 EBA report.

Aim

The recent development in KTO, and the organization’s explicit use of the previous EBA study and its definition of sextortion, is the context and point of departure for this follow-up study. The aim is threefold as the study seeks to document and analyse three aspects:

1. The process through which a policy against sextortion was developed by KTO
2. The content of this policy
3. The prerequisites for and first steps in implementing this policy

We explore how KTO in its work with a policy against sextortion interacts with the PCCB and how the teachers and principals in the FDCs understand and implement this policy in the everyday work in colleges.

When we use the word policy in this study, we use it in a broad sense, as encompassing both the more formal policy adoption process within the ministry and the development of guidelines and strategic programming. We look at the reasons for establishing such a policy, the process that led to it, and the content of the policy. We are also interested in the prerequisites for implementing this policy, and KTO’s and the FDCs’ first steps in this implementation process.

Apart from the importance of documenting these interesting developments in an organization working with education in Tanzania, we also hope that this follow-up study will inspire and provide tools to combat sextortion in other sectors, organizations, and countries.

Material and method

This follow-up study has used qualitative methods to study the process of developing policy against sextortion, the content of this policy and the prerequisites for and first steps in policy implementation.

The study has been carried out in close collaboration with KTO. KTO has shared, and when needed translated, written material, such as annual and semi-annual reports, minutes from meetings and workshops, and FDC action plans. We have conducted nine interviews with twelve persons. This includes interviews with four representatives from KTO's management, and the PCCB representative who has worked close together with KTO to provide information and education to the FDCs. In addition, we have interviewed three principals and three teachers from different FDCs. The principals and teachers were selected by KTO and have all participated in workshops where sextortion was discussed. Moreover, several of them have specific responsibilities connected to the implementation of sextortion policy in the colleges.

This is a small follow-up study, and respondents were selected for pragmatic reasons. It is likely that the respondents that we interviewed were biased in the sense that they cast the implementation of sextortion policy in the FDCs in a positive light. However, because the policy is so new, it is crucial to collect information from the few actors and individuals that have worked practically with its implementation.

The aim of this follow-up study is to document and analyse a policy against sextortion that uses a definition of sextortion that was developed by the authors of this study and their colleagues. This is a unique opportunity, but one that also bears with it potential problems that need to be considered. The respondents might be biased not only as they are loyal to the internal processes of policy implementation, but also as they want to show good will, perhaps even loyalty, to the authors/interviewers representing the definition of sextortion that they use. At the same time, to have the possibility of following the practical use of a theoretical definition from the very beginning of its implementation, is a situation that very rarely occurs and that entails unique opportunities. It enables in-depth knowledge about dilemmas and obstacles and well as opportunities that might further strengthen the work against sextortion in this specific context as well as in other settings.

All interviews were conducted digitally via Zoom or WhatsApp, recorded and transcribed. Even though we cannot guarantee full anonymity for all respondents, as they belong to a limited group, we do not use names or locations to identify our respondents, but we refer to their positions: KTO management (KTO 1 and 2), PCCB representative, FDC principals (P1-3), and FDC teachers (T1-3), respectively. The respondents have approved the direct quotes used in this report.

Sextortion: corruption and gender-based violence

The definition of sextortion that was developed in the 2020 EBA report was grounded in previous research, policy initiatives and the case studies from Tanzania and Colombia. It reads as follows:

Sextortion is a form of corruption and gender-based violence. It occurs when a person with entrusted authority abuses this authority to obtain a sexual favour in exchange for a service or benefit which is within their power to grant or withhold.

Sextortion is a corrupt conduct in which the currency is sex, and a sexual conduct involving coerced quid pro quo (this for that). The responsibility for sextortion always lies with the actor that abuses their entrusted authority (the perpetrator), and the transactional aspect of sextortion adds to the shame, fear, and invisibility by making the victim appear ‘complicit’.

Sextortion is a violation of human rights and an abuse of power, and must be understood in the context of gendered power relations and norms. (Eldén et al., 2020)

Sextortion has elements of both corruption and gender-based violence. Just like corruption, sextortion involves the abuse of entrusted authority for personal gain, but the currency of the corrupt exchange is sex. Just like gender-based violence, sextortion involves coerced sexual acts enabled by unequal gender norms, but the transactional aspect blurs the issue of consent. In the cases of sextortion that are documented in research and reports, men are highly overrepresented as perpetrators. Women and girls are by far the most targeted, and LGBTQI-persons are also at high risk.

Thus, sextortion must be interpreted in the context of gendered norms and relationships between gender and power (ibid, see also Towns, 2015; Lindberg & Stensöta, 2018; Feigenblatt, 2020).

Sextortion is often made invisible because it does not neatly fit the definition of either corruption or gender-based violence. From a corruption perspective, the fact that sex can be used as the transaction currency is not yet universally acknowledged. From a gender-based violence perspective, the transactional (*quid pro quo*) aspect of sextortion may be interpreted as the victim having ‘consented’ to the sexual act (IAWJ, 2012). This means that most cases of sextortion pass un-reported, and that “the scale and dynamics of sextortion in different sectors and countries are still largely unknown” (UNDP-SIWI, 2017:12, referring to IAWJ, 2012).

Corruption is a serious obstacle to development and is consistently given high priority in development cooperation. There is also growing attention to how sexual harassment, exploitation and abuse hinder sustainable development and violate human rights. In the last few years, the nexus between these areas of concern has gained growing attention. High profile cases have put the spotlight on abuses of power and position to obtain sexual benefits, and in 2008, the term *sextortion* was coined by the International Association of Women Judges to describe this particular phenomenon (IAWJ, 2012). In the Tanzanian context, the local branch of IAWJ, the Tanzanian Woman Judges Association (TAWJA), was involved in this work early on (IAWJ, 2012). The anti-corruption organization Transparency International has recently started focusing on sextortion (Feigenblatt, 2020). Questions about sextortion are now to be included in their regional corruption barometer surveys, in order to collect more systematic data on its prevalence (Transparency International, 2019b, 2019a).

Also in Sweden, the issue of sextortion has been introduced as a concern of relevance for development cooperation. In the annual report from 2018 on how Sida handles corruption, it is stressed that corruption includes “when a manager or any other kind of superior uses their position against someone in a subordinate position in exchange for sexual services”, and the report points at the need for establishing channels to report such forms of corruption (Sida, 2019). In the 2021 directions and measures for the Swedish Foreign Service’s action plan for feminist foreign policy,

“‘sextortion’, the abuse of power and position in exchange for sexual services” is explicitly mentioned as part of efforts to “promote the continued updating of knowledge on the links between gender and corruption” (Ministry for Foreign Affairs, 2021).

This is evidence of an increased focus on sextortion in anti-corruption work. However, sextortion remains a marginalized perspective and is not yet included in any internationally agreed definition of corruption. Research about sextortion is also scarce, and empirical knowledge about the phenomenon and how it can be prevented is limited.

What we do know based on existing studies is that sextortion is a global phenomenon that systematically occurs in a wide range of sectors, such as education and health, migration, border control, humanitarian aid, diplomacy, the water sector and the judiciary system – and that it disproportionately affects women (Chêne, 2009a, 2009b; Feigenblatt, 2020; IAWJ, 2012; Merkle et al., 2017; Towns, 2015; UNDP-Huairo Commission, 2012; UNDP-SIWI, 2017; Yusuph, 2016). A study focusing on the intersection of gender, poverty and age in universities in Ghana and Tanzania concluded that sex for grades was the most common form of sexual harassment, and that male lecturers “had a *droit de seigneur*, or patriarchal entitlement to the sexual favors of their female students” (Morley, 2011, 103).

The definition of sextortion developed in the 2020 EBA report *Sextortion: Corruption and Gender-based Violence* emphasizes the abuse of authority and the context of gendered power norms and relations. It thereby moves away from the question of potential consent between two actors and from the question of initiative. To accept sexual favors in exchange for any service that a person may grant or withhold due to his position constitutes corrupt behavior: sextortion. The question of who took the initiative, or if it was explicitly demanded or not, is irrelevant in this case. Thus, this definition is perpetrator-focused in the sense that it stresses that the *responsibility always lies with the person with entrusted authority* in cases of sextortion.

