Do International Non Governmental Organizations have a Corporate Social Responsibility?

Master thesis in Societal Safety
by Tina Nyhuus

University of Stavanger

Spring 2011

UNIVERSITETET I STAVANGER

MASTERGRADSSTUDIUM I
SAMFUNNSSIKKERHET

MASTEROPPGAVE

SEMESTER: Vår 2011

FORFATTER: Tina Nyhuus

VEILEDER: Bjørn-Tore Blindheim

TITTEL PÅ MASTEROPPGAVE:

Do International Non Governmental Organizations have a Corporate Social Responsibility?

EMNEORD/STIKKORD:

Corporate Social Responsibility, Corporate Citizenship, International Non Governmental Organization, ISO 26000, Humanitarian Assistance, Citizen Rights

SIDETALL: 74

STAVANGER …………………………………………….
                    DATO/ÅR

Abstract

The assumption that International Non Governmental Organizations (INGOs) are actors without social, economic, or political impact is becoming increasingly untenable. With an average of 270 million people affected by natural disasters every year and millions affected by war- or conflict, and with INGOs fulfilling the rights of citizens in the absence of a functioning state, the INGOs activities are affecting millions of people every year. In this thesis I explore the role and responsibility of INGOs by using existing concepts of Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) and applying them to a new context; the context of INGOs operating in humanitarian crises'. In doing this, I hope to contribute to a rethinking of the INGOs role and responsibility and inspire to further research. By using the concept of Corporate Citizenship in regards to INGOs, I have found that INGOs are administrating citizenship in crises-situations. They are *providing* for social rights, *enabling* for civil rights and being a *channel* for political rights and they are, in certain aspects, becoming an alternative to a non-functioning state. I also explore the social responsibility of INGOs by looking at four different perspectives of CSR. I argue that even though INGOs do not have a classic- or stakeholder responsibility, they do in fact have a responsibility in the social demandingness and social activist perspective. I conclude that the concept of CSR is in fact a fruitful concept to view the role and responsibility of INGOs in a new way.

Foreword

This thesis is the final paper to finish my Masters degree in Societal Safety at the University of Stavanger. The modules at the University have been incredibly educational and have given me a solid knowledge base which I hope to use in real life and utilized in the field. Writing this thesis has been a challenging and exciting journey where I have learned much about the two major fields of CSR and INGOs – and myself.

Firstly and foremost, I would like to thank my informants for making time from their busy schedules to answer all my questions. Thank you Erling Kvernevik, Oddhild Günther, Svein Beksrud, Beate Thoresen, Jan Egeland and Gunhild Ørstavik.

I also want thank the employees at the library of the University of Stavanger for helping me with academic, as well as non-academic questions. To Bjørn Ivar Kruke and Odd Einar Olsen – thank you for implementing - and letting me benefit from - your open door policy.

Thank you Jeanneth my dear friend, for always being there when I need you. And Marie, my beautiful big sister, thank you for bearing with me when the thesis was governing my life.

Last, but definitively not least, an immensely thank goes to my supervisor Bjørn Tore Blindheim. Thank you for always being positive and keeping the finish-line within reach. Without your valuable advice and our discussions along the way, the thesis would not have been the same.

Acronyms and Abbreviations

CSR	Corporate social responsibility
CC	Corporate Citizenship
INGO	International Non Governmental Organization
NGO	National Non Governmental Organization
NRC	Norwegian Refugee Council
NPA	Norwegian People's Aid
NRK	Norwegian Red Cross
MNC	Multinational corporations
StC	Save the Children Norway
ICRC	The International Committee of Red Cross and Red Crescent
UNGC	United Nations Global Compact
OECD	Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (aka Office of Economic Cooperation and Development
GRI	Global reporting initiative
ISO 26000	International Organization for Standardization; Standard of Social Responsibility
CoC	The Red Cross and Red Crescent Code of Conduct
NUPI	Norwegian Institute for International Affairs

Table of Contents

1. Introduction

"As we move from emergency aid to long-term reconstruction, let us recognize that we cannot accept business as usual. What we envision, today, is wholesale national renewal [...] a sweeping exercise in nation-building on a scale and scope not seen in generations"

Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon's opening remarks to

Haiti donors' conference, New York, 31 Mar. '10

International Non Governmental Organizations[1] (hereafter referred to as INGOs) are facing a world where there is an increasingly need for humanitarian relief. In the last decade an average of 270 million people have been affected by natural disasters every year[2], and millions affected by war- or conflict related crises'[3], humanitarian assistance has become an essential part of international crises management. Within areas such as food-distribution, shelter, water and health**,** INGOs have become an essential actor in regards to helping vulnerable people all over the world. So what sort of role do INGOs have when they operate in foreign countries? What responsibility does this role entail?

The rapid pace of globalization and news being broadcasted all over the world has increased the focus on INGOs activities and role. Up until the end of the 1990's, INGOs were seen as apolitical and neutral organizations, where the responsibility to save lives came before everything else, including political assessments and bureaucratic restrictions, and providing aid was assumed to have no negative consequences (Duffield, 2001). However, by the end of the 1990's, one saw what Duffield (2001) refers to as the new humanitarianism, where INGOs saw that their relief could have consequences, in which not all were positive.

Today, questions are often being raised in regards to how aid affects war (Anderson, 1999), if development-programs are exclusively positive (Crewe and Harrison, 1998), how INGOs should include the local community (Murshed, 2004), and what the effects of

---

[1] See chapter two for definition of the term
[2] World Disasters Report (2010) of the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Society. Focus on urban Risk.
[3] According to the Red Cross' annual report the numbers affected by war or conflict is often underreported

Civil-Military cooperation are (De Coning, 2007). It is also expected that relief is given in a long-term perspective, with focus on local capacity building, conflict resolution and sustainable development (Murshed, 2004; ISO 26000, 2010). Though one might claim that the main objective of INGOs is to help people in need (beneficiaries), the picture of INGOs role and responsibility is quite comprehensive. INGOs are actors with political, economic and social influence as there exist few (if any) societies who are not in some way political, economic or historically coupled with the world outside of their own (Nustad, 2003). Although the contributions of INGOs in humanitarian assistance are much needed and necessary, the challenge is to find a way for INGOs to take into consideration their political, economic and social influence.

The last 50 years has also been witness to an increasing focus within the international aid-milieu on multinational corporations (MNCs). MNCs are profit-seeking corporations that have activities in multiple countries at the same time, for instance Statoil. MNCs are with increasing pace molding the values and norms of societies and defining public policy and practice (Zadek, 2006). As their influence and power has grown and corporate scandals have heightened, the focus on how MNCs operations affect societies' social, political, economic and environmental structures has also increased (Zadek, 2006). When operating in a globalized world, there are certain 'rules' to follow, which has resulted in national and international pressure towards businesses to take a Corporate Social Responsibility (hereafter referred to as CSR). CSR entails taking a responsibility for the impact that the decisions and activities of a corporation have on the society and environment at hand (ISO 26000, 2010)[4]. The focus on CSR has been made explicit through an increasing number of tools for reporting on, and executing, CSR. The international guidelines from the UNGC, GRI and OECD provide voluntary principles and standards for responsible business conduct, and cover areas such as combating bribery, securing employees' right to organize and protecting public health and safety.

CSR has also become an important part of the political agenda in Norway. The Norwegian Government expects MNCs to not only follow international guidelines, but also to take a leading role in contributing to sustainable development through CSR which has been made explicit through the Norwegian Governments parliamentary

---

[4] See chapter two for an elaboration of the term.

White Paper nr 10. According to the paper, CSR means to integrate and consider social and environmental elements in day to day operations. According to the paper, main elements in responsible business conducts also include to protect human rights, respect fundamental employee rights, providing a worthy working environment, take environmental considerations, and fighting against corruption (Norwegian Parliamentary White Paper. 10, 2008- 2009: 7)

1.1 Why Corporate Social Responsibility in International Non Governmental Organizations?

Since the numbers of people affected by natural disasters and conflict have grown the activities of INGOs are becoming far reaching and comprehensive. Operating in conflict- or natural disaster struck areas such as Haiti, Afghanistan, Sudan, Somalia, Congo and Pakistan has resulted in INGOs becoming influential actors. According to Simmons (1998), there is a widespread agreement that the influence of INGOs, their reach and numbers, are unprecedented. They are "*muscling their way into areas of high politics […] that were previously dominated by the state*" (Simmons, 1998: 84). This means that INGOs are important actors not only in crises and conflicts, but also in areas where the state usually have had a primary role and responsibility.

According to Arenas, Lozano and Albareda (2009), the literature concerning the role of INGOs in relation to CSR has been mostly concerning INGOs participation in placing pressure on MNCs to take a CSR or MNC- INGO partnerships[5]. However, when it comes to the question on whether the INGOs *themselves* carry a CSR, there is a surprising lack of academic research and discussions in the aid-discourse and CSR-discourse. Even though studies have shown that INGOs are actors who have a significant effect and influence in the local communities and societies in which they operate (Anderson, 1999), the literature has so far not tied the concept of CSR to INGOs. Though many may see it as obvious that INGOs have a responsibility for beneficiaries this is still an implied responsibility that springs from the organizations' mandate as lifesaving, good, human rights fighting organizations. Some critics have argued that INGOs can't break free from the technocratic way of looking at relief, which means that the 'west' views the 'south' as countries that are not able to develop without western expertise and technology

---

[5] See also Kourula and Laasonen, 2010

3

(Duffield, 2001; Nustad, 2003). Consequently, such a view entail that western INGOs impose their own way of thinking rather than helping beneficiaries from their own perspective, culture and norms (Nustad, 2003; Crewe and Harrison, 1998;). Simmons (1998) criticizes further, stating that INGOs are hailed as the exemplars grassroots of democracy in action; they are unaccountable to those they claim to represent. These criticisms might indicate that INGOs can benefit from taking a look at their role and responsibility in a new way.

