Norwegian University
of Life Sciences

Master's Thesis 2020 30 ECTS
Faculty of Landscape and Society

Humanitarian Organisations Experience with and Response to Sexual Harassment in the Aftermath of #AidToo: The Case of NORCAP

Vilde Rolstad
Master of Science in Global Development Studies

The Department of International Environment and Development Studies, Noragric, is the international gateway for the Norwegian University of Life Sciences (NMBU). Established in 1986, Noragric's contribution to international development lies in the interface between research, education (Bachelor, Master and PhD programmes) and assignments.

The Noragric Master's theses are the final theses submitted by students in order to fulfil the requirements under the Noragric Master's programmes 'International Environmental Studies', 'Global Development Studies' and 'International Relations'.

vrolstad@online.no

Noragric, Department of International Environment and Development Studies, The Faculty of Landscape and Society

P.O. Box 5003 N-1432 Ås Norway

Tel.: +47 67 23 00 00 Internet: https://www.nmbu.no/fakultet/landsam/institutt/noragric

Declaration

I, Vilde Rolstad, declare that this thesis is a result of my research investigations and findings. Sources of information other than my own have been acknowledged and a reference list has been appended. This work has not been previously submitted to any other university for award of any type of academic degree.

Signature…….. Date: 15th of August 2021

Acknowledgement

Throughout the writing process of this thesis, I have received support and assistance from several people. First, I would like to express my gratitude to my colleagues in NORCAP for giving me the opportunity to explore and learn, and for sharing documents that have given me valuable insight. Without the support from NORCAP, this thesis would not be possible. I would also like to thank my key informants for making time to share their experiences, knowledge, and reflections on this given research phenomenon. Your participation is highly appreciated. Further, I would like to thank my two supervisors, Kaja Borchgrevink and Ingrid L. P. Nyborg, for their engagement, support, and guidance. Without your feedback and expertise, this thesis would not have been what it is today.

I would also like to thank my family, friends, and boyfriend for their support and motivation – especially at times I did not believe in myself or my work. You have given me much needed and happy distractions, so that I have been able to rest my mind outside of this thesis. Last, but not least, a special thanks to my mom who bought my favourite ice cream, patiently sat up with me at nights, and discussed and helped me choose the right direction for my thesis. I could not have carried out this thesis without any of you.

Any errors are mine alone.

Abstract

The purpose of this thesis is to gain insight into humanitarian organisations' experience with and response to sexual harassment in the aftermath of the #AidToo movement. This is done through a case study of a humanitarian recruitment organisation's organisational changes, policies, procedures, and trainings by comparing this with employees' experience and perceptions of the organisation's preventative efforts. To do this, a qualitative study approach was chosen, involving my data being gathered through semi-structured interviews with the chosen organisations' employees. I also reviewed a selection of the organisation's documents regarding prevention of sexual exploitation, abuse, and sexual harassment, to be able to compare what is written in the document and the employees' understandings.

This study found that sexual harassment still persists, even though the humanitarian organisation responded and adapted after #AidToo by making updates or establish new policies and guidelines on how to prevent and handle the issue. I also found that the managers and leaders play a major role in addressing this issue, despite their employees underlining their lack of awareness on how to *actually* prevent it. There is a tendency of perpetrators in the sector not being held accountable for their behaviours, as well as managers and leaders protecting their organisation and lacking sufficient investment, all in which hampers sufficient implementation of the established efforts. I also found aspects of gender and power central in this matter.

This research also found a gap between the organisation's policies, procedures, and trainings and the employees' perception on this matter and how it is managed. It found that sufficient training, communication, capacity building, and investment are lacking to adequately implement what is stated in the documents. The implementation of the organisation's guidelines for the prevention of sexual exploitation and abuse and sexual harassment have therefore not been sufficiently implemented and have not reaching all the targeted members in the organisation. The findings are relevant for the organisation under study in their attempts to improve their organisational responsibility in the prevention of sexual exploitation and abuse and sexual harassment, as well as other, similar humanitarian organisations struggling to do the same.

Acronyms and Abbreviations

AFP	Association of Fundraising Professionals
CoC	Code of Conduct
DFID	The Department for International Development
HO	Head Office
HO Staff	NRC and NORCAP Head Office Staff
HWN	Humanitarian Women's Network
IASC	Inter Agency Standing Committee
NGO	Non-Governmental Organisation
NORCAP HO	NORCAP Head Office
NPO	Non-Profit Organisation
NRC	Norwegian Refugee Council
NRC HO	Norwegian Refugee Council Head Office
PSEA	Preventing Sexual Exploitation and Abuse
PSEA & SH	Preventing Sexual Exploitation and Abuse and Sexual Harassment
RQ	Research Question
RTA	Report the Abuse
SEA	Sexual Exploitation and Abuse
SH	Sexual Harassment
UN	United Nations
UN Women	United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women
UNAIDS	Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS

Table of Contents

1. Introduction

In early 2020 I had an internship at NORCAP[1], and I was involved in a survey on bullying and harassment survey targeted at NORCAP deployees. NORCAP had seen a steady increase in the reports of such cases in the past couple of years, in addition to the #MeToo and #AidToo movements being brought up several times. Because of this, and my interest for human rights, view of women, gender roles and gender equality, I was curious to see how humanitarian organisations have adapted and responded to sexual harassment in the aftermath of #AidToo.

Tarana Burke started the 'Me Too' Movement in 2006 (Riley, 2020). In October 2017, due to a string of accusations against the high-profile Hollywood producer Harvey Weinstein, actress Alyssa Milano encouraged women to share their experience with sexual violence by using the hashtag #MeToo on Twitter (Fileborn & Loney-Howes, 2019). Journalists, academics, politicians, and activists have spoken of a MeToo movement ever since (Riley, 2020). Sexual harassment has been, and continuous to be, a major issue across different sectors and countries (Dey, 2019; Fileborn & Loney-Howes, 2019). As the growing awareness and engagement of #MeToo progressed, a revelation of various cases of sexual harassment and assault within the global humanitarian sector emerged. To stress the frequency of such behaviours in this specific sector, humanitarian women created their own version of the hashtag – #AidToo (Gillespie, Mirabella & Eikenberry, 2019).

Sexual harassment and assault have not only been present for decades, but are also well documented in the humanitarian sector. #AidToo reveals several stories of both aid workers and beneficiaries being harassed, abused, or assaulted by humanitarian aid workers. Despite the incidents being seemingly widespread, the issue remains highly underreported, under-acknowledged, and understood as a hush-hush conversation (Gillespie et al., 2019; Mazurana & Donnelly, 2017; Dey, 2019). Even though humanitarian organisations are expected to protect and work for a better future for the most vulnerable, the movement have shown that some – conceivably many more than we already know about – are clearly failing these expectations (Gillespie et al., 2019). Despite data being available and revealing of the magnitude of the problem, there has been little research into how organisational changes have been established within humanitarian organisations after the #AidToo movement - and whether these have been sufficiently implemented, and how this is perceived by the organisations' employees. With this

[1] NORCAP is the NRC's global provider of expertise to the humanitarian, development, and peacebuilding sectors. Further information about the organisation is presented in section 1.3.

study I aim to contribute to fill this knowledge gap and contribute to further research within the field of development studies.

1.1 Problem Statement

The overarching goal of this research is to gain insight into how humanitarian organisations have adapted and responded in the aftermath of the #AidToo movement. To do this, I will look at the organisational culture and practice within NORCAP. NORCAP is a well-recognised humanitarian organisation and presents itself as an organisation that works to protect lives, rights, and livelihoods globally (Norwegian Refugee Council [NRC], n.d.a). This, I believe, makes it pertinent to study how sexual harassment is understood and dealt with within a humanitarian organisation. The focus of this thesis is to provide insight into NORCAP's policies, procedures, way of working, and organisational change in relation to prevention of workplace sexual harassment, as well as their employees' perception on these matters. Such insight will be of value beyond the specific case, and contribute to the study of sexual harassment in the humanitarian sector and development studies. As a leading organisation in the field, we may assume that NORCAP also are leading in terms of education and protection of employees, and how to handle and prevent such behaviours.

Based on new empirical data and analysis, I will contribute to the academic study of sexual harassment in development studies. As NORCAP is a major provider of experts to United Nations (UN) organisations, a study of this organisation is of high relevance to both development studies and practice. Development studies commonly focus on how organisations collaborate with partners and beneficiaries. Studies of change in humanitarian organisations tends to focus on change process in relation to external factors such as changing trends in humanitarian policy and practice, political situations, and instability. The #AidToo movement, on the other hand, has turned the attention to issues within the humanitarian sector itself, specifically to (mis)conduct and (mal)practice within the organisations. I set out to examine internal malpractices within the humanitarian sector and how this relates more broadly to the culture and practice of humanitarian organisations. From a development studies perspective, to examine how #AidToo has affected the organisational procedures, practice, and way of working within NORCAP can bring insights of high relevance to development practice. This, because NORCAP is an organisation with high standards for its operations, among others, through Code of Conducts, policies, and guidelines. Based on interviews with NORCAP Head Office (HO)

staff and NORCAP experts deployed to crisis areas (NORCAP deployees), I seek to gain insight into what is making the process of preventing sexual harassment in the humanitarian sector so difficult, and to what extent the established efforts and organisational changes in NORCAP have been effective in reaching its objective to prevent such behaviour. Previous studies (e.g. Mazurana & Donnelly, 2017; UN Women 2018; Deloitte, 2019; Riley, 2020) have shown that most survivors of workplace sexual harassment within the humanitarian sector are women, while most perpetrators are men in positions of power. This makes it an interesting topic for development studies by involving gender and power perspectives and theories on organisational culture and practices.

1.2 Research Questions (RQs)

With this problem statement in mind, and based on the following research questions, this study aims to gain insight into how NORCAP has adapted and responded to workplace sexual harassment in the aftermath of #AidToo. To do this, this study will look at NORCAP' policies, procedures, way of working, and organisational changes after the movement – and how this might have contributed to changes in the organisation or the humanitarian sector more broadly. Furthermore, this study will look at how these matters are perceived by NORCAP employees, involving both HO staff and deployees, and how they see this in relation to broader questions on management and leadership, gender, and power. All in which will be answered based on the following Research Question (RQ) and sub-research questions:

To what extent have NORCAP's established efforts to prevent workplace sexual harassment in the aftermath of the #AidToo movement been effective in reaching its objective?

Sub RQs:

1. To what extent and in what ways has NORCAP changed its policies, procedures, and way of working?
2. How is prevention of workplace sexual harassment conceptualised and practiced in NORCAP, and how is this perceived by its employees?
3. How are the changes perceived by the HO staff and deployees? Do they differ and in what ways? How does this relate to gender, power and organisational values and practice within NORCAP and the humanitarian sector more broadly?

The first sub-question will shed light on NORCAP's efforts to prevent sexual harassment,

and to what extent and in what ways the #AidToo movement has changed their policies, procedures, and way of working. This part will mainly be answered based on what is written in NORCAP documents and data provided by NORCAP HO staff. The second sub-question will examine how prevention of sexual harassment is conceptualised and practiced within NORCAP and how this is perceived by the employees. The last sub-question will enlighten differences and discrepancies between what is written in the NORCAP documents and the employees' perceptions of these matters. The two latter questions will be answered based on data collected in my interviews, and will draw on perspectives on gender, power, and organisational values and practice within NORCAP and the humanitarian sector more broadly. Moreover, all RQs will be addressed through the analysis of 11 in-depth interviews with NORCAP HO staff and deployees, providing qualitative insights into participants' experiences and perspectives on prevention of sexual harassment. This qualitative research is conducted as a case study aiming to capture and examine the given research phenomenon in the context of NORCAP. However, this study will also be of relevance for other humanitarian organisations.

1.3 NORCAP

The Norwegian Refugee Council (NRC) is an independent humanitarian organisation providing help and expertise in more than 30 countries worldwide (NRC, n.d.b). NORCAP is under the NRC umbrella and is NRC's global provider of expertise to the humanitarian, development, and peacebuilding sectors. By collaborating with partners on local, national, and international levels, NORCAP aims to contribute to humanitarian operations in a consistent and effective manner, and help the international community prevent and respond to humanitarian needs (NRC, n.d.e). NORCAP has a pool of over 1000 experts deployed to both national partners and international organisations in more than 70 countries (NRC, n.d.a; NRC, n.d.d). NRC's Secretary General is portraying NORCAP with the following words:

"At the heart of NORCAP are our excellent roster members. They are hardworking experts who build capacity and improve the humanitarian coordination and response. They are the ones who make a difference on the ground in challenging and complex working conditions" (NRC, n.d.a)

To support humanitarian response, NORCAP was established as a standby capacity with the purpose of having personnel ready to assist and support the UN in humanitarian crises (NRC, 2018). NORCAP is a part of the Standby Partnership (SBP), which today includes an

assortment of Standby Partner organisations and UN agencies (Standby Partnership [SBP], n.d.a). Every Standby Partner uphold their own roster of experts ready to support the UN in operations whenever needed (ibid.). The SBP Network exists to provide "high quality personnel consistently available for support to humanitarian action through organisational engagement and collective preparedness", in which NORCAP is NRC's contribution to this partnership (SBP, n.d.b). NORCAP is also collaborating with other partners, such as regional institutions, national authorities, and NGOs, in addition to having their own thematic projects, some in cooperation with partners (NRC, n.d.d).

1.4 Thesis Outline

The following chapter is the literature review which presents and reviews relevant theories, approaches, and gaps in existing literature, and outlines the data used in this thesis. Chapter 3 contains the conceptual framework and draws on both organisational, humanitarian, and development studies literature to address relevant concepts, such as sexual harassment, gender, power, organisational culture, practice, and change. Chapter 4 outlines the research design and methodology used in this study, justifies the methods and why I found these methods suitable. It further addresses my positionality, the study's weaknesses and limitations, as well as its trustworthiness and authenticity. The analysis is presented in chapter 5 and presents and discusses this research' findings in the light of the literature presented in chapter 2. The final chapter contains the conclusions. Here, the research questions and overall goal of this research is addressed by drawing and deriving from the analysis and discussion. It also includes suggestions for further research.

2. Literature Review

This chapter will explore literature within the fields of organisation and development studies. The aim is to anchor and address the research questions and place this study within already existing research. This thesis aims to identify knowledge gaps within the given field of this study, by bringing insight into the given research phenomenon based on previous literature on the following search terms: "#AidToo", "#MeToo", "workplace sexual harassment", "management and leadership", "gender", and "power", as well as "organisational culture", "organisational practice" and "organisational change". By combining the terms with "in

humanitarian organisations" or "in the humanitarian sector", I aimed to find literature on awareness and prevention of sexual harassment within humanitarian organisations.

2.1 Workplace Sexual Harassment, Power & Gender

According to McDonald (2011), studies on sexual harassment (SH) have proliferated "since its recognition as a socio-legal phenomenon in the 1970s" (p.1). There has however been little attention to studies of sexual harassment in the humanitarian sector. Particularly studies which look at how prevention of sexual harassment in the aftermath of the #AidToo movement is perceived by humanitarian workers. To gain insight into the given research phenomenon, an overview of literature on workplace sexual harassment will be included by drawing on power and gender perspectives.

In an analysis article drawing on previous research, Siuta & Bergman (2019) argue that sexual harassment "must be discussed within the context of the social stratification of gender that permits it" and that theories of sexual harassment today have developed to understand that the gendered nature of the term is crucial for the understanding of it (p. 4). In addition to underlining age, marital status, sexual orientation, and education level as individual factors related to experiences of sexual harassment, they also state that it is "motivated by reinforcing societal power hierarchies" (p. 1). In fact, several researchers claim power as a critical component of harassment, which also includes social power hierarchies within organisations (e.g. Berdahl, 2007; Maass, Cadinu, Guarnieri, & Grasselli, 2003; McDonald, 2011). In their academic journal on #MeToo and sexual harassment, Clair et al. (2019) describes sexual harassment as a practice that is almost untraceable and "steeped in power relations" (p. 111). They argue that the #MeToo movements has enlightened how people, especially women, have been treaded within organisations, but also how such harassment organise discrimination based on gender (Clair et al., 2019, p. 115).

In an article discussing what #MeToo have thought about stop and frisk, Ross (2018) explains that one outcome of the movement was a growing understanding of power and authority imposing new meanings on what superficially can be seen as consensual encounters (p. 544). She further elaborates that it can be truly disturbing and coercing when a person submits to someone who has power over them, even if a meeting is lacking visible violation (ibid.). By including the impact of #MeToo, Kovack (2020) draws on literature on "gender dissimilar supervisor-employee workplace dyads" in her review of powerful leaders' impact on

employee motivation (p. 1). She states that #MeToo shed light on settings "when men in positions of power took advantage of their rank", placing women in compromising situations (ibid.). She also claims that the movement brought knowledge, awareness, and tolerance to the forefront in discussions regarding business relations – especially and specifically on the power dynamics between supervisors and employees (Kovack, 2020, p. 2). House of Commons (2018) also highlight abuse of power as the core of sexual violence, where "the power imbalance is predominantly, although not exclusively, men abusing women and girls" (p. 4). Despite this literature acknowledging that sexual harassment can be targeted towards men, they state the commonness of women being the most vulnerable target of such acts.

In their conceptual analysis on workplace bullying, Leigh, Reid, Geldenhuys & Gobind (2014) describe gender as "a prominent socio-demographic influence in workplace bullying" and harassment (p. 6059). Furthermore, the scholars argue how women are often regarded as 'the weaker sex', which has "portrayed women as vulnerable and defenceless, privy to abuse and victimization" (ibid.). Leigh et al. (2014) inform that from a gendered perspective, and due to the gendered nature of organisations, workplace bullying and harassment "can be understood by examining the theory of *gendered organisation*", which stresses "how organisations is gendered and how gender inequalities are promoted" (6063). This involves processes within an organisation which contributes to the construction of gendered work divisions. This entails males dominating upper management, leaders being portrayed as successful, forceful, and masculine. It further entails the gendered division within relations being motivated by power relations and social roles, involving males in leader roles and females in more supportive roles, and organisational processes that form the 'appropriate presentation' of the gendered self as part of the organisation' (ibid.). Leigh et al. (2014) further debate that these gendered factors affect the bullying and harassment experienced by both women and men in the workplace, and underline how women and men often face different types of bullying, where women often experience more "gender incivility" bullying, which is sexist in nature (p. 6063).

Feminist theoretical perspectives, according to MacKinnon (1979), are underpinned by concepts of power. Gillespie et al. (2019) takes a feminist perspective in their essay aiming "to explore the implications of #metoo and #aidtoo for understanding nonprofit/nongovernmental organization (NPO/NGO) theory and practice" (p. 1). They focus on women and their continuous experience with sexual harassment and examine why these incidents persist. They and highlight "institutional power disparities; a misogynist culture; gender mainstreaming; a focus on the individual victim and perpetrator; and the capitalist system" as the main reasons

(Gillespie et al., 2019, p. 6). Gillespie et al. (2019) also base their arguments on findings provided by earlier research (Harris Insights & Analytics 2018; Humanitarian Women's Network [HWN], 2016), and do not include own data. They are not only trying to measure the extent of the problem, but they are also contributing to the literature by discussing an approach on how to address this issue, based on intersectional feminist practice and theory. However, their essay can be criticised for exclusively focus on the experiences of women.

Primary theoretical explanations of sexual harassment have focused on what is seen as the most prevalent form, involving a male boss sexually harassing a female subordinate (Berdahl, 2007; McDonald & Charlesworth, 2016; Gillespie et al., 2019). However, these perspectives have been criticised for not including "harassment by men towards other men and by women towards men or other women", which McDonald & Charlesworth (2016) state have received relatively little attention in the literature (p. 118-119). To fill this gap, McDonald & Charlesworth (2016) investigate this 'atypical' form of sexual harassment and contribute with a better understanding of its extent and nature, by drawing their research on "a number of overlapping theoretical perspectives that have been posed to help explain these more unusual manifestations" (p. 119). Their empirical analysis draws on qualitative and quantitative data from 282 complaints of workplace sexual harassment in Australia, "allowing for a systematic examination of both the relative frequency with which formal complaints of atypical and 'classic' forms of SH are made", in which they highlight men being targets of sexual harassment "far more commonly than typically assumed" (McDonald & Charlesworth, 2016, p. 119-120). In similarity with Ross (2018), House of Commons (2018), and Kovack (2020), McDonald & Charlesworth (2016) found a commonness of complains being placed against perpetrators with a more senior position than the survivor (p. 123). McDonald & Charlesworth (2016) provide an important contribution to the previous research addressed in this thesis, as it provides a thorough understanding of sexual harassment as not only involving sexual harassment towards women by men, but also other 'atypical' forms rooted in other aspects than simply biological gender.

Sexual harassment has commonly been understood as mainly targeted towards women by men, however it has also been proven to happen towards men by women or other men. In recent years, sexual harassment is understood as not only emerging because of gender, but also power relations. There seems to be a gap in literature regarding how humanitarian organisations' employees perceive how their organisation has adapted and responded to workplace sexual harassment in the aftermath of the #MeToo and #AidToo movements, and

how this is related to broader questions on gender and power. Thus, and based on the reviewed literature, key concepts such as gender and power are highly relevant when aiming to fill this research gap.

2.2 Sexual Harassment in the Humanitarian Sector

The existing body of literature on sexual harassment in the humanitarian sector is limited. A thorough review of the existing literature shows that in recent years, especially in the aftermath of #AidToo, there has been an upsurge in studies. Most studies have been about trying to measure the issue and the extent of the problem, in which most of the data is gathered through secondary literature analysis, systematic literature reviews, primary confidential, online surveys, or a mix of those.

Although the #MeToo movement first started within the film industry, it quickly turned its focus to other industries and sectors. This was also the case for the humanitarian sector, resulting in the creation of the #AidToo movement. Regarded as one of the main reasons for its creation is the Oxfam scandal, revealing that Oxfam staff paid Haiti survivors for sexual favours after the earthquake in 2010 (The Times, 2018; Riley, 2020; Scurlock, Dolsak & Prakash, 2020). Senior figures in the sector have described these accusations as the sector's #MeToo moment which "lifted the lid on instances of sexual abuse and exploitation in the sector" (Gillespie et al., 2019; Beaumont & Ratcliffe, 2018; Daniels, 2018). Scurlock et al. (2020) argues that Oxfam, "one of the most prominent international humanitarian organizations, had covered up claims of its Haiti-based senior staff" (p. 94). In the wake of this scandal, the Guardian interviewed experienced humanitarian workers (Beaumont & Ratcliffe, 2018). Several of them "told largely similar stories of colleagues' use of sex workers, suspicions of the exploitation of vulnerable women for sex – including minors" (ibid.). Riley (2020) informs that such cases usually are dealt with by trying to let the cases go under the radar and not be publicly noticed, in which also was the case with Oxfam prior to the big reveal. This is done by allowing perpetrators to quietly resign, without severe consequences (p. 52). Despite repeated warnings and public attention, sexual harassment, exploitation, abuse, and the culture of impunity still exists in the humanitarian sector (Cornaz, 2019, p. 2; UN Women, 2018). Due to the rapid increase in such cases across the humanitarian sector, it could be assumed that the issue is much more widespread than many realise, as several researchers state that what has emerged through #AidToo is only the tip of the iceberg (Gillespie et al., 2019; Cornaz, 2019;

House of Commons International Development Committee [House of Commons], 2018; Beaumont & Ratcliffe, 2018). Even though it might be too early to see the long-term impacts, the campaign still portrays a real and welcomed wake-up call for the sector (ibid.).