Part 2: Developing, introducing and implementing sextortion policy

As mentioned, the point of departure for this study is KTO's initiation of a policy process around sextortion. This process goes both in internal and external directions.

It is important to write a few words about the status of the word sextortion in the Tanzanian context. As previously mentioned, there is a word for *sexual corruption* in Swahili: *rushwa ya ngono*. Sexual corruption is, in contrast to in many other contexts, criminalized in Tanzania and has its own legal space in the Prevention and Combating of Corruption Act.² Whereas corruption criminalizes both parties (section 15)³, sexual corruption, as described in section 25, only criminalizes the person who abuses authority:

Any person being in a position of power or authority, who in the exercise of his authority, demands or imposes sexual favours or any other favour on any person as a condition for giving employment, a promotion, a right, a privilege or any preferential treatment, commits an offence and shall be liable on conviction to a fine not exceeding five million shillings or to imprisonment for a term not exceeding three years or to both. (United Republic of Tanzania, 2007)

While this legislation is progressive in many ways, the status and knowledge of sextortion among the general public is more ambiguous. *Rushwa ya ngono* is a well-known phenomenon, but the English word sextortion is less known, and it is not entirely clear to what extent the two concepts overlap in meaning and legal support (Yusuph, 2016).

KTO has adopted a policy for their own activities, including programs for the FDCs, and worked with programming around sextortion in their collaboration with the FDCs. In this process, the PCCB has played an

² Apart from the Prevention and Combating of Corruption Act, the penal code and legislation concerning economic and organized crime control may be used in cases of sextortion (PCCB-representative). Due to its limitations and focus, this follow-up study has not dug deeper into how these different parts of the legislation relate to each other, or under what circumstances they are used. However, this is a question that will be further explored in coming research.

³ In section 15, responsibility is assigned to two parties: the person who "(a) solicits, accepts or obtains" [...] and the person who "(b) gives, promises or offers".

important role. KTO is a CSO functioning as an umbrella organization for the FDCs, which means that their own policy is not mandatory for the FDCs but only relevant for the specific programs that they run in collaboration. As the FDCs themselves are state-owned and lie under the Ministry of Education, Science and Technology, KTO has also turned to the ministry for knowledge and clarifications regarding relevant policy in their work against sextortion. The ministry is right now in a process of formal policy change in their ongoing general revision of the guidelines for the FDCs, and there are indications that work against sextortion might be added as a new component. The guidelines have not yet been formally approved but are discussed at higher levels within the ministry without the involvement of KTO (KTO 2).

This section proceeds as follows. We first describe the background to the introduction of sextortion policy in KTO's work and the content of the policy. We then turn to assessing the prerequisites for implementation, by describing the awareness and understanding of sextortion in the implementing organization, as well as the first steps that they have taken in implementing the policy, by developing tools and starting awareness-raising campaigns.

Developing and introducing policy against sextortion: KTO and the PCCB

In their Anti-fraud and Corruption policy from 2020, KTO uses the definition of sextortion that was developed in *Sextortion: Corruption and Gender-Based Violence* (Eldén et al., 2020), quoted above.

The direct reference to the 2020 EBA report and the use of the same definition in the KTO policy from the same year is no coincidence. It was during a workshop organized by the Embassy of Sweden in Dar es Salaam, as part of the field work for the EBA report in January 2020, that KTO realized the need for working with sextortion. Despite the fact that sextortion is a well-known phenomenon in Tanzania, they felt that the presentation of sextortion in the workshop and the subsequent report made important advances in the understanding of the phenomenon. Whereas previously they had worked with sexual harassment, they could now see how sextortion was both sexual harassment and corruption.

We have really made use of the report. You come from the outside and shed light on what Tanzania has and what we do not have. We have been thinking about what we can do, and we have used the report when we have included sextortion in our own KTO policy, and in dialogues with the ministry. But especially when we are working with our FDCs: Look, they see a gap here and we also see that gap and in this we can play a role. What is our role? To fill the gap with our own policy. (KTO 2)

KTO states that the clear allocation of responsibility to the person with entrusted authority, which permeates the definition of sextortion in the 2020 EBA report, is key for their work (KTO 2). As we will see, even if the question of responsibility is important for KTO's decision to use this definition in their work, it is perhaps also the most difficult aspect of the work against sextortion.

During 2021, KTO was involved in a process together with the FDCs and with the PCCB to disseminate information and take the first steps in implementation. KTO has introduced a "Sextortion Campaign in FDCs", which integrates awareness-raising of sextortion and gender-based violence in regular FDC workshops with principals and teachers, with the aim of "enhancing violence free learning environment and corruption free society" (KTO, 2021b). At these workshops, the FDCs have set up action plans for their work against sextortion, including planned activities, allocation of responsibility for the work, target group, achievements, challenges/mitigations, results and plans for the next steps. Because they have been initiated at the joint workshops, the action plans relate to a similar framework, but individual FDCs may develop them to suit their own purposes (KTO 2).

In the following, we will focus on how the KTO management and their PCCB partners reason around the policy and its implementation.

Policy: raising awareness and taking action

One important reason for introducing a specific policy against sextortion is to raise awareness. With a specific policy against sextortion, the problem becomes visible among KTO and FDC staff, and it is discussed as something that might occur in the colleges.

In the 2020 EBA study, we saw how sextortion tends to fall between lines of responsibility since it does not necessarily fit established definitions of either corruption or gender-based violence (Eldén et al., 2020). This gap has been important in KTO's decision to explicitly address sextortion in their work.

Because it highlights measures to be taken, and it helps people on our side and the FDC staff to be cautious and aware. It is very important because before when we had a gender harassment policy, people were concerned about harassment but skipping the part of sextortion. When there is a part of sextortion in the policy, then they become conscious about it. It makes us as KTO staff aware. And the FDC staff have become aware that this should not happen in our colleges. It brings people to be much more aware of the issue. (KTO 1)

There is a widespread opinion at KTO that the previous policy on sexual harassment was not precise enough, because it did not cover the corruption aspect that is inherent in sextortion (KTO 1; KTO 2). With a policy in place, sextortion becomes an issue that is taken seriously.

At the national level in Tanzania, there is still no specific sextortion policy, although several policies include aspects of sextortion. The PCCB are currently working on developing such a policy that can be shared with other political offices (PCCB representative).

As noted above, sextortion – in Swahili *rushwa ya ngono* – is not an unknown concept or phenomenon in Tanzania (Eldén et al., 2020). The English word *sextortion* is not widespread, however, and *rushwa ya ngono* translates directly to *sexual corruption*. The fact that the concept *rushwa ya ngono* is used and known in Tanzania provides an “entrance” to talk about sextortion (KTO 2). But there also seems to be a recent change in political will at the highest level, which is key for raising the issue of sextortion and women's rights in general.

The new president who is a woman gave fuel to the discussion. She is a woman and a president who dares to talk about what is happening at workplaces, in the academia, in secondary college. It is more ok now to talk about it compared to how it was in the past. (KTO 2)

However, even if sextortion is a known phenomenon, it is often not recognized and rarely dealt with in policy terms.

It is a common terminology. In many offices you come across *rushwa ya ngono*. We knew about it, but not enough. Now we can connect to PCCB to know more. After your report we know the measures to take and we have now decided to take it seriously. (KTO 1)

KTO claims that a policy against sextortion in their organization is a prerequisite for connecting to others in this line of work, in particular to the PCCB. A formal and explicit policy is seen as necessary in order to act – devise measures, plan work, communicate, install reporting mechanisms, organize workshops – as opposed to simply noting that the phenomenon exists. KTO describes their own policy as a working tool that connects the high-level legislation and experiences in everyday life.

It is a working tool, a guideline that guides us. It is now much clearer what needs to be done, how to go about when it happens. We have the law, but the law does not tell us what needs to be done, how to go about it. This policy now tells us what should be done. Before we knew that this was sextortion, but not what to do about it. The girls know that what is happening is sextortion, but the policy makes it easier for them to know how to go about it. It guides you. (KTO 1)

KTO claims that there is a need for a specific policy on sextortion because it is different both from sexual harassment and from corruption. They have previously talked a lot of about sexual harassment but looking at sexual harassment and other forms of corruption clarifies the issue of responsibility. In the case of corruption, both parties are seen as complicit but in sextortion, although it is corruption, it is always the person in the position of power who is responsible, as in the case of sexual harassment.