Even though INGOs by definition are non-profit organizations[6], and they have not previously been included in the term CSR, this doesn't necessarily mean that the concept of CSR, applied to INGOs, should not be explored. In fact, in the new standard ISO 26000 (2010) for CSR, a link has been made between CSR and all types of organizations, and not only profit seeking corporations. In the new standard from December 2010, the term CSR has changed from being *corporate social responsibility* to *social responsibility.* The definition further holds that social responsibility is the:

> Responsibility of an organization for the impacts of its decisions and activities
> on society and the environment, through transparent and ethical behavior that
> contributes to sustainable development, including health and the welfare of
> society; takes into account the expectations of stakeholders; is in compliance
> with applicable law and consistent with international norms of behavior; and is
> integrated throughout the organization and practiced in its relationships. (ISO
> 26000, 2010: 3).

This definition presupposes that all organizations, both economic and non-profit should take a social responsibility. The ISO 26000 (2010) thereby argues that CSR no longer is a terminology applied exclusively to corporations.

1.2 Research Question

As every superhero knows; *"with great power comes great responsibility"*[7]. As INGOs, in today's interlinked world, become more powerful and influential their responsibilities must correspond with their role, power and influence. INGOs are today viewed as

---

[6] See chapter two for further a further elaboration of the term
[7] 'Uncle Ben' from the movie Spiderman in 2002

political, social and economic actors who need to take into considerations how their decisions and actions are affecting the societies at hand. They have become actors who are challenging national governments and changing societal norms (Simmons, 1998). As governments downsize and new challenges crowd the international agenda, INGOs are increasingly filling the breach (Simmons, 1998). INGO activities have been debated for many years, and there still exists several unanswered questions regarding what the role and responsibility of INGOs is. Even though the aim of this thesis is not to find the answer to all of these questions (that would be too great of a challenge for a master-thesis), it is my goal to contribute to the INGO-discourse by providing a new view.

There are two objectives I hope to meet with the completion of this thesis. The first aim is to explore the role that INGOs play when conducting activities in foreign countries. Secondly, based on the first aim, I will explore what the social responsibility of INGOs. Two research questions will be explored in an attempt to achieve these aims. The first research question is: "*what role do INGOs play when providing humanitarian assistance[8]?* I will address this question in chapter five, which has a descriptive approach, and which is based on interviews with representatives from Norwegian People's Aid (NPA), Norwegian Refugee Council (NRC), Save the Children (STC) and Norwegian Red Cross (RC). The second research question I seek to answer builds upon an assumption that INGOs play a significant role in society in regards to fulfilling the rights of citizens. It explores what implications this role might have for their responsibility. The second part will therefore have a more normative approach and will be a theoretical discussion. Thus, the second research question I will explore is; *"If INGOs play a role in the area of citizen rights, what is INGOs social responsibility?"*

1.2 Follow the yellow brick road

To address the proposed questions, the next chapter will outline some central definitions for this thesis. I will also look closer at the relationship between INGOs and the state's sovereignty, human rights, citizen rights and donor governments. I have called the chapter Mapping the Territory because it provides background information in regards to central aspects in the humanitarian world relevant to this thesis. The chapter is not however, an attempt to map the entire humanitarian sphere in relations to all

---

[8] For definitions of citizen rights see chapter 2.4

dilemmas and challenges they face when they provide aid, face globalization and protect human rights, but rather to create a knowledge foundation in order to answer the research questions mentioned above.

The theory chapter is divided into two parts. The first presents a framework in order to explain the role of INGOs. The conceptual frameworks by Matten and Crane (2005) and Crane, Matten and Moons (2008) are outlined with corporations in mind, and explore the role corporations have in administrating social, civilian and political rights of individuals. However, in regard to this thesis, the framework will be presented to explore the role of INGOs. The second part of the theory chapter explains Brummers (1991) four approaches to CSR; the classical view, the stakeholder view, the social demanding approach and the social activist approach. These four categories create the foundation for answering the second research question regarding the responsibility of INGOs.

Thereafter, in chapter four, I outline the methodology used for this thesis. The chapter focuses on choices I have made during my research, in order to show the reader how I have reached my conclusions. It explains my preparations and background research, the research design, how I conducted my interviews, and discuss the validity and reliability of the thesis.

The findings and discussion will be presented in chapter five and six. I have chosen not to separate the analysis of the interviews and the discussions, but rather combine them and present findings and discussions in the same chapters. Thus, chapter five consists of an analysis of the interviews and discussions in relation Matten and Cranes (2005) and Crane, Matten and Moons (2008) conceptual framework. I use their framework not in regards to corporations (as they do), but to explain the role of INGOs. Based on what I find out regarding INGOs role in humanitarian crises' and conflicts, chapter six explores what their social responsibility is. Chapter six is a theoretical discussion of INGOs responsibility viewed through the lenses of Brummer's (1991) approach to CSR. Last, in chapter seven, I present conclusions and implications and some suggestions for future research.

2. Mapping the territory

Since this thesis is an effort of combining two major fields CSR and INGOs, an overview of central aspects and definitions are necessary in order to explore the complex and substantial relationship between these. In order to provide a meaningful and thorough analysis when exploring the role and responsibility of INGO in CSR-terminology, I need to explain some of the challenges that INGOs meet when give short- or long-term humanitarian assistance in foreign countries. Even though this overview is not meant to give a total account of humanitarian assistance, (there will certainly be more dilemmas and challenges INGOs meet then mentioned here), the objectives are to look at INGOs in relationship to CSR, and the elements presented here provides a background to do this. The following section thus starts by outlining some central definitions in regards to both CSR and INGOs. Thereafter I go deeper into the development of INGOs since the early nineties and the relationship between INGOs and donor-governments, state sovereignty and human rights.

2.1 Definitions and concepts

In this part I will give explain some of the central concepts in this thesis; CSR, INGOs, crises and humanitarian assistance. These concepts are used throughout the thesis and thereby it is necessary to explain what they mean in regards to this paper.

2.1.1 Corporate Social Responsibility as a phenomenon

Although the literature and research is quite extensive in the field of CSR, there have been various opinions as to what the role of the business sector's role and responsibility in society entails. The following section provides some of the perspectives and subfields used to explain CSR.

In the early 1950s, as a response to businesses growing in a rapid pace and gaining more power, Bowen (1953) promoted one of the first definitions of the company leader's social responsibility. He stated that *"it refers to the obligations of businessmen to pursue those policies, to make those decisions, or to follow those lines of action which are desirable in terms of the objective and values of our society* (Bowen 1953: in Carroll 1999: 291). This definition established a relationship between the values and objectives of society and the decisions of business. In the 1970', the Nobel Prize winner Milton Friedman

(1970) argued for a different approach to CSR then what Bowen (1953) did. Friedman claimed that the only social responsibility of business is to increase its profits. He stated that,

> There is one, and only one social responsibility of business – to use its resources and engage in activities designed to increase its profits so long as it stays within the rules of the game, which is to say, engages in open and free competition without deception or fraud (Friedman, 1970: 6).

Another famous and widely accepted view on CSR was promoted by Carroll in 1979 who argue for a four-part conceptualization that includes the idea that the corporation has economic (i) and legal obligations (ii), ethical (iii) and discretionary responsibilities(iv). Later, Carroll revised the theory and described a model, also known as the pyramid of CSR. This pyramid attempted to show the economic and legal expectations of businesses by relating them to more social concerns of ethical and philanthropic responsibilities (Carroll, 1991). In 1984 an alternative but similar theory was developed by Freeman (1984). He argued that corporations have a responsibility to involve all stakeholders such as the community, the public, employees, suppliers and customers that have an interest in the company (Freeman, 1984). Sims (2003) on the other hand, define the responsibility of business as:

> An organization's obligation to engage in activities that protect and contribute to the welfare of society. CSR refers to an organizations moral obligation toward others who are affected by the organizations actions [and are] always shaped by the culture and the historical period in which the organization operate (Sims, 2003: 44).

The definition presented by Sims (2003) goes further than the one of Freeman (1984) and Carroll (1991) by as it portrays a dynamic responsibility which must adapt to the context and by promoting corporations responsibility to contribute to the welfare of society.

The definitions presented above portray insight to the phenomenon of CSR. On one side, we find the Friedman's (1970) perspective, where CSR only concerns the production of goods and services the society wants to and to make profit. On the contrary side, CSR means to only be allowed to operate when business also solve social problems and promote welfare (Sims, 2003). Even though there are several definitions of CSR, the

intention with giving this overview is not to find *one* that is appropriate for this thesis. The intention with the above definitions has been to show the complexity of CSR and its variations. As mentioned in the introduction, the ISO 26000 (2010) argues that being social responsible should apply for all organizations. This is because *all organizations* should recognize that they have responsibilities for contributing to sustainable development, no matter if they are profit-seeking organizations or non-profit seeking organizations. This brings us over to the next definition, INGOs.