In her article, Riley (2020) analyses the aid industry and the #MeToo movement and stresses that the abusive environment in the sector could be explained by the sector's awkward relationship with its own imperial past (p. 49). She writes that this is studied as a part of the new humanitarian history approach to explore how its history have influenced and framed humanitarian and development achievements, as humanitarianism is influenced by what she describes as "racism and the associated prioritising of the desires of the global north", with white humanitarian workers viewed as 'white saviours' (Riley, 2020, p. 49-50). Riley (2020) further stresses the difficulty of writing about sexual harassment and abuses in the humanitarian sector, as organisations tend to seek to control the narrative and hide as much as they can, even if investigations are conducted and reports being placed (p. 50). She argues that reports written on sexual harassment, assault and abuse in fact are a way to stop the conversation on this topic, as these "documents 'work' precisely by not bringing about the effects that they name" and blames the patriarchal society the humanitarian organisations operate in (ibid.). Riley (2020) considers women most vulnerable to sexual abuse, harassment, and assault, and argues that regardless of being women working for an NGO or beneficiaries of aid, "all women, in short, are at risk in the aid and development sector […] in all areas of the aid industry" (p. 49). By drawing on literature to examine #AidToo within a British context, Riley (2020) describes reasons why sexual violence is so pervasive within the humanitarian sector and who is most vulnerable to such acts (p. 49). She emphasises power inequalities within the sector, and request and argue for ethical code of conducts which recognise these differences (ibid.)

Research has shown that sexual exploitation and abuse (SEA) and sexual harassment not only is an issue between professionals and beneficiaries, but also between humanitarian workers (Nobert 2016; Nobert, 2017; Einbinder, 2018; House of Commons, 2018). According to Nobert (2017), Report the Abuse (RTA) was the first international NGO to solely address sexual violence towards humanitarian workers by creating "the first good practices tool to assist humanitarian organisations in their efforts to improve how they address this problem" in 2016 (p. 4). Back then, RTA claimed that this type of sexual violence, despite its long history, was only an emerging problem in the sense that it just recently had started to be openly discussed (Nobert, 2016, p. 3). While discussions were a starting point, RTA argued that few development and humanitarian organisations had prevention policies, strategies, or procedures on this topic

at that time (ibid.). To fill this gap, RTA created a 'Prevention, Policy and Procedure Checklist' and stated that this was an "essential and timely contribution to the discourse" and "a first step toward ensuring prevention and accountability for humanitarian and development workers subjected to sexual violence" at work (Nobert, 2016, p. 4 & 8). RTA used both quantitative and qualitative approaches to analyse the issue, aiming to create a nuanced and comprehensive "picture of the issue of sexual violence against humanitarian and development workers" (Nobert, 2016, p. 7). This included web-based secondary data from 92 organisations to determinate what they at that time utilised of policies and procedures on sexual violence applying to their employees (ibid.). They also conducted a survey to map the type and nature of such sexual violence, which provided "important first-hand insights into what humanitarian and development workers require from their employers" (ibid.). Nobert (2016) concludes that "no documents were identified that specifically addressed the topic of sexual violence against humanitarian and development workers" in 2016, and that RTA's Checklist was the first step to make sure accountability and prevention approaches was established (p. 6 & 8).

RTA took this further and publish a new report in 2017, presenting good practices for improved prevention measures, policies, and procedures on how to address sexual violence in humanitarian organisations (Nobert, 2017). This report draws on quantitative and qualitative data, and information and knowledge collected through the creation of their Checklist. They examined internal response and prevention approaches from over 100 humanitarian organisations, several organisations' safety and security manuals and trainings, as well as data from "Human Resources staff, Ombudsman, Ethics departments, Staff Welfare, Safety and Security personnel, and Legal departments", and feedback from humanitarian workers, "many of whom were survivors of sexual violence" (Nobert, 2017, p. 7). Nobert (2017) claims that this "wide-reaching base of information allowed for the creation of a holistic and comprehensive tool" for humanitarian organisations to respond to and prevent workplace sexual harassment, by drawing on sensitive and survivor-centred strategies (p. 7). Arguably, this contributes to a nuanced and comprehensive research of great value for the sector and their work on preventing sexual violence. RTA's research does not simply measure the extent of the problem, but it also investigates the policies and procedures established at that time and gains insight into how employees and survivors perceive humanitarian organisations' response and proposes a tool the organisations can use to prevent employees from experiencing workplace sexual harassment. They are also reflecting on why these issues occurs, and what can be done to provide and adequately respond to such cases. With their approach and reports (Nobert, 2016;

Nobert, 2017), RTA provides important and crucial contributions to the prevention of workplace sexual harassment towards humanitarian workers, even before the establishment of the #MeToo and #AidToo movements. This, in turn, could also work as a limitation to their efforts. Their reports could be less visible in the literature regarding sexual harassment, especially in relation to the #MeToo and #AidToo literature, which has gained a lot of attention the last years.

Because of the UN's position and power within the humanitarian sector, their work and understanding of issues is considered to be crucial for the rest of the sector (Sengupta, 2016; Morrow, 2016). I also consider this in relation to preventative work and perceptions of sexual harassment within the sector. According to UN Peacekeeping (n.d.), the UN's strategies to address such issues is based on "prevention of misconduct, enforcement of UN standards of conduct and remedial action". To put these strategies into action, the UN provides trainings, awareness raising campaigns, clear standards of conduct, investigations and disciplinary measures, and assistance to survivors (ibid.). The UN also have a zero-tolerance policy on sexual exploitation and assault (SEA), which states that this always have "been unacceptable behaviour and prohibited conduct for United Nations staff" (United Nations [UN] Secretariat, 2003, p. 2). Workplace sexual harassment was, according to Nobert (2016), officially recognised by the United Nations General Assembly in late 2015, after IACS Principals "endorsed a statement on sexual exploitation and abuse that focuses on humanitarian personnel" (p. 5). The efforts to prevent SEA in the humanitarian sector is today led by IASC, commonly known as 'PSEA' (Sandvik, 2019, p. 3). In 2017, the UN strengthened their PSEA by involving a new approach (UN General Assembly, 2017), where "the Secretary-General outlined a comprehensive four-pronged strategy to prevent and respond to sexual exploitation and abuse across the United Nations system" (UN, 2021, p. 1). The strategy includes "prioritizing the rights and dignity of victims", "ending impunity through strengthened reporting and investigations", "engaging with Member States, civil society and external partners", and "improving strategic communication for education and transparency" (UN General Assembly, 2021, p. 2). Every year since, the UN Secretary-General has provided updates regarding the implementation of their strategy (UN General Assembly 2018, 2019, 2020 and 2021). The UN launched 'Clear Check' in 2018, "an electronic tool aimed at preventing United Nations personnel from being deployed or reemployed within the system if they have been dismissed for substantiated allegations of sexual exploitation and abuse, or if they left while an investigation was pending", and a 24-hour helpline in 2019 where employees can report sexual harassment which will be followed

up by investigators (UN General Assembly, 2019, p. 10; Bolle, 2019). Despite the UN General Assembly (2019) stating that the collaboration among UN organisations and agencies had been strengthened, the UN General Assembly (2021) argue that accusations of SEA continue to surface.

The International Development Committee was chosen by the House of Commons in the UK to study "the expenditure, administration and policy of the Department for International Development [DFID] and its associated public bodies" (House of Commons, 2018, p. iv). After looking at the PSEA measures across the UN system and how they investigate these allegations, House of Commons (2018) found the lack of consistency in the UN' approach to PSEA and SH, flawed mechanisms for holding perpetrators accountable, and an existing culture of impunity (p. 6). They argue that this undermines the idea of zero tolerance and weakens the work that is done by trying to strengthen the reporting mechanisms, as the impunity makes it seemingly unvaluable to bring allegations forwards and report incidents (House of Commons, 2018, p. 7). House of Commons (2018) acknowledge that policies and programmes aiming to prevent these issues have been implemented by several humanitarian agencies. Thus, they describe it as "particularly horrifying to find evidence of personnel from the aid and security sectors perpetrating these abuses rather than combating them" (p. 4). House of Commons (2018) examine the expenditure, administration, and policy of DFID and its associated bodies, in which they contribute to the literature with their insight and further recommendations. They reviewed the literature and history of the given research phenomenon, involving discussions on management and policies.

In 2018, the UNAIDS published an internal report worked on for four months on prevention of and responses to harassment, bullying and abuse of power, involving sexual harassment. UNAIDS (2018) used an independent expert panel to review their leadership and culture; asses why they have high levels of harassment reported through anonymous surveys but not through formal report mechanisms; evaluate the effectiveness of their policies and procedures; and suggest comprehensive measures on, among others, their organisational culture and policies related to these matters in the workplace. The external panel used several approaches to gather data, involving 103 interviews and written submissions, a survey with a 60+% response rate, and internal and external research (UNAIDS, 2018). UNAIDS (2018) writes that based on the time limit, their focus was on "the issues of greatest concern to UNAIDS staff and stakeholders", involving "the perceived decline in good governance, a systemic lack of trust in the informal and formal processes available for complaint handling, and the patriarchal culture of favouritism and cronyism" (p. 5). As UNAIDS (2018) further

state, by using "multiple methods—survey, interviews, open-solicitation of feedback—compared together", they assured "that convergent and validated results were obtained" (p. 10). The panel makes recommendations in four areas within the organisation: governance, leadership, management, and policy and processes, and provide significant contributions to the literature by drawing on these aspects of sexual harassment. Already in the first part of their report, they clearly state that UNAIDS's leaders, policies, and processes "have failed to prevent or properly respond to allegations" and describes that the evidence found "of a broken organisational culture is overwhelming" (UNAIDS, 2018, p. 3).

UN Women (2018) published a report worked on by people both at and beyond the organisation, which investigated the urgency and nature of change in the era of #MeToo towards an end to sexual harassment (p. iv). They acknowledge the fact that existing literature has established what sexual harassment is, its gendered character, placed 'unwelcomeness' at its core, evaluated previous efforts effectiveness and examine the extent and ubiquity of the issue. However, as UN Women (2018) argues, this literature is full of promises and potentials which will never materialise "without the fracturing of the norms that structure expectations and behaviours along gender lines" (p. 30). Their report is envisioned to be a resource for other organisations and partners to collectively produce profound cultural change (ibid.). The UN Women (2018) are very much basing their report on survey results published by others. They are also focusing on core elements or practice and procedures, as well as power and inequality, to address the urgency and nature of change in the era of #MeToo. However, as they also state, their "publication is not a comprehensive document on sexual harassment" (p. 2).

Different research is conducted to better understand humanitarian workers' experience with sexual harassment (HWN, 2016; Mazurana and Donnelly, 2017; Harris Insights & Analytics, 2018; Deloitte, 2019). To better understand women's experiences in the humanitarian field, a survey was conducted by the Humanitarian Women's Network (HWN) (2016). Their aim was to gather information on four main categories of issues they believe women face, involving 'discrimination and harassment', 'sexual aggression and assault, 'reporting', and 'impact on professional and personal well-being' (HWN, n.d.; HWN, 2016). On their webpage, they clarify that their survey did not aim "to be an exhaustive evaluation of all gender issues internal to the profession, but rather an indication of how prevalent certain issues may be" (HWN, n.d.). They are aware of their survey being heteronormative and only focused on experiences of female humanitarian staff. Despite this, they contributed to literature on sexual harassment, even before the establishment of the #MeToo and #AidToo movements.

Lastly, on their webpage, they "strongly encourage others to conduct further research to explore any key aspects or dynamics" they did not include. With this research, they have inspired other scholars (e.g. Gillespie et al., 2019; Mazurana and Donnelly, 2017)

Research on humanitarian workers, regardless of their gender, is found in a report by Mazurana and Donnelly (2017) for the Feinstein International Centre, a survey by the Harris Poll on behalf of Chronicle of Philanthropy in partnership with the Association of Fundraising Professionals (AFP) (Harris Insights & Analytics, 2018), and a survey by Deloitte (2019) for the UN. Mazurana and Donnelly (2017) aimed to contribute with knowledge "to the prevention of and response to sexual harassment and assault against aid workers", and claims their research is one of the first in-depth studies of such occurrences (p. 1). Mazurana and Donnelly (2017) included a collection of different data. They did a review of the findings and data collected by RTA (Nobert, 2017) and WHN (2016), a "thorough review, coding, and analysis of 78 scholarly works, grey literature, and media reports", they checked databases which track cases of violence against humanitarian workers, "reviewed security training materials from international aid organizations and consortiums" and conducted 30 in-depth interviews (p. 1). All in which represents over 70 international humanitarian organisations (ibid.). Mazurana and Donnelly (2017) are aware of WHN (2016) and Nobert (2017) not using random samples, meaning their research cannot be generalised to workers not participating in their surveys.

The report by Deloitte (2019) is based on a survey targeted to all UN staff, "to obtain information on sexual harassment across the United Nations system and related entities globally" (p. 2). Despite only having a 17% response rate, this includes over 30 000 staff and non-staff personnel (ibid.). One could however question why the remaining 83% did not participate, if they did not respond due to lack of such experience and/or felt they had nothing to contribute into these matters. Despite their focus being on workplace sexual harassment within the UN, I believe this is of highly relevance for other humanitarian organisations as well, due to the UN's position and power within the sector. By being an actor outside the UN system, I consider this an unbiased contribution to the literature. One could however question if Deloitte's lack of context into the humanitarian sector could influence their results. By structuring the report based on their quantitative survey results, in which they underlined everything with numbers and percentages and comparisons between these, I consider this an insignificant aspect.

Harris Insights & Analytics (2018) based their report on a survey with over thousand AFP members participants with a fundraising aspect or function to their job. This report begins

by giving some explanatory descriptions of contexts they have found formed in text, before listing and presenting their results using descriptive tables with numbers and percentages. Harris Insights & Analytics (2018) found that around every other participant had either witnessed, heard about, or experienced workplace sexual harassment. In which 25% of the women, compared to 7% of the men, had experienced such behaviours themselves (p. 2). In their survey, HWN (2016) found that near to 50% of the female workers have experienced unwanted touching by male colleagues, and more than half being "subjected to persistent romantic or sexual advances from a male colleague" (p. 2). While Deloitte (2019) found that almost 40% had been subjected to sexual harassment as a UN employee. In similarity to Harris Insights & Analytics (2018), Mazurana & Donnelly (2017) and Deloitte (2019) found that most survivors of sexual harassment were women. Both Deloitte (2019) and Harris Insights & Analytics (2018) found that most perpetrators are men, in which they predominantly have a superior position. Deloitte (2019) further write that near to 60% of the occurrences of sexual harassment was found in the office environments, while the "second most commonly reported setting for sexual harassment was at work-related social events". Mazurana and Donnelly (2017) claims that sexual harassment is under-reported and under-researched. Deloitte (2019) stresses that only one in three of the ones who had experienced sexual harassment reported what happened, while Harris Insights & Analytics (2018) found, based on the ones who has experienced workplace sexual harassment, that almost 3 out of 10 did nothing. Among those who told their organisation about their experience, Harris Insights & Analytics (2018) found that 71% reported no action was taken, while 53% were "not very or not at all satisfied with how their manager or supervisor" or organisations responded (p. 6).

The mentioned literature provides context for my study by portraying the extent of the issue of sexual harassment within the humanitarian sector, as well as to what extent this is recognised by the organisations. It also describes who is most vulnerable to such behaviours by drawing on gender and power perspective. Despite efforts and research, the issue persists. I found a gap in literature regarding how humanitarian employees perceive their organisation's adaptation and response to workplace sexual harassment in the aftermath of the #AidToo movement. By gaining insight into these matters based on one-to-one in depth interviews, an approach I found lacking in the literature, I aim to contribute to this knowledge gap by also draw on organisation studies and literature.

2.3 Organisational Culture & Practice

To gain sufficient insight into the given research phenomenon, I consider literature on organisational culture, practice, and change of great value. This is included to better understand the context of an organisation and how processes of organisational change evolve. I will include literature on humanitarian organisations to map the main features within the sector, as well as literature on management and leadership to gain insight into their role and impact in organisational changes. Throughout, aspects of gender and power within an organisation is included, with a focus on the prevention of workplace sexual harassment.

According to Riley (2020), individual men apologised for former behaviours and organisations publicly committed themselves "to a lack of tolerance for this behaviour in the future" as a result of the #MeToo movement (p. 49). The response to sexual harassment has earlier been to call for "stronger organizational accountability and bureaucratic reforms", while it in more recently, as stated by Gillespie et al. (2019), has been to improve codes of ethics, in which organisations are tightening up their 'safeguarding' procedures. In the Journal of International Humanitarian Action, Sandvik (2019) claims that talks around 'safeguarding' and a sector-wide 'safeguarding crisis' was "everywhere" in 2019, and that the aid sector engaged in 'safeguarding' exercises in the wake of the Oxfam scandal (p. 1). She informs that initially, the term 'safeguarding' applied to vulnerable adults and children, but is now acquiring a broader meaning, including "all actions by aid actors to protect staff from harm (abuse, sexual harassment and violence) and to ensure staff do not harm beneficiaries" (ibid.). According to Sandvik (2019), "the normative perspectives and positions of international organizations have rapidly evolved, at least on paper" (p. 3). However, as Mazurana & Donnelly (2017) state, incidents of SEA and sexual harassment even happened in Oxfam, despite them being an organisation highlighted as having the "best practice for an international agency" when it comes to addressing such incidents (p. 52). Riley (2020) sees the sector as a place where safeguarding of male protagonists who have abused females are a fact and that "the exposure of sexual abuse, harassment or assault should be thought about primarily as a problem *for* the organisation rather than a problem *of* the organisation" (p. 50). She explains that it is not surprising that they will protect their organisation and brand at all costs, as they have international recognition and power. The organisations are often reliant on respectable reputations as 'good', meaning they could gain more by covering up such problems than revealing them (ibid.).

To explain the persistent practices of sexual harassment and assault, Gillespie et al. (2019) posit that feminist theories have debated that sexual violence persists not only due to lax

rules, ethical codes, or lack of reporting, but "because these organizations exist within a larger context that oppresses women, people of color, and other marginalized groups" (p. 1). Gillespie et al. (2019) propose several reasons to consider, both social and cultural, including "institutional power disparities, a misogynist culture, gender mainstreaming, a focus on the individual victim and perpetrator, and the capitalist system" (p. 2). Even though plenty of policies regarding sexual violence are established, they claim that "research suggests these cannot adequately protect women in misogynist cultures that are strongly prejudiced against women" (ibid.). Gillespie et al. (2019) posit that to address violence against women, the broader context and social structures must be changed.

In an article on agency and empowerment in a #MeToo world, Ozkazanc-Pan (2019) draws on existing literature and discusses opportunities and challenges "for changing extant gender structures and systems that have allowed for sexual harassment and assault to take shape" (p. 1212). She explores what agency and empowerment look like in a context where women collectively raise their voice. She argues that to understand "how we have come to think about agency and empowerment […] is essential if we want to think about the possibility of a new world where we never again say #MeToo" (ibid.). Ozkazanc-Pan Her "article focuses explicitly on different notions of agency deriving from various feminist traditions to underscore possibilities for engaging in" societal and organisational change (p. 1212). By drawing on "intersectional, decolonial, postcolonial and transnational feminist perspectives", she suggests that to achieve gender system change, a collectivist approach to agency is needed (ibid.). By looking at organisations in a context of #MeToo, she contributes to the literature by involving gender perspectives to the discussion around change and prevention of workplace sexual harassment.

In her PhD "on humanitarian workers in South Sudan and the interrelation of mental health, gender, and organizational staff support", Strohmeier (2019) argues that a 'masculine culture' or 'cowboy culture' are dominating the humanitarian organisations, making gender a dimension "attached to the perils of humanitarian work" (p. 1-2). Lina Abirafeh, a woman with nearby two decades of experience in the humanitarian sector, substantiates to this assertion by confirming that the sector "is driven a lot by a toxic masculinity culture" (Einbinder, 2018). In their report, House of Commons (2018) confirms that there exist a 'boys club' culture in the sector, where sexual violenc against humanitarian workers are allowed to bloom unchallenged (p. 7). Leimbach (2015) claims in an article in PassBlue that an investigation done by the UN in 2013, in which the report was never made public, revealed that the 'masculine privilege' of

peacekeepers is a factor contributing to the culture of sexual harassment and abuse by workers in the sector (Leimbach, 2015). Other research has also found a widespread and harmful masculinity dominating the humanitarian sector and organisations (Mazurana and Donnelly, 2017; UN Women, 2018). This, together with female subordination and historic power imbalances, is factors contributing to tolerance and practice of sexual violence (ibid.). UNAIDS (2018) also found what they describe as a "boys' club" and a male-dominated culture within their organisation, further expressed as "a significant impediment to change" (p. 31).

When it comes to the organisational level, Siuta & Bergman (2019) claim that "organizational climate, job-gender context, and relative power between the harasser and the target" are factors predicting sexual harassment (p. 1). They also argue that sexual harassment of women increases parallelly with the masculinity of the work environment, involving organisational cultures and environments more tolerant of sexual harassment producing more sexual harassment (ibid.). In their article, Fredriksson & Alvinius (2019) base their arguments on qualitative research on organisational culture and strategies of leaders within the Swedish army, police and fire and rescue service in the aftermath of #MeToo. They explain that according to previous studies, women in organisations with a high proportion of men report more sexual harassment cases than women in organisations where the proportion of men is lower (p. 30). Fredriksson & Alvinius (2019) argue that previous studies also illustrate that the organisational culture is a strong contributing factor to such incidences, in which they further portray the importance of a sufficient management and leadership in an organisation to prevent sexual harassment.