For it to happen, it has to be a person who is a more powerful person and one person who does not have power over the other. The one who does not have power is always the victim. According to the laws here in Tanzania, the one who is guilty is always the one in power. When it comes to corruption, the normal corruption, both parties would be the sources of corruption, but when it comes to sextortion it is only the one in power.” (KTO 1)

As noted above, the KTO staff point at the fact that the 2020 EBA report stressed the issue of responsibility in cases of sextortion, an aspect that has not necessarily been part of the awareness of *rushwa ya ngono*. This view on responsibility is also reflected in Tanzanian legislation, where corruption legislation criminalizes both parties, whereas sextortion legislation puts all responsibility on the person in a position of power or authority (United Republic of Tanzania, 2007).

Your report sheds light on something that I don't think that everyone has been aware of. That is the difference compared to other forms of corruption where both can be guilty. This is not the case here as the victim is not guilty. This is where we have leaned against that definition, because the difference compared to corruption is that the victim is never guilty, only the perpetrator is guilty. (KTO 2)

The allocation of responsibility in theory and in practice are, however, two different things. Even though sextortion policy makes clear that the responsibility lies with the perpetrator, in practice and in the eyes of the community, the victim is also often seen as responsible.

It is actually the one in power, according to the law and to PCCB. The one who is in power is guilty. In corruption, both of them might be guilty. But in our communities, most of the time the girl will be seen as the guilty one. You will find that they say: you dressed badly, that is why he got interested in you, you're the bad. You condemn the girl, instead of the man who did it. Even in some rape cases this is happening. You blame the victim, say they she is the one who made this happen. (KTO 1)

Even the PCCB recognizes some joint responsibility:

In most cases, the one with power and authority is the one who is responsible. [...] The person who is a victim can be responsible for not reporting, and for allowing this to happen. (PCCB representative)

Developing tools for implementation

KTO is, together with the FDCs, now in the process of putting the policy into practice by developing tools and measures. In every training that KTO organizes, they now set aside two hours to discuss sextortion. In 2021, almost all trainings with teachers and principals included a sextortion component. This has been well received by the participants, according to the KTO representative, who stated that “our expectations were different, we thought that it would be difficult to bring up this subject with our FDCs. But we managed to create a platform for them to talk and discuss in a positive way” (KTO 2).

A representative of PCCB attends the KTO trainings and makes a presentation about sextortion and corruption: what the law says, what to do when an incident occurs, how to report and the consequences for the perpetrator. KTO also presents and explains the policy, with the 2020 EBA report as a starting point. According to KTO, an important aspect of why the report is useful in the work against sextortion in Tanzania is that it does not only point at what is bad and not working but also shows positive aspects that KTO can build their work on (KTO 2).

In their trainings, KTO uses a figure from the EBA report, as they find it useful to illustrate how sextortion occurs in the intersection between corruption and gender-based violence, sexual harassment and abuse (Figure 1 below).

Figure 1: Sextortion at the intersection of corruption and gender-based violence



The trainings also include Q&A sessions and opportunities for discussion among participants. Following the joint workshops, KTO and the individual FDCs work together to create action plans for the FDCs that specify new activities or strengthen or revise organizational structures in the FDCs (KTO 1; KTO 2; KTO, 2021c).

The collaboration with the PCCB is important in the implementation, particularly concerning the measures to take when there is a case of sextortion at an FDC. There is a lot of uncertainty about the correct way of handling cases of sextortion, so the collaboration with PCCB is seen as a guarantee for receiving the right information (KTO 1). But the relationship between KTO and the PCCB is mutually beneficial, and a PCCB representative readily acknowledges that the PCCB has learnt much through their collaboration with KTO.

We want to say thanks to KTO. Because through KTO we managed to get in contact with people from different districts and regions and we managed to exchange ideas and experiences on how to fight sextortion and sexual harassment. (PCCB representative)

The collaboration seems to be institutionalized in the sense that both KTO and PCCB are planning to continue the collaboration, build on previous experiences, and expand the work against sextortion beyond the FDCs.

We are looking for how we can develop our work together, to arrange a workshop with KTO to see how we can go further, to educate more students, also at the university. To see how KTO and the PCCB can share and use the tools and the experiences that they have to continue fighting against sextortion and sexual harassment. (PCCB representative)

The PCCB does not only operate at the national level but is also present at the regional level. This is important for the collaboration between PCCB and the individual FDCs.

A month ago, I met the person at the PCCB responsible for education and information. They are willing to, at their cost, make sure that the FDCs get all the relevant information and publications, but also that they can establish contacts with the PCCB district offices all over the country. So, there is a will from the PCCB to work with FDCs through KTO. (KTO 2)

The collaboration with the PCCB gives weight to the work against sextortion that KTO carries out. It constitutes a direct connection to those who are responsible for anti-corruption work at the national level and leaves no doubt as to whether sextortion officially constitutes corruption or not.

PCCB are the main implementers of the laws and policies of anti-corruption in the country. Anti-corruption and sextortion are in the laws of this country. Having this collaboration makes it easier to make the implementation important and powerful, everyone sees that this is important, and everyone has to take care of this because it is part of the law. Everywhere you go there is PCCB. It starts at the district level, goes up to the regional and national level. You see that if you go against the sextortion policy, you go against the laws of the nation. Working with them gives it more power, and everyone will know what happens if we go against that policy. (KTO 1)

The PCCB thus connects different levels of work against sextortion – from the highest national level all the way down to the FDCs. They have a structure of PCCB offices at district level and have even established local structures that the work against sextortion can feed into. For instance, there are PCCB clubs in many educational institutions in Tanzania. The role of these clubs is to make students aware of corruption in general, but the recent focus in the FDCs has been on sextortion (PCCB representative).

The role of the clubs is first of all to make them aware of all types of corruption. But currently, because of the seriousness of sexual corruption in the universities and the colleges, we educate them and we teach them the way they can respond when they are requested to give a sexual favour to their teachers. We also use these clubs to educate the parents at home. And we use these clubs to encourage those who are already affected, for them to know where they can report and where they can get assistance.” (PCCB representative)

In their action plans against sextortion, no FDC notes that it has had any concrete cases, and there is a lack of knowledge about the actual prevalence of sextortion at the FDCs (KTO, 2021c). However, the work also includes the establishment of a harmonized protocol for all FDCs on how to deal with sextortion *if* it occurs. They are building on the existing structures in the colleges to increase the chances of reporting. Each FDC has a matron and/or a patron, responsible for coordinating groups of students. It is the responsibility of the matron/patron to make sure that the students receive the education and information that they need, that they are aware of the reporting procedures and their rights. Furthermore, the matrons/patrons also serve as bridges between the PCCB clubs and the students, and as coordinators, they can reach students, but also the principal, KTO or PCCB (KTO 1; KTO 2).

The matrons and patrons are thus crucial focal points in KTO's work on establishing clear and safe reporting procedures across the board – from the student/victim in spe to the PCCB – that connects different levels. The first step in reporting must be very close to the students as well as connected to teachers and principals, as highlighted by KTO: “Matrons and patrons help the participant to be open. For a girl, it is good to report to a matron, she can be open and feel comfortable. And for a boy to the patron” (KTO 1).

It is noted, however, that there are different ways of reporting. The matron/patron is the closest to the student, so it is likely that they will be a natural starting point, but it is also possible to go directly to the principal, to the KTO or even to the PCCB (KTO 1). The focus on reporting mechanisms close to the students demonstrate an awareness that there is a widespread fear of speaking up, leading to sextortion being made invisible.

The first main challenge is secrecy. This happens in secrecy and most of the victims don't speak up, so we need to raise awareness among the college participants and the teachers. Even with the clubs and matrons and patrons, most girls don't speak up. It may take a long time for them to be able to speak and explain what is happening. They will find themselves falling into the trap of not speaking up. (KTO 1)

As highlighted by the PCCB representative, the transactional aspect of sextortion may inhibit reporting because the victim feels complicit: “In this kind of offences, most people who are affected by sextortion fear to report, they feel shy to say what they have experienced. They are already affected” (PCCB representative).