2.1.2 International Non Governmental Organizations (INGOs)

Explaining and determining what lies within the term INGO is not an easy task as the INGOs are not uniform and rational, but rather diverse and fractious organizations (Donini, 1995), who differ in activities, mandates and objectives. Anheier and Seibel (1990: 7) define Non Governmental Organizations (NGOs) as organizations who are *"neither profit-oriented businesses nor governmental agencies or bureaucracies"*. Although the term NGO is used when talking about local, national *and* international nongovernmental organizations, I use *International* Non Governmental Organizations (and the acronym *INGO*) in order to emphasize the *international* and multinational aspect of the NGOs explored in this thesis.

INGOs often perform a variety of humanitarian functions and services in crises-situations. They advocate and monitor policies, encourage political participation through provision of information, and bring the citizens concerns to the government's attention[9]. They are also specialized in different aspects; such as health, environment and human rights. When I hereafter use the term INGOs, I refer to multinational, humanitarian, voluntary, non-profit organizations. Although they have different specialties, the INGOs main objective is to contribute in crises by providing relief in one form or another. As the INGOs defined in this thesis operate in crises-situations, this brings me over to the next definition.

2.1.3 What is a Crisis?

There are many different types of crises in today's society, and consequently several definitions of a crisis. Rosenthal, Charles, and 't Hart (1989: 10) defines a crisis as *"a*

---

[9] The Non-Governmental Organization Section of the Department of Public Information at the United Nations Headquarters

serious threat to the basic structures or fundamental values and norms of a system, which under time pressure and highly uncertain circumstances necessitates making critical decisions". Rosenthal, Boin and Comfort (2001) further describe modern crises' to be *"increasingly characterized by complexity, interdependence and politicization"* (2001: 6). Thus, a crisis includes elements of threats, damage, time pressure and uncertainty. UN-OCHA specify this by using the term complex crisis as a *"crisis in a country, region or society where there is total or considerable breakdown of authority resulting from internal or external conflict and which requires an international response that goes beyond the mandate or capacity of any single agency and/or the ongoing UN country program"* (IASC December, 1994[10]). This definition places attention to situations of internal or external conflict where an international response is needed, but since many INGOs also give assistance in other humanitarian emergencies such as natural disasters, the term crises in this thesis will include both conflict related and other emergencies. When human rights (see 2.4) are being violated because of a crisis, there are two main ways of contributing to the stopping or reduction of the violations. This brings us over to the next definitions; humanitarian intervention and humanitarian access.

2.1.4 Humanitarian Assistance

Humanitarian assistance is provided in situations where the state is unwilling or unable to provide for its citizens. International humanitarian law provides a right to receive humanitarian assistance and a right to offer such assistance (the humanitarian imperative). According to the UN resolution 46/182 (Guiding principle nr 3) "*humanitarian assistance should be provided with the consent of the affected country and in principle on the basis of any appeal by the affected country and in principle on the basis of an appeal by the affected country*". This statement is based upon the principle of sovereignty which can be defined *as authority and the right to rule over a delimited territory and the population within* (Ayoob 2002). However, the right to provide humanitarian assistance can be executed without the consent or wishes of the government[11] (Mills, 1997). It is also argued that this right is warranted in the Geneva conventions of 1949 and in two additional protocols from 1977. As such, the Geneva Conventions and protocol I and II have provided an important basis for providing

---

[10] http://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/3D153DA3049B322AC1256C30002A9C24-ocha_orientation_handbook_on_.html#1

[11] Even though consent is the main argument of sovereignty, there is debate related to if the state explicitly needs to give consent, or if organizations can intervene regardless.

humanitarian assistance, and the state-government is obligated to accept assistance in situations where it cannot provide for the needs of its population itself (Mills, 1997: 21).

In this part I have explained some central definition in my thesis; CSR, INGOs, crises, and humanitarian assistance. Since my objective is to explore the role and responsibility of INGOs when they are giving humanitarian assistance in crises, and doing so by using CSR-terminology, the above mentioned definitions creates a foundation for this. However, since it in the humanitarian sphere there are several elements that can influence INGOs giving humanitarian assistance in crises, some of these will be explained in the following section.

2.2 Local involvement and contextual understanding

The debate on how and when to give aid is ongoing. Anderson (1999) states that aid *should* be given, but one must be aware of the ways in which it can prolong the conflict. In order to prevent aid from prolonging the conflict, INGOs need to be aware of context and culture and *"if aid workers are aware only of the factors that divide communities and do not recognize and relate to those that link them, their aid can reinforce the former and undermine the latter"* (Anderson, 1999: 33). As such, the importance of contextual and cultural understanding when providing humanitarian assistance becomes clear.

In order to do less harm, there has been a growing focus on the use of local capacities in humanitarian operations (Quinn, 2002; Kent, 1987; Anderson, 1999; Murshed, 2004). Through article number 6 in the Red Cross and Red Crescent Code of Conduct (CoC) from 1994, the inclusion of the local community in crises has been made explicit. The Code of Conduct has been signed by over 300 organizations and states that "*we shall attempt to build disaster response on local capacities*"[12]. According to Quinn (2002), the need to communicate and cooperate with the local-community in emergencies and conflicts is of great importance, because organizations and people who are affected by the crisis, are those best equipped to bring about its transformation.

2.3 The State's responsibility in relation to citizen rights

The Norwegian Parliamentary White Paper No. 17, 2001-2002 (p 4, personal

---

[12] http://www.icrc.org/web/eng/siteeng0.nsf/htmlall/code-of-conduct-290296

translation) defines societal safety as "*the society's ability to protect the life and health of the citizens and to meet the citizens' basic requirements in a variety of stress situations*". This definition[13] attaches a focus on citizen rights in crisis situations, and holds that when society is not able to provide for its citizens, there is no societal safety. Harvey (2010) identifies two situations where the state cannot provide for the citizens, and where international relief is needed. The first situation relates to the government being willing, but unable to and the second situation happens where the government is unwilling to fulfill the citizen's rights due to that they for instance are a part of the conflict[14]. In these situations INGOs or states have a responsibility to protect citizens (R2P). This means that they must interfere in a situation in order to protect a population who might experience genocide, ethnic cleansing or crime against humanity.

2.3.1 The rights of citizens and human rights

By being a citizen in a country, one gains a legal status in the community that provides the basis for various rights for the individual (Crane, Matten and Moon, 2008). One also becomes entitled to what Marshall (1965) refers to as social-, civil-, and political rights. *Social rights* are those rights a citizen has in relations to participate in society in a free matter. It also means that individuals have the right to a satisfying standard of life (adequate food, clothing and house), to the highest obtainable health possible, to equality, and a right to education (UNs International Covenant on economic, social and cultural rights, part III). *"The right to adequate food is realized when every man, woman and child, alone or in a community with others, has physical and economic access at all times to adequate food or means for its procurement"* (UN-committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, general Comment 12). As for civil- and political rights this is warranted in the UN International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. In relation to *civil rights,* the convention consist of articles that concern freedom from abuses (torture and murder), the right to property, freedom of speech, freedom of religion and individual privacy. According to Matten and Crane (2005) these rules exist to protec the individual from abuses and interference from third parties such as governments. In relation to *political rights*, the covenant establishes the right to join a union, freedom from discrimination, the right to vote and to participate in public matters trough holding office. This entitles citizens to take part in the political processes of forming a society.

---

[13] For elaboration and challenges in regards to the term society safety, see Olsen, Kruke and Hovden (2007)
[14] See in relation to chapter 3.1.1

The two above covenants form, together with the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) they form The International Bill of Human Rights[15]. Following the human rights and providing for its citizens and civil protection is first and foremost the state-government's primary responsibility (ISO 26000, Matten and Crane, 2005: Quarantelli, 2000). This responsibility applies in emergency situations as well as conflicts:

> Each State has the responsibility first and foremost to take care of the victims of natural disasters and other emergencies occurring on its territory. Hence, the affected State has the primary role in the initiation, organization, coordination and implementation of humanitarian assistance within its territory (UN resolution 46/182: guiding principle 4).

In some situations however, the state's response to a crisis is, as mentioned, not sufficient, and humanitarian assistance is provided. As stated by Kofi Annan in the UN agenda for development:

> Many long-standing problems - and their solutions - have increasingly taken on international dimensions as well. Environmental degradation, extreme poverty, sudden population shifts, massive human rights violations, illegal drug trafficking and organized crime are all threats to development that can no longer be resolved by national efforts alone, no matter how important those efforts may be[16].

2.4 Donor governments and neutrality

When providing humanitarian assistance, INGOs are often financed by donor-governments. According to Harvey (2010) there has been a shift in the way donors provide aid. In the 1970-1980 aid was given directly to support governments, but today it is mostly provided through funding international humanitarian agencies (Harvey, 2010). By the early 1990, the share of European Commission's relief budget that was channeled directly through national governments had fallen to 6 % from over 90 % in 1976 (Harvey, 2010). In Norway, it is the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA) who is the donor and political implementer of emergency aid. Norad[17] does not work in the 'relief business', but are donors of long- term aid. Every year the Norwegian Government

---

[15] http://www.ohchr.org/EN/ProfessionalInterest/Pages/InternationalLaw.aspx
[16] In the foreword of the UN Agenda for Development. http://www.un.org/Docs/SG/forward.htm
[17] Norad is a directorate under the Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs and works with developmental programs, ensuring the goals of Norway's development policy are achieved.

donates 1, 09 % of Norway's gross domestic product (BNP), about 27 billion NOK to over 10 00 different development activities worldwide (Lie 2006). This means that the allocation of aid is an important part of Norwegian development policy, foreign policy and political agenda. In a press release from 13.10.2009, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs states that the funding should be spent on peace building, poverty alleviation, environment and climate, and women and children.