To report workplace sexual harassment to organisational authorities has been hypothesised to lead to positive outcomes (Siuta & Bergman, 2019). However, reporting rates in humanitarian sector are low (Siuta & Bergman, 2019; House of Commons, 2018). Riley (2020) underlines her understanding of aid worker choosing not to report incidents, both for the reputation of the sector, but also because of the apparently low chance of their abuser to be held accountable (p. 51). House of Commons (2018) finds that improving the reporting mechanisms are an essential factor in understanding sexual harassment, how to prevent it and how to adequately respond to it (p. 5). In a report on workplace sexual harassment, Siuta & Bergman (2019) find that reporting mechanisms and procedures often are unclear. They also claim that the reporting of sexual harassment "often leads to worse outcomes for targets of harassment than their non-reporting peers" (p. 1). This is also found within the humanitarian sector and within humanitarian organisations, in which House of Commons (2018) claim that

humanitarian workers are lacking trust in their employers regarding managing accusations of sexual abuse and harassment. They also found a tendency of the reporter to face negative consequences, which the humanitarian workers consider as a big concern and an obstacle to reporting (p. 7). Evidently, House of Commons (2018) argue that there exists a need for a safe environment within humanitarian organisations for those who choose to report such cases, without the fear of not being taken seriously or facing retaliation (ibid.).

When interviewing humanitarian workers in the wake of the Oxfam scandal, the Guardian state that several claimed an unwillingness among organisations to appropriately handle the issue. They also claimed that despite frequent cautions, the concerns have long been ignored by managers (Beaumont & Ratcliffe, 2018). This corresponds with an article published in the Conversation, where Freyd (2018) argues that sexual harassment is ignored by managers to almost the same extent as they occur. Freyd (2018) further claims that leaders and their behaviour “can become a powerful force in how the victim fares”. She outlines that "if institutions want to do the hard work, they can help victims and prevent violence in the first place – by choosing courage instead of betrayal" (ibid.). This betrayal involves organisations failing to do “what is reasonably expected of the institution, such as not providing relief to disaster victims or failing to respond effectively to sexual violence” (ibid.). Freyd (2018) adds to this by claiming that some survivors are punished, downgraded, or fired after reporting incidents of SEA or sexual harassment to their organisation.

This literature review presents an overview of the existing literature on workplace sexual harassment, humanitarian organisations, organisational culture, and practice, with a focus on related gender and power dimensions. Literature shows that humanitarian organisations have strengthened their safeguarding procedures and established PSEA and SH policies. However, employees are lacking trust in their managers and leaders regarding their handling of such behaviours and reports. Based on this literature, I find a lacking in insight into how humanitarian workers perceive their organisation’s adaptation and response to workplace sexual harassment in the aftermath of the #AidToo movement. With my analysis, I aim to gain such insight and thus contribute to further research within this field. Prior to my analysis, an overview of concepts and methods used in my thesis process will be presented.

3. Conceptual Framework

To study sexual harassment in the humanitarian sector, I take an interdisciplinary approach, combining insight, concepts and theory from different disciplines and literatures. I will include organisational theory when examining how NORCAP has responded to sexual harassment, and development practice literature when seeking to understand how this is perceived by NORCAP employees. Most notably, literature on organisational culture, practice and change within organisational theory and the study of humanitarian aid organisations in the development practice literature. Nevertheless, also literature on gender in development literature and the study of gender and organisations, as well as power-relations and authority within an organisation.

Just so it is clear: NORCAP deployees are the humanitarian experts employed by NORCAP but deployed to other humanitarian organisations. Further in this thesis 'HO staff' will be used as an umbrella term for NRC and NORCAP Head Office staff to ensure their anonymity. NRC HO staff is included as participants due to the close relationship and co-operation between the two organisations, as well as NRC's influence on NORCAP. Lastly, when writing about 'management and leadership' in my analysis, this refers to the management and leadership in both NRC and NORCAP, unless stated otherwise.

3.1 Sexual Harassment

According to Pina, Gannon & Saunders (2009), the term 'sexual harassment' emerged in the mid 1970s, after several researchers brought the issue to light (p. 127). It has, among others, been understood as a way to maintain power and status (Maass, Cadinu, Guarnieri, & Grasselli, 2003), mainly a women's issue (Berdahl, 2007; Fitzgerald and Cortina, 2017), a sex-based social power hierarchy existing within organisations (Berdahl, 2007), and primarily a workplace phenomenon (Dey, 2019; Siuta & Bergman, 2019). Defining what constitutes this term and an all-inclusive definition of it has proven difficult to establish (ibid.). Pina et al. (2009) outline that one reason for this is that by creating a definition, "boundaries would be set on this particular term which would distinguish it from other expressions of sexual interest" (p. 127).

To gain insight into the given research phenomenon, I choose to rely on a definition by UN Women (2018). UN Women (2018) defines sexual harassment as "rooted in historic power

imbalances and the male dominated culture that permeates governments, the private sector, international organizations and even areas of civil society" (p. 17). They highlight that addressing leadership and culture is essential to achieve permanent organisational change to prevent sexual harassment. UN Women (2018) argue that there is a need for sexual harassment to be understood as "a matter of sex and gender inequalities of power that intersect with other dimensions of inequality including race and ethnicity, age, disability and sexual orientation" (p. 3). UN Women (2018) further debate that it needs to be understood as "a human rights violation of gender-based discrimination, regardless of sex, in a context of unequal power relations such as a workplace and/or gender hierarchy" (p. 8). This definition emphasises and allows me to explore the historic power imbalances and the male dominated culture in the humanitarian sector as reasons for the occurrences of such behaviour. Particularly within the unequal power relations characterised in the workplace, which is the focus of this thesis. It also underlines the importance of leadership and cultural change to prevent sexual harassment. Thus, I consider this a suited definition when seeking to understand the given study in the case of NORCAP.

3.1.1 Sexual Violence

UN Women (2018) explains that the UN treats sexual harassment and SEA as "distinct areas of abuse with distinct reporting and policy domains", involving sexual harassment referring to sexual abuse between staff and SEA "perpetrated by UN staff (or those operating under a UN banner) against others outside UN employment" (p. 17). UN Women (2018) describes sexual violence as everything "from rape to child abuse, including sexual harassment" (p. 10). For this study, sexual violence will be used as an umbrella term referring to sexual exploitation, sexual abuse, and sexual harassment between humanitarian workers, unless stated otherwise.

3.1.2 Victim & Survivor

Survivors of the #MeToo movement are, according to Kovach (2020), victims of "a negative power influence, often from those in leadership roles" (p. 1). When using the term victim in this thesis, this relates to a person who has experienced sexual violence. While a survivor, drawing on Mazaura & Donnelly's (2017) definition, is used "to designate the person who was victimized is also someone who shows resistance, action, ingenuity, and inner strength" (p. 1).

3.2 Gender & Power

To study sexual harassment, it is important to consider how it might be gendered and how gendered relations are constructed in the context of the workplace. Cohn (2013) describes gender as a complex term with a history of being understood in multiple ways. According to Hilhorst, Porter, & Gordon (2018), gender today is understood as relational, rather than viewing women and men as two separate, binary terms, or simply as a synonym for 'women and girls', which they claim all too often has been the tendency, also within the humanitarian community (p. S5-S6). Cohn (2013) argues that gender needs to be understood as "a social structure which shapes individual identities and lives" (p. 3). She defines gender as "a way of categorizing, ordering, and symbolizing power, of hierarchically structuring relationships among different categories of people, and different human activities symbolically associated with masculinity and femininity" (ibid.). At the heart of gender, Cohn (2013) finds structural power relations and explains that gender, just as "colonialism, slavery, class, race, and cast", are systems of power (p. 4). Cohn (2013) further highlights the need to not simply understand gender as power differences *between* categories (men and women) but also *within* each category. She further substantiates this by explaining that gender "never stands alone as a factor structuring power in a society, but rather is inflected through, and co-constituting of, other hierarchical forms of structuring power, such as class, caste, race, ethnicity, age, and sexuality" (p. 5). Similar views are also understood by UN Women (2018), which argues that gender inequality "sits alongside and across other forms of inequalities", such as race, sexual orientation, age, and disability (p. 7).

By adapting the definition by Cohn (2013), gender will not only be about biological sex, but also a social construction that involves relations of power. I aim to look at power-relations based on gender, work position, status, seniority, age, race, and class. All in which might influence people's experience with sexual harassment and the way organisations adapt and respond. Based on my field of study, I will further include a section on how power is understood within the humanitarian sector.

3.2.1 Power within the Humanitarian Sector

Riley (2020) argues that organisations and individuals in the humanitarian sector should be aware of the inbuilt "power imbalance between senior and junior members of staff, between donors and recipients, between aid workers and the people they are helping" (p. 53).

Humanitarian aid organisations exist in a world shaped by "race, gender and class – by racism, patriarchy and inequality", and Riley (2020) further argues that the sector "exists in a historical, social and political space that is particularly volatile when it comes to sexual abuse, harassment and assault" (p. 49 & 53). She outlines the fact that racial and gendered dynamics of the sector results in some groups being more vulnerable and prone to abuse, and less tending to be trusted, if they ever try to tell their story (p. 49). She explains that the power hierarchy present in the sector makes the issue easy to cover up and difficult to reveal, as men in position of power is safeguarded by their image of being 'humanitarian saviours' (ibid.). Moreover, she argues that humanitarian workers' and organisations' "claims to uphold higher values" and good intentions cannot be accepted "to stand in for critical analysis of the power imbalances in charities and NGOs that allow abuse to take place" (Riley, 2020, p. 53). This understanding of power within humanitarian organisations, also concerning on a higher level between donor and recipients, is valuable and pertinent for this study when seeking to gain insight into how sexual harassment is perceived and prevented within an organisation, which could be influenced by several aspects of power within the humanitarian sector.

3.3 Organisational Culture

The humanitarian sector is characterised as having a wide range of actors all over the globe, making it especially exposed to varying currents of change (Clarke & Ramalingam, 2008, p. 25). Humanitarian organisations also operate in several different areas, resulting in "a situation where a great many forces pull and push actors in different directions" (Hilhorst, 2003; Clarke & Ramalingam, 2008, p. 25). Thus, humanitarian organisations must often adjust their practices, structures, and tools to improve performance or basically remain operational (ibid.). To gain insight into to what extent #AidToo has affected NORCAP's policies, procedures, and way of working, I consider it essential to define organisational culture, climate, and practice.

There exists a wide range of approaches recommending how to view an organisation. Clarke & Ramalingam (2008) suggest looking at humanitarian organisations as groups of people and human societies, as it then will be "easier to accept that an organisation will inevitably have both a social structure and a culture, and that any process of organisational change will involve changes in both of these areas" (p. 35-36). They further adopt Handy's (1988) definition, which portray organisations as communities with "its own taste and flavour, its own way of doing things", referring to an organisation's culture (ibid.).

In similarity with a lot of other terms in social sciences, one general definition of the term culture has been proven hard define. Despite the prevalence of this interpretation, Geertz (1973) argue that culture should *not* be considered as complex and concrete behavioural patterns, involving ways of acting and behaving, traditions and habit pattern, but rather as a set of control mechanisms, such as policies, rules and instructions that govern behaviour (p. 44). By adapting Ke & Wei's (2008) understanding, this thesis will recognise organisational culture "as the kinds of behavior that are valued and promoted in the organization" (p. 211), which in this research will be assessed through NORCAP policies, procedures, and way of working to prevent sexual harassment. Ke & Wei (2008) further follows Hurley & Hult's (1998) example and characterise organisational culture by five dimensions, of which "learning and development", "support and collaboration", and "power sharing" will be the focus in this thesis (p. 211).

3.3.1 Organisational Climate & Practice

Wallace, Hunt, & Richards (1999) state that "a close and sometimes ambiguous relationship between organizational culture and climate" often have been overlooked in literature (p. 551). According to Barker (1994), evidence also show that these terms commonly have been used synonymously. However, Wallace, Hunt, & Richards (1999) outline that organisational climate involves "more empirically accessible elements such as behavioural and attitudinal characteristics" than organisational culture (p. 551). This thesis will draw on an understanding by Ehrhart, Schneider & Macey (2014), defining organisational climate as "the shared meaning organizational members attach to the events, policies, practices, and procedures they experience and the behaviors they see being rewarded, supported, and expected" (p. 69). The organisational climate in NORCAP will therefore be assessed based on the perceptions of my informants regarding NORCAP's organisational culture to prevent sexual harassment, involving their procedures, way of working, and practices. For this thesis, by adapting a definition by Schau, Muñiz & Arnould (2009), organisational practices "are linked and implicit ways of understanding, saying, and doing things" among employees within NORCAP (p. 31).

All the above-mentioned dimensions in this chapter are chosen based on existing literature and how these concepts have been understood, of which my contribution to the literature is that I put these concepts in relation to each other and create a new analysis.

4. Research Design and Methodology

In this chapter, the chosen research design and methodology will be presented. To gain insight into how humanitarian organisations have adapted and responded to sexual harassment in the aftermath of the #AidToo movement, a case study of NORCAP was chosen. Thus, to properly address the research questions, sufficient insight into NORCAP's organisational culture, climate and practice is needed. Scholars explain that qualitative research is concerned of and seeks a deeper understanding of a chosen topic and (Silverman, 2014; Queirós, Faria & Almeida 2017). Its objective, according to Queirós, Faria & Almeida (2017), "is to produce in-depth and illustrative information in order to understand the various dimensions of the problem under analysis" (p. 370). For this study, I therefore adopted a qualitative research design to be able to gain insight into my given research phenomenon. Throughout this chapter, an account of the qualitative methods used will be given. Furthermore, this chapter will include reflections on my positionality and ethical considerations. As well as address the trustworthiness and authenticity of my study.

4.1 Sample Selection

To gather a sufficient sample and adequate data to address my research questions (RQs), the non-probability sample approach purposive sampling was chosen, in which snowball sampling was the main approach.

Cypress (2018) state that RQs are "the starting point and the primary determinant of the design" (p. 302). Thus, when mapping this study's population and sample, the research questions must be considered. The population of my study will be NORCAP employees, in which is "the universe of units [my] sample is to be selected" (Bryman, 2016, p. 174). This samle size should neither be too small – as you might not accomplish saturation – nor too big – as it could be difficult to achieve a deep analysis of your data (Bryman, 2016, p. 417). To gather an appropriate sample, I used a non-probability approach. Bryman (2016) describes this as a method which "implies that some units in the population are more likely to be selected than others" (p. 174). For this study, this means that some NORCAP employees have a zero chance of being selected (Bhattacherjee, 2012). Typical for such sampling is that the selection of units is based on certain non-random criteria (Bhattacherjee, 2012). To make sure the informants were able to see possible changes in the wake of #AidToo, the chosen NORCAP employees had to have been part of NORCAP for at least some years. I also chose special criteria for the

NORCAP HO staff, in which they should work closely with the deployees or at least have knowledge about NORCAP' organisational culture to prevent sexual harassment.

As I had already chosen which research questions to address through my study, I further chose the non-probability sampling strategy purposive sampling. Bryman (2016) explains that such approach places my RQs "at the heart of the sampling considerations" and therefore samples "participants in a strategic way" relevant to my RQs (p. 407 & 694). I found purposive sampling most suitable, because I knew I needed to gather specific units to gain a deeper understanding of my chosen topic and properly address my RQs. By using this approach, I wanted to "sample in order to ensure that there is a good variety in the resulting sample, so that sample members differ from each other in terms of characteristics relevant to the research questions" (Bryman, 2016, p. 408). To make sure variety was included, I aimed to interview people of different ages, genders, nationalities and working positions or areas within both NORCAP and NRC. I included NRC staff, as NORCAP is a part of NRC, meaning a lot of NRC staff also covers and are linked up with NORCAP and its members. In total, my sample size contained of 11 informants, involving NORCAP and NRC HO staff, as well as NORCAP deployees. I interviewed five deployees, three women and two men. Some of them were currently deployed, while some were not. They also had varying degrees of field experience, ranging from 25 years to around two-three years. The deployees also had different backgrounds and birth countries, as well as areas of expertise in the field. The remaining six informants are the HO staff, involving two men and four women. They covered different work positions within NORCAP and NRC, and have different previous backgrounds, as well as length of employment with NORCAP or NRC. However, all of them worked at the HO at the time #AidToo exploded on social media. Most my informants were international, while three of them were Norwegian. I consider their differences as a positive influence into my data. This provided me insight into perspectives from different starting points based on their differences in age, gender, ethnicity, field, and work experience.

Further, I found the purposive sampling method snowball-sampling most suitable for my research. According to Bryman (2016), this is an approach which makes it easier to find appropriate informants (p. 415). With this sampling approach, Bhattacherjee (2012) explains that the starting point is to identify "a few respondents that match the criteria for inclusion in your study, and then ask them to recommend others they know who also meet your selection criteria" (p. 70). My starting point was two NORCAP HO staff I knew was relevant to my study. With this method, I was allowed for these to participants to lead me to and get me in

contact with other informants, which in turn lead me to other informants and so on (Silverman, 2014; Bryman, 2016). I was also aware that the selection approach must consider the accessibility and availability of informants, especially now under the Covid-19 pandemic. I therefore considered snowball-sampling as a sufficient tool, as this made it easier to get in contact with relevant informants in this unique and abnormal time. With this approach, my first participants lead me to other participants they knew were available and relevant for my research. I informed the two NORCAP HO staff about the criteria I had created for my participants, and then the snowball started to roll. Through this process, I was also provided with an overview of how NORCAP is built up. Information about different work positions and areas, involving who work closely with the deployees, who create and update policies and guidelines, and who deployees can report cases of sexual harassment to. With their and the following informants' help, this approach provided me 11 relevant informants.

4.2 Data Collection

A data collection is a range "of interrelated activities aimed at gathering information" to address the RQs (Cypress, 2018, p. 303). Bhattacherjee (2012) proposes two main and broadly grouped methods, involving positivist and interpretive (p. 35). The latter is aimed at theory building and "employ an inductive approach that starts with data and tries to derive a theory about the phenomenon of interest from the observed data", which heavily relies on qualitative data (ibid.). When evaluating the methods necessary to address my RQs, I considered qualitative data most relevant.

Compared to quantitative questionaries, Bhattacherjee (2012) portrays interviews as a more personal form of data collection. Interviews are described by Cypress (2018) as "a conversation with a purpose" (p. 303), in which understandings are established based on interaction (Edwards & Holland, 2013). Scholars argue that interviews are the widely most used and favourite tool in qualitative research, probably due to its flexibility and lack of fixed structure (Bhattacherjee, 2012; Bryman, 2016; Cypress, 2018; Edwards & Holland, 2013). Cypress (2018) argue that qualitative interviews "is motivated by the aim of eliciting information useful to a study", intended to get participants to talk about their own experiences (p. 304). As explained by Bryman (2016), such approach includes a great interest in the participants' point of views, meanings, and perspectives. Thus, when aiming to gain insight into NORCAP employees' perceptions and perspectives, I considered qualitative interviews as

a sufficient tool. Bryman (2016) further states that qualitative interviews often encourage rambling or going off at tangents, which gave me the opportunity and flexibility to collect data and insight based on my informants' understandings, directions, and views of the given topic.

My interview data was collected through semi-structured interviews. Bryman (2016) writes that this term covers a wide range of interview types (p. 696). Most typically, this refers to "a context in which the interviewer has a series of questions that are in the general form of an interview guide but is able to vary the sequence of questions" (ibid.). According to Harrell & Bradley (2009), semi-structured interviews are also often considered for policy research. Thus, for my interviews, a prepared interview guide with a set of pre-made questions was created (ibid.). I was aware of the chance of me not thinking about and being aware of all the aspects of the issue prior to my data collection process, and this approach provided me the flexibility to adjust the structure of the guide or add new questions throughout the interviews if needed (Bryman, 2016; Harrell & Bradley, 2009). This increased the possibility of addressing new perspectives of my research, as my interviews was driven by the reflections and directions taken by my informants (Bryman, 2016). All in which is reasons I found semi-structured interviews highly helpful.

For this study, two separate, yet very similar, interview guides were established. One for the NORCAP HO staff (See Appendix 1) and one for the NORCAP deployees (See Appendix 2). Both interview guides contained six categories of questions: 'Workplace Sexual Harassment', 'NORCAP's Response to Sexual Harassment', 'Thoughts About & Reactions to #AidToo', 'Changes in NORCAP post #AidToo', 'Staff Care Seminars' and 'Characteristics and Background', as well as a short section on 'Introductory Questions'. My RQs were kept in mind while creating these guides, so as many relevant aspects of the topic as possible would be covered. I also considered the importance of questions neither being leading nor too specific, as well as the guides also should consist of both general and specific information and use a language that is understandable for all the interviewees (Bryman, 2016, p. 471). My interview guides therefore mostly contain open-ended questions, however also some specific question. The latter regarding when my participants became a part of NORCAP or NRC, their time of first deployment, or what kind of work positions they have. Bryman (2016) highlights the significance of forming questions in an order so that the interview easily could flow, as well as the importance of being prepared and aware of that, if necessary, changes in the order could occur (p. 471). My questions were not always asked in the way they were outlined. Due to choosing semi-structured interviews, I also had the flexibility to include different types of

questions based on my interviewees' replies. This created a nice flow in my interviews. However, mostly all questions were asked to all the informants using a similar wording (Bryman, 2016). A total of 11 individual interviews were conducted, one with each of the informants. Most interviews were conducted in English, but three were also conducted in Norwegian. This made it even more important for me to have interview guides to follow, to make sure all the essential topics were covered. All in which are advantages I found helpful, and is the reason I considered semi-structured interviews most appropriate.

Qualitative interviews are commonly recorded and transcribed (Bryman, 2016, p. 479). I found this very helpful, as I thus was able "to be alert to what is being said – following up interesting points made, prompting and probing where necessary, drawing attention to any inconsistencies in the interviewee's answers", rather than being distracted by noting down what people are saying (ibid.). However, as underlined by Bhattacherjee (2012), it was also important for me to note down on "key issues, probes, or verbatim phrases", as well as other types of observations or behaviours (p. 79). Benefits with recording that I found most helpful was the fact that it "helps to correct the natural limitations" of my memories, "allows more thorough examination of what people say", and "helps to counter accusations that [my] analysis might have been influenced by [my] values or biases" (Bryman, 2016, p. 479). To make sure as little as possible were lost in the process, the transcription happened as soon as possible after the interviews were conducted (Bhattacherjee, 2012). The most relevant content in the interviews conducted in Norwegian was also translated into English. I found this process very helpful, however also very time-consuming. Bryman (2016) also outlines the importance of good-quality equipment when recording, as well as the interview being in a quiet and private setting to make the informants comfortable and prevent unwanted noise in the recording (p. 471). Due to the Covid-19 pandemic, all interviews were conducted through 'Zoom', involving both video and audio. It was important for me to schedule the meetings at the time best suited for the informants, as I knew there are different elements influencing people's home offices. By scheduling the meeting based on the informants' calendar, I hoped to avoid interruptions and unnecessary noises in the recording.