Both KTO and PCCB also reason around issues of poverty and vulnerabilities. When a student gets something that she thinks that she deserves and has the right to get, it is difficult for her to take action because it means she might lose it. Another challenge is customs and traditions, and how many young women are not aware of their own rights (KTO 1; KTO 2).

As shown in the beginning of this section, a key motivation for KTO to take on the agenda of working against sextortion was to fill the gap between national legislation and ambitions, and the everyday life in the FDCs. This is also where they see the great challenges in their work.

There are clear laws, sure. But at FDC-level it is difficult because there is no clarity there. What happens if it happens? Where do you turn to? There are rules saying that you should go directly to the PCCB and report, but there is also a system within the ministry that is not clear. How are the principals supposed to handle this? How much of an investigation should they themselves do? When should the ministry be involved? When should they go to the PCCB? They do not have any clear instructions about what they as state employees should do here. There are many things that are not in place. We are trying to put things in place but we don't have the mandate. We don't have the mandate to decide. (KTO 2)

Thus, KTO sees “operationalization” as a huge challenge, but also the fact that the regulations and procedures are not clear even at national level: “If things are woolly at the ministry level, it will be woolly also at the FDCs” (KTO 2).

It is widely recognized that reporting is difficult, but KTO's implementation efforts are mainly aimed at prevention. This includes awareness-raising campaigns involving FDCs as well as the surrounding communities. The first efforts to reach out to the community took place already in 2020.

In December 2020, we did a community engagement activity event at one of the FDCs during the 16 days of activism. We were there with our representative from PCCB, we had the college students as well as the teachers and members of the community. It was a graduation day and before the event, we had a chance to speak about sextortion and sexual harassment in general. It was very nice because at first people could not differentiate sextortion, people did not know what to do once they came across such thing. After this discussion they demonstrated that they were aware and knew how to take action against sextortion. (KTO 1)

The following campaign, launched in May 2022 and ongoing at the time of writing, is even larger. The focus of this campaign, in line with the general focus of the work, is on prevention. KTO stresses that they do not want to be involved in naming and shaming: "Some are doing the 'speak out, tell who they are' thing, but we are not. We want to fight and prevent so that it does not happen. We spread information and find ways to prevent, that is where we are" (KTO 2).

The campaign was launched at a college located close to the border to Burundi. KTO, the PCCB, UNFPA and possibly also UNHCR (and indirectly also the Ministry of Education, Science and Technology that has given their blessing even if they are not formal partners) co-organized the event. The campaign has several components. The first is directed towards the FDCs to strengthen the internal structure in the work against sextortion. This includes the further spreading of information to students and staff in all colleges, the updating of the action plans, and the strengthening/establishment of the PCCB clubs. The teachers also asked for a special session with the PCCB, through which they themselves could deepen their knowledge and discuss with colleagues. The second component is a community outreach activity. KTO organized a football tournament and all participants and visitors received information through leaflets and speeches. The third component is directed towards KTO itself, and how the organization could increase its advocacy work in relation to the ministry, with a focus on the guidelines for the FDCs, and on a new function aimed at universities: gender desks and the possibility of expanding this to other parts of the education system in Tanzania (KTO 2).

Although these campaigns are important to raise awareness and disseminate information, KTO emphasizes the importance of continuous work, stating that “it cannot be a one-time activity; it must go on and on. Because things are happening in our daily life, students are coming and going, and all teachers must be trained” (KTO 1).

First steps of implementing policy against sextortion: principals and teachers

Even if the FDCs are state-owned and therefore not directly governed by KTO policy, the activities of the programs run by KTO in collaboration with the Ministry of Education, Science and Technology and the FDCs are implemented in the local colleges. Therefore, the policy-bearers of KTO’s policy on sextortion are the staff of the FDCs around the country: principals and teachers. KTO holds workshops and trainings with principals and teachers, who then develop action plans that are implemented at the college level. KTO’s presence at the FDCs is thus mainly indirect, and they rely on the workshop communication to generate ideas, discussions and activities at the colleges. The sextortion policy is still new, so the purpose of this section is to assess baseline conditions for implementation and potential opportunities and challenges in the implementation process. It does not say anything about the success of the implementation as such.

The section will be organized as follows. First, the level of awareness of sextortion in general, and of the new policy in particular, is described. We then delve a bit deeper into the problem description, focusing first on identified implementation challenges, and then on unidentified challenges relating to the question of responsibility. Finally, we describe the organization concerning how to work with sextortion in the FDCs and relate this to the implementation process at large.

Awareness of phenomenon and policy

The awareness of the phenomenon of sextortion, *rushwa ya ngono* in Swahili, is widespread among both principals and teachers at the FDCs. Everyone knows about the concept and trace their knowledge back to long before the policy was adopted by KTO. Several respondents bring up their own education and say that it was a common occurrence (also) then. Sextortion has received a lot of attention in the media, contributing to knowledge about the phenomenon among the general public.

One principal says: “I have been aware of the concept for very long, ten to fifteen years. In colleges, this happens. Most of the cases I heard about were in the media” (P1). One of the teachers confirms the view that sextortion is common knowledge: “For Tanzania, this concept is very common. It has been understood well and there is a concept in Swahili. [...] There is a broad awareness in Tanzania about sextortion” (T3).

This reinforces the conviction that sextortion is known in Tanzania. It is talked about in public, and many people have heard about it occurring. The fact that a concept is known constitutes an important starting point for successful policy implementation – the problem is on the public agenda – but a second step is a shared understanding of what the concept actually means.

We find that such a shared understanding largely exists among principals and teachers. Most of the respondents provide a definition very similar to the one in the KTO policy document, highlighting sexual favours given to a person in authority in exchange for services (e.g. P2, P3). It is clear that sextortion commonly is seen through a corruption lens. The exchange is central, and the college staff has no problems with distinguishing sextortion from sexual harassment. One teacher elaborates:

From my knowledge, we can decide if it is sextortion if a student is supposed to provide a sexual service in exchange for grades or other treatment. Sexual harassment in my understanding is that a man does something to someone only because she is a woman, not to give her advantages. Exchange of services providing something – that is sextortion. (T3)

One of the principals also discusses the definition of sextortion and emphasizes the misuse of power as central to corruption, both sexual and other forms of corruption. To distinguish between corruption and sextortion, he elaborates on the exchange, “the ingredients of the matter”:

Is there any sort of favour that the teacher wants to get from that student? What is that kind of favour? Is it money? Is it sex? Is it anything? Sometimes it can be like, you work in my garden and I give you this and that. So I’ll be careful on looking at the ingredients of the matter. That is how I can know that it is sextortion or any other kind of bribery. (P3)

The abuse of authority and the use of sex as a currency in the corrupt exchange are central to the understanding of sextortion among principals and teachers at KTO's FDCs. This understanding of sextortion and the relevance for the colleges seem to be quite recent insights, likely early results of KTO's activities and awareness-raising. One principal makes the direct link:

I had heard about it but I was not very familiar with it and did not see it as something of that weight in my activities. [...] I got that knowledge when I attended the KTO seminars. I didn't know from the beginning that sextortion is also part of corruption. When I attended the seminars with KTO, that is when I came to understand it, that it is also part of corruption. (P3)

In the next section, we will take a closer look at what principals and teacher themselves identify as potential problems when taking action against sextortion.

Identified challenges: information and reporting

It is perhaps not surprising that the principals and teachers see it as their main task to protect their pupils. The problem for them as college staff is that when sextortion takes place, it negatively affects the students. With this as the predominant problem definition, the focus becomes one of educating the students about the dangers of sextortion (e.g. T2; P2).

This brings about a focus on preventive measures at the individual level. Students need to understand why sextortion is bad and how to avoid it. For instance, one principal says that some students who struggle with certain subjects may see sextortion as a possible alternative (P2). To avoid that students take that route, the principal gives the following advice: "So we are telling them that the proper way is to adhere to the rules and the regulation in college. Wake up early, follow the template of the day so that you can be safe and avoid those issues that are not proper" (P2).