At the same time, international humanitarian organizations and the governments which fund them are committed to the humanitarian principle of independence. The Good Humanitarian Donorship (GHD) gives a broad definition of the principle, and claims that to be independent one should have autonomy from political, economic, military or other objectives (GHD 2003). Bouchet Saulnier (2007:157) also points out the importance of independence and states that; *"humanitarian action must be independent from any political, financial or military pressures. Its only limit, its only constraint and its only goal must be the defense of the human being".* However, governments often have their own agendas and priorities when granting long- and short-term aid. Keen (2008) argues that international governments give aid based on five reasons: (i) *Strategic interests* such as during the Cold War, Ethiopia 1984, Sudan 1990s, (ii) *Providing food in the line of fire,* but without any political backup such as the situation in Darfur, (iii) In order to *legitimize political inaction*, (iv) in order to *limit population flows*, such as the situation in North Korea, when South Korea and China provided aid because they were afraid of getting to many refugees[18], and (v) in the light of new legislations and restrictions such as the 11/9. If INGOs and their funding governments have different motives and priorities, this can be a challenge for the independence of INGOs. If funding comes with 'strings attached' and these strings are not flexible, it can result in INGOs following regulations of donors instead of their own.

2.5 Summary

This chapter has provided an overview of elements concerning humanitarian assistance, sovereignty, donor governments, INGOs development the last decade, and citizenship rights. Hopefully, I have shown that INGOs face many dilemmas, and that many actors are involved in situations where humanitarian assistance is given. The dilemmas of

---

[18] See Olsen, Carstensen and Høyen, (2003)

state-sovereignty vs. humanitarian assistance without consent, of being neutral and independent organizations vs. keeping the donors "happy", and providing assistance quick an efficient vs. including local capacities are some of the challenges INGOs face when operating in foreign countries. This brings us to the question of what their role in regards to giving humanitarian assistance entails, and what responsibility this implies. Thus, in the next chapter I will outline the theory relevant in order to explore what their role is in regards to citizen rights and what this means for INGOs responsibility viewed through the lenses of CSR-terminology.

3. Theoretical Background

The responsibility of business in society has been debated for decades, and the vast literature on CSR has been developed and discussed for over 60 years. Even though this has resulted in a variety of theories, models and definitions there still exists no common universal definition of the term CSR (Whitehouse, 2006). The aim of this thesis is not to find *one* definition or to try to find one solution that 'fits all', but use different perspectives and understandings of CSR in order to do two things. As such, the first part of this chapter presents the concept of Corporate Citizenship (hereafter referred to as CC) and the conceptual framework of Matten and Crane (2005) in order to answer the first research question. The concept has been used by Matten and Crane (2005) to descriptively analyze the role of corporations in regards to the administrating of rights. I will use this concept to explore the role of INGOs. The second part of the chapter consist of four perspectives to view the responsibility of business; the classical- stakeholder, social demandingness and social activist perspective (Brummer, 1991). These perspectives will be used in order to explore what the social responsibility of INGOs is and thereby answer the second research question.

3.1 Corporate Citizenship and administrating of citizen rights

CC is a fairly new perspective that was coined in the 1990's and thereafter began to replace the existing notions of management theory (Matten, Crane and Chappel, 2003). According to Crane, Matten and Moon (2008) CC has emerged as a response to the social role of business. One perspective on CC was presented by Carroll in 1998. He argued that CC has four faces; the economic face (to be profitable), the legal face (to obeying the law), the ethical face (engaging in ethical behavior), and the philanthropic face (giving back trough philanthropy). He further argued that "*each of these faces of corporate citizenship does not exist apart from or in isolation from the others. Each of them is but one facet of what it means to be a good corporate citizen*" (Carroll, 1998: 6). As such, Carroll (1998) holds that corporations have a responsibility to fulfill economic, legal, ethical, and philanthropically obligations towards society in order to be a corporate citizen. Matten and Crane (2005) on the other hand, argue that Carroll's (1991, 1998) way of looking at CC is not adequate to explain the role of corporations in today's society because it does not incorporate the political aspect of corporate role. Matten and Crane

(2005) therefore presents a new view[19] of CC in order to understand the political dimensions of corporations. As such, they define CC as "*the role of the corporation in administering citizenship rights for individuals [...] for other constituencies. These include traditional stakeholders, [...] customers, or shareholders, but also include wider constituencies with no direct transactional relationship to the company*" (Matten and Crane, 2005: 173). In the following section I outline this new way of looking at CC, the extended conceptualization of CC.

3.1.1 Toward an extended conceptualization of CC

The extended view on CC involves a way of looking at corporations as entities who in some situations take over some of the government's responsibility in the administration of social-, civil-, and political rights. Matten and Crane (2005) holds that CC is an arena where two parties are involved; the state (originally) as the party of administering rights of citizenship and the private citizen as the receiver of those rights. Corporations have, however, recently become major actors in this arena, and this has implications for their responsibility. This way of looking at CC is my point of departure in exploring the role of INGOs in chapter five.

Matten and Crane (2005) claim that it is first and foremost the state-governmental institutions responsibility to protect the citizen's rights. However, due to globalization, there are now several social activities that are taking place beyond the power and influence of the nation state, which means that as powerful public actors corporations have a responsibility to respect individual citizen's rights (Wood and Logstdon, 2001). Matten and Crane (2005) does not claim that corporations are citizens or have citizenship, but they argue that they are active *in* citizenship and exhibit citizenship behaviors. "*We do not wish to suggest that corporations are the <u>only</u> actors administering these rights - merely that they have taken over considerable responsibility from governments. By administration of rights, we mean a number of different roles and actions; provider, enabler, channel*" (Matten and Crane, 2005: 175). They further argue that corporations take on the role as *provider* of social rights, *enabler* of civil rights and/or as a *channel* for political rights in situations where the governmental actors fail to be the "counterpart" of citizenship, and where the state ceases to be the only guarantor of

---

[19] For the previous views of CC, the limited and equivalent view, see Crane, Matten and Moon (2008: 21-22) or Matten and Crane (2005: 168 - 169).

citizenship rights (Matten and Crane, 2005). They hold that there are three ways in which government and corporate roles are changing, and where corporations might be taking over the role of the government institutions.

1. Government ceases to administer citizenship
When government ceases to administer citizenship, this leaves an open space where corporations are encouraged to enter the arena of citizenship (Matten and Crane, 2005). It can also happen in situations where corporations already are active in an area, and where their role becomes more pronounced when government retreats as for instance a natural crisis where the government becomes unable to provide for its citizens. Crane, Matten and Moon (2008: 64-65) argue that corporations also have become increasingly active in the takeover "*of formerly public services, such as energy, water, postal services, healthcare or education [and that] many so-called 'CC initiatives are fundamentally equivalent co corporate philanthropy and targeted at reinvigorating (or replacing) the welfare state*". This means that several of the social rights are being co-managed by corporations, and that they can act as an alternative to the governmental-institutions. In relation to civil rights, this is mostly relevant in regards to developing or transforming countries. When the government fails or is unwilling to provide citizens with a reasonable protection of their status and civil rights such as the freedom of speech, this can be partially offset by corporate action (Matten and Crane, 2005). This was the situation when Shell was expected to 'step in' as a response to state-failure in the protection of the Ogoni people in Nigeria (Wheeler 2002). In relation to political rights, corporations usually play a more indirect role in the sense that they help to facilitate, enable or block certain political processes in society. They do not directly take over formerly governmental prerogatives, but rather play a more indirect role in the political arena through lobbying and party funding (Matten and Crane, 2005: 172). The situations where government ceases to administer citizenship leaves, as mentioned a vacuum where corporations can (or not) contribute to the fulfillment of social, civil and/or political rights in one way or another. In regards to INGOs it will be interesting to see how, and if, they participate in citizenship the same way as Matten and Crane (2005) argue that corporations do.

2. Government has not yet administered citizenship
The second way corporations can enter the arena of citizenship includes situations

where government has not yet administered citizenship (Matten and Crane, 2005). This is mostly seen in developing countries where the welfare state is not operational. As globalization has raised awareness of these existing vacuums, corporations become some sort of a "default-option" for the government (Crane, Matten and Moon, 2008: Matten and Crane, 2005). In regards to social rights, the responsibility can include improving working conditions or finance school for children. It can also be to provide social services beyond the immediate actors surrounding the corporation's. In the area of civil rights, corporations might play a crucial role in encouraging or discouraging oppressive regimes to offer genuine citizenship to their people because *"corporation's very presence in the country already assumes some form of enabling relationship with the government"* (Crane, Matten and Moon, 2008: 67). As an example of corporations becoming a default option in governmental inability or unwillingness to protect civil rights, they mentions that corporations tried to involve Aborigines in deliberations about claims to sacred places and enabled their right to property long before the Australian government did. In this situation, corporations were directly involved in the protection of civil rights.