The second part of my data is chosen to get an overview of NORCAP's organisational culture to prevent and respond to sexual harassment, as well as their organisational changes. By doing this, I analysed NORCAP and NRC efforts and changes in the wake of #AidToo, involving policy documents and trainings on this topic. To start with, I had to familiarise myself with NORCAP and NRC's intranet SharePoint to map out relevant data. Based on their

SharePoint and talks with NORCAP staff, I was able to gather the latest versions of the relevant data to properly address my RQs. It was important for me to use credible sources, so this data is only NRC and NORCAP materials. I also made sure the chosen documents are the latest versions, and that I had permission to analyse their contents. The core of this analysis is therefore NORCAP's Prevention of Sexual Exploitation and Abuse (PSEA) and Sexual Harassment (SH) Reporting Guidelines, PSEA and SH trainings, and their Code of Conduct (CoC) – jointly understood as NORCAP's efforts to prevent, educate, and properly respond to sexual harassment. These are also efforts established and/or updated in the aftermath of the #AidToo movement.

Qualitative research and interviews are commonly a time-consuming methodological approach (Bryman, 2016; Harrell & Bradley, 2009; Queirós, Faria & Almeida, 2017). Due to the Covid-19 pandemic, this approach has required even more planning and flexibility. To begin with, I found when and how to interview informants a bit challenging, as new interview methods – at least for me – were necessary to implement. I was not able to meet my interviewees in person. Luckily, I was familiar with Zoom and how to schedule meetings. However, it was hard for me to interpret my informants' body language, as I mostly only saw their faces. One informant also had to turn off her camera due to bad internet connection, making it almost impossible to tell how she was acting, as this was something I had to interpret only based on her voice.

A positive element, if being allowed to view this pandemic as something positive, is the fact that most people tend to spend a lot of time at home, making it easier to schedule for an online meeting. This interview type requires less planning and time, as you only need the exact time for the interview, a computer (with a microphone and camera), and a sufficient internet connection. The latter can play a significant role and potentially ruin the records. Some informants were in countries and locations with unstable internet connections, making noises and occasionally lagging in my records. Others also struggled with their microphone. Unwanted noises, such as their family members' voices, was in some interviews also recorded, which was a bit challenging. However, I would not say that this noticeably ruined the conduct or content of the interviews, as the unwanted noises or technical problems commonly were short-time issues. We were able to find a solution, such as turn off the camera or move to another room.

A downside with online interviews is that it seems to be as easy to re-schedule meetings as it is to schedule them. People seemingly also have a lot on their agenda. Some informants did not reply on my emails until days later, while others were a bit late or had to leave the interview

earlier than planned. However, I do not consider this a remarkably negative influenced, as I was able to complete all interviews and ask the most important questions to the once in a hurry. Some NORCAP HO staff did not answer my initial request but replied when a superior reached out to them concerning my thesis. There might have been some additional staff at the Head Office that could have been beneficial for my study. Through online interviews, I am also aware that I was not able to gather observations of my informants' work environment and daily life. These are limitations I acknowledge, but I do not consider them as crucial for the findings or conclusion of this specific study. I believe I achieved sufficient saturation for this type of study through my participants, as several informants underlined the same perspectives (Cypress, 2018). When all needed data was gathered, I could start my data analysis, interpreting and coding process.

4.3 Data Analysis

To analyse my data, I chose an inductive approach, involving both thematic and content analysis. An inductive approach is defined by Bryman (2016) as "an approach to the relationship between theory and research in which the former is generated out of the latte" (p. 691).

According to Bryman (2016), data analysis is a process that includes several elements, where the starting point is to manage the raw data (p. 11). My raw data was NORCAP and NRC documents and my interview transcripts. Firstly, I had to familiarise myself with the content of the NORCAP Code of Conduct and PSEA and SH Reporting Guidelines. For this, I used a thematic analysis approach. Secondly, for my interview transcripts, I used both thematic and content analysis approaches. Bryman (2016) refers to thematic analysis as "a term used in connection with the analysis of qualitative data to refer to the extraction of key themes in one's data" (p. 697). As the name implies, this approach includes themes. Both my document data and interview data were therefore divided into categories in which the findings in each group had essential common features (Johannessen, Råfoss & Rasmussen, 2018, p. 279). This is coding – an approach used to make sense of the gathered data, by aggregating the data into categories and provide the codes a label (Cypress, 2018). For the documents, I divided the data into the categories 'Organisational Culture' and 'Organisational Change'. While the interview data was categories within the sections 'Organisational Climate & Practice' and 'Organisational Change'. By doing so, my analysis was more organised, and I was able to find new connections

within my findings, which made it easier to address the RQs (Johannessen et al., 2018, p. 279-280). After these categories was established, I again coded my interview data by using a content analysis approach. A content analysis is described by Berg & Lune (2012) as "a careful, detailed, systematic examination and interpretation of a particular body of material in an effort to identify patterns, themes, biases, and meanings", where the purpose is to design codes based on the data, making it simpler to address the study's research questions (p. 349-350). Thus, this approach was done to in best terms quantify the content in terms of the categories created through the thematic analysis. Based on this, the categories 'Gender', 'Power' and 'Management & Leadership' were created, which relates back to the already established categories: 'Organisational Practice' and 'Organisational Change'. This, together with 'Organisational Culture', therefore create the key categories in my findings. By choosing both a thematic and content analysis, I was able to create a better overview of my data's contents in terms of my RQs. I was also able to sufficiently identify repeated themes, trends, and patterns, as well as contrary knowledge and understandings. Through the thematic analysis, my interviews were colour-coded using different colours to each category. Through the content analysis, the already established categories were used to in best terms cover all relevant aspects of the RQs, which in turn formed the new categories. The transcripts, codes, and categories were considered several times to make sure essential information were not overlooked.

To discuss my findings, my analysis draws on previous research and literature. This involves reports, studies, and documents published by or on behalf of humanitarian organisations. For these sources, it was important for me to identify who the data was collected by and what their intentions were. This was done to ensure that the sources were trusted and that the writers researched and evaluated what they aimed for. Additionally, it was important to notice when the data was collected, and if this was consistent with data collected from other sources. This is to be able to compare similarities and contrarieties between NORCAP and other humanitarian organisations. This involves information on their organisational culture, organisational climate and practice, and their awareness of sexual harassment and how to prevent it. As well as their perceptions and awareness of how this more broadly can be linked to questions on management and leadership, gender, and power within an organisation.

According to Bryman (2016), data analysis is basically about reducing one's data, in which the researcher must be able to reduce "the large body of information that the researcher has gathered so that he or she can make sense of it" (p. 11). Unless this is done, he further stresses that "it is more or less impossible to interpret the material" (ibid.). For me, this was the

biggest challenges and time-consuming part of the process, together with the actual writing of the interview transcripts. With 11 transcripts containing 10 to 16 pages each with a lot of information I characterise as relevant and important, this was really a time-consuming process. Bhattacherjee (2012) describes an inductive approach as heavily relying on the ability of the researcher, where the "interpretation may be biased by researcher's prior knowledge of the phenomenon being studied" (p. 29). Hence, it was important for me to be open to new interpretations and aspects than the ones I knew about, even though my prior knowledge of the topic was limited. After interpreting all the above-mentioned data, I established links between the process of making sense of my data and my starting point: my RQs (Bryman, 2016, p. 11). I also positioned this in context with existing literature.

4.4 My Positionality

Hall (1990) highlights that you "have to position yourself somewhere in order to say anything at all" (p. 18). To illustrate the importance of positionality and its potential effects on the research process, partakers, and researcher, Bourke (2014) claims that "the identities of both researcher and participants have the potential to impact the research process" (p. 1). This is because the research is a product shaped by both the participants and the researcher (ibid.). It is therefore important to consider the relationship I have with my informants, and the impact I can have on my research. In this study, and based on the nature of qualitative research, I am put in a position as the data collection instrument (Bourke, 2014, p. 2). Meaning my "beliefs, political stance, cultural background (gender, race, class, socioeconomic status, educational background) are important variables" that could affect my research (ibid.). My biases might not only affect my participants and their responses, or my observations and analysis, it might also influence the nature of my study (ibid.). Bourke (2014) further outlines these aspects as important factors to acknowledge. I therefore tried to not allow my "personal values or theoretical inclinations to sway the conduct of the research and the findings deriving from it", even though Bryman (2016) claims it is impossible to achieve complete objectivity (p. 386).

By having a part-time job in the organisation I am examining, I can be characterised as an 'insider'. Chavez (2008) argues that the outsider perspective has been seen as optimal for its objective and accurate description of the field, while the 'insider', "who possessed deeper insights about the people, place, and events, were believed to hold a biased position that complicated their ability to observe and interpret" (p. 474). However, as Chavez (2008)

explains, ‘insider’ research also brings unique advantages into the research process, and are not only considered “valid and significant, but in some ways more facile or effectual than outsider research” (p. 476). Through my position, I feel I had an advantage in terms of more easily being able to gather a sufficient and relevant sample. This was because I was familiar with some of the HO staff working closely with the deployees and with PSEA and SH. However, I also consider it an advantage that I to several of them was a familiar with a ‘trusted’ email address (work email). I was also able to easily access relevant NORCAP and NRC documents. I felt I was mostly taken seriously, and several of the people I reached out to wanted to contribute to my study. By being an insider, I am considered as one of them and as a part of the organisation. However, I am also “only” a parttime worker. I felt trusted, and I believe this placed me in a position where they felt they could be open and speak freely to me about their experiences and viewpoints, as they know I have no power to affect their work and future within NORCAP or NRC.

In a study on this specific topic, I cannot get away from reflecting on my gender. As a white, woman from Norway, I am aware that I do not have the same positionality as some of my informant. I was also aware of humanitarian organisations, including NORCAP, being very hierarchical and male dominated. This might place me, as *only* a part-time worker with relatively little humanitarian experience, low in the system. In conversations with superiors (especially males), this could put me in a subordinate position. I also considered how the men would react to my research topic, as sexual harassment commonly is targeted towards women by men. By being white from the global north, I also considered if my informants from the global north (both males and females) would be tired of “yet another white researcher” wanting to gain insight into an issue which has proven to be influenced by aspects of not only power and gender, but also race and ethnicity. I also considered this in conjunction with the sector being characterised by racism and a western way of thinking. I also had to consider my position in relation to the females, especially the deployees from the global south. Before conducting the interviews, I knew that deployees usually not report or talk about cases of sexual harassment. This is because they fear this could ruin their career and future opportunities. By having a part-time job in the organisation in question, this could have hampered their willingness to speak the truth. By making it clear that this study was taken on my own initiative and not NORCAP’s, even though NORCAP was my inspiration for choice of topic, I believe I was able to create trust and comfort for my informants to speak freely. Moreover, I feel that my position in NORCAP brought positive outcomes into my study.

4.5 Ethical Considerations

Cypress (2018) writes that data collection includes more than simply the data and the procedure for gathering them, it also considers ethical aspects. Prior to the interviews, I created a 'Information Letter' (see Appendix 3) to be sent out to everyone who showed interest to contribute to my study. Here, they were informed about the aim and purpose of the study, the data collection process, that the interviews are confidential and that their anonymity is guaranteed. The latter is guaranteed through making the informants anonymous in my thesis (Silverman, 2014, p. 148). In my letter, I further wrote that their participation is voluntary and that they can withdraw whenever they want to (Silverman, 2014, p. 149). If they chose to withdraw, they knew their information would be deleted, and that no negative consequences would follow. Prior to the interviews, I asked my informants if they approved to be recorded, as well as informing that the record would be deleted right after the transcript was written. I also asked for their informed consent (Bryman, 2016; Cypress, 2018).[2]

A topic like #MeToo and #AidToo, involving experiences with sexual harassment, might be a sensitive topic. My intentions were to talk about organisational culture, climate, practice, changes, and related challenges within NORCAP and the humanitarian sector, rather than personal experiences or observations. However, I knew I had to make sure the interviewees were comfortable and relaxed during the interviews. Thus, I tried to complete the interviews in a comfortable pace. I also knew I had to speak as casual as possible to accomplish rapport, as Bryman (2016) argues that "very quickly a relationship must be established that encourages the respondent to want (or at least be prepared) to participate in and persist with the interview" (p. 206). I believe there exists a bigger challenge when it comes to accomplish trust with online interviews, compared to interviews in person. However, due to being over a year into this new 'normal' with everything happening online, I felt that my informants were comfortable and spoke freely about the topic and that a casual and informal setting was created. This also led to interviewees touching upon topics or information I had not considered beforehand. The flexibility of semi-structured qualitative interviews was therefore much appreciated, as well as the premade interview guides. If I noticed that some interviewees answered short, I naturally skipped to the next question or section, to not make the person uncomfortable or stressed. This was not a big concern. Most interviewees said they were happy to share and contribute, and some told me to "please stop me whenever you feel like" or "I feel that a talk a lot". Several

[2] The project was approved by NSD (Norwegian Centre for Research Data)

informants even thanked me for including them and for choosing this exact topic, as they see this as very important and as a topic that must be addressed and surely needs more attention.

4.6 Trustworthiness and Authenticity

While quantitative research emphasizes the importance of reliability and validity in research assessment, Lincoln & Guba (1985) and Guba & Lincoln (1994) suggest that it is necessary to identify ways and terms to be able to also assess and establish the quality of qualitative research (Bryman, 2016, p. 383). Thus, a discussion around the trustworthiness and authenticity of my study will be presented, which I overall tried to maintain in the best way possible, even though this is a small-scale study.

Two main criteria to assess the quality of qualitative research is proposed: *trustworthiness* and *authenticity* (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Guba & Lincoln, 1994). The former involves assessing the research's credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability (Bryman, 2016, p. 44 & 384). This is to assess if my study research what is aimed for, is "carried out according to the principles of good practice" and are believable (ibid.), as well as to what extent my findings are likely to apply for other contexts or times, or if my values have intruded my finding to a high degree (Bryman, 2016, p. 44). Authenticity on the other hand, "raise a wider set of issues concerning the broader political impact of research" (Bryman, 2016, p. 386). This ranges from questions regarding if my research fairly represents the different viewpoints of NORCAP staff and deployees, help them to better understand their social environment or to better appreciate perspectives of other NORCAP staff or deployees, as well as if my research has "acted as an impetus to member to engage in action to change their circumstances" or if it has empowered NORCAP staff or deployees to "take the steps necessary for engaging in action" (ibid.)

As with my study, qualitative research tends to entail studies of small groups sharing certain characteristics, like being a NORCAP employee (Bryman, 2016). Qualitative research also tends to be "oriented to the contextual uniqueness and significance of the aspect of the social world being studies" (Bryman, 2016, p. 384). A non-probability sampling approach does not allow the estimation of sampling errors and could lead to sampling bias, resulting in the researcher not being allowed to generalise the findings and conclusions to a wider population (Bhattacherjee, 2012; Bryman, 2016; Queirós, Faria & Almeida, 2017). However, in similarity to most qualitative research, this was not purpose of my study (ibid.). By only gaining insight

into one organisation and their employees' perceptions on the research topic, this is not something that can be transferred to another context. My informants also contain of only eleven participants, out of thousands other staff and experts. My findings can therefore neither be generalised to the whole population of NORCAP employees. Furthermore, Lunt and Livingstone (1992) debate "whether there is a time limit on the findings that are generated" and underline that one should be aware that things could and probably will change over time (Bryman, 2016, p. 194). By gathering data over few months, I am aware of the limitations this brings. I am also aware of #AidToo being a quite new phenomenon. Thus, by looking at how #AidToo has affected NORCAP's organisational culture, climate, and practice only a few years after its establishment, I am aware that my findings might not apply for other times. The reality and perception found may, and probably will, vary if studied in another time. I also study the given research phenomenon in the aftermath of #AidToo, which might be too soon to research, as we somewhat are still in a time marked by the movement. Despite these limitations, my study and findings represent well both NORCAP HO staff and deployees at a certain point in time, with some even underlining that they became aware of new aspects of the issue by reflecting to my questions.

By being aware of these possible limitations and weaknesses, by including NRC and NORCAP's own materials, and being aware of my positionality and its potential effects on my research (see sub-chapter 4.4), I believe I was able to address and mitigate all the biases mentioned in the last three sections.

5. Findings & Discussion

In this chapter, the study's findings and discussion will be presented jointly. It is organised based on the contents in my data and divided into two main categories: "Changes in Organisational Culture" and "Organisational Climate & Practice". The latter includes a discussion on the influence aspects of gender and power have into these matters. Interpretations and arguments will be supported through the inclusion of my informants' quotes and understandings, NORCAP's own policy documents, and existing literature. My focus will be on NORCAP's establishments and implementations today, involving their current organisational culture, climate, and practice, rather than planned work or aims for the future.

5.1 Changes in Organisational Culture

This section will present NORCAP's organisational culture and will include organisational changes made in the aftermath of #AidToo to prevent sexual harassment. I quickly learned that NORCAP's system is rather complex. Both because NORCAP is a part of NRC, meaning that a lot of NRC materials also involve NORCAP, and because NORCAP deployees are deployed to host organisations where they are covered by and must follow their rules, policies, and guidelines. However, my focus will be on NORCAP's own contributions to prevent sexual harassment, mainly focusing on established mandatory online trainings, the NRC Code of Conduct for NORCAP Deployees (NORCAP CoC) and their Preventing Sexual Exploitation and Abuse and Sexual harassment Reporting Guidelines (NORCAP PSEA & SH Reporting Guidelines). The two latter, together with the NRC PSEA & SH Policy (2020), constitute NRC and NORCAP's strategy to prevent sexual exploitation and abuse (SEA) and sexual harassment (SH), "either between staff and beneficiaries or between co-workers" (NRC, 2016, p. 9).

"Before the movements we [NORCAP] had nothing, basically. Maybe NRC had a system, but we had basically nothing. Now, we do have a PSEA guideline" (HO Staff, Female).

Several HO staff informed that when the #MeToo and #AidToo movements emerged in 2018, NORCAP started to invest more into trainings and awareness raising, resulting in the establishment of the NORCAP PSEA & SH Reporting Guidelines, PSEA and SH trainings, and updates in their CoC. Some consider these efforts as a direct result of the movements, while others clarify that related work had started earlier, but that the movements helped push processes forward. Regardless of the process, some people in NRC and NORCAP started to work on the NORCAP PSEA and SH Guidelines, which was released in late 2018.

"Eventually, NORCAP were basically linked with the NRC PSEA Head of Unit […] to ensure that NORCAP has a better grasp of the situation and can better manage any upcoming cases" (HO Staff, Female).

Based on my interviewees, it seems to exist a consensus that the NORCAP CoC has been there for years, however, not as complete as today's version. On the top of the CoC document, I found an overview of its adjustments. The most relevant and recent one was done in March 2019, involving making the document more aligned with the NRC CoC and enhance the section about PSEA by including some additions and "reference to reporting guidelines PSEA/SH" (NRC & NORCAP, 2019, p. 1). One HO staff confirms that the CoC technically is

updated based on the PSEA and SH Reporting Guidelines that was put in place, to make the two documents more align with each other. A HO staff explains today's CoC as followed:

"It provides much more granular details about the types of behaviours that are not permitted or behaviours that are considered sexual harassment" (HO Staff, Male).

My informants enlightened that PSEA and SH somewhat have been a part of the NORCAP CoC for a long time, making it hard to track when points about SEA and SH was firstly included. However, they state that a lot of things were missing in the earlier versions. This involves such as aspects of SEA and SH between humanitarian workers, as the focus was more on the protection of beneficiaries. Several HO staff clarified that the earlier CoC was less detailed, less specific, and not that expressive. A HO staff explained that it referred to harassment and inappropriate behaviours, but that the updates are a lot clearer about the behaviours NRC and NORCAP consider as sexual harassment.

5.1.1 NORCAP CoC

A Code of Conduct (CoC) is according to NRC & NORCAP (2018) "a set of standards about behaviour that staff of an organisation are obliged to adhere to" (p. 10). Several standards are presented in the NORCAP CoC, applying to all NORCAP deployees. Its purpose is "to serve as an ethical platform and formal commitment", so that deployees are held accountable for their behaviours and actions (NRC & NORCAP, 2019, p. 1).

Having emphasised that the NORCAP CoC is a binding document, it is clearly written that if one "fail to adhere to any of the provisions set out in this document, you can face disciplinary action, dismissal or even legal action" (NRC & NORCAP, 2019, p. 1). When signing the CoC, deployees are obliged to not take advantage of their power, position, and influence regarding the lives and well-being of beneficiaries, colleagues, and others (NRC & NORCAP, 2019). The section on PSEA clearly informs that SEA always have been unacceptable behaviour for NRC staff, and that NORCAP deployees, under no circumstances, should conduct any harassment (ibid.). The CoC states that NORCAP deployees are obliged to report any breach, concerns, or suspicions contravention of the CoC by a colleague – whether it is a fellow worker in the same or in another organisation or agency – to one's supervisor or through reporting mechanisms established by NRC, NORCAP, or the host organisation (ibid.). It further informs that the deployees themselves are accountable for making sure they apply and understand not only the CoC, but also the NORCAP PSEA and SH Reporting Guidelines. The

latter is, as written, “part of the pre-deployment package and briefing” (NRC & NORCAP, 2019, p. 5). Lastly, the CoC underlines that the standards presented are not an exclusive list and that other types of unacceptable behaviours also could be basis for disciplinary actions (ibid.). NRC also provides ‘Explanatory Notes to the Code of Conduct’ (NRC, 2016), envisioned to assist “line managers implement, monitor and enforce the Code of Conduct”, and includes “procedures for awareness raising and trainings, whistleblowing and how to follow up on breaches” (p. 4).

5.1.2 NORCAP PSEA & SH Reporting Guidelines

“This document summarizes the principles and actions NORCAP is following to respond to sexual exploitation and abuse (SEA) and sexual harassment (SH) experienced or witnessed by NORCAP members during deployment with partner organizations (NRC & NORCAP, 2018, p. 2).

At an IASC meeting in May 2018, the Principals committed to a set of concrete ways to address SEA and sexual harassment, which establish “an ambitious agenda for action to strengthen the humanitarian sector’s approach to” prevent, investigate, and respond to such issues (IASC, n.d.). They encouraged to continuously share knowledge of good practices, leaders to address these challenges, and highlight that action should be taken collectively to, among others, “promote positive change in organizational culture through strategic communications and role modeling” and “strengthen sector-wide investigations capacity” (ibid.). I was informed that the NORCAP PSEA & SH Reporting Guidelines is based on the NRC PSEA & SH Policy. The latter, according to NRC (2020), is in turn guided by the UN Secretary-General’s bulletins from 2003 (UN Secretariat, 2003), which again is superseded by IASC’s main principles (IASC, 2019).