There seems to be a widespread assumption that the problem of sextortion is a problem of girls not knowing what is morally right and wrong. With this problem description, girls need to be empowered and informed. In principals' and teachers' descriptions of sextortion policy implementation at the FDCs, there is a clear focus on information dissemination among students. A teacher emphasizes that the students

need more knowledge about corruption in general, and sextortion in particular, and that they can use this knowledge: "We give them knowledge so that they know what is black and what is white, what is the best way to go. They can make a decision through the knowledge that we give them" (T1).

Another teacher thinks that education about sextortion should become part of the curriculum already in primary college, so that students learn about its negative impacts (T2). One principal further elaborates on the information that they need to provide to girl students to teach them about their rights and responsibilities. They tell the girls that while it is their right to get good grades, they will have to earn them – not get them through sexual involvement with a teacher (P3). This is part of a broader discussion about the societal consequences of corruption, and there is a tendency to situate the students as active agents for change. One of the principals talks at length about the need to not just educate students about the fact that corruption is illegal, but to also make them aware of the consequences of a corrupt society for the country as a whole and for coming generations. This type of reasoning emphasizes the risk of people getting grades and certificates that they have not earned from studying hard, but from providing sexual favours. It is said to lead to a situation in which the country has experts that are not real experts (P2).

This emphasis on teaching students about what is proper or immoral behaviour in relation to sextortion may inadvertently affect their propensity to report. Reporting sextortion would imply confessing to immoral behaviour on the part of the student, adding to the shame and stigma. On the other hand, not reporting makes the student complicit in other ways, as it is the responsibility of students to report their teachers if sextortion occurs. The tension between, on the one hand, teaching students that sextortion is improper behaviour that brings undue advantages and, on the other hand, urging them to report this behaviour is not recognized. This is despite the fact that the challenge of making students report when they hear about or experience sextortion is a major concern and one that everyone brings up as something that the policy needs to address.

When you face this, you are supposed to take these measures. You are supposed to come to me and when you come to me, we can do this and this and this. Then other measures can follow. If we keep quiet, nobody knows. (T1)

It is only if the students report that they can work to make the college community a better place for girl students (P3). There is a realization that it won't be easy to ensure reporting, but that it is necessary: "If we provide some kind of confidence, awareness to girls that please, you are the key aspect in this. If you don't do this, these issues can continue daily, daily, daily. So be brave, speak it out, let's take action" (P2).

There are, however, a few different problem descriptions associated with the lack of reporting. The first one has to do with the quid pro quo aspect – the exchange. The fact that there is an exchange is seen as one reason for why girls may hesitate to report sextortion as they can feel complicit. A student who received better grades in exchange also runs the personal risk of losing the good grades if the story comes out. One principal elaborates:

Sometimes it becomes difficult to work with sextortion, because the person who has been affected can feel shy to report. And sometimes you can find that the victim wants to...doesn't want to harm the person who affected her. They come into a certain relationship. Do not say this! I will help you, I will give you that, but please do not say. And it is simply because the affected person thinks: I have assisted on this. I have been assisting to acquire this. Probably in college: I have been assisted to acquire these grades that I could not get so I have assisted. Let me as well try to assist the perpetrator so he could help me next time. So they come to some sort of agreement. That's how the difficult point comes. (P3)

It is also commonly raised that girls may be afraid and shy to raise the issue. The culture stipulates that students should respect teachers, and teachers and principals express that it is very difficult for a young girl to expose a teacher (e.g. P2; P3). A principal states that "I think you see the barrier here. According to our traditions, that will make the girl to think: how can I go to stand in front of the people, giving evidence about a person who is the age of my father?" (P3).

Particularly if the student sees this as a kind of agreement and exchange that she has consented to, and if she sees it as some form of relationship, she may hesitate to report it. The potential consequences for the teacher may also be a hurdle for reporting. Many girls are not ready to accuse their teachers and potentially destroy their lives, as these accusations can lead to teachers losing their standing in the community, losing their jobs or even being imprisoned (P2; P3). The fact that the consequences are more

severe in the case of sextortion than sexual harassment is important. There are often policies on how to deal with sexual harassment cases within the institution itself, whereas sextortion, because it is corruption, becomes a criminal case, a “big issue”. It needs to be reported to the police, who collaborates with the PCCB (T2). One of the principals notes that:

Shame is also there. And fear, the girls are afraid. You say if I report this, and the teacher loses his job, what will happen to me? If the teacher gets sentenced to jail, what will happen to me? So those are the issues that also can be the factors, that these girls cannot come and speak out what had happened. (P2)

Finally, the shame and stigma associated with sexual activity for girls may prevent them from reporting (P2). The fact that sextortion has received a lot of media attention may, in a way, exacerbate the hurdles for reporting. One of the principals points out that there is a risk that details of the case are exposed in the media (P1). This would not only hurt the reputation of the teacher, but also that of the student:

The most difficult aspect in our country is dealing with culture. We are ashamed. According to the culture, a victim of sextortion cannot report it anywhere. She decides to be quiet. She does not want to acknowledge what she experienced. (T3)

In summary, the principals and teachers point to two main solutions to the problem sextortion in the colleges: (1) students need more information about corruption and sextortion, so that they know how and why it is wrong and harmful for society, and (2) the students need to report sextortion when it happens. These suggested solutions reflect two overarching problem descriptions: (1) sextortion is a problem of lack of information on the part of the students, and (2) sextortion is a problem of lack of reporting on the part of the students/victims.

Unidentified challenges: responsibility

As important as it is to grasp the understanding of sextortion as a phenomenon and of the sextortion policy, it is also central to discern what is *lacking* in this understanding. This section seeks to identify the aspects that lie beyond the focus of the interviewed principals and teachers, where there are silences, and what is left unproblematicized in their understandings of the new policy and its implications.

While there is, in general, a good understanding of what sextortion means, there is one aspect where there is some blurring of boundaries. This has to do with the form of power and authority that needs to be invoked for a case to be called sextortion. For instance, one teacher sees poverty as an explanation for why students may engage in sextortion:

With students, the issue that we face is that some of them come from poor families. That is a very big issue. As they come to college they face many issues, they are missing some needs. Maybe they like to have beautiful clothes, they like to have phones. They want to have what other students have. How do such students get money? If someone in authority shows this sexual interest, she will accept because she needs something, she needs something from the one in authority. Relationships, African relationships, go together with money. Someone in a relationship have money, will provide money. Coming from poor families is a big issue, for students to be trapped. (T2)

In the above hypothetical example, a student is given money, clothes and phones as part of an unequal relationship. Power comes in many shapes and forms and is an important factor in all cases of corruption as well as sexual harassment and gender-based violence. The example given in this case has nothing evident to do with abuse of *entrusted authority*, namely with the particular services that a teacher can give or withhold in his capacity as a public servant and a professional teacher. Thus, this example is not an evident case of sextortion.

While all principals and teachers interviewed mention power and authority as important elements in sextortion, there is a lack of precision concerning the *type* of authority that is invoked. It is often discussed in much more general terms, such as benefits and services. For instance, one principal elaborates on the concept, but seems to emphasize the service providers' need for sex more than how and in what way such service providers abuse the power they have been entrusted with:

Sextortion in our country, in Swahili we call it *rushwa ya ngono*. It is a kind of action where someone who needs benefits, she is supposed to give sex or to conduct sex to get that service. Mostly this depends on authorities. There are service needs and service providers. Service providers need sex. That is sextortion in Tanzania.