3. The administration of citizenship rights may be beyond the reach of the government. Corporative administration of rights usually takes place when governments are not able to administer rights in an efficient matter because some of the rights are associated to global entities such as the ozone layer or global markets (Matten and Crane, 2005). In terms of social rights, it can become incumbent for corporations to protect social rights by introducing global codes of conduct as for instance the UNGC (Matten and Crane, 2005).Corporations may also contribute in governance by placing pressure on state regulation of economic, social and environmental standards. As a powerful and international actor, corporations often have a significant possibility in influencing the regulation and protection of rights.

3.1.2 Corporations as providers, enablers, and channels for citizenship
In regards to the above mentioned arguments, the role of corporations has changed. They have, to some degree, become an administrator of rights (Matten and Crane, 2005). By supplying individuals with social services, corporations work as *providers.* In regards to civil rights they act as *enabler's* through capacitating or constraining citizen rights. Finally, in the realm of political rights the corporation primarily assumes administration

through a *channeling role* (Matten and Crane, 2005). The three ways corporation's roles have changed, provides the theoretical basis for chapter five. In this thesis I will explore if INGOs enter the same role as corporations when it comes to the administration of rights. The next section, however, provides the theoretical foundation for answering the second research question, the social responsibility of INGOs.

3.2 Four perspectives on Corporate Social Responsibility

In order to answer the second research question: *"what is the social responsibility of INGOs?",* this part outlines four different perspectives presented by Brummer (1991) that can be seen as containers for different theoretical contributions to CSR. The perspectives are (i) the classical-, (ii) the stakeholder-, (iii) the social demandingness-, and (iv) the social activist perspective. Although dividing of CSR into four separate categories might give an impression of a simple picture, by structuring in this way I am able to explore and explain the phenomena through a systemized structure.

3.2.1 Business for Business itself; the Classical view

There is little doubt that when corporations perform, they have to create profit in order to be able to survive in the marked. However, in the classical perspective of CSR, creating profit, increasing the economic value of the business and obeying the law is the only social responsibility a corporation has (Friedman 1970). Friedman (1970) offers a view of corporations' responsibility that through increasing and creating profit this in itself will contribute to society. Brummer (1991) states that having a classical perspective of CSR means believing that a society benefits when a corporation lowers its costs and increases its profit; society will benefit because businesses can pay workers more improve working-conditions. Brummer (1991) further states that the classical perspective entails that the "*corporate executives have a primary and positive economic responsibility toward the shareholders to secure the latter's financial goals or to respond to their wishes relative to the corporation* "(Brummer, 1991:103). This entails that the most important responsibility for business is that of its shareholders and one can say that it is the capitalistic forces that define the primary criteria CSR. The classical perspective is also referred to as a shareholder perspective because the business primary responsibility is towards the ones with stocks in the corporation. Within the classical perspective one also see the various spheres in community as for instance the business sector, civil society and politics as spheres that should not be mixed together,

and where ethical and moral obligations are not the concern of a corporation but of other institutions in society (Melè, 2008).

When it comes to corporations operating in foreign countries, there exists little acceptance for only relating to a classical perspective, because operating only with a focus on the bottom line without considering social and environmental effects is not considered to exercise good corporate responsibility (Norwegian Parliamentary White Paper No. 10 2008/2009). In the next section I outline a perspective that takes the responsibility somewhat further than the classical perspective by including all stakeholders.

3.2.2 Including all stakeholders; the stakeholder perspective

The Stakeholder includes a responsibility towards not only to its shareholders, but also to involve individuals or groups with an interest in the corporation or that can be directly affected by corporate decisions (Brummer, 1991). Freeman (1984) claims that stakeholders are those who have the power to affect the corporation in a significant way[20]. Brummer (1991) and Freeman (1984) presents a wide description of stakeholders. As such, the definition of a stakeholder used in this thesis is based on Mitchell, Agle and Woods (1997) model. This model includes three attributes that define a stakeholder (power, legitimacy and urgency) which "*creates different types of stakeholders with different expected behavioral patterns regarding the firm" (Mitchell, Agle and Wood, 1997: 863)*. When it comes to the notion of power, they argue that a stakeholder has *power* when it can or has access to means that are (i) coercive and based on physical resources of force, violence, (ii) utilitarian and based on material or financial resources or (iii) normative based on symbolic resources such as prestige, esteem, acceptance. The second notion, the *legitimacy* of the stakeholders, relates to a generalized perception or assumption that stakeholder actions are desirable, proper or appropriate within socially constructed systems of values, norms and beliefs (Mitchell, Agle and Wood, 1997). The last element, *urgency*, includes stakeholders that are calling for immediate attention. Mitchell, Agle and Wood (1997) argue that this entails a relationship or claim that is time-sensitive (when a delay in attending to the claim is unacceptable to the stakeholder) and it is important or critical to the stakeholder.

---

[20] For an overview of other perspectives on what a stakeholder is, see Mitchell, Agle and Wood, 1997, p 858.

All of these attributes are changeable variables that are socially constructed and when stakeholders have all attributes; power, legitimacy and urgency, they are referred to as *definitive* stakeholders and managers give them top priority (Mitchell, Agle and Wood, 1997). Scherer and Palazzo (2006) argues that powerful stakeholders receive the most attention from corporations, and thus a stakeholder that holds the attribute of power will be prioritized before legitimacy or urgency. However, Mitchell, Agle and Wood, 1997 argues that holding only one attribute, even the attribute of power, is not enough to gain influence and managers may not even recognize that they exist. As for holding two attributes, Mitchell, Agle and Wood (1997) claim that power together with legitimacy creates <u>dominant</u> stakeholders with a dominant influence at the corporation's decisions. This is because they have legitimate claims *and* the power to act on them. Stakeholders who have legitimate and urgent claims are defined as <u>dependent</u> stakeholders, because they *"depend upon others (other stakeholders or the firm's managers) for the power necessary to carry out their will"* (Mitchell, Agle and Wood, 1997: 877). In regards to urgency combined with power, these stakeholders are viewed as '<u>dangerous</u>' because they act outside the bounds of legitimacy by being coercive and possibly violent towards the firm (Mitchell, Agle and Wood, 1997).

Based on the definition of Mitchell, Agle and Wood (1997) I argue that the stakeholder perspective on CSR involves a responsibility towards several different actors who has one or more of the attributes legitimacy, urgency and/or power. The stakeholder perspective entails that executives have a responsibility to provide the stakeholders with certain benefits that will contribute to stakeholders effectively carrying out their stakeholder roles or functions (Brummer, 1991:144). In regards to this, it will in chapter six discuss which attributes the stakeholders of INGOs hold and what this means in regards to INGOs responsibility towards the different stakeholder. But before I get to that, Brummer's (1991) third perspective on CSR, social demandingness perspective, will be reviewed.

3.2.3 Meeting the expectations of society; The Social Demandingness theory
The Social Demanding theory goes yet further than the stakeholder perspective, and entails a responsibility based on what the society *expects* and needs from the corporation. The theory differs from the classical- and stakeholder theory in the way that the management is *"directly responsible to society or the general public, that is, even*

to those who are only indirectly affected by its decisions" (Brummer, 1991: 165). This means that not only the stakeholders, but also non-stakeholders should be involved when it comes to social and moral corporate activities (Brummer, 1991). If one has a social demandingness perspective on a corporation's responsibility, it isn't enough that corporations provide services and goods, but they also have to consider the demands, expectations and opinions of members of the public regarding corporate activity. Corporations are seen as social institutions and thereby they have social and moral obligations towards the society to at least eliminate or limit the negative effects of their decisions and actions. "*Corporations are expected to restrict the negative social effects that directly or indirectly result from their actions, such as poverty, deteriorating cities, defacement of the landscape, environmental pollution and disregard for consumers*" (Davis, 1975: 23 in Brummer, 1991). This means that businesses must take part in solving social problems if this is expected of them by the society, which according to Melè (2008: 49) means altering corporate behavior too produce less harmful and more beneficial outcomes for society at hand and its citizens.

Brummer (1991) holds that there are three aspects to the social demandingness theory that are of importance when viewing what CSR entails. The first relates to how one defines what constitutes as a moral or a social demand, and what constitutes an expectation or interest. The second notion entails the challenge of the theory's relativistic aspect since it varies in time and place. The third notion entails who or what defines the responsibility; is it the demands of society, the expectations, or the welfare needs of society.

How does one define expectations, social and moral demands?
Since the theory builds on the expectations or demands of society, the definition of what lies within these terms needs a closer look. Brummer (1991) holds that some theorists claim that social demands is the same as explicit legal demands whilst others equate them with what the majority of the public express. Some also hold that social demands is defined by a certain part of the population; either experts with a certain education, the media, clergies, professional groups, anyone with a college degree, etc. Also in regards to expectations and moral demands we find several different views on who defines them and what the proper method is for measuring their strength.