The objective with the NORCAP Reporting Guidelines is, as stated by NRC & NORCAP (2018), to create a reporting mechanism which is clear, professional, and confidential to make sure incidents of SEA and SH are properly addressed. It is also emphasised that these guidelines are “essential for stopping would-be serial perpetrators, as unreported incidents are more likely to result in escalated or repeated acts” and that NORCAP must manage to create trust among their staff and deployees regarding their reporting mechanisms to adequately address these concerns (NRC & NORCAP, 2018, p. 3). I was told that the Guidelines and the CoC both inform and speak to each other, and that the Guidelines are intended to protect both

NORCAP deployees and beneficiaries. A HO staff further elaborates that the Guidelines also exist:

"To ensure that the NORCAP experts do follow the Code of Conduct, because they could be the conflict as well. Whether they are perpetrating that harassment towards the beneficiary or towards another staff within the humanitarian system. It is quite holistic in its approach" (HO Staff, Female).

Lastly, NRC offers a 'PSEA & Safeguarding Glossary" (NRC, 2021), intended to provide NRC staff with a mutual understanding of key terms (p. 1).

5.1.3 Mandatory Online Trainings

NORCAP provides two mandatory online trainings regarding PSEA and SH to their deployees. Firstly, all new NORCAP members must complete the 1-hour online training 'Prevention of Sexual Exploitation and Abuse' in relation to their employment (Kaya, n.d.a). This course is available in several languages, jointly developed by several UN organisations provided by UNHCR. It aims "to raise awareness about how acts of sexual exploitation and abuse impact individuals and whole communities and what to do about it" and informs about the responsibility and duty deployees' have regarding reporting such acts (ibid.). Secondly, in advance of each deployment, deployees must complete an online training developed and provided by NORCAP, regarding 'What you need to know – Reporting sexual harassment, exploitation and abuse' (Kaya, n.d.b). This course includes the PSEA training provided by UNHCR and NORCAP's own reporting module (ibid.). If deployees recently have completed this course, I was told that they can mark it as completed and upload a certificate as proof.

5.1.4 Organisational Support Structures

I was informed that prior to the #MeToo and #AidToo movements, neither NORCAP nor NRC had any staff working on PSEA and SH or investigations of such cases. In an article in Bistandsaktuelt, Jørgensen (2018) writes that NRC created a new position in the aftermath of #MeToo, where the job description is to work with preventing and reporting whistleblowing cases. In this article, Staff Care Specialist Adviser, Catrine Ulleberg, stresses that NRC had ethical guidelines and reporting procedures covering sexual harassment even before #MeToo, but that they in the wake of the movement have reminded their managers and employees about

their procedures (ibid.). Ulleberg also says that NRC has hired a person who specifically will work to prevent sexual harassment within the organisation (ibid.). My informants add that the PSEA and SH staff are hired to do all the investigations of sexual harassment and SEA cases within NRC and NORCAP. They are also responsible for doing training and capacity building of employees, managing and leading high-profile investigations, and advice both NRC and NORCAP on how they can put more safeguard measures in place.

According to Fossvik (2016), NORCAP strongly emphasis the welfare of their deployees, in which close engagement with them "before, during and after their deployment is critical to NORCAP's staff care system". I was informed that NORCAP has a Staff Care Adviser who works to provide mental health support to staff and advice NORCAP based on information shared by employees. Additionally, NORCAP has several Deployment Advisers, in which one deployee is assigned one Deployment Adviser each. I was told that during deployments, the deployees can contact the Staff Care Adviser and/or their Deployment Adviser for support, whether it is for personal matters, administration and HR help, or whistleblowing. After being hired and before being deployed, NORCAP provides online induction trainings, including the ones regarding PSEA and SH, and a 'pre-deployment brief' to the deployees. The latter is arranged by the Deployment Advisers to prepare the deployees for occurrence they might face during deployments. It turns out there exists a pre-deployment checklist which states that topics like the CoC, practical and administrative procedures, and the Reporting Guidelines must be reviewed. One Deployment Adviser explains the following:

"At least I try to tell them, in the briefing before they go out, that they might experience or observe [SEA and SH] incidents, that it is difficult, and that we have a great understanding that there is no right and wrong answer on how to handle it, which is why it would be nice if they could talk to us about it" (HO Staff, Female).

As post-deployment debriefs sessions, NORCAP provides Staff Care Seminars. Fossvik (2016) writes that these seminars are provided to give the deployees support after missions and involves discussions on a range of topics. NRC (n.d.c) informs that they view their staff's security and safety as a moral as well as legal obligation to provide protected working environments and conditions to the extent possible. NRC therefore continuously aim to uphold and advance their management system in these areas, to sufficiently assess and reduce risks. NRC (n.d.c.) writes that they have strengthened their staff care system in recent years (ibid.).

To prevent and adequately respond to cases of sexual harassment, NORCAP has made changes in their organisational culture. They have established new guidelines and hired staff to

work with PSEA & SH, investigate such cases, and hold people accountable for their actions. This, together with their organisational support system, form a seemingly good basis to prevent sexual harassment. Based on the presented changes in their organisational culture, NORCAP seems to have adapted and responded in the aftermath of the #AidToo movement. Furthermore, this thesis will address how this is perceived by NORCAP employees. To gain such insight, this analysis will look at the organisational climate and practice within NORCAP.

5.2 Organisational Climate & Practice

This section will present NORCAP's organisational climate and practice, and discuss this up against their current organisational culture. As the humanitarian sector is complex, in which all the organisations are somehow interconnected and dependent on each other, I will include some of its characteristics to outline how my informants perceive sexual harassment. Because most NORCAP experts are deployed to UN agencies, I also consider the UN's organisational climate and practice relevant for NORCAP. Lastly, I will discuss how my informants recognise this in relation to broader questions on gender and power.

5.2.1 The Humanitarian Sector and the UN

"The fundamental thing I will say to you, Vilde, about the entire of this issue, is that people don't like being held to account. People in our sector are no different from that" (HO Staff, Female).

When asking both male and female informants why they believe sexual harassment is so pervasive in the humanitarian sector, its characteristics of being male-dominated, patriarchal, hierarchical, macho, sexist, racist, and having a cowboy culture is brought up. My informants further blame the way the sector is set up. Firstly, because of the commonness of short contracts. As a result, workers are afraid to speak up and are more easily accepting unappropriated behaviours, as they do not want to ruin future work relations and opportunities and always are dependent on 'the next contract'. Secondly, the sector is set up in a way in which people automatically assume they are *only* doing good. As my informants outlined, this allows workers to not be as accountable as they should. In addition, several humanitarian workers tend to seek to alcohol to destress, especially in warzones. It turns out that over time, all this has been

normalised and accepted. With a culture that open, my informants describe a short way to someone taking it too far.

My informants describe #AidToo as a 'double-edged sword'. They are glad to see sexual harassment being brought to light, survivors being empowered, and perpetrators being held accountable. However, they also express a scepticism of 'here we go again', as the issue has been raised before – even before the #MeToo movement – without any major changes implemented. However, my informants believe that the humanitarian sector is under more scrutiny now, thanks to #AidToo. Generally, humanitarian organisations are putting more emphasis on PSEA and SH and zero tolerance policies. Despite this, my informants think there is a need for greater support. They still see sexual harassment as a major issue within the sector. A HO staff further underlines:

"I think it's just a matter of time until someone, whether it is the UN, NRC, or Save the Children, has another massive allegation of sexual harassment and sexual abuse. I think it's a matter of time. It will happen again" (HO Staff, Male).

Informants explained that other sectors have a monitoring body – whether that is an ombudsman or police force through some sort of legal recourse. In the aid sector, I was told that no such body exists. The organisations are asked to monitor themselves. Furthermore, my informants believe the sector is not responding properly to sexual harassment partly due to the (bad) example set by the UN. The UN has a position within the humanitarian community in which they lead by as an example. However, some of my informants believe that the UN is not investing in or considering PSEA and SH seriously enough. My informants also portray the UN as male dominated and hierarchical, with people in subordinate positions easily being pushed around and harassed. Despite the UN having skilled and experiences staff, a zero-tolerance policy and a clear vision, my informants explain that they are very good at protecting their reputation. It turns out the UN is not using their power and position adequately, as the reputation of the UN is prioritised over the survivor, supporting the survivor, and having accountability mechanisms and transformative justice available to prevent sexual harassment. One informant portrays the UN as followed:

"I think the UN is very much about sweeping it under the rug, whatever the problem is. They are not serious about any kind of challenge" (HO Staff, Male).

It turns out my informants do not think cases of sexual harassment has been properly handled within the sector. They also mentioned humanitarian organisations, in similarity to

Oxfam (Riley, 2020), often handling such allegations by "moving" the problem and perpetrators around. Instead of adequately prevent sexual harassment, they let people quietly resign. My informants do not think this is sufficient, as several of them see the problem with unappropriated behaviours as following the person. When comparing my data with existing literature, similarities are found. Riley (2020) writes that Burke wanted to show survivors they were not alone by starting 'MeToo'. She wanted to encourage women to stand in solidarity against the commonness of sexual violence in patriarchal culture (ibid.). The term 'patriarchal' is frequently mentioned by my informants to describe the sector. Thus, there seems to be a consensus that the culture in the sector fosters sexual harassment. My informant's descriptions correspond with Mazurana & Donnelly (2017) claiming that "sexism, machismo, and male domination" characterise the humanitarian sector (p. 30). Mazurana & Donnelly (2017) also outline alcohol and drugs as elements used by humanitarian workers to release stress. Scholars, in similarity with my informants, portray this as contributing factors to sexual violence within the sector (Mazurana & Donnelly, 2017; Nobert, 2017).

In an article about the UN, Bolle (2019) writes that the UN's Secretary-General, António Guterres, recognises the issue with sexual harassment. Guterres, like several of my informants, argues that the UN – a protagonist of equality, dignity, and human rights – needs to set higher standards (Bolle, 2019). House of Commons (2018) found that the UN's investigation approach lacks coherence, as there "is no single body taking an overall interest in the outcomes of investigations or driving them towards resolution, and the victims appear to be too easily forgotten" (p. 6). This is also a body my informants miss, then also in the context of the whole sector. Hansson, Sveningsson, Ganetz & Sandgren (2020) argue that sexual harassment issues commonly have not been acknowledged as "a broad political concern but has rather been framed as the occasional problem of individuals" and that it commonly has not been a focus on the underlying structural issues (p. 121). Literature also states that sexual violence within an organisation is seen as a problem that "has to be dealt with as quickly and as secretly as possible, rather than as a cultural and systemic issue that has to be acknowledged, owned and brought to justice" (Riley, 2020, p. 50). Daniels (2018) explains that because men in Oxfam were approved to resign from their work instead of being fired, some of them continued to work for other organisations in the sector. By not properly deal with such behaviours and hope that they will go unnoticed, Riley (2020) explains that this approach to "prevent" sexual harassment "illustrates the systemic nature of abuse within the aid sector" (p. 52-53). This can be related to my informants view of the sector as well as the UN. The issue seems to not be adequately

addressed, as the UN is more focused on "fixing" individual cases than the actual underlying issue – despite the UN's organisational culture stating otherwise (UN General Assembly, 2017)..

The characteristics of the humanitarian sector and the UN seem to contribute to the frequent occurrence of sexual violence. Humanitarian organisations also tend to solve such issues by protecting their reputation, move people around and ignore allegations – despite policies, guidelines, and mechanisms in place provide other approaches. In the following sections, insight into how NORCAP conceptualises and practices prevention of sexual harassment, as well as how this and their organisational changes is perceived by employees will be discussed. During the interviews, perceptions of the humanitarian sector, the UN and NRC were frequently mentioned. This portray the complexity of the sector, and aspects of this is therefore included. Comparisons between the HO staff and deployees will also be given to identify potential differences in understandings.

5.2.2 NORCAP

"There has definitely been changes, which is better than nothing" (HO Staff, Male).

My informants have noticed changes in NORCAP in the aftermath of the #AidToo movement. A Deployment Adviser claimed that several deployees have told her that NORCAP have increased their focus on sexual violence in the wake of #AidToo. Several times, directly and indirectly, several HO staff have heard that experts would rather be on a contract with NORCAP than with other humanitarian agencies, even other Standby Partners. A HO staff adds that this indicates that NORCAP is *seemingly* better than other organisations. The deployees claimed they feel safer with NORCAP, which is why they no longer take long term contracts with the UN. One deployee describes NORCAP as a tool he can use to raise his voice, as he does not have a career to protect and 'a next contract' to be worried about within the host organisations. However, a HO staff underlined that NORCAP, in similarity with the rest of the sector, is characterised by short contracts. She further claims that NORCAP members therefore might be afraid to speak up. Deployees seem to prefer NORCAP because NORCAP has a better personnel policy, and has created, and is good at maintaining, the direct contact with their experts. The latter through the Deployment Advisers, Staff Care Adviser, and Staff Care Seminars. Conversely, one Deployment Adviser clarified that no deployee has approached her saying that major changes have been implemented on the ground in terms of prevention of sexual harassment.

I found a variety in my informants' answers in terms of if they consider sexual harassment a problem within NORCAP. Ranging from deployees stating "no, not in NORCAP, but definitely within the sector", to HO staff informing that it is a significant issue. Most deployees told that they are not aware of any case of sexual harassment within NORCAP or involving NORCAP deployees. Deployees further state that even if such cases exist, this is not communicated to them due to confidentiality and their distance to the NORCAP HO. As one deployee puts it:

"You know these things normally is confidential. They don't make it public unless journalists start writing about it" (Deployee, Male).

Apparently, the number of SEA and SH cases reported to NRC and NORCAP does not match the amount of people being deployed, as they numbers should be much higher. My informants suspect there are "tons" more, as it is clear to them that such cases are underreported. When comparing with previous literature on sexual harassment (HWN, 2016; Harris Insights & Analytics, 2018), a HO staff states that she would not be surprised if this was the *actual* figure. However, she underlines:

"The case statistics I have worked on don't match up with those. But because these cases are so underreported, I would not expect them to" (HO Staff, Female).

Another HO staff believes the numbers presented in the literature are too low, and points at the fact that the mechanisms to report such cases are not there. Despite not providing concrete figures, the HO staff clarifies that there has been an increase in cases of sexual violence in both NRC and NORCAP. A HO staff explains:

"I would say in the last three years, since the #AidToo movement, our number of cases has gone up four to five times. It still steadily goes up every year" (HO Staff, Male)

This is stated in the article in Bistandsaktuelt, in which Ulleberg says that NRC has seen an increase in reports of sexual harassment in the wake of #MeToo (Jørgensen, 2018). Ulleberg paints this as positive and claims this means their systems are improved (ibid.). My HO staff informants believe the increase could be explained by NORCAP's encouragement with deployees, their Reporting Guidelines, and their investments in having a team working with PSEA and SH. As a result, I was told that cases are more sufficiently tracked, and deployees are more aware of their rights and options. However, HO staff also consider the impact of #AidToo as a contributing element. One HO staff believes the reports will go up by as much as

one invest into it. He adds that the number of reports went significantly up after NORCAP and NRC made changes in their organisational culture.

Despite NORCAP and NRC's organisational changes, my informants claimed this is not enough. Frequently mentioned is the lack of sufficient capacity building of staff and further investment, as well as the lack of implementation and insight into action and result of the organisational changes. Related to this, informants emphasised aspects of gender and power, strongly related to perceptions on management and leadership. Thus, I have decided to further analyse and discuss my data in two sections: 'Management & Leadership' and 'Gender & Power'. I will discuss how my informants perceive NORCAP's organisational change, also in relation to organisational values, climate and practice within NORCAP and the humanitarian sector more broadly.

5.2.3 Management & Leadership

"There is a lot of hierarchy, and that is also the case within NORCAP. It's definitely a hierarchy. This is also reflected in the way the management refers to people, who is mentioned and who is not" (HO Staff, Female).

While the NORCAP deployees seem honoured to be a part of NORCAP and uttered their gratefulness and trust in the organisation, several HO staff seemed sceptical about its own management and leadership. As they see it, their management and leadership do not *really* understand what it means to prevent sexual violence, as they are not willing to invest the time, money, and political approach that is needed. The deployees feel that NORCAP has improved and gained focus on the issue, yet HO staff do not think the management and leadership address and recognise the issue seriously enough. According to an informant, a survey targeted to both NRC and NORCAP staff earlier this year found that 76% of their staff had not experienced workplace bullying and/or harassment. She underlined that the management presented this as positive and as a great result, before she uttered:

"What about the remaining 24%? That's quite much. And even if it was only 10% who said they felt bullied or harassed at work, that is also a lot" (HO Staff, Female).

This informant thinks such presentation says a lot about the management and what they recognise as serious matters and not. She outlined that the management justified the negative outcomes by arguing that this is just how the sector is, as if there is nothing they can do to prevent or improve the situation. Other HO staff mentioned a culture within NORCAP in which

sexual harassment and other unacceptable behaviours are pushed aside and seen as the least of their worries, as beneficiaries experience more 'important' issues like famine and living in war zones. HO staff stressed the importance of all members of an organisation to feel respected and valued by their management, but that the general focus has been on the abuse carried out on the communities they serve, rather than on humanitarian staff. Some informants believe that humanitarian staff experience higher than average rates of sexual violence anywhere in their structure, not only out in the fields. A HO staff further highlighted that people in Head Offices, also within NRC, has told her that they have experienced sexual harassment. She explains:

"I can imagine situations between managers and their line reports; assaults, unwanted attention, unwanted touching, and communicating inappropriate through social media. I don't think the HO is any different from anywhere else in the sector" (HO Staff, Female).

According to a HO staff, a lot of senior managers at Head Offices make the mistaken assumption that they do not have any problems, including NRC. She believes these issues are hidden because NRC did not want to hear bad news, as they were more interested in growing and getting aid out to more people, rather than addressing how they did that and the quality and safety of their programming. She further stated that she knows some of her colleagues in NRC have been told to be quiet, because it is disloyal to talk about these problems as you are feeding into the agenda to shut down aid. Another HO staff informed that NRC has a relatively high turnover (12%), and blamed the tone from the top, their managers, leaders, and the attitudes in the organisation. She further draws a connection from this to outcomes and success within an organisation:

"If people at the Head Office – the core of where programs are prepared for the field – feel they are not valued and taken care of in several ways, or does not feel respected for their work, the program in Congo would not necessarily be good either" (HO Staff, Female).

According to a HO staff, NRC and NORCAP are trying. However, he believes that the main challenge to prevent sexual harassment is the will of the organisations within the sector. Despite being aware of the organisational changes, he claimed that #AidToo did not have the impact they hoped in terms of sufficient investment from leadership to prevent sexual violence within NORCAP or NRC. To add to his claim, he explained that when hiring PSEA and SH staff, NRC hired three people to cover all investigations in both organisations. He further portrayed the situation with the following words:

"I think, if there was a greater commitment within the organisation, you would see more than 3 people employed to cover over 15.000 staff. It is impossible for 3 people to cover 15.000 staff and respond appropriately. You are setting up those people to fail in their jobs and their ability to protect people" (HO Staff, Male).

This makes it difficult for NRC and NORCAP to have a system responding quickly to complaints, which my informants state is missing. I was told that the investigators tend to have so much to do that it could take months to respond to sexual violence reports. A case of sexual harassment could take anywhere between 3 months and a year to investigate. Several informants highlighted that the response time is really affecting the reputation in the organisation, in which one informant claims that:

"They are like 'okay, why would I report that my manager is trying to touch my back, my butt, or my thigh, if it takes them 6 months to respond? Why would I ever make a complaint?'. So that type of reputation and delayed response starts to spread in the organisation and then people do not feel safe to report" (HO Staff, Male).

I found my informants pleased to see that organisational changes have been put in place. However, they believe that simply signing the NORCAP CoC and pass some online trainings will not be enough to make desired change – nor do they believe these measures *actually* prevent sexual harassment. Some further argued that it might establish some important standards and frameworks, but that those always will be flexible. If there not is proper response mechanism in place to ensure that people are held accountable for their behaviours, people might think they can get away with all sorts of behaviours. According to a HO staff, this is usually the reason for the big allegations one sees. So, at the end of the day, several informants believe that people's behaviours will depend on their attitudes and values. One informant drawed comparisons to school rules:

"It was like when we were in Elementary School, we were not allowed to wear hats or chew gums, or we had to do certain things. Like the approach does not really work that well, it regulates some people's behaviours, but it does not reach the roots of actually addressing the type of the problem. It does not change the culture" (HO Staff, Male).

The NORCAP PSEA and SH Guidelines inform that the briefings before and after missions should include a session on PSEA and sexual harassment, and that NORCAP should provide mandatory online trainings for all deployees, where certificates should "be updated every third year" (NRC & NORCAP, 2018, p. 8). Despite this, HO staff argued that there is

really room for the management to improve and investment more in adequate training to make sure NORCAP members truly understand what is required of their conduct. The deployees seemed to not be fully aware of the PSEA and SH trainings. However, they did state that there exists a lot of trainings, provided by both NORCAP and the host organisations. A HO staff explained that when doing training and talking to people about how they are not allowed to use sex workers when they work for NORCAP, a lot of people ask him why he think he is in a position where he can tell them what to do in their private time. This unwanted act is for instance clearly stated in the NORCAP CoC (NRC & NORCAP, 2019, p. 5). My informant describes it as emblematic that there is a real issue of not understanding the guidelines and the basic concepts. All deployees claim they are aware of the NORCAP CoC. Despite the CoC stating the NORCAP PSEA and SH Reporting Guidelines is "part of the pre-deployment package and briefing" (NRC & NORCAP, 2019, p. 5), some say they do not know if NORCAP has a reporting mechanism in place or they "guess they have something". I was informed that the pre-deployment package includes a bunch of documents. A HO staff expressed his scepticism about whether the deployees sit down and read everything, which could be reflected in their lack of awareness of the guidelines. When asking my informants what they believe is the biggest challenge to prevent sexual harassment, one informant stated:

"I feel like the biggest challenge would probably be implementing all these guidelines that are put in place. To hold people accountable for their behaviour, as well as encouraging people to report on any concern they may face" (Deployee, Female).

Even now, in the aftermath of #AidToo and NRC and NORCAP's organisational changes, the deployees are not sure what to do if they experience sexual harassment. They are not even sure if there is a system in place, and sought more emphasis on the mechanisms and procedures in place. However, all deployees concluded that they would probably contact their Deployment Adviser for advice and support. One deployee explained:

"Honestly, if I have to report something at this very moment because something happened to me, I don't think there is a specific system, I just need to reach out to my Deployment Adviser, and she will respond" (Deployee, Female).