Sextortion happens in colleges, in job seeking, in university. In colleges and universities, the pupils need high performance and the providers need sex. Those who are job seekers need a job and the employers need sex to complete their task. (P1)

While principals and teachers were able to discuss these issues when asked directly about them, they usually did not come up until we probed towards the end of the interview. Often, we had to ask them to elaborate on the abuse of power several times before they would reason around the responsibility of the teacher in relation to their professional role. When the responsibility of the teacher was discussed, it was more often in general terms: that they should act as role models, that they should not take advantage of their students etc. One exception is a principal who clearly stipulated that the service needs to be “in relation to their job description” (P2). The more common answer was to highlight responsibilities on both sides, not to tie the misbehavior on the part of the teacher directly to the integrity of his/her profession. Concerning the question of who is responsible, one principal responded:

Both. The teacher who might insist the girl to accept him. And the girl who is supposed to know about her rights. To be fair. To know that to get good grades, she needs to struggle and work hard in class. So both of them need to be taught. Both of them are responsible. The teacher who has to be aware of the moral practices, the moral way of working with the students. Plus sextortion. And the student who has to know about her rights. (P3)

In statements like this, the teacher is given moral responsibility, but less professional responsibility. Many principals and teachers seem to understand the emphasis on responsibility in letter, but not in spirit – the intention of focusing on entrusted, professional responsibility is often not explicit. Rather, it is pointed out that a teacher has to be aware of the moral way of interacting with the students. No respondent mentions that teachers should use their professional knowledge and integrity to provide grades according to performance and that they are responsible for ensuring that grades are adequate measures of educational attainment. Giving out grades in exchange for sexual services is thus not just morally wrong, but it also hurts the professional integrity of teachers because they abuse their entrusted authority. This aspect is almost never raised. Instead of being reminded of their responsibility as teachers, staff members are told that they are not allowed to touch the students (T1).

One teacher talks about college slogans: “We have our slogans at the college, that a girl child is your child so treat her the way you treat your children at home” (P3). This raises the question of whether teachers and principals should treat students the way they treat their children at home or according to what is suitable given their professional capacities. The character of the FDCs may in fact make this distinction more difficult in practice. The FDCs are described as being big families, and as a second homes to both students and teachers. Students and college staff live on the college premises and meet and socialize outside of college hours. Teachers are described as more than teachers; they are guardians, facilitators, stand-in relatives and role models (KTO 2).

Rather than pointing to the responsibility of the professional teacher, the more common response is a vague “everyone is responsible”: “All of us are responsible for preventing that sextortion happens. From the girls to the boys to the teachers to the principal. The prevention of corruption is supposed to be for all human beings” (P1). In the same vein, a teacher states that:

All the community is responsible. Students, teachers, governments, parents and the guardians are responsible. When you come to the college, you are not outside of the society. The whole society is responsible for sextortion if we want to combat it. (T3)

When probed, teachers and principals say that they need to remind staff that sextortion is illegal and cannot be tolerated. Measures like teacher training, competence building etc. are, however, never discussed in our interviews. However, in the campaign that started in May 2022, KTO introduced specific teacher trainings as a response to teacher requests. Thus, even though it did not come up in our interviews, this may be on the radars of both teachers and KTO. In their description of discussions at workshops, KTO confirms that the issue of responsibility remains a challenge.

That is where we always end up in our capacity building with teachers. We get stuck there: she came and knocked the door, she wanted, she suggested that I get this and you get this. This is something that we must dig into, and I don't think that the surrounding society is always ready. You know the other things, but often you see the victim as complicit, like in pure corruption. (KTO 2)

Organization of work at FDCs

In the interviews, we asked questions both about existing structures and about which structures would be mobilized if there was a case of sextortion. This section will briefly describe the implementation of the sextortion policy as it is manifest in the FDC structures.

One important aspect of implementing sextortion policy is to inform students about sextortion and take preventive measures. It is common that people from the PCCB visit the FDCs to give lectures about corruption. While this has happened for a long time and on a regular basis, at least every term, the PCCB now also make sure to include sextortion in their lectures (P3). One teacher also talks about inviting new actors in order to provide new perspectives:

With us, the first thing is that we would like to invite people to give more education. When we talk with the students, we feel that they are hearing the same thing from the same people. We want to invite specialists who are dealing with gender issues, those who are dealing with corruption, the police. With them, they can hear something new. (T2)

As expected, there is less focus on informing and educating the teachers. The issue is, however, sometimes raised in staff meetings and discussions (P1; P2). One principal mentions the impact of the KTO seminars and how they call teachers to meetings to discuss what they have learned. They have been encouraged to talk about it as an everyday issue: “We always talk and talk about it, because it is something we are told to include in our everyday work. When we meet, in all college meetings, we talk about it” (P3).

One college principal says that it is difficult to talk to the staff about it, but that he tries to explain it from the point of view of the victim – that she can get HIV or get pregnant. This college even has a motto relating to sextortion, but it focuses on the moral aspect of sextortion that would be generally applicable to all responsible adults rather than to the teachers’ roles and responsibilities in particular (P1). The principal says:

I try to make sure it does not happen. Every Monday morning speech we say our motto: ‘don’t take the product of farm during the growth time’. We speak about this to make sure that it will not happen. (P1)

When it comes to informing the students and encouraging them to report, colleges have a rather elaborate system that they build on. Colleges already have a set of clubs, where students can meet and learn more about issues of relevance to society and to students as citizens. The clubs are linked to the head of the college but are largely student-driven (P1; T1; T3). Students use them to listen to invited speakers and to engage in discussions. Most colleges have PCCB clubs, focusing on issues relating to corruption (also mentioned above by the PCCB-representative). There are also guidance and counselling clubs. As these clubs are already institutionalized, FDCs also use them to channel information about sextortion:

Most colleges in Tanzania have clubs or teams that try to prevent that bad things happen, for instance corruption clubs. The clubs try to teach students to fight corruption, they teach them about citizenship. Secondly, these clubs try to show the threats of corruption. If you use corruption, you will not use your capacity. (P1)

The clubs are also seen as useful for increasing reporting about sextortion. One principal says that he thinks that if they talked about a case of corruption in a club, the club would report it back to him. He believes in the clubs and wants to collaborate with them in this way (P1).

Another system put in place in most colleges is that of matrons (and patrons), discussed in the previous section. Matrons are responsible for taking care of the welfare of the students, and they are the students' closest contact persons. If a student gets sick or needs permission to take time off from college, this is handled by the matrons. The matrons are seen as natural contact persons for students if they experience sextortion. They are always told to report to the matron if they experience any problem (P2). Respondents highlight that it is important that the matrons are women, and that girls may find it easier to report to another woman:

We tell them to report to the matron. Sometimes the girls, the females fear to come and report to the men because they have the idea that the men may defend their fellow men. We appoint the matron as the person they report to. Last year, we had a case like that and of course when we have such a case, we know how to go through it, we have our ethics. That is what we are trying to do. We call the matron so that they are free, they feel they are free to go to their matron rather than coming to the principal or coming to the training coordinators because they think the males may defend. (T2)

It is then up to the matron to decide if and how the case should be handled. In one college, the routine, if sextortion occurs, is that the matron reports what has happened to the principal, and the principal contacts the involved teacher.

After that the one affected is also called to present the evidence about what had happened. Sometimes it might be true or not true. We weigh the evidence from the staff and from the girl who presented the case. (T2)

Apart from taking the matters further, matrons can also provide emotional support. There are also guiding and counselling units in some colleges, and students can go there for any type of consultation. At least in one college, the principal tells us that the guiding and counselling committee has explicitly encouraged students to report all types of bullying and mistreatment, including sextortion (P3). In the same college, these units are run by teachers nominated and chosen by the students themselves: “They are the ones who are chosen by the students, which means that they trust them to be open to them and they can talk about whatever they feel” (P3).

It is clear that the colleges agree that the reporting structures are crucial and should be in focus, alongside information events. There are already structures in place, but this also seems to be where new initiatives and ideas arise. One principal is going to put up a suggestion box where students can put anonymous messages:

I am going to put a suggestion box up as well. Because there are those students who feel shy to report. Having a suggestion box means that they can write and put their message in the suggestion box. The principal will open it every day to see if something of that sort has come up. (P3)

The description of what happens when a sextortion case is reported is largely hypothetical, as most principals and teachers claim that they have not had a sextortion case in their college. Of course, it is not possible to determine whether this reflects a lack of reporting or a lack of actual incidents. We can, however, be fairly certain that the accounts of the procedures in place for investigating and taking action on particular cases are largely hypothetical. Nevertheless, they give us an indication of what is communicated, and which procedures are implemented, at least on paper.