The inherently relativistic aspect of social demandingness theory

Since the theory builds on what society at any time is expecting or demanding from companies, good CSR will vary over time and the meaning will vary between communities (Brummer, 1991). Brummer (1991) further argues since the theory is relative to both time and place, it places management under a general duty to consider the demands or expectations of the public. This means that the usage of social demandingness theory presupposes that corporations are aware of the political and social context in countries they have activities. The expectations can change as society itself changes and if one is to exercise social responsibility based on the expectations a community has, corporations must also have knowledge about the culture and norms in the society they operate since expectations will largely be contingent to culture and norms. Another argument presented by Brummer (1991) is that the changeable nature of the social demandingness responsibility suggests an element of instability and flexibility and the responsibility will always depend on the actual demands or expectations of society.

Defining responsibility in accordance to what?

The first element entails that executives would be required to meet the *demands* of society, and to fulfill those responsibilities that are viewed as moral or social duties (Brummer, 1991). For instance this can be done by providing truthful information to stakeholders and the public, avoiding contaminating water, or ensuring safe working conditions for employees. These actions are responsibilities whose nonperformance would result in corporations being looked upon as acting wrong and maybe even being evil.

The second element includes a responsibility where executives need to consider the social and moral *expectations* of the public. This is a broader way of viewing the responsibility because the term expectation has a considerably broader meaning than the term demanding; it *"involves reference to what is good and beneficial to perform but whose nonperformance does not necessarily constitute serious harm, wrongdoing or evil"* Brummer, 1991: 168). In this regard the expectations of the public involves executives giving charitable donations to for instance educational institutions, or to fund the rebuilding of cities without it being fronted as an actual demand or requirement (Brummer, 1991).

The third notion one can define responsibility is by equate the social demandingness with the promotion of social welfare. This notion comes very close to the social activist theory that is to be discussed shortly, and entails not what the public explicitly and directly says, but rather what actually contributes to welfare (Brummer, 1991). Here the executives have a responsibility to take action in contributing to welfare-tasks even before the public expressively asks for it, before they have formulated distinct demands or expectations (Brummer, 1991).

3.2.4 A universal standard of CSR; the Social Activist theory
In the classical view, the stakeholder perspective and the social demanding perspective, the meaning of CSR rely on what different actors (shareholders, legitimate actors, society) expect from companies. However, in the Social Activist theory, time, place and the current opinions of actors do not have an influence on what lies in the notion of CSR (Brummer, 1991).

Brummer (1991) argues that there are two points to the social activist theory. The first one entails that there exists a universal standard that determine responsible corporate action and that this is independent of interests and claims of stakeholders which has an ethical foundation. The second point to the view is that this standard *"requires that executives be social and moral leaders in the corporate community rather than the moral followers they would be if they followed the lead of the other theories"* (Brummer, 1991: 187). Returning to the first point, this notion means that there is an absolute standard regarding how corporations should act in order to be responsible. It is not relative to expectations of any individuals and deals with economic and noneconomic matters, and even though the standard is independent of what people presently think about it, it captures what the public's real welfare is (Brummer, 1991). This means it provides a stabile set of values that one can use to judge current social demands and opinions regardless of what is the public's attitudes or views (Brummer, 1991). By doing this, it expresses criteria's with a normative foundation independent of subjective demands and opinions. Thus, the responsibility is based on independent, universal standards that do not vary between societies or in time (Brummer, 1991). This brings us to the second notion of social activist theory, the executives' commitment to social or moral activism. According to Brummer (1991: 187-188), the theorist's opinions on what executives need to do vary. It can be that the responsibility of corporations is to contribute to

general human flourishing or to optimize the welfare of everyone, *"that corporate decision making is irresponsible when it involves a severe infringement on the rights of individuals"* (Brummer, 1991: 187) or that executives need to act in a way that can be justified before an impartial board of inquiry where the members are technically competent in the field of question.

Brummer (1991) suggests several ways of being responsible in relations to the social activist theory. This includes actively examining the impacts of their actions, developing codes of conducts in their organizations, conduct social impact studies before important business decisions are made, be active in lobbying government agencies to frame and execute laws with positive social impact. In sum, Brummer (1991) argues that the social activist theory entails that corporations should pursue social or moral goals from voluntary motives, even when this is compromising the firms profit performance.

3.3 Reviewing the research questions

In the first part of this chapter, I outlined Matten and Cranes (2005) extended view of CC. This view creates the foundation for exploring the role INGOs have in regards to administration social, civil and/or political rights. Part 3.2 outlined four approaches to CSR which I will use to explore what the social responsibility of INGOs is.

In regards to this chapter and chapter two, I would like to bring forward the research questions presented in the introduction. The first research question I presented was: "*what role do INGOs play when providing humanitarian assistance?* After explaining the challenges of sovereignty and state responsibility in regards to humanitarian assistance provided to ensure the citizens human rights (social, civil and political), the question can be elaborated further. In the beginning of this chapter I also outlined Matten and Cranes (2005) new way of looking at the role of corporations, by stating that CC entailed corporations becoming administrators of rights in situations where the state-government for some reason was unable or unwilling to do so. According to McIntosh, Thomas, Leipziger and Coleman (2003: 25) "*CC applies to all organizations and the implication that it applies purely to the private sector is misleading. We might, therefore, recognize that we live in a society of organizations, and make the proposition that we rename this field as organizational citizenship*". Based on Matten and Cranes (2005) extended view, and INGOs growing role in humanitarian crises, I specify the research

question further; *"what is the role of INGOs in regards to fulfilling citizen's social-, civil- and political rights in crisis'? Are they administrating citizen rights, and thereby becoming an alternative to the state?* I will address these questions in chapter five, by exploring the role played out by INGOs in situations where government does not fulfill the social, civil and political rights of its citizens. The chapter has a descriptive approach, and is based on interviews with representatives from the Norwegian INGOs Save the Children, Norwegian People's Aid, Norwegian Refugee Council, and Norwegian Red Cross.

The second research question I presented in the introduction was; *"if INGOs play a role in the area of citizen rights, what is INGOs social responsibility?"* This question, as mentioned, builds upon the assumption that INGOs do in fact play a significant role in society when giving humanitarian assistance. If they in some situations are administrating rights, and thereby moving into state-like responsibilities, what does this mean for their responsibility? In chapter six I discuss this question by looking at INGO-responsibility trough the lenses of the four categories presented by Brummer (1991). The extended research question will thus be; *"given that INGOs play a pivotal role in regards to administrating citizen rights through humanitarian assistance, what is their classical-, stakeholder-, social demandingness- or social activist responsibility?* This part will be a theoretical discussion with a slightly normative approach.

4. Methods and Methodology

Blaikie (2000) holds that there is a difference between method and methodology. Method involves an introduction of the procedures and techniques the researcher used in order to gather and analyze the data, while methodology is a critical discussion regarding how the research was (or could have been) done (Blaikie, 2000). Even though explaining my thought process in working with this thesis is not an easy task, it is an important one. As such, this chapter provides an overview of the different choices I made in regards to both methodology and method, in order to explore the role and responsibility of INGOs.

The idea of looking at INGOs from a CSR-perspective came to me after a lecture regarding CSR and sustainable development. The week before, I had attended a lecture in humanitarian crises where we had been discussing the many challenges INGOs meet when they go into foreign countries responding to a crises. I thought to myself that the responsibility expected to be taken in corporations, surely must be relevant in INGOs as well. If INGOs argue that corporations should work against corruption, contribute to welfare, work for a better environment, include local capacities and ensure safe working conditions, this must be a term that they can apply to themselves? Even though INGOs are entering countries on regularly basis, either because of a conflict or a natural disaster, what lies in their responsibility has yet to be agreed upon. There still exists different opinions on what their role and responsibility entails, and what it does not. With this thought in mind, and with a hope to contribute to the discourse of INGO-responsibility in a new way, I started exploring the concept of CSR in INGOs.

4.1 Preparations and background research

Once I had decided on my topic, I started the preparations and background research. The first preparation for this thesis was conducted by writing semester papers in the University of Stavanger's offered subjects of 'CSR and Sustainable Development' and in 'Decision Making in Crises Situations'. Through these papers I started the foundation for this thesis.

A Literature review is used to frame a problem by *"looking at other studies that are closely related to the one being undertaken"* (Creswell, 2009: 25). During my search for

published papers, I used concepts of NGOs and INGOs in connection with terms such as CSR, social responsibility, CC, stakeholder perspective, shareholder-, classical-, social demandingness-, and social activist perspective, business, citizenship, sovereignty, and various other words presented in chapters two and three. The literature I found was mostly related to *either* INGO- *or* CSR-related issues. Of the literature I found connecting both fields (CSR and INGOs), this was related to the themes of INGOs as stakeholders, INGO-business partnerships, how corporations can 'befriend' INGOs. I found no literature describing a CSR role or responsibility of INGOs. Thus, to my knowledge, there exists no previous research that explores the role and responsibility of INGOs through CSR-lenses. However, argued by Creswell (2009) the purpose of a literature review is also to relate a study to a larger ongoing debate and contribute to filling in gaps in prior studies. Therefore, in chapters two and three I presented the relevant literature in the ongoing debate concerning INGOs and CSR.

4.2 Research design and strategy

According to Blaikie (2000), a research design is not a linear process, but a dynamic one where change is part of the research process. This has also been the case for me. In order to make my decisions explicit and give the reader the opportunity to criticism my thesis, this part consists of a discussion regarding the structure of my thesis, the method I chose (qualitative, quantitative or mixed methods), how I chose my informants and how I interpreted the data.