This deployee knows she has two options for reporting – either through the host agency or through NORCAP. However, she clarified that she is more aware of the UN system. She knows she can talk to her Deployment Adviser, but she does not know how NORCAP operates internally and what mechanism they use. Despite this, the deployees explained that they have an open dialogue with NORCAP regarding reporting, dealing, and acting against something

that is not the way it should be, and they see NORCAP as a supporting organisation with a clear standpoint. One deployee portrayed deployees' relationship with NORCAP as followed:

"I think NORCAP is an organisation which holds your back, and the figure of Deployment Adviser is key to do so. Another thing we have green light to do, is to hold these UN agencies accountable. We are here to support and provide with expertise they might not have to respond to a certain emergency, but also to hold them accountable" (Deployee, Female).

I consider the deployees much reliant on their Deployment Advisers. It turns out that the Deployment Adviser one has, is crucial for how a case or issue will evolve and if the deployees will be taken seriously. I was told that some Deployment Advisers are better than others in terms of response to issues raised. One deployee explained that if she felt that her Deployment Adviser was not understanding enough, she would have doubts regarding whether she would report incidents of sexual harassment. Another deployee talked about an earlier experience with a Deployment Adviser:

"I was having someone who was not answering my questions, she was not understanding. So, I guess that's a weak part. And if you do not have any response from your Deployment Adviser, what do you do? That is another weak part. To whom you should reach out. When the direct person you are supposed to communicate with is not responding in the way you need or the way you expect" (Deployee, Female).

I was told that one Deployment Adviser should have the responsibility for no more than 25 experts. However, it turns out that the number of experts Deployment Advisers have vary a lot. In some cases, I was told that they could even have a portfolio of 50 deployees in the field. As a result, things easily could be missed or forgotten, basically due to the overload of work. A Deployment Adviser explained that when being responsible for more than 25 deployees, there is no way one can follow up on more than basically order the experts' plane tickets. As stated by another Deployment Adviser:

"We are all humans, and errors could happen so… I am not saying it does happen, only that it could" (HO Staff, Female).

Some HO staff questioned their colleagues working closely with the deployees, due to lack of field experience and knowledge of its context. One of the worries highlighted is that they might not understand the seriousness of issues brought up by the deployees. If the deployees do not feel appropriately treated, they tend to back off because they are afraid of the

consequences they might face if moving forward with a case without being supported. A repeated concern among my HO staff is the lack of systematic capacity building of staff. Deployment Advisers told me that they believe they are not given sufficient information and training in terms of issues like PSEA and SH and the guidelines, which they claim is needed to be able to inform the deployees about attitudes, unacceptable behaviours, and safe reporting pathways. Some also claimed they are not sure what to do if deployees report something to them. Despite working for NORCAP for several years, one Deployment Adviser told me that she has not been introduced to NORCAP's current system and the PSEA and SH Guidelines. She had to learn about this based on own curiosity and initiative, even though – as she states – she is the person supposed to inform the deployees that NORCAP has this in place. HO staff highlighted the importance of deployees knowing there exists a safe place they can turn to, which also will respond quickly to their complaints. A Deployment Adviser explained the following:

"I have also said that we as Deployment Advisers – who have the direct contact with the experts – should receive much more training in how we relate to these guidelines and work a lot more with it. It's about reassuring people who are in a difficult situation, yet also be very clear about the zero tolerance" (HO Staff, Female).

My informants are aware that there is no sufficient reporting mechanism in place within the sector as a whole, and usually there is no formal repercussions or appropriate consequences for the perpetrators. The UN has 'Clear Check' (UN General Assembly, 2021), in which people who have been found guilty of sexual violence will not manage to move around within the system and between the organisations like nothing happened (Bolle, 2018). Sexual harassment is typically dealt with by moving people to another office, or basically sweep it under the rug. Organisations seem to have an "out of sight, out of mind" – mentality, only waiting to see what happens next. However, the deployees do not see this as the case within NORCAP, as they feel NORCAP takes things seriously, no matter the case. The HO staff underlined that they think NORCAP could invest *a lot* more into doing background check on people they are about to hire. There is no "Clear Check" system in NRC or NORCAP. Several informants believed that the lack of investment into such systems is what leads to the existing culture of impunity. One informant clarifies that if someone working for Save the Children has sexually harassed someone and been fired, he or she can still decide to apply for a position at NORCAP. As written in the NORCAP PSEA & SH Guidelines regarding new recruitments, the candidate should be asked about potential prior breaches of companies' policies or CoC, if they have ever

been investigated for SEA and SH, and if they could explain potential employment gaps (NRC & NORCAP, 2018, p. 8-9). To make sure the candidate is suited for the job, their criminal record should also be provided and checked, as well as "at least two references taken from previous employers which include questions on candidate's conduct" and prior behaviours (ibid.) However, according to a HO staff, NORCAP is only doing background checks of new candidates through references, which the applicant apparently is not obliged to give. Even if they give references, I was informed that the prior organisation is not allowed to disclose why persons were fired. NORCAP can also ask if the applicant ever have been accused of or found guilty of violation of sexual harassment. Yet, one informant highlighted its challenges:

"It is an honour system, so they could just select 'no' and then they will get hired. Then all of that is behind them and they have a new job" (HO Staff, Male).

Leigh et al. (2014) argue that workplace bullying and harassment could lead to serious consequences not only for individuals, but also for the organisation. Scholars state that sexual harassment leads to decrease levels of job satisfaction and productivity and hampers staff's work efficiency, and should therefore be relevant to address for the organisations' managements (Dey, 2019; Leigh et al., 2014). Leigh et al. (2014) underlines that if not properly addressed, this could result in more employees wanting to resign. This could be reflected in NRC's relatively high turn-over percentage and my informant's thoughts around feeling valued and its effect on their programs. Riley (2020) and Nobert (2017) concludes that any discussion and prevention of sexual violence must start with why it flourishes in the first place. Informants feel that such emphasis is missing in NRC. When a survey found that a lot of NRC members felt stressed at work, NRC provided a stress management course, rather than addressing the underlying issue. In which some informants believe is rooted in having too high ambitions and too few staff, and draw similarities to the organisational culture not matching up with the number of PSEA and SH staff they have employed.

RTA's practice tools "begins by examining the most significant risk factor for sexual violence in humanitarian workplaces: organisational culture" (Nobert, 2017, p. 4). As highlighted by both Nobert (2017) and my informants, leadership might be "one of the most important elements to preventing incidents of sexual violence, as it addresses the main underlying risk factor: organisational culture" (p. 22). House of Commons (2018) concludes that the sector "seems to have reacted to the increase of reports of sexual abuse", however, the focus has faded (p. 4). They found that the new "policies and programs have not been implemented effectively enough" (ibid.). They claim that there has been an emphasis on

procedures and processes "without much apparent focus on outcomes" (ibid.). This also seems to be the case with NRC and NORCAP. They have adapted and responded to #AidToo, but it turns out the focus has decreased. The leadership and management seem to be satisfied with the changes they have made, despite my informants stating that any major changes have not been made on the ground. My informants outlined lack of implementation. After saying that she feels #AidToo can be seen as a trend, one informant explained:

"And that's why it's so important to be systematic. Because when the trend is over, we have ticked that box and we are done" (HO Staff, Female).

Some HO staff believe the management and leadership established the PSEA and SH Guidelines and trainings only to be able to 'tick the box' and move on to the next issue. A HO staff believe NRC and NORCAP's organisational changes are only there to look good at the surface. Scholars find policies and procedures "utterly meaningless without a root and branch transformation of organisational culture", and that preventing and addressing sexual harassment goes beyond one line in the Code of Conduct or one training (House of Commons, 2018, p. 6; Nobert, 2017). Nobert (2017) state that a strong management and leadership goes beyond only telling that there exists a zero tolerance for such behaviours, as words need to be put into action, accountability must be pushed, and support ensured for survivors (p. 22). Gillespie et al. (2019), as well as my informants, also underline that it is not sufficient to approach sexual violence simply through a set of organisational reforms or by tightening up ethical codes. They argue that #AidToo is clearly presenting the need for wider systemic change in our thinking, culture, and practice (p. 1). Fredriksson & Alvinius (2019) also portray the importance of leadership, as they found evidence of fewer perpetrators in organisations where the leaders and managers actively work to prevent these occurrences (p. 31). Deloitte (2019) also identified "perceived gaps in the tone being set by senior leaders, managers and supervisors", and conclude that measures should be taken to hold leaders accountable for assuring a zero-tolerance culture (p. 5).

Nobert (2017) found that PSEA and SH policies and guidelines "have the potential to significantly reduce" incidents of workplace sexual violence, but only if combined with a strong leadership (p. 22). Policies and procedures must underline both prevention and respond, and include "simple and clear messaging about how sexual violence will not be tolerated, combined with appropriate, sensitive, and frequent trainings on the topic" (ibid.). Nobert (2017) also emphasises the importance of the guidelines being understood by all staff members (ibid.). In which the latter seems to be missing in NORCAP. Their organisational culture contains clear

messaging about unappropriated behaviours, and they have preventative efforts in place (on paper). However, I found a lack of awareness, understanding and implementation, rooted in lack of investment and involvement from the management and leadership. Nobert (2017) claims that a zero tolerance must start with the implementation of robust and repetitious prevention measures. As an organisation providing expertise based on human qualities of individual deployees, I consider NORCAP highly dependent on sufficient relations, communication, and co-operation, based on deployees that are aligning and understanding of the policies and procedures applied at all times. Thus, I believe NORCAP could benefit from investing more into doing regular trainings and awareness raising of PSEA and SH, and the Reporting Guidelines - of both deployees and HO staff working closely with them. This is so that they will be able to influence their members' attitudes and behaviours in the right direction.

House of Commons (2018) state, a zero-tolerance culture "must go hand in hand with a culture of transparency" to be able to detect not only why it is happening, but also what is the most effective way to prevent and respond to it (p. 6). Cases, reports, and results of sexual harassment cases are not communicated between levels within NORCAP or NRC. This is needed to be able to trust the system, which in turn is needed for the NORCAP members to feel confident enough to report. Together with the deployees' distance to the HO, this seem to be a crucial reason for SH cases being so rarely reported. As Nobert (2017) argues, the organisational culture is not only a reason for the occurrences of sexual harassment, but also underpins why reports of such cases are hardly reported.

Even though NORCAP's organisational culture line out a seemingly good basis to prevent sexual harassment, I found missing links between this and my informants' perceptions of the climate and practice within NRC and NORCAP. Nobert (2017) concludes that establishing an organisational culture that sufficiently prevents and address issues of SEA and SH, holds perpetrators accountable, cares for the survivors, and ends impunity is in the need of a holistic approach. This will require both commitment and time (p. 6). My informants also understand that this process will take time and demand investments. Even though they do not believe their NRC and NORCAP management and leadership so far has invested what is needed into this issue, some informants believe and hope they, as well as other humanitarian organisation, eventually will to be able to end impunity and sufficiently prevent sexual harassment. As one deployee states:

"The day we see some consequences for the perpetrators, I think that will be a real change" (Deployee, Female).

5.2.4 Gender & Power

"I think it is because of the system we are in. There is a perception of power, just because you are a man you are entitled to [sexually harass]" (Deployee, Female).

In concern of sexual harassment, my informants described a trend in which men – whether of colour or white, European – in higher positions usually are the perpetrators. Whilst the survivors, the most vulnerable, are usually women. In particular, women of colour. The HO staff that believes the numbers and statistics presented in literature are too low would say that up to 75 to 80 percent of women in the NRC and NORCAP program at one point have faced some sort of sexual harassment, unwanted comments, or unwanted touching. He also clarifies that this depends on the staff one is talking about. He explains:

"I think some of our national staff and field staff, so particularly like women of colour, face a much higher percentage of sexual harassment and unwanted touching" (HO staff, Male).

My informants believe the sector is set up in a colonising way, involving a very Northern, mostly white-western, way of thinking. This creates a lot of racism and assumptions about difference, involving people of colour not being equally listened to or valued. As other contributing factors to sexual harassment, my informants highlighted men, especially with power, their attitudes and lack of involvement in the process of preventing it. When discussing #AidToo and sexual harassment, one deployee explained:

"Women are not going to let this go. The problem is, where are the men? I don't see a lot of men involved in this, to be honest. And if you don't have men involved, the change is probably not going to happen the way we want it to" (Deployee, Female).

One male deployee sees "us men" as the main problem and claims that men are the ones who need to tell other men that some behaviours are not welcomed. He explains that he today, easier than before, can show and tell colleagues his attitude and standpoint. Now that he is older, he meets greater acceptance when speaking up, and explains this by pointing to the respect his age and gender carries. However, he must be careful who he approaches, as a lot of men tend to be insulted or offended. He claimed he also was able to influence in subordinate positions, due to his gender. He is embarrassed by the fact that he has significance and importance due to his skin-colour, age, and gender, but being aware of this he understands that he also has power and a particular responsibility to set a standard for certain behaviours, such as sexual harassment. He made it clear that the responsibility for making change lies in the hands of men, and that they are the ones who must be held accountable. Ashamed, he explained:

"It is our job as men to tell each other that we do not accept it. Unfortunately, it's embarrassing to say, but we men tend to best listen to each other. Many of us men have a problem listening to women and gain information from them" (Deployee, Male).

He further underlined that it is about time that, especially men, wake up and understand that the world has changed. They cannot continue to take advantage of their rank and power. Some HO staff claimed that the sector's recruitment system is a main reason for the occurrences of sexual harassment, as the sector has a recruitment system in which people becomes leaders based on seniority, and not necessarily because they are good leaders. People also become leaders because they are friends with other powerful people, or basically because they do not threaten the people in the management team. This situation is portrayed as followed:

"That's a part of the status quo and the old boys' network, which is now a bit bigger and has lots of women and some people of colour in it – but it's still a boys' network" (HO Staff, Female).

A highlighted problem related to sexual harassment cases is that staff often do not know how to speak about discrimination respectfully enough. Assumptions are being made about how comfortable people feel to speak out, both in Head Offices and other parts of the organisations. A HO staff believes that the sector in general, including the NRC HO, has a problem speaking about discriminatory behaviours like sexism and racism. She underlines this as important because if people do not feel comfortable to speak about difference, this will have a huge impact on whether they feel comfortable to speak out and report cases. She finds it extremely important for senior management teams to be sufficiently reflective and representative of both beneficiaries and the staff members, of which she believes is a real problem NRC and NORCAP faces, as she describes the NRC and NORCAP boards as "incredibly non-diverse". She further explains:

"In my experience, discriminatory behaviour is often going hand in hand with abuse of power. It's really easy for perpetrators to carry out abuse if they are carrying out abuse against people who are less powerful, less respected, or discriminated against" (HO Staff, Female).

A deployee explains that sexual violence situations bring a lot of complications. One must think *many* times before making the decision to report. Her initial thinking is that she would want to hold perpetrators accountable, but it is not an easy decision to make. Generally, one cannot guarantee correct processing of the complaint. She explains that this implies risks, which depends on ones' trust in the system and the type of incident you have faced. Several

informants emphasise the importance of proof required to hold someone accountable, without being accused of own overreaction of the incident. This is mostly highlighted by female informants. They underlineed that accusation of overreacting is most often directed towards women. It turns out that at the end of the day, it is basically her words against his, because sexual harassment tends to be difficult to prove with hard evidence. Which usually ends up with more worries for the women. My informants linked this up to male managers and leaders not understanding "women's issues". It turns out the sector is led by extremely proud people (men). A HO staff explains the situation as followed:

"The people who are managing our organisations are politicians, they are media. They are people who have a lot of personal interest and investment in the status and their association with the organisations" (HO Staff, Female).

There is a variety in the answers concerning if my informants believe deployees feel safe to report cases or concerns of sexual harassment to NORCAP. None of the deployees said they have reported such behaviours, however, there is a difference between male and female deployee1s confidence in the reporting system. The male deployees were convinced that if they ever reported, NORCAP would take them seriously and take action. The males stated that there are no barriers for reporting, in which one even claims that it is rather the opposite. It would almost be a service beautification for him if he did not report. This correspond with what is stated in the NORCAP CoC (NRC & NORCAP, 2019); deployees have a duty to report if experiencing or observing incidents of SEA or SH. However:

"I am not convinced experts know they have a duty to report…" (HO Staff, Female).

Several HO staff believes deployees that do decide to report are extremely brave, because the organisations usually protect their own reputations and staff, instead of protecting the person reporting. It turns out a reason for this protection is that humanitarian organisations are highly dependent on other organisations within the sector, as well as donors. Thus, they need to have a clean sheet. In contrast to the male deployees, the female deployees were more unsure if they would dare to report. Not because of NORCAP or their support, the uncertainty lies within the consequences that might follow. Deployees are unsure about the impact and power NORCAP can have on a UN agency, in terms of holding UN workers accountable for their actions. Even though HO staff try to tell deployees that they can trust them, the deployees still hesitate to report. The HO staff also expressed their scepticism about NORCAP's impact and power, in which one HO staff elaborates:

"Unfortunately, it is like we have our own power, and they have their own power. We have had cases where the agencies say that 'we did not find any wrongdoing' and we thought we had enough evidence to say that 'you know what, we found wrongdoing'. Our power is to say that 'you might not believe it, but we do, and as long as you have somebody – that person, in that position, in that country – we are not going to deploy anybody there', because we are going to protect our staff" (HO Staff, Male)

In the PSEA & SH Reporting Guidelines, NRC & NORCAP (2018) write that all agencies "have zero tolerance for any form of harassment and have policies and procedures in place to protect staff" and that the person reporting the incident can have full trust in the system without fearing retaliation (p. 7). The guidelines also clarify that if a host organisation finds their own staff not guilty of SEA or sexual harassment, and NORCAP still believes that a case or cases took place, "NORCAP will not deploy to any mission that the alleged abuser is based", as NORCAP has to fully agree with the outcome of the case to in best terms be able to protect their deployees (NRC & NORCAP, 2018, p. 4). A HO staff explained that when one of their deployees felt sexually harassed by a UN senior worker, they chose to pull her out of the mission. She believes NORCAP handled the situation decently. Yet, both NORCAP and staff in that host organisation knew this perpetrator was not going to be moved due to his power. As a result, NORCAP told this UN organisation that they would deploy anyone to such circumstances. In this case, the deployee felt supported by NORCAP, and NORCAP was able to offer the deployee a new mission – which is not always possible. Similar cases have happened. One host organisation promised to act on a sexual harassment case in 2017. Yet I was told the perpetrator still is working there. A HO staff explains that their options of actions are restricted when the host organisations chose to not act. Despite NORCAP claiming that they would not send any new deployees to that office before action was taken, which also is clearly stated in the Reporting Guidelines, NORCAP now has two experts deployed there, despite the case having no consequences for the perpetrator in question. Several informants underline that NORCAP is reliant on maintaining a good relationship with the host organisations. I was told that if sexual harassment cases come up, it is not only about informing the host organisations about the case – which turns out to be a somewhat nerve-wrecking situation for some HO staff – it is also about maintaining the collaborative and collegial relationships and partnerships. A HO staff portrayed being a humanitarian worker like walking around on eggshells; One wants to uphold the relationships between the organisations to be able to continue the work and are therefore afraid to report cases. As she explains:

"If you damage that bond, whether it is a positive or toxic bond, it has negative consequences on you" (HO Staff, Female)

Based on my informant's perception, one could imagine that female leaders might be a contributing factor to prevent sexual harassment. However, some informants expressed that they at times have been shocked to see that women in leading positions does not necessarily make a difference to the cases reported. A friend of a deployee was assaulted and wanted to take the case forward, but the women leading that specific operation pressed her to keep quiet. Several informants conveyed similar stories, of women in leading position covering up or denying cases. Despite this, my informants believe women in leading positions is needed, as some senior does not realise that women and mothers have needs they are unaware of.

A deployee argued that one can see the difference when there are mainly men leading a response, as they tend to forget the most basic things. A deployee often finds herself surrounded by men that – simply because they are men – does not understand the importance of certain issues, nor do several of them bother to ask women about their opinions. A female deployee portrays how it is to be a female worker in a male-dominated sector with the following words:

"In general, you are already exposed to many risks and challenges and because of just the fact that you are a woman, you have to take extra precautions in your work environment. And then we are supposed to provide protection and lifesaving services to people that goes through some type of disaster or conflict. So, you have to be in a position where you have to be ready to do so. Otherwise, it is like you have to be careful of your back and your front, you know. It is too much to deal with" (Deployee, Female).

Numerous of accusations was brought up by women in various sectors through #MeToo– uttering their experiences of SEA and SH at the hands of powerful men and according to Riley (2020), also "how these experiences have historically been covered up or denied" (p. 49). Furthermore, innumerable more women spoke up "only to have their experiences and their histories dragged open and pored over to achieve little tangible change" (Riley, 2020, p. 49). As Riley (2020) suggests, the racism and gendered dynamics within the sector lead to some groups being less tending to be trusted, if they ever try to tell their story (p. 49). UN Women (2018) argues that the "construction of women's words and memories as untrustworthy is a deep, pervasive and enduring prejudice that impacts all aspects of sexual violence", including sexual harassment (p. 10). While the male deployees consider no barriers to reporting, this literature strongly underpins the female deployees' fear of not be taken seriously and accused of overdramatising happenings. Mazurana & Donnelly (2017) inform that most operations are

dominated and led by men (p. 30). They argue that the "male domination of the power, space, and decision-making in aid agencies is reported to contribute to a macho environment", involving men with power promoting a work and living environment where SEA and SH, sexual jokes related discussions, and "boys will be boys" attitudes flourish (ibid.). Mazurana and Donnelly (2017) found that male leaders might feel uncomfortable discussing what is frequently viewed as 'women's problem' (p. 24). This is also frequently highlighted by my informants, especially the female deployees. Mazurana and Donnelly (2017) found that male leaders not necessarily understand that trainings and awareness-raising on such issues crucial and something everyone should learn about. They also state that their informants claim that women feel uncomfortable raising their concerns regarding sexual violence or other "women's problems" to male leaders (p. 24). This can be drawn to a deployees stating the following:

"Because when you are a woman, you become an object. That happens a lot, so you have to be with your guard all the time sometimes. Don't even bother to talk about periods or your needs when you have you period, that is something totally taboo" (Deployee, Female).

Even though sexual violence has been proven by scholars to target both men and women, women and minoritized groups are more likely to be survivors, involving women personifying with several minority identities being the most vulnerable (Siuta & Bergman, 2019; Riley, 2020; Mazurana & Donnelly, 2017; HWN, 2016; Nobert, 2016). This is also understood by several of my informants, in which they blame the male-dominated, hierarchical, and racist culture within the sector. The trend my informants see is also male perpetrator and female survivor, in which the perpetrator usually holds some sort of power over his survivor. House of Commons (2018) also claim a commonness of perpetrators of harassment and abuse mainly being men, or rather "men in the community with power, money and influence" (p. 18). However, House of Commons (2018) also underline that one should not ignore the possibility of women behaving sexually inappropriate. Riley (2020) argues that "all women, in short, are at risk in the aid and development sector […] in all areas of the aid industry" (p. 29). This is comparable to Mazurana & Donnelly (2017) claiming that most survivors reporting sexual harassment and assault were women aid workers "of different nationalities and across a range of educational, experience, and authority levels within missions" (p. 2).