The process is usually described as being initiated by the principal, once the reports have reached him or her. The involved teacher would then be informed about the report about his potential crime, after which he would be asked to write a short statement. There is a college management, which, in some colleges, has a specific disciplinary committee. Some colleges have an appointed coordinator for sextortion, and this person may also be involved. The management ultimately decides if the matter should be reported outside the college (P3; T1).

There seems to be a consensus that suspected sextortion cases should be handled outside the college, by relevant authorities, as soon as possible. Most respondents refer to handling by the corruption bureau, but the police is also mentioned as a step in between (P3; T1; T2). In cases of suspected sextortion, the corruption bureau will come to the college to conduct an investigation, which entails interviewing students and teachers and collecting information (T1). One principal states that:

It is good that the investigation is external. If most of the questions are asked from the PCCB team, it becomes fairer. Maybe I would be biased against a good teacher, but the team don't know anyone. They can act on the problem and give contacts for the higher level. (P1)

Again, hypothetically, the consequences for a teacher who is found guilty are severe. There are also important consequences for the student involved. One principal describes his view of what would happen if a sextortion case was confirmed:

If the investigation finds that someone is guilty, the consequences for the person who did it will be jail. It will come out in the media if someone is taken to jail. The victim would be taken to the hospital to check if there is any infection. She would also be transferred from one college to another to protect her and prepare her for a new life. If she stays, people may have different opinions. Many feel it is a small thing and that she should keep quiet about it. (P1)

The main strategy at colleges is, as mentioned, preventing sextortion from happening in the first place. Teachers and principals state that they are ready to work with the problem if it occurs, but also that it rarely does (T1; P1).

For me, I didn't see a case. It is hard and shameful to admit that you got a good performance or a job because you gave sex. The government now tries to chase those who are doing that, the cases are there but it is very rare that you see them. As leaders of institutions, the government has tried to give us the means to work with this. (P1)

The emerging organization of the work against sextortion at the FDCs largely reflects the problem descriptions – as well as the silences. The focus of the work is on the students. There are plenty of mechanisms in place for students to learn more about corruption and sextortion and to increase their reporting of incidents. These mechanisms largely build on already existing structures and thus seem to be partly institutionalized. Many also mention additional ideas that they hope to implement or are in the process of implementing. The silences around the irreconcilability of sextortion and professionalism – the essence of the abuse of entrusted power – lead to a lack of initiatives targeting school staff.

The newly implemented structures clearly demonstrate that sextortion is taken seriously, and that information campaigns have increased significantly. The problem of barriers for reporting is also taken seriously and there are many mechanisms in place for facilitating this. Paradoxically, however, the fact that sextortion is taken so seriously also means that the consequences – at least hypothetically – are described as very wide-reaching and harsh. This may undermine or counter the efforts made to facilitate reporting. The hurdles for reporting, or for talking about one's experiences, are likely to be immensely higher if reporting risks upsetting your entire life and leading to year-long investigations and potentially the imprisonment of the accused teacher. This is a conundrum that needs to be further discussed and dealt with.

Furthermore, an issue to discuss further is the silence – in terms of the problem description as well as implemented structures – surrounding the role of a teacher who misuses the tools that are at his disposal not because he is an older man or authority in general, but because he is a teacher. A discussion about professional duties and responsibilities, and how these relate to the problem of sextortion, is clearly lacking, as are the initiatives to change the behavior of teachers, *as teachers*.

Part 3: Conclusions and recommendations

Conclusions

This follow-up study has shown that KTO's hard work to put the spotlight on sextortion has indeed borne fruit. The KTO management as well as the FDC principals and teachers who were interviewed embrace the new KTO policy on sextortion, and there is largely a shared understanding of what sextortion is and how it relates to other forms of corruption as well as to other forms of sexual harassment and abuse. A specific policy against sextortion is considered important not only for acknowledging that sextortion exists, but also for taking action as it paves the way for setting up concrete measures, reporting mechanisms, awareness-raising and communication. The KTO sextortion policy has also opened up for a far-reaching collaboration with the PCCB, which also has the potential to develop into a long-standing relationship. Moreover, KTO has an ongoing dialogue with the Ministry of Education, Science and Technology, which is involved in a general revision of the guidelines for the FDCs that might include work against sextortion. For the state-owned FDCs, this would mean that this work reaches a new level of formality and is provided with a clearer frame.

KTO and the FDCs have taken several important steps towards putting the policy against sextortion into practice. There is an awareness of the importance of clear and safe reporting mechanisms close to the students. This is demonstrated, for example, in the use of the key roles given to the matrons at the colleges in the work against sextortion. In the FDC structure, the matrons are responsible for the everyday well-being of the girl students. The role of the matrons in reporting sextortion also shows an awareness of the importance of connecting different levels, as they as coordinators can serve as bridges between actors within the college (students, teachers and principals) as well as in relation to KTO and the PCCB. Matrons are important but they do not constitute the only avenue for reporting. There are different entry points available at the FDCs, including the principals and the PCCB clubs. The use of the existing institution of PCCB clubs is another example of how established institutions at colleges in Tanzania are used in the work against sextortion. In the case of the PCCB clubs, they also have connections to the PCCB at the district levels and to the national corruption authority.

However, the descriptions of reporting mechanisms in cases of sextortion are largely hypothetical and their practical relevance remains unclear. The principals and teachers claim that they have not had any cases of sextortion in their colleges, at least not since the program to combat sextortion was initiated. Consequently, the focus of KTO's and the FDCs' work on sextortion is on prevention and awareness-raising in colleges, outreach in relation to the surrounding communities and (for KTO) advocacy in relation to authorities. Thus, information and communication are in focus.

When the principals and teachers describe the implications of the introduction of the policy at the college level, the focus on prevention and awareness-raising largely translates into providing information to students, indicating that the strong emphasis on the responsibility of the person with entrusted power that is clear in the written policy is diminished or even absent in the implementation process. When the principals and teachers describe the content of the information provided, they highlight the importance of *students* understanding why sextortion constitutes improper behaviour, why they should not engage in it, and how it is harmful to them as well as to society. A problematic tension is introduced as there simultaneously is an emphasis on students' responsibility to report sextortion when it happens.

This combination – the focus on prevention, on information directed to the students, and the responsibility of students to report – might in fact counteract the ambitions of the policy to make sextortion visible. If a sextortion case occurs in a college, it may be seen as a failure. And if the main recipients of information about sextortion are the students, and the information describes sextortion as improper behaviour also on the part of the student, the responsibility is placed on her. This likely adds to the hindrances for reporting already inherent in sextortion – shame, fear, stigma, complicity – as it makes the student potentially responsible also for the successful or failed implementation of policy against sextortion.

However, the findings of this study also point at a potential different path in the next steps in implementing the sextortion policy. According to KTO, the teachers have requested more and teacher-specific information from the PCCB. KTO also stresses that the reason why they decided to use and actively work with the definition of sextortion developed in the 2020 EBA study is that it makes clear that the responsibility for sextortion always lies with the person in power, the one with entrusted authority, i.e. college staff in the case of the FDCs. However, as we have shown in this study, even if this responsibility is clear in theory, it is not reflected in the views of interviewed staff, or in their descriptions of the practical implementation.

When describing the character of the responsibility of the teachers in cases of sextortion, morality is stressed. Teachers should be aware of the moral way of interacting with students and they should act as role models and not take advantage of their students. What is not emphasized, or rather not mentioned, is the *professional* responsibility of teachers not to engage in sextortion. To demand sex in exchange for grades is not only morally wrong, but it also makes you a bad and unprofessional teacher and potentially a criminal. Even though the responsibility of the person with entrusted authority is emphasized in theory, there is a persistent silence around this responsibility when sextortion policy is turned into practice. The essence of the abuse of entrusted power, namely the irreconcilability of sextortion and professionalism, is absent.

Recommendations

The below recommendations build on conclusions from this study and are directed at organizations, like KTO, that work to combat sextortion in their field of work. It is also relevant for Sida and other donors and development actors, as a guide in their own work as well as in support to organizations in partner countries.