In order to answer the research questions presented in chapter one, I chose to divide the discussions of the thesis into two sections. Since my research to a certain degree is combining two fields (CSR and INGOs) in a new way, this seemed the most expedient and suitable solution. It allowed me to first look at the role INGOs play in administrating or fulfilling citizen rights (a descriptive discussion based on interviews) and thereafter look at how characteristics of different approaches to CSR can be seen in relation to INGOs (theoretical discussion). As such, the first research question is answered in chapter five and the second question answered in chapter six. However, in both chapters I have chosen to present the data analysis and the discussion simultaneously.

4.2.1 The selection of theoretical perspectives

The structure of chapter five is based on the conceptual frameworks of Matten and

Crane (2005) and Crane, Matten and Moon (2008) to explore the role INGOs play in administrating citizen rights. Their article and book, respectively, discuss the role of corporations in administrating citizen rights, and presents three different situations where corporations play a role in the area of citizenship. I chose these frameworks because they base their argument on a changing role of corporations due to globalization and regressing state-sovereignty (which also concerns INGOs), and partially because they use social, civil and political rights to define the areas in which corporate roles are changing. By using their frameworks and transferring them to INGOs, I was able to systematically explore and explain the phenomena of social responsibility in INGOs. Also, it allowed me to interview my informants by using terminology familiar to them (globalization, state sovereignty, human-, social-, civil- and political rights). Chapter five consists of exploratory research to find the role INGOs have in administrating social, civil and/or political rights of the individual. In order to do this, the representatives from the four interviewed organizations (see 4.2.3) and the above mentioned framework are the subjects of analysis.

The discussion of chapter six is based on the hypothesis that INGOs play a pivotal role in fulfilling citizen rights, and thus chapter six builds on the conclusions from chapter five. The structure of chapter six explores the second research question, the social responsibility of INGOs by using Brummer's (1991) four perspectives on CSR (the classical-, the stakeholder-, the social demandingness-, and the social activist perspective). By using the four-parted conceptual framework of Brummer (1991), I was able to discuss these different perspectives in a way that makes it possible to explore the social responsibility in regards to *INGOs*. Even though the interviews also function as a foundation for chapter six, this chapter is mainly based on the theoretical concepts of CSR. The chapter is therefore a theoretical and normative discussion more than chapter, five which is purely descriptive. The possible implications of INGOs social responsibility is discussed under each of the four approaches.

4.2.2 Choosing a method

In primary data there are three ways of executing the gathering; quantitative method, qualitative method, or mixed methods[21]. Creswell (2009) holds that quantitative

---

[21] There are several ways of viewing mixed methods and it is also referred to as method-triangulation or mixed model. See for instance Bryman (2006) or Burke (2004)

research procures to test objective theories by using a large selected numbered data whilst qualitative research entails "*exploring and understanding the meaning individuals or groups ascribe to a social or human problem*" (Creswell, 2009: 232-233). Mixed methods entails that the researcher use of both qualitative and quantitative data, either sequentially or at the same time (Blaikie, 2000). I chose the qualitative method because it allowed me to uncover attitudes and views the INGOs had in regards to if and how humanitarian assistance could result in administration of citizenship rights. It was also used because my research is of an exploratory character, and thereby important to come close to the representatives of the INGOs to get a more in-depth understanding for the phenomenon. Giving informants (and myself) the possibility to reflect on the concept of CSR in INGOs, and give comments and ask questions during the interview would not have been possible in a quantitative approach (it often incorporates a standardized questionnaire). As such, qualitative approach was the right for me.

4.2.3 Analysis and interpretations

Danemark (1997) claims that a research strategy is the way to get from one point to another. In order to do this, he presents four research strategies; the deductive, the inductive, the abductive and the retroductive[22]. The way I have conducted the analysis and interpretations in this thesis can be characterized as what Danemark (1997) refers to as abduction, because it means to look upon, describe, interpret or explain a phenomenon in new way through looking at it in a new (theoretical) setting (Danemark, 1997: 142-151). Since my thesis regards a re-contextualizing of the role and responsibility of INGOs in a new setting, This is what I did when I interpreted the INGOs role in providing humanitarian assistance in the frame of Matten and Cranes (2005) extended view on corporate citizenship (chapter five). I interpreted empirical data in a new theoretical perspective. In regards to exploring INGOs responsibility given the role they have as administrators of social, political and social civil rights (chapter six), this research was also conducted in an abductive way as I discussed INGOs responsibility in the setting of various perspectives on CSR.

4.2.3 Conducting the interviews

According to Jacobsen (2005) there are four methods to collect data using a qualitative method; Individual and open interviews; open group interviews; observation and

---

[22] For an overview of the four strategies, see Danemark (1997:134) .

document analysis. I chose to conduct individual interviews with representatives from four of Norway's largest International Non Governmental Organizations who provide humanitarian assistance in crises; Save the Children, Norwegian Red Cross, Norwegian Refugee Council and Norwegian People's Aid. They are also organizations who "push" corporations into taking CSR and thus the social responsibility expected from corporations would not be an unfamiliar term to them.

According to Kvale (1996) an interview is a conversation between two parties with a common interest to a topic, where the knowledge is accessed through dialogue. The reason why I chose interviews as a method was due to that the topic of my thesis relates to an area where little research has been done before. Thereby observation or document analysis has not been relevant. Even though it could have been useful to also conduct open group interviews with each organization, this was not possible due to the time-limitations of those working in the INGOs. In order to get a hold of informants from Save the Children, Red Cross, Norwegian Refugee Council and Norwegian People's Aid, I used what Stewart (1998) refers to as the snowball method. By talking to professors at the University of Stavanger, sending e-mails and calling the INGOs main office explaining my topic for the thesis, I was eventually forwarded to the right person.

Before I started conducting the more formal interviews with the Norwegian INGOs, I had several informal conversations with Gunhild Ørstavik and Jan Egeland. My first conversation with Gunhild Ørstavik, Advisor for CSR at the Norwegian Forum for Environment and Development (ForUM), was conducted in January of 2011 in her house at Nesodden in Akershus. ForUM is national and international contact point "*for the coordination of policy initiatives and recommendations. These are anchored in a community of 54 member organizations in Norway, and the viewpoints of our international partners and those in the Global South[23]*". The informal communication I had with Ørstavik during the initial research period gave me input on important imperative areas of the discourse and I was given the opportunity to discuss my thoughts and ideas with someone who works with CSR in the humanitarian world. The second conversation I had was by phone from Stavanger, and as the previous conversation it was open with only a few questions. During my talks with Gunhild Ørstavik I was able to gain a better understanding of the humanitarian milieu in regards

---

[23] http://www.forumfor.no/English/index.html

to how they relate to CSR. Thus, I created a foundation for exploring the topic closer and for creating the interview-guide I used while conducting interviews. I also got to speak to Jan Egeland. Egeland is the director of human rights watch in Europe and Asia, one of the world's leading independent organizations dedicated to defending and protecting human rights of people around the world[24]. He has also worked as the director of NUPI and as an advisor for the UN in regards to humanitarian crises. Since Egeland is an honor-professor at the University of Stavanger, I was fortunate enough to conduct two interviews with him. In January 2011 we discussed in an informal conversation how CSR can be explored in INGOs which contributed, in the same way as with Ørstavik, to create an understanding for the humanitarian world concept of CSR in INGOs. In April 2011, I had a second conversation with him, this time as an interview instead of an informal conversation. The interview gave me the opportunity to ask him some of the same questions that I had asked my informants in Red Cross, Save the Children, Norwegian Refugee Council and Norwegian People's Aid, which gave me a deeper understanding of the topic in order to answer the research questions.

In Red Cross, I interviewed Erling Kvernevik. He is a currently working as a senior adviser for Disaster Risk Reduction and Climate Change Adaptation. He has also worked as a Senior Adviser for Disaster Management at the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent and as the head of International & National Emergency Assistance at Norwegian Red Cross. Thus he has a lot of experience with international emergency- and disaster situations. The interview I had with him was conducted in Norwegian Red Cross' headquarters in Oslo and lasted for approximately one hour. In regards to Norwegian Refugee Council (NRC), I interviewed Oddhild Günther, who is a Senior advisor for strategic management support. Oddhild Günther has worked with humanitarian assistance for several years and has a lot of experience with the challenges INGOs meet when securing the rights of refugees. The interview was conducted in the headquarters of NRC in Oslo and lasted for about 45 minutes. In relation to Norwegian People's Aid (NPA), I interviewed Beate Thoresen at the headquarters of NPA in Oslo. The interview lasted for 60 minutes. Beate Thoresen is working as the leader for development at Norwegian People's Aid which means that she was familiar with the dilemmas of long term-development. This was my first interview, and I used this interview to elaborate in the interviews conducted later on. In Save the Children, I spoke

---

[24] http://www.hrw.org/en/about

with Svein Beksrud, who works as Emergency director at Save the Children in Norway. He is the Head of the Humanitarian Section in the International department and works, together with Save the Children International, with emergency responses, emergency preparedness and disaster risk reduction and mitigation. I was fortunate enough to get two interviews with Beksrud. The interviews were conducted at his house at Nesodden, and this made the setting quite relaxed which in turns I felt affected the interview in a positive manner.