My informants believe it is hard to quantify the exact numbers of survivors, and they are also aware of the issue being highly underreported. This is supported by Gillespie et al. (2019) claiming that "many agencies are unable or unwilling to provide figures" (p. 2), and House of Commons (2018) confirming an underreporting of such cases which makes the exact scale

impossible to identify (p. 4). Despite the differences in numbers and statistics, the pattern is clear; perpetrators often being men in positions of power, commonly related to men in "supervisory or higher-level positions compared with their victims" (Mazurana & Donnelly, 2017, p. 2). Riley (2020) further claims that organisations tend to "overlook" cases, and that this is especially true when powerful and public men are the ones accused of such unaccepted behaviors, as they cannot be accountable for their actions because they are "too well-connected" (p. 50). House of Commons (2018) found fundamental cultural change in the humanitarian sector is needed if organisations should be able to take care of their survivors rather than focus its energy in "taking care of reputations and tackling whistleblowers" (p. 5). As House of Commons (2018) clarifies, a "reactive, cyclical approach, driven by concern for reputational management, will not bring about transformational change" (p. 29). A HO staff questions the somewhat negative view senior managers tend to have on the people raising concerns within the humanitarian sector, as "they are ruining the organisations' reputation". This informant praises reporters and whistle-blowers with the following words:

"For me, they are our best friends, they are brave, they are taking such big risks and it's usually our staff in national positions who are really principal, who really care about the quality of the programming we are doing in the country they are from. For obvious reasons. I think it shows a total lack of respect for who we are really here for" (HO Staff, Female).

This is also argued by Nobert (2017), stating that organisations in the humanitarian sector must develop approached which both will work for the organisations and the ones affected by the problem, which must "involve engagement with national staff" (p. 6). This again could be linked to the discrimination, racism, and westernism my informants argue is striving within the sector. Additionally, it turns out that most humanitarian organisations have not created a safe enough place to hear from, reach out to, and protect the most vulnerable, or trust and believe in whistle-blowers. A HO staff underlined that this is also something that she has found in NRC, replicated at Head Office level. My informants believes that if the power is decentralised and the investigators positions are separated from the management – people would be more likely to trust the system. In her opinion, strong management and strong commitment to accountability and addressing problems head on is what is needed to create a safe place and culture. Some HO staff think it is a myth that Head Offices does not have inappropriate behaviours, and that it is easy for organisations like NRC to think that things are okay at the HO and that the problem is elsewhere. However, as argues by one informant:

"All of the analysis shows us that there is senior people who carry out abuse. Like someone in a position of power or authority – actual or perceived. And the more senior you are, the closer you are to HO. I am pretty sure that HO is a critical part of the problem. I don't think it is a part of the solution. But I think a lot of seniors think it is" (HO Staff, Female).

As specified by my informant in these previous sections, and as scholars also argue, there is a need for a safe environment for those who choose to report SEA or SH cases, without the fear of not being taken seriously or face retaliation (Siuta & Bergman, 2019; House of Commons, 2018). According to Nobert (2017), it is necessary for all employees "to understand their rights to a safe and healthy workplace, as well as how they must contribute to the creation of one" (p. 5). This again leads back to the capacity building and awareness rising of employees. Siuta & Bergman (2019) argue that the reporting of sexual harassment "often leads to worse outcomes for targets of harassment than their non-reporting peers" (p. 1), while House of Commons (2018) describes "a common thread in this apparent inability of the aid sector to deal well with allegations, complaints and cases involving sexual abuse" (p. 4). House of Commons also found that it seemingly is a convincing trend that victims or whistle-blowers are the ones ending up feeling penalised, rather than the actual perpetrators (ibid.). In similarity with my informant's perceptions, House of Commons (2018) report that humanitarian workers are lacking trust in their employers regarding managing accusations of sexual abuse and harassment, and that they see the negative consequence the reporter face as a big concern (p. 7). Despite the NORCAP deployees not lacking direct trust in NORCAP, they have doubts about the UN agencies and the sector more broadly. Because of this, my informants are not convinced NORCAP have the impact on UN agencies to hold anyone accountable. Like most humanitarian workers, NORCAP has adapted and responded to the #AidToo movement. However, I find a hampered correlation between their desired organisational culture and their daily organisational climate and practice. All in which deeply rooted in aspects of gender and power within NORCAP and the humanitarian sector more broadly.

6. Conclusion

The overarching goal of this thesis was to gain insight into how humanitarian organisations have adapted and responded in the aftermath of the #AidToo movement. More precisely, how humanitarian organisations have made changes in their organisational culture to prevent workplace sexual harassment, and how this is perceived by employees. To examine the given research phenomenon in the context of a humanitarian organisation, this study chose to examine NORCAP's organisational culture, climate and practice using in-depth qualitative interviews with NORCAP staff.

Overall, the findings show that there is a common perception among both male and female informants that the characteristics of the humanitarian sector make it particularly vulnerable to sexual harassment. Informants describe the sector as male-dominated, patriarchal, hierarchical, sexist, and racist. They also link the issue of sexual harassment with the sector's characteristics of having bad managements and leaderships – in that they are more worried about their organisations' reputation than addressing the persistent issue of sexual harassment. Another highlighted contributing factor is the (bad) example set by the UN – an actor with significant power within the humanitarian community. The sector is complex in that sense that it has organisations in several countries and context. Various forces therefore pull and push the actors in different courses, resulting in humanitarian organisations often having to regulate their structures, practices, procedures, and tools. This also applies for the #AidToo movement and its focus on sexual harassment.

Evidence was found of an organisational culture within NORCAP that had adapted and responded to the #AidToo movement. This includes organisational changes established to prevent sexual harassment, involving updates in their Code of Conduct, the establishment of PSEA and SH Reporting Guidelines, related online trainings, and new work positions to specifically work with PSEA and SH in both NRC and NORCAP. This, together with NORCAP's organisational support system, form an outwardly good basis for them to be able to prevent and adequately respond to such unwanted behaviours.

Generally, the deployees are proud to be a part of NORCAP. They would rather be on a contract with NORCAP than any other agency and see NORCAP as a tool. However, I found that HO staff misses sufficient and desirable investment from their management and leadership, and a deeper understanding into preventative efforts that will *actually* avoid sexual harassment. Based on both HO staff and deployees, I found a lack of satisfaction in terms of the level of

implementation of NORCAP's organisational changes. They all request more awareness-raising and training regarding the Reporting Guidelines, and capacity building of both HO staff and deployees on how to act and respond, as well as to make sure they are aware of their rights and what is required of their conduct. Informants also request a system that can respond quickly to complaints, so that action can be taken and perpetrators held accountable. My informants acknowledge that NRC and NORCAP have a system, but due to the workload of the PSEA and SH staff, they are not able to respond appropriately and quickly enough to such complaints. As a result, NORCAP deployees seem unaware of the system, the help they can receive, and results they might achieve if reporting. Thus, they tend to let things go or figure it out on their own, which could be reflected in their low reporting rates of sexual harassment within NORCAP.

Furthermore, I found aspects of gender and power influencing the pervasiveness and difficulty of preventing sexual harassment cases within the humanitarian sector, as well as within NORCAP. Some deployees blamed lack of sufficient involvement of males. This, together with the male-dominated culture striving in the sector, often involving powerful men in leader positions, results in sexual harassment being maintained and not properly addressed. However, my informants also highlighted women in leadership positions as part of the problem – in that they also have proven to be more concerned about the reputation of their organisation, rather than supporting the survivor and hold perpetrators accountable. Moreover, it seems that the issue is normalised. Also, because humanitarian organisations have reputations as actors only doing good, and they depend on other agencies and donors, leaders tend to cover up and deny cases of sexual harassment within their organisations. I was informed it was common that people – usually men in position of power – were allowed to quietly resign due to unappropriated behaviours. As a result, they can easily be hired in other organisations later like nothing happened, and without facing needed consequences to stop their inappropriate behaviour. Due to the lack of an overarching body to hold people accountable for their actions, and a shared system that will allow every humanitarian agency to adequately background check the people they are about to hire, these behaviours remain.

As a leading organisation in the field, I assumed that NORCAP also were leading in terms of education and protection of employees, involving how to handle and prevent sexual harassment. Nevertheless, I found evidence of lack of communication between levels within the organisation, also between NRC and NORCAP. I also found that what is desired based on their organisational culture does not match with how the NORCAP employees describe their organisational climate and practice. They have established necessary PSEA and SH Reporting

Guideline, but, as my informants state, by just condemning something will not work. NORCAP also seems to have too few employees to adequately cover the important and crucial tasks the PSEA and SH staff are intended to, and that the Deployment Advisers also tend to be responsible for far too many deployees.

6.1 Contributions & Further Research

This study, by analysing in-depth, qualitative data from both employers and deployees of NORCAP, offers new insight into how organisations have addressed sexual harassment. Also, despite the limitations presented earlier connected to the limited generalisability of an in-depth case study at a particular point in time, I consider this study of relevance for other humanitarian organisations, as the insight given is of value beyond this specific case. I believe it contributes to the study of sexual harassment in the humanitarian sector and development studies, as well as for the understanding of organisations' policies and practices.

Considering this, further research could benefit from looking at the given research phenomenon on a bigger scale by, for example, including data from more employees within the organisation in question. I also suggest gathering insight from managers, leaders, and employees within different types of humanitarian organisations to be able to explore these issues comparatively. Another interesting aspect would be to compare #MeToo research from other sectors and industries with the existing research on #AidToo to see if what is found within the humanitarian sector also applies for other contexts. By making such a comparison, one might accomplish a deeper understanding of what is needed to make changes in the organisational climate and practice within a broader set of organisations. One might also be able to map if solutions and changes made to prevent sexual harassment in other sectors also could be beneficial tools for humanitarian organisations and create change beyond the organisational culture. Lastly, it could be interesting to seek insight into whether age is a contributing factor for accomplishing such change, since leaders and their perception of sexual harassment is probably based on both age and experience within their field. One might assume, for example, that the younger generation, who have grown up with #MeToo and a different approach to gender, looks at things differently than their older peers.

Despite finding qualitative in-depth interviews and its contribution highly appreciated and valuable for this given research phenomenon, I suggest additional insight could be gained using a mix-method approach by combining both qualitative and quantitative data, where quantitative

surveys could add knowledge on the extent and trends of these phenomena across a broader scale. In the wake of the Covid-19 pandemic, when field studies could be possible, one could also include observations into the analysis and perhaps be able to create a broader understanding of the context of this issue. I would also suggest having a team of researchers when researching such sensitive topics, involving both insiders familiar with the humanitarian context and outsiders to try to avoid researcher bias.

6.2 Recommendations

The findings presented in this thesis have several implications for how humanitarian organisations might improve their work in handling and preventing sexual harassment. Some suggestions include:

- Establishing an overarching body which could be responsible to really hold people accountable for their behaviours.
- Establish greater trust between employers and employees through a strong leadership and management and robust PSEA and SH guidelines and policy.
- Improve transparency, communication, and more similarity between levels within an organisation and within the sector. Transparency and communication about SEA and SH, reported cases and results, again, to establish trust.
- Ensure support for the survivors is in focus, rather than organisations' reputation.
- More investment into training and awareness raising of both humanitarian field workers and Head Office staff. To make sure they are aware of their rights and what is required of their conduct.
- Employ more women and people of colour in leader positions. As well as be sure to engage and listen more to national staff, to meet the beneficiaries' needs more sufficiently.
- The possibility of more permanent contracts to make humanitarian workers more confident. Must consider that permanent positions are a challenge in such a complex sector where the need for humanitarian assistance often is short-term.

7. Reference List

Barker, R. A. (1994). Relative utility of culture and climate analysis to an organizational change agent: an analysis of general dynamics, electronics division. *The International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, *2*(1), 68–87.

Beaumont, P., & Ratcliffe, R. (2018, February 12th). #MeToo strikes aid sector as sexual exploitation allegations proliferate. *The Guardian*. Retrieved from https://www.theguardian.com/global-development/2018/feb/12/metoo-strikes-aid-sector-as-sexual-exploitation-allegations-proliferate

Berdahl, J. L. (2007). Harassment based on sex: Protecting social status in the context of gender hierarchy. *Academy of Management Review, 32*(2), 641–658.

Berg, B. L. & Lune, H. (2012). *Qualitative Research Methods for the Social Sciences*. (8th ed.). Boston: Pearson.

Bhattacherjee, A. (2012). *Social Science Research: Principles, Methods, and Practices*. (2nd ed.). USA: Global Text Project.

Bolle, T. A. (2018, May 8th). FN-register skal forhindre trakassering. *Bistandsaktuelt.* Retrieved from https://www.bistandsaktuelt.no/nyheter/2018/fn-register-skal-stanse-trakassering/

Bolle, T. A. (2019, January 16th). Sjokktall fra FN: En av tre ansatte utsatt for seksuell trakassering. *Bistandsaktuelt.* Retrieved from https://www.bistandsaktuelt.no/nyheter/2019/en-av-tre-fn-ansatte-utsatt-for-seksuell-trakassering/

Bourke, B. (2014). Positionality: Reflecting on the Research Process. *The Qualitative Report*, *19*(33), 1–9.

Bryman, A. (2016). *Social Research Methods* (5th ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Chavez, C. (2008). Conceptualizing from the inside: Advantages, complications, and demands on insider positionality. *The Qualitative Report*, *13*(3), 474-494.

Clair, R. P., Brown, N. E., Dougherty, D. S., Delemeester, H. K., Geist-Martin, P., Gorden, W. I., Sorg, T., & Turner, P. K. (2019). #MeToo, sexual harassment: An article, a forum, and a dream for the future. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, *47*(2), 111–129. https://doi.org/10.1080/00909882.2019.1567142

Clarke, P. & Ramalingam, B. (2008). Organisational change in the humanitarian sector. *ALNAP/Overseas Development Institute*, 21-82.

Cohn, C. (2013). *Women and Wars: Contested Histories, Uncertain Futures.* UK, Cambridge: Polity Press.

Cornaz, N. (2019). *An analysis of the #AidToo movement on Twitter: What impacts can a hashtag achieve on sexual exploitation and abuse in the aid sector?* (Master thesis, Malmö University). Retrieved from https://muep.mau.se/bitstream/handle/2043/27749/Cornaz-N-DP18.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y

Cypress, B. (2018). Qualitative Research Methods: A Phenomenological Focus. *Dimensions of Critical Care Nursing, 37*(6), 302–309. https://doi.org/10.1097/DCC.0000000000000322

Daniels, J. P. (2018, March 23rd). 'In Haiti, no one is surprised by the Oxfam scandal'. *Devex.* Retreived from https://www.devex.com/news/in-haiti-no-one-is-surprised-by-the-oxfam-scandal-92342

Deloitte. (2019, January). *Safe Space Survey Report January 2019*. Retrieved from https://viraltopiczone.files.wordpress.com/2019/01/d3bcc-un_safe_space_survey_report_15_january_2019_final.pdf

Dey, T. (2019). Sexual harassment in organizations: An investigation of the #Me Too movement in India. *International Journal for Advance Research and Development*, *4*(5), 61-73.

Edwards, R. & Holland, J. (2013). *What is Qualitative Interviewing?*. London: Bloomsbury Academic. https://doi.org/10.1108/eb028802

Ehrhart, M. G., Schneider, B., & Macey, W. H. (2014). *Organizational climate and culture: An introduction to theory, research, and practice*. New York: Routledge.

Einbinder, N. (2018). Amid allegations of abuse, aid workers describe culture of sexual misconduct. *Frontline.* Retrieved from https://www.pbs.org/wgbh/frontline/article/amid-allegations-of-abuse-aid-workers-describe-culture-of-sexual-misconduct/

Fileborn, B., & Loney-Howes, R. (2019). *#MeToo and the Politics of Social Change* (1st ed. 2019). Springer International Publishing: Imprint: Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-15213-0

Fitzgerald, L. F. & Cortina, L. M. (2017). Sexual harassment in work organizations: A view from the twenty-first century. In J. W. White & C. Travis (Ed.), *Handbook on the psychology of women.* Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Fossvik, I. (2016, December). Support in stressful times. Retrieved from https://www.nrc.no/expert-deployment/2016/2016/caring-for-norcap-deployees/

Fredriksson, M., & Alvinius, A. (2019). Organisationskultur och ledarstrategier i ljuset av #metoo. *Arbetsmarknad & Arbetsliv*, *25*(2), 28–45.

Freyd, J. J. (2018, January 11th). When sexual assault victims speak out, their institutions often betray them. *The Conversation.* Retrieved from http://theconversation.com/when-sexual-assault-victims-speak-out-their-institutions-often-betray-them-87050

Geertz, C. (1973). *The interpretation of Cultures.* London: Hutchinson.

Gillespie, E. M., Mirabella, R. M., & Eikenberry, A. M. (2019). #Metoo/#Aidtoo and Creating an Intersectional Feminist NPO/NGO Sector. *Nonprofit Policy Forum, 10*(4), 1-9. https://doi.org/10.1515/npf-2019-0019

Guba, E. G. & Lincoln, Y.S. (1994). Competing Paradigms in Qualitative Research. In N.K. Denzin and Y.S. Lincoln (Ed.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Hall, S. (1990). Cultural identity and diaspora. In J. Rutherford (Ed.), *Identity: community, culture, difference* (p. 2-27). London, England: Lawrence & Wishart.

Handy, C. (1988). *Understanding Voluntary Organizations: How to Make Them Function Effectively.* Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Hansson, K., Sveningsson, M., Ganetz, H., & Sandgren, M. (2020). Legitimising a Feminist Agenda: The #metoo petitions in Sweden 2017–2018. *Nordic Journal of Media Studies*, *2*(1), 121-132.

Harrell, M. C., & Bradley, M. A. (2009). *Data Collection Methods: Semi-Structured Interviews and Focus Groups*. RAND Corporation. https://www.rand.org/pubs/technical_reports/TR718.html

Harris Insights & Analytics. (2018). *Professional Harassment Survey, Prepared for The Chronicle of Philanthropy and The Association of Fundraising Professionals*. The Harris Poll. Retrieved from https://chronicle-assets.s3.amazonaws.com/7/items/biz/pdf/ProfessionalHarassmentSurveyResultsPDF.pdf

Hilhorst, D. (2003). *The Real World of NGOs, Discourses, Diversity and Development.* London: Zed Books.

Hilhorst, D., Porter, H., & Gordon, R. (2018). Gender, sexuality, and violence in humanitarian crises. *Disasters*, *42*(S1), S3–S16. https://doi.org/10.1111/disa.12276

House of Commons International Development Committee. (2018). *Sexual Exploitation and Abuse in the Aid Sector – Eighth Report of Session 2017–19.* Retrieved from https://publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm201719/cmselect/cmintdev/840/840.pdf

Humanitarian Women's Network. (2016). Humanitarian Women's Network Full Survey Results. Retrieved from https://docs.wixstatic.com/ugd/26ce7a_2d83a5dafb904c59b441fe0132f0169d.pdf

Humanitarian Women's Network. (n.d.). Survey Data. Retrieved from https://www.humanitarianwomensnetwork.org/about

Hurley, R. F., & Hult, G. T. M. (1998). Innovation, market orientation, and organizational learning: an integration and empirical examination. *Journal of marketing*, *62*(3), 42-54.

IASC. (2019, September 12th). IASC Six Core Principles Relating to Sexual Exploitation and Abuse. Retrieved from https://interagencystandingcommittee.org/system/files/iasc_six_core_principles_relating_to_sexual_exploitation_and_abuse_sept_2019.pdf

IASC. (n.d.). IASC Champion on Protection from Sexual Exploitation and Abuse and Sexual Harassment. Last retrieved March 8th 2021 from https://interagencystandingcommittee.org/iasc-champion-on-protection-from-sexual-exploitation-and-abuse-and-sexual-harassment

Johannessen, L. E. F., Råfoss, T. W. & Rasmussen, E. B. (2018). *Hvordan bruke teori? Nyttige verktøy i kvalitativ analyse.* Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.

Jørgensen, N. B. (2018, March 27th). Skjerper rutiner mot sex-trakassering. *Bistandsaktuelt.* Retrieved from https://www.bistandsaktuelt.no/nyheter/2018/bistandsbransjen-skjerper-rutiner-mot-sex-trakassering/

Kaya. (n.d.a). Prevention of Sexual Exploitation and Abuse. Retrieved from https://kayaconnect.org/course/info.php?id=1212

Kaya. (n.d.b). What you need to know – Reporting sexual harassment, exploitation and abuse. Retrieved from https://kayaconnect.org/course/info.php?id=1358

Ke, W. & Wei, K. K. (2008). Organizational culture and leadership in ERP implementation. *Decision Support Systems*, *45*(2), 208–218. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dss.2007.02.002

Kovach, M. (2020). The Impact of #MeToo: A Review of Leaders with Supervisor Power on Employee Motivation. *The Journal of Values-Based Leadership, 13*(1), 1-7. https://doi.org/10.22543/0733.131.1295

Leigh, L., Reid, R., Geldenhuys, M. & Gobind, J. (2014). The Inferences of Gender in Workplace Bullying: A Conceptual Analysis. *Gender and Behaviour*, *12*(1), 6059–6069. Retrieved from https://journals.co.za/doi/pdf/10.10520/EJC154673

Leimbach, D. (2015, March 16th). An independent report on sexual abuse cases by UN peacekeepers surfaces. *PassBlue*. Retrieved from https://www.passblue.com/2015/03/16/an-independent-report-on-sexual-abuse-cases-by-un-peacekeepers-surfaces/

Lincoln, Y.S. & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic Inquiry.* Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Maass, A., Cadinu, M., Guarnieri, G., & Grasselli, A. (2003). Sexual harassment under social identity threat: The computer harassment paradigm. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 85*(5), 853–870.