- It is important to label sextortion in policy, and to explicitly position it at the intersection between corruption and gender-based violence.
- Sextortion policy should use a clear and efficient definition of sextortion as its point of departure. In this definition, the responsibility of the person with entrusted authority must be stressed.
- It is of great importance that the definition makes sense to and is embraced by the organization that will use it.
- There needs to be open and ongoing discussions about the definition of sextortion, particularly concerning the emphasis on the responsibility of the person with entrusted authority and what it implies in a particular context.
- The responsibility of the person in a position of entrusted authority should also be discussed in relation to the understanding/lack of understanding of sextortion in society as well as in relation to existing gender norms and legislation, and the relevant organizational context.
- Make sure that information and education targeting potential victims of sextortion does not create disincentives to report.

- Safe reporting mechanisms close to potential victims are crucial. The steps to take and the actors to involve at different stages and levels should be clear both to those who risk becoming victims of sextortion (for example students) and to those who are responsible for handling cases of sextortion (for example principals). Multiple entry points for reporting are recommended in order to decrease the dependence on a particular individual.
- A focus on prevention of sextortion needs to be coupled with a clear emphasis on the responsibility of those with entrusted power.
- Codes of conduct for relevant professionals (e.g. for teachers and principals in the education sector) should include the irreconcilability of sextortion and professionalism.

References

- Bjarnegård, Elin, and Pär Zetterberg. 2016. "Gender Equality Reforms on an Uneven Playing Field: Candidate Selection and Quota Implementation in Electoral Authoritarian Tanzania." *Government and Opposition* 51(3): 464–86.
- Chêne, Marie. 2009a. "Gender and Corruption in Humanitarian Assistance." *U4 Anti-Corruption Resource Centre*. <https://www.u4.no/publications/gender-and-corruption-in-humanitarian-assistance/> (April 11, 2021).
- . 2009b. "Gender, Corruption and Education." *U4 Anti-Corruption Resource Centre*. <https://www.u4.no/publications/gender-corruption-and-education.pdf> (April 11, 2021).
- Eldén, Åsa et al. 2020. *Sextortion: Corruption and Gender-Based Violence*. The Expert Group for Aid Studies (EBA).
- Feigenblatt, Hazel. 2020. *Breaking the Silence around Sextortion: The Links between Power, Sex and Corruption*. Transparency International.
- IAWJ. 2012. *Stopping the Abuse of Power through Sexual Exploitation: Naming, Shaming and Ending Sextortion*. International Association of Women Judges. <http://www.iawj.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/04/Corruption-and-Sextortion-Resource-1.pdf> (April 11, 2021).
- KTO. 2021a. Annual Report 2020. *Life Long Learning for Sustainable Development*. Karibu Tanzania Organization (KTO).
- . 2021b. *Semi-Annual Report*. Karibu Tanzania Organization.
- . 2021c. *Sextortion Program in FDCs. FDC Action Plans January-March*. Karibu Tanzania Organization (KTO).
- Lindberg, Helen, and Helena Stensöta. 2018. "Corruption as Exploitation: Feminist Exchange Theories and the Link Between Gender and Corruption." In *Gender and Corruption: Historical Roots and New Avenues for Research*, Political Corruption and Governance, eds. Helena Stensöta and Lena Wängnerud. Cham: Springer International Publishing, 237–56. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-70929-1_12 (April 11, 2021).
- Merkle, Ortrun, Julia Reinold, and Melissa Siegel. 2017. *A Gender Perspective on Corruption Encountered during Forced and Irregular Migration*. Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit.
- Ministry for Foreign Affairs. 2021. *The Swedish Foreign Service Action Plan for Feminist Foreign Policy 2019-2022, Including Direction and Measures for 2021*.
- Morley, Louise. 2011. "Sex, Grades and Power in Higher Education in Ghana and Tanzania." *Cambridge Journal of Education* 41(1): 101–15.

- Rogers, Alan. 2019. "The Homelessness of Adult Education: Some Lessons from the Folk Development Colleges of Tanzania." *Studies in the Education of Adults* 51(1): 15–35.
- Sida. 2019. *Sidas Hantering Av Korruptionsmisstankar. Årsrapport 2018*. Sida. <https://cdn.sida.se/publications/files/sida62216sv-sidas-hantering-av-korruptionsmisstankar.pdf> (March 11, 2022).
- Towns, Ann. 2015. "Prestige, Immunity and Diplomats: Understanding Sexual Corruption." In *Elites, Institutions and the Quality of Government, Executive Politics and Governance*, eds. Carl Dahlström and Lena Wängnerud. London: Palgrave Macmillan UK, 49–65. https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137556288_4 (April 11, 2021).
- Transparency International. 2019a. *Citizen's Views and Experiences of Corruption*. Transparency International.
- . 2019b. *Gender and Corruption in Zimbabwe, 2019*. Transparency International. <http://www.tizim.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/07/Gender-and-Corruption-in-Zimbabwe-2019.pdf> (April 11, 2021).
- UNDP-Huairo Commission. 2012. *Seeing Beyond the State – Grassroots Womens Perspectives on Corruption and Anti-Corruption*. UNDP and Huairo Commission.
- UNDP-SIWI. 2017. *Women and Corruption in the Water Sector. Theories and Experiences from Johannesburg and Bogotá*. Stockholm: SIWI. WGF Report.
- United Republic of Tanzania. 2007. "The Prevention and Combating Corruption Act 2007." <https://www.fiu.go.tz/pcca.pdf> (April 11, 2021).
- Yusuph, Kambuga. 2016. "Sextortion in Education Sector and Response to Criminal Legal System in Tanzania - A Review." *Asia Pacific Journal of Education, Arts and Sciences* 3(1): 56–63.

Appendix

Interviews:

FDC teacher	Woman
FDC teacher	Man
FDC teacher	Woman
FDC principal	Man
FDC principal	Man
FDC principal	Man
KTO management (3)	Woman, woman and man
KTO management (2)	Woman and man
PCCB-representative	Man

In addition, we have met with members of the KTO management online on several occasions and have had continuous exchange of material over e-mail.

Interview guides:

Principals and teachers:

- How do you define sextortion?
- Which policies do you have in your schools today, that can be used in work against sextortion?
 - Policies against sextortion
 - Policies against corruption
 - Policies against GBV/SEAH
- How do these policies correspond with national laws and policies?
- What is your role and responsibility as a principal/teacher to implement these policies (to make them work in everyday life)?

- If there is a case of sextortion in your school, how would that be dealt with?
 - Reporting mechanism
 - Measures
 - Consequences for the perpetrator
 - Consequences for the victim
- If you want: give us an example of a case/cases of sextortion that you have dealt with in your school
 - Note: we will not use the specific case – but an example helps us to understand
- What are the main challenges in cases of sextortion?
 - To identify and recognise (for victim to interpret their experiences as sextortion/corruption/violence/abuse of power)
 - At different stages:
 - Reporting mechanism
 - Measures
 - Consequences for the perpetrator
 - Consequences for the victim
- Do you think that the policies/tools should be strengthened in any way?
- If so: how?

KTO management:

- How do you define sextortion?
- We know that you have recently adopted a KTO-policy against sextortion. Can you tell us about the process that led to this policy?
- Why is it important to have a specific policy against sextortion?
- What are the tools and methods that you use to implement this policy?
- We know that you have organized workshops on sextortion with teachers and principals, in collaboration with the PCCB.
 - Can you tell us about these workshops?
 - What about the collaboration with PCCB, how does that impact the implementation of the policy?

- What do you think are the main challenges in the implementation of a policy against sextortion?
- What do you think are the most difficult aspects in dealing with cases of sextortion?
- What would help you to reach further in your work against sextortion?

PCCB-representative:

- How do you define sextortion?
- Can you tell us shortly about the Tanzanian legislation relevant for sextortion?
- Do you as PCCB have a specific policy against sextortion, apart from the legislation?
- In your opinion, is it important to have a specific policy against sextortion?
- What are the tools and methods that you use to work against sextortion/implement policy?
- We know that you have been involved in the KTO workshops on sextortion with teachers and principals, in connection to their policy against sextortion.
 - Can you tell us about these workshops?
 - What is your role as PCCB in implementing the KTO policy?
- What do you think are the main challenges in the implementation of a policy against sextortion?
- What do you think are the most difficult aspects in dealing with cases of sextortion?
- What would help you to reach further in your work against sextortion?