MacKinnon, C. (1979). *The Sexual Harassment of Working Women.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Mazurana, D. & Donnelly, P. (2017). *STOP the Sexual Assault against Humanitarian and Development Aid Workers a report*. Retrieved from https://fic.tufts.edu/publication-item/stop-sexual-assault-against-aid-workers/

McDonald, P. (2011). Workplace Sexual Harassment 30 Years on: A Review of the Literature. *International Journal of Management Reviews, 14*(1), 1-17. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2370.2011.00300.x

McDonald, P., & Charlesworth, S. (2016). Workplace sexual harassment at the margins. *Work, Employment and Society*, *30*(1), 118–134. https://doi.org/10.1177/0950017014564615

Morrow, S. (2016, October). What Kind of Power Does The UN Wield Internationally?. Last retrieved August 13th 2021 from https://www.legalzoom.com/articles/what-kind-of-power-does-the-un-wield-internationally

Nobert, M. (2016). *Prevention, Policy and Procedure Checklist Responding to Sexual Violence in in Humanitarian and Development Settings.* Retrieved from https://gisf.ngo/wp-content/uploads/2020/02/2097-Report-the-Abuse-2016-Prevention-Policy-and-Procedure-Checklist-Responding-to-Sexual-Violence-in-Humanitarian-and-Development-Settings.pdf

Nobert, M. (2017). *Addressing Sexual Violence in Humanitarian Organisations: Good Practices for Improved Prevention Measures, Policies, and Procedures.* Retrieved from https://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/RTA%20Addressing%20Sexual%20Violence%20in%20Humanitarian%20Organisations%20-%20Good%20Practices%20for%20Improved%20Prevention%20Measures%2C%20Policies%2C%20and%20Procedures.pdf

Norwegian Refugee Council & NORCAP. (2018, November). *Reporting Guidelines for NORCAP, Preventing Sexual Exploitation and Abuse and Sexual Harassment*. Unpublished internal company document.

Norwegian Refugee Council & NORCAP. (2019, March). *NRC Code of Conduct for NORCAP Deployees*. Unpublished internal company document.

Norwegian Refugee Council. (2016, February). *Explanatory Notes to the Code of Conduct.* Unpublished internal company document.

Norwegian Refugee Council. (2018). Our story. Last retrieved June 2nd 2021 from https://www.nrc.no/expert-deployment/our-story/

Norwegian Refugee Council. (2020, January). *NRC Protection from Sexual Exploitation, Sexual Abuse (PSEA) & Sexual Harassment Policy*. Unpublished internal company document.

Norwegian Refugee Council. (2021, January). *PSEA & Safeguarding Glossary.* Unpublished internal company document.

Norwegian Refugee Council. (n.d.a). About NORCAP. Last retrieved June 2nd 2021 from https://www.nrc.no/expert-deployment/aboutnorcap/

Norwegian Refugee Council. (n.d.b). About us. Last retrieved June 2nd 2021 from https://www.nrc.no/who-we-are/about-us/

Norwegian Refugee Council. (n.d.c). Frequently asked questions. Last retrieved June 2nd 2021 from https://www.nrc.no/career/frequently-asked-questions/

Norwegian Refugee Council. (n.d.d). Our expertise. Last retrieved June 2nd 2021 from https://www.nrc.no/expert-deployment/our-rosters/

Norwegian Refugee Council. (n.d.e). Partners and donors. Last retrieved June 2nd 2021 from https://www.nrc.no/expert-deployment/norcap-donors/

Ozkazanc-Pan, B. (2019). On agency and empowerment in a #MeToo world. *Gender, Work & Organization*, *26*(8), 1212–1220. https://doi.org/10.1111/gwao.12311

Pina, A., Gannon, T. A., & Saunders, B. (2009). An overview of the literature on sexual harassment: Perpetrator, theory, and treatment issues. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, *14*(2), 126–138. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2009.01.002

Queirós, A., Faria, D., & Almeida, F. (2017). Strengths and limitations of qualitative and quantitative research methods. *European Journal of Education Studies*, *3*(9), 369–387. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.887089

Riley, C. L. (2020). Powerful Men, Failing Upwards: The Aid Industry and the 'Me Too' Movement. *Journal of Humanitarian Affairs*, *2*(3), 49–55. https://doi.org/10.7227/JHA.052

Ross, J. (2018). What the #MeToo Campaign Teaches About Stop and Frisk. *Idaho Law Review*, *54*(2), 543-547. Retrieved from https://digitalcommons.law.uidaho.edu/idaho-law-review/vol54/iss2/9

Sandvik, K. B. (2019). 'Safeguarding' as humanitarian buzzword: An initial scoping. *Journal of International Humanitarian Action*, *4*(1), 1-6. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41018-019-0051-1

Schau, H. J., Muñiz, A. M., & Arnould, E. J. (2009). How Brand Community Practices Create Value. *Journal of Marketing*, *73*(5), 30–51. https://doi.org/10.1509/jmkg.73.5.30

Scurlock, R., Dolsak, N., & Prakash, A. (2020). Recovering from Scandals: Twitter Coverage of Oxfam and Save the Children Scandals. *VOLUNTAS: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, *31*(1), 94–110. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11266-019-00148-x

Sengupta, S. (2016, September). The United Nations Explained: Its Purpose, Power and Problems. *The Times.* Retrieved from https://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/19/world/what-is-united-nations-un-explained.html

Silverman, D. (2014). *Interpreting qualitative data* (5th ed.). Los Angeles, California: SAGE.

Siuta, R. L., & Bergman, M. E. (2019, June 25th). *Sexual Harassment in the Workplace*. Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Business and Management. https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780190224851.013.191

Standby Partnership. (n.d.a). About Our Organization. Last retrieved June 2nd 2021 from https://www.standbypartnership.org/

Standby Partnership. (n.d.b). About the Standby Partnership Network. Last retrieved June 2nd 2021 from https://www.standbypartnership.org/about

Strohmeier, H. (2019). *Humanitarian workers in South Sudan: Mental health, gender, and organizational staff support* (Doctoral dissertation, Queen Margaret University). Retrieved from https://eresearch.qmu.ac.uk/handle/20.500.12289/10582

The Times. (2018, February 9th). Oxfam's Shame. *The Times.* Retrieved from https://www.thetimes.co.uk/article/oxfam-s-shame-tdjbzxgmq

UN Women. (2018). *Towards an end to sexual harassment: The urgency and nature of change in the era of #MeToo.* Retrieved 25th of March 2021 from https://www.unwomen.org/en/digital-library/publications/2018/11/towards-an-end-to-sexual-harassment

UNAIDS. (2018). *Report on the work of the Independent Expert Panel on Prevention of and response to harassment, including sexual harassment; bullying and abuse of power at UNAIDS Secretariat.* Retrieved from https://www.unaids.org/sites/default/files/media_asset/report-iep_en.pdf

United Nations General Assembly. (2017). *Special measures for protection from sexual exploitation and abuse: a new approach.* Retrieved from https://undocs.org/A/71/818

United Nations General Assembly. (2018). *Special measures for protection from sexual exploitation and abuse, Report of the Secretary-General.* Retrieved from https://undocs.org/A/72/751

United Nations General Assembly. (2019). *Special measures for protection from sexual exploitation and abuse, Report of the Secretary-General.* Retrieved from https://undocs.org/en/A/73/744

United Nations General Assembly. (2020). *Special measures for protection from sexual exploitation and abuse, Report of the Secretary-General.* Retrieved from https://undocs.org/A/74/705

United Nations General Assembly. (2021). *Special measures for protection from sexual exploitation and abuse, Report of the Secretary-General.* Retrieved from https://undocs.org/A/75/754

United Nations Peacekeeping. (n.d.). Standards of Conduct. Retrieved 13th of June from https://peacekeeping.un.org/en/standards-of-conduct

United Nations Secretariat. (2003). Secretary-General's Bulletin – Special measures for protection from sexual exploitation and sexual abuse. Retrieved from https://undocs.org/ST/SGB/2003/13

United Nations. (2021, March 19th). *Zero Tolerance for Sexual Exploitation and Abuse – Fact sheet on the Secretary-General's initiatives to prevent and respond to sexual exploitation and abuse.* Retrieved from https://www.un.org/preventing-sexual-exploitation-and-abuse/sites/www.un.org.preventing-sexual-exploitation-and-abuse/files/fact_sheet_un_system-wide_sea_initiatives.pdf

Wallace, J., Hunt, J., & Richards, C. (1999). The relationship between organisational culture, organisational climate and managerial values. *International Journal of Public Sector Management*. Retrieved from http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.476.7754&rep=rep1&type=pdf

8. Appendix

8.1 Appendix 1 – Interview Guide for NORCAP HO Staff

Introductory Questions – Working at NORCAP

1. What is your position at NORCAP?
2. How long have you been a part of NORCAP and what kind of positions have you had?
3. Have you ever been deployed yourself? When, where, to which host organisation?

Theme 1 – Workplace Sexual Harassment

1.1. I would like to know how the existing literature on this issue correspond with your own experience and observations from working in the humanitarian sector? Do you see sexual harassment as a problem in the sector?

1.2. Would you say sexual harassment is a problem in NORCAP? Or in the host organisations where NORCAP staff are deployed to?

1.3. In your opinion, why do you think sexual harassment is so pervasive in the sector?

1.4. Do you think humanitarian aid organisations face different challenges than other organisations or sectors?

Theme 2 – NORCAP's Response to Sexual Harassment

2.1. What is NORCAP doing to deal with bullying and harassment, and specifically to deal with and prevent workplace sexual harassment?

2.2. Do you think these measures taken by NORCAP are appropriate, effective, and efficient?

2.3. What do you see as the greatest challenges to address sexual harassment in NORCAP, and in the humanitarian sector more broadly?

2.4. What could be done better, and how?

2.5. Humanitarian aid organisations are expected to protect vulnerable people. Do you think humanitarian organisations like NORCAP have a special responsibility to deal with sexual harassment?

2.6. As a leading actor in its field, do you think NORCAP/NRC has a particular responsibility to address the issue?

2.7. In your experience, how is sexual harassment dealt with within the UN organisations in which NORCAP deploys staff to?

2.8. Do you have the impression that deployees and staff feel that there is safe to report incidents of sexual harassment to NORCAP?

- Do you believe staff/deployees may perceive barriers to report such incidents to NORCAP? What might such barriers be?
- Have NORCAP implemented any anti-sexual harassment policies? Have you experienced any challenges when it comes to implementing these policies in different cultural and organizational contexts? In relation to NORCAP and the host organisations.

2.9. There is a frequent critique in the literature on #AidToo that there exists a "culture of impunity" in the aid sector. Do you agree with this statement?

- What is NORCAP doing to change this? What can potentially be done?

2.10. Do you know if NORCAP is working to change its organisational culture? In what ways?

2.11. Do you see the humanitarian aid sector as "macho"? If so, in what ways?

- Do you see this as problematic?

2.12. Are NORCAP's policies designed to address the inbuilt inequalities in sexual harassment, exploitation, and abuse? If you think of this related to gender, racial, age, social, economic, geographical (north/south) hierarchies and power inequalities?

- In what ways?
- Which policies do you know of, addressing this issue?

Theme 3 – Thoughts About & Reactions to #AidToo

3.1. How and when did you first learn about #AidToo?

3.2. What did you think about #AidToo when you first heard of it?

- Do you support the cause? Agree with it?
  - Do you see where this movement came from, or was this shocking for you to learn about?
- Have you contributed to sharing knowledge around this topic? For example, by bringing up discissions at work, using the # or by liking and sharing your own experiences?

3.3. Do you believe #AidToo has been effective in reaching its objectives? Hereby I mean spreading awareness and knowledge on the issue, as well as making changes in the sector and within humanitarian organisations.

- In what ways do you believe #AidToo has been effective? Can you give some concrete examples?
- In what ways do you believe it has been ineffective, and why?

3.4. What do you think of the movement now?

3.5. Have you ever discussed the movement at work? At meetings or during lunch breaks etc?

Theme 4 – Changes in NORCAP post #AidToo

4.1. Have you seen any changes in your sector or at NORCAP since the spread of these movements?

4.2. In your view, has #AidToo (and the attention on sexual harassment brought up by the Oxfam and Save the children cases) effected:

- The ways NORCAP deal with sexual harassment, involving how they organise meetings, provide information, educate and train their staff, or handle reports of bullying and harassment?
- The number of reported cases? The types of incidents reported?
- The way sexual harassment is talked about among staff?

4.3. Do you feel there have been changes in the way sexual harassment is talked about at work, if you compare pre- and post- #AidToo?

4.4. Do you know if NORCAP is collaborating with other organisations to educate themselves on how to prevent workplace sexual harassment? And how to respond?

Theme 5 – Staff Care Seminars

If interviewee is a Staff Care Advisor or have been a part of the Staff Care Seminars.

5.1. As you are a part of the Staff Care Seminars, could you describe how these seminars work and who are invited?

5.2. What are NORCAP's main goals with these seminars?

5.3. When was the ever first Staff Care Seminar, and why did NORCAP start with them?

5.4. Do you ever discuss #Aidtoo and/or workplace sexual harassment in these seminars?

- Have you noticed any changes in the way the participants talk about sexual harassment etc, after #Metoo or #Aidtoo?

5.5. Is NORCAP giving information and knowledge regarding workplace sexual harassment to deployees and staff?

- What kind of information is given? How and how often?

Theme 6 – Characteristics and Background

6.1. Could you tell me a little bit about yourself? Including where you are from, your age and gender and your educational level, please.

6.2. Is there something you would like to add? Do you have any questions?

8.2 Appendix 2 – Interview Guide for NORCAP Deployees

Introductory Questions – Working at NORCAP

1. How long have you been a part of the NORCAP team? When was your first deployment?
2. How many deployments have you had, through NORCAP? For how long have you been deployed, in total?
3. When was your last deployment? To which organisations and countries have you been deployed to?

Theme 1 – Workplace Sexual Harassment

1.1. I would like to know how the existing literature on this issue correspond with your own experience and observations from working in the humanitarian sector? Do you see sexual harassment as a problem in the sector?

1.2. Would you say sexual harassment is a problem in NORCAP? Or in the host organisations you have been deployed to?

1.3. In your opinion, why do you think sexual harassment is so pervasive in the sector? Is this something you have experienced or observed yourself?

1.4. Do you think humanitarian aid organisations face different challenges than other organisations or sectors?

Theme 2 – NORCAP's Response to Sexual Harassment

2.1. Do you know if NORCAP is doing something to deal with bullying and harassment, and specifically to deal with and prevent workplace sexual harassment?

2.2. Do you think these measures taken by NORCAP are appropriate, effective and efficient?

2.3. What do you see as the greatest challenges to address sexual harassment in NORCAP, and in the humanitarian sector more broadly?

2.4. What could be done better, and how?

2.5. Humanitarian aid organisations are expected to protect vulnerable people. Do you think humanitarian organisations like NORCAP have a special responsibility to deal with sexual harassment?

2.6. As a leading actor in its field, do you think NORCAP/NRC has a particular responsibility to address the issue?

2.7. In your experience, how is sexual harassment dealt with within the UN organisations in which NORCAP deploys staff to? In the organisations you have been deployed to?

2.8. As a deployee, do you feel that it is safe to report incidents of sexual harassment to NORCAP?

- Do you feel that there are any barriers to report such incidents to NORCAP? What might such barriers be?

2.9. Do you know if NORCAP have implemented anti-sexual harassment policies? Do you see any challenges with these implementations? Example: in different cultural and organizational contexts.

2.10. There is a frequent critique in the literature on #AidToo that there exists a "culture of impunity" in the aid sector. Do you agree with this statement?

- Do you know or have the impression that NORCAP is doing something to change this? In your opinion, what can potentially be done?

2.11. Do you know if NORCAP is working to change its organisational culture? In what ways?

2.12. Do you see the humanitarian aid sector as "macho"? If so, in what ways?

- Do you see this as problematic?

2.13. Are NORCAP's policies designed to address the inbuilt inequalities in sexual harassment, exploitation, and abuse? If you think of this related to gender, racial, age, social, economic, geographical (north/south) hierarchies and power inequalities?

- In what ways?
- Which policies do you know of, addressing this issue?

Theme 3 – Thoughts About & Reactions to #AidToo

3.1. How and when did you first learn about #AidToo?

3.2. What did you think about #AidToo when you first heard of it?

- Do you support the cause? Agree with it?
    - Do you see where this movement came from, or was this shocking for you to learn about?
- Have you contributed to sharing knowledge around this topic? For example, by bringing up discissions at work, using the # or by liking and sharing your own experiences?

3.3. Do you believe #AidToo has been effective in reaching its objectives? Hereby I mean spreading awareness and knowledge on the issue, as well as making changes in the sector and within humanitarian organisations.
    - In what ways do you believe #AidToo has been effective? Can you give some concrete examples?
    - In what ways do you believe it has been ineffective, and why?

3.4. What do you think of the movement now?

3.5. Have you ever discussed the movement at work? At meetings or during lunch breaks etc?

Theme 4 - Changes in NORCAP post #AidToo

4.1. Have you seen any changes in your sector or at NORCAP since the spread of these movements?

4.2. In your view, has #AidToo (and the attention on sexual harassment brought up by the Oxfam and Save the children cases) effected:
    - The ways NORCAP deal with sexual harassment, involving how they organise meetings, provide information, educate and train their staff, or handle reports of bullying and harassment?
    - The number of reported cases? The types of incidents reported?
    - The way sexual harassment is talked about among your colleagues at NORCAP?

4.3. Do you feel there have been changes in the way sexual harassment is talked about at work, if you compare pre- and post- #AidToo?

4.4. Do you know if NORCAP is collaborating with other organisations to educate themselves on how to prevent workplace sexual harassment? And how to respond?

Theme 5 – Staff Care Seminars

If interviewee has attended Staff Care Seminars

5.1. As you have attended one or more Staff Care Seminars, could you describe how these seminars work and who are invited?

5.2. Do you know what the main goal with these seminars are?

5.3. Do you ever discuss #AidToo and/or workplace sexual harassment in these seminars?

- Have you noticed any changes in the way sexual harassment is talked about, after #Metoo or #AidToo?

5.4. Is NORCAP giving information and knowledge regarding workplace sexual harassment to deployees and staff?

- What kind of information is given? How and how often?

Theme 6 – Characteristics and Background

6.1. Could you tell me a little bit about yourself? Including where you are from, your age and gender and your educational level, please.

6.2. Is there something you would like to add? Do you have any questions?

8.3 Appendix 3 – Information Letter

Are you interested in taking part in the research project *"NGOs in the Humanitarian Aid Sector and Their Experience with and Responses to Sexual Harassment in the Aftermath of #AidToo"*?

This is an inquiry about participation in a research project where the main purpose is to see how #MeToo and #AidToo have affected NORCAP as an organisation. In this letter we will give you information about the purpose of the project and what your participation will involve.

Purpose of the project

The aim of this study will be to examine how #MeToo and #AidToo have affected NORCAP as an organisation. Mostly looking at their organisational culture, working environment and employers' health and safety, as well as how these factors are understood by the employers and employees. This is a master thesis, where the research questions stated below will be examined.

Research Questions (RQs)

1. How is NORCAP's policy regarding sexual harassment, and how has the #MeToo and #AidToo movements changed NORCAP's organisational culture and ways of working?
2. To what extent are changes in the way NORCAP conceptualises and practices the safety of its employees' working environment after the movements visible? How is this viewed by their employees?
3. Are there any differences, or potential discrepancies, between the organisational and the employees' perspectives, and can this reflect roader questions relating power, organisational values and culture?

Who is responsible for the research project?

The Norwegian University of Life Sciences, NMBU, is the institution responsible for the project.

Why are you being asked to participate?

The population for this study, from which the sample is to be selected, is the staff at NORCAP. As a NORCAP staff, who has been working there for quite some time – enough to be able to see potential changes before and after the #MeToo and #AidToo campaigns – you have been chosen to participate in this project.

What does participation involve for you?

A qualitative research design will be adopted, using qualitative document analysis and interviews. The research will then draw on both primary and secondary data, including already existing data and strategies documents from both the organisation of interest and other humanitarian aid organisations, as well as thoughts and experiences from employers and employees at NORCAP.

The primary data will be collected through semi-structured interviews. If you chose to take part in the project, this will involve a semi-structured interview where you will be asked questions related to the RQs. If it is okay for you, your answers will be recorded digitally.

Participation is voluntary

Participation in the project is voluntary. If you chose to participate, you can withdraw your consent at any time without giving a reason. All information about you will then be deleted. There will be no negative consequences for you if you chose not to participate or later decide to withdraw.

Your personal privacy – how we will store and use your personal data

We will only use your personal data for the purpose(s) specified in this information letter. We will process your personal data confidentially and in accordance with data protection legislation (the General Data Protection Regulation and Personal Data Act). The people who will have access to the data provided by you to this project will be me, Vilde Rolstad, and my s and my supervisors, Kaja Borchgrevink and Ingrid Nyborg.

I will replace your name and contact details with a code, to make you anonymous. The list of names and contact details will also be made anonymous, and respective codes will be stored separately from the rest of the collected data. The data collected will be stored on a serve, locked away from other people to reach. As a participant, you will not be recognisable in publications. Your personal information (e.g. name, age, sex etc) will not be published. The only thing that will be published is the fact that you work at NORCAP, as this is what my research topic is based upon, and – if relevant for the study – whether you work in a senior or junior position.

What will happen to your personal data at the end of the research project?

The project is scheduled to end 1st of June 2021. At the end of the project, all the personal data, including the digital recordings, will be deleted.

Your rights

So long as you can be identified in the collected data, you have the right to:

- access the personal data that is being processed about you
- request that your personal data is deleted
- request that incorrect personal data about you is corrected/rectified
- receive a copy of your personal data (data portability), and
- send a complaint to the Data Protection Officer or The Norwegian Data Protection Authority regarding the processing of your personal data

What gives us the right to process your personal data?

We will process your personal data based on your consent. Based on an agreement with The Norwegian University of Life Sciences, NMBU, NSD – The Norwegian Centre for Research Data AS has assessed that the processing of personal data in this project is in accordance with data protection legislation.

Where can I find out more?

If you have questions about the project, or want to exercise your rights, contact:

- The Norwegian University of Life Sciences, NMBU, via Vilde Rolstad (master student) and/or the supervisor for this project Ingrid Nyborg.

  Vilde Rolstad

  - Mail: vilde.rolstad@nmbu.no. Phone: +47 90541020.

  Ingrid L. P. Nyborg

  - Mail: ingrid.nyborg@nmbu.no. Phone: +47 95904751

- NSD – The Norwegian Centre for Research Data AS, by email: (personverntjenester@nsd.no) or by telephone: +47 55 58 21 17

Yours sincerely,

Vilde Rolstad

(Researcher/Student)

Consent form

I have received and understood information about the project *"NGOs in the Humanitarian Aid Sector and Their Experience with and Responses to Sexual Harassment in the Aftermath of #Aidtoo"* and have been given the opportunity to ask questions. I give consent:

☐ to participate in an interview

☐ to participate in a group discussion, if applicable

I give consent for my personal data to be processed until the end date of the project, approx. 1st of June 2021.

(Signed by participant, date)

Norges miljø- og biovitenskapelige universitet
Noregs miljø- og biovitskapelege universitet
Norwegian University of Life Sciences

Postboks 5003
NO-1432 Ås
Norway