4.3.1 A closer look at the interview process
As mentioned, I interviewed informants from four major INGOs in Norway; Save the Children, Red Cross, Norwegian Refugee Council and Norwegian People's Aid. Most of the interviews were conducted at the organizations' main quarter in Oslo, with the exception of Save the Children, where I conducted the interview at my informant's house. All the interviews where performed by using a semi-structured interview guide with open-ended questions. When not having too structured questions this can create a better communication between the interviewer and informants, and give a good flow in the interview process (Grønmo 2004). I experienced that this way of interviewing was the right choice for me, because it allowed the informants to answer more broadly which in turn allowed me to uncover arguments that I hadn't thought of**,** which was of importance because of the little research that exists in this field from before.

My interviews were what Andersen (2006) refers to as active informant-interviews, where the researcher has is an active participant in the interview process. I started all of my interviews with explaining the topic and the problem in order to make sure the informants understood the meaning behind writing the thesis. The rest of the interviews were more of a discussion and conversation between two parties where we exchanged opinions, than an interview where *I* asked questions and *they* answered. I mean that this contributed to that the informants (and I) became more aware of the topic and thus I was more likely to get truthful and thought trough answers. In most of my interviews, which lasted from 45-110 minutes, I used a tape recorder, and transcribed this after I was done conducting the interviews. This helped me to get all the details, even those I might otherwise have missed in the process. The transcriptions and interviews were done in Norwegian, but since this thesis is written in English, I needed to translate some parts in order to use quotes. Thus, the quotes translated in a way so they express the

opinion and meaning from the informants.

4.3 The Validity and reliability of the thesis

When using an abductive research strategy, there exists "*no definite criteria in which one can judge the validity of the research*" (Danemark, 1997: 134). Since the strategy in many aspects is based on the subjectivity of the researcher, in regards to that it involves imagination and creativity in order for the interpretations is being viewed in a new setting (Danemark, 1997), the most important for the researcher is to be transparent in regards to the thought-process.

This thesis is based on frameworks presented by Matten and Crane (2005) and Crane, Matten and Moon (2008) and Brummer (1991). The first two are conceptual frameworks that views corporations' role as administrators of citizen rights. Brummers (1991) consist of analysis of four different approaches to CSR. These frameworks are available for other researches to review. In regards to the interviews, as previously mentioned, they were conducted in an open, semi-structured way in order to get as much information as possible of INGOs role in administrating and fulfilling citizen rights. Even though I interviewed four organizations, and only one representative from each, this does not necessarily make the selection to small. As the four interviewed representatives all have worked for a long time with humanitarian assistance, and are key informants with significant knowledge about their field, they have provided me with important information in regards to administrating of citizen rights in INGOs. Also, this thesis is as mentioned two parted. The first part is descriptive and based on empirical interview data, the other is a theoretical discourse-analysis based on the findings from chapter five. As such, the foundation for looking at the role and responsibility of INGOs is based on both interviews and a theory-discussion.

By making my thought-process as transparent as possible I have contributed to the validity of the thesis. As a researcher, I cannot do much else than interpret the data I have gathered in what I consider to be the best way possible. However, as I have made my understanding of key concepts and the theoretical frameworks transparent, and explained the choices I have made along the way, I think that my interpretations can be regarded as valid and reliable. As it has been necessary to translate the interviews from oral Norwegian to written English, some words may have gotten 'lost in translation'.

However, as I used a tape-recorder in all interviews, I was able to listen to them several times, and placing the quotes in their setting. I mean that the above mentioned arguments have contributed to this thesis validity and reliability being satisfactory.

5. Findings and discussions; the role of INGOs in relation to citizen rights

---

"A basic problem with many of the western humanitarian organizations is that they become some sort of an alternative to the state".

Jan Egeland, Executive Director of Human Rights Watch's

Europe and central Asia Division

In today's world, being a citizen of any particular state will normatively entail a certain set of social-, civil- and political rights. Embedded in the notion of the individual citizens rights is the expectation that the State should be both the provider of these rights, as well as the guarantor that the rights are being upheld (Crane, Matten and Moon, 2008; Marshall, 1965). However, sometimes governments may lack either the resources, power *or* will to provide and fulfill these rights for their citizens. In severe cases, the international community may react – and may wish to intervene or intercede, and will in many cases turn to corporations and INGOs for assistance and/or support (Margolis and Walsh, 2005). Another reason why some of the responsibility for protecting citizenship (R2P) has shifted away from governments and over to i.e. INGOs is because globalization has resulted in several activities finding place outside of the nation state's power and influence (Matten and Crane, 2005). As a result of this, the state is no longer is the sole guarantor of citizen rights.

In this chapter I will look at the role INGOs play as in the area of citizen rights (social, civil, and political) when operating in crises-situations in foreign countries. To do this it is necessary to pick up the thread from chapter three and repeat the first research questions; *"what is the role of INGOs in regards to fulfilling citizen's social-, civil- and political rights in crisis'? Are they administrating citizen rights, and thereby becoming an alternative to the state?* In order to answer this question, I will use Matten & Cranes (2005) descriptive analysis of corporation's role in administrating rights as a framework to explore the role of INGOs. The analysis and discussion is also based on Crane, Matten and Moon (2008) and interviews with representatives from Save the Children Norway, the Norwegian RC, Norwegian People's Aid, and Norwegian Refugee Council (hereafter

referred to as StC, RC, NPA and NRC, respectively[25]. In the first part of the chapter, I explore in which situations INGOs provide for social-, civil- and political rights, respectively. Under each of these categories, I look closer at the different interviewed organizations, and which role they play in regards to administrating these rights. I also explore how the role of INGOs relates to the role of the state and how INGOs build on local capacities when fulfilling rights. The answers of chapter five will create the foundation for chapter six where I explore the responsibility of INGOs.

5.1 INGOs role as providers, enablers and channels for citizen rights

In order for a society to provide for it citizens rights it need to maintain their societal safety (be able to operate once negative situations have been manifested). However, when this is not the case and the government fails to protect the citizens, other actors (such as corporations and INGOs) might facilitate, protect and enable citizen rights (Matten & Crane 2005 and informants). As presented in chapter three, there are tree situations in the area of citizenship where state-governments role as sole guarantor of citizen rights is changing (Matten and Crane, 2005). These situations are; (i) when the government retreats and ceases to administer citizenship, (ii) when government has not yet administered citizenship rights and (iii) when the administrating of citizenship may be beyond the reach of the nation state. In the following section I will look at these categories to explore if INGOs participate in the administration of citizen rights.

The Government ceases to administer citizenship
A situation where the government ceases to administer citizenship entails for instance situations where the government is unable to provide for its citizens due to a natural disaster (Matten and Crane, 2005). This situation can occur when the government possesses few resources to begin with, and thereby it is not capable to contribute to the crises management, or when the government itself is affected by the crises and is rendered incapable to help its citizens. Natural disasters are usually sudden and the successfulness of crisis management often depends on how resilient a society is and how well the government has prepared to meet the crises (Kruke and Olsen, 2005). Resilience means "*the ability of a system, community or society exposed to hazards to resist, absorb, accommodate to and recover from the effects of a hazard in a timely and*

---

[25] In order to differentiate between the Norwegian Refugee Council (NRC) and the Norwegian Red Cross I have used the RC to represent the Norwegian Red Cross.

efficient manner" (UNISDR, 2009:25)[26]. As such, a community needs to be able to resist or adapt to the situation at hand to be able to manage it in a good way. However, poor societies are often predisposed to not being resilient due to a lack of resources:

> In general, catastrophes and wars strike the poorer part of the citizens for the simple reason that they cannot afford to build houses that are resilient or that they are given properties that are more exposed. [...]In Pakistan, when the flood came, who had the soilpatches that where closest to the river? It was the poor population. Because they could not afford to make the expensive irrigation systems with electric pumps, but was dependent on being able to drain the water into the fields to ensure irrigation of the crops. And then they were hit very, very hard" (Beksrud, Emergency Director at StC)

This indicates that the need for humanitarian assistance in natural disasters will be greatest in regards to poor communities, and that INGOs assistance will be mainly provided in situations where the society lacks resilience.

The situation of governments ceasing administration of citizenship can however also happen in armed conflicts such as civil wars. In these situations, the government who normally has been the actor in enabling or providing for citizen rights becomes unable or unwilling due to it for instance is a part of the conflict. This often results in refugees and IDPs, having the need for humanitarian assistance such as shelter, food and water.

The government has not yet administered citizenship
Governments who has not yet administered citizenship are often found in situations in developing countries where actors from the international society are expected to fill a vacuum that the nation-state is unable or unwilling to fill (Matten and Crane, 2005). In relations to INGOs, this situation might arise in countries with suppressive regimes or in countries with extreme poverty. Through my interviews, I saw that in these situations the INGOs provided assistance in order to fulfill social-, civil- and political rights in several situations. An example on this is the NRC who works with people who are refugees within their own country (Internally Displaced People, IDPs). IDPs have often become refugees by being driven from their land by government or oppressive regimes. In these situations NRC told me that their main objective is to secure the refugees right

---

[26] http://www.unisdr.org/eng/terminology/UNISDR-Terminology-English.pdf

to health and enable them to own property eventually. This shows that INGOs also becomes an actor in fulfilling rights in areas where the government not yet has administrated citizenship.

Administrating of citizenship may be beyond the reach of the nation state
When administrating citizenship goes beyond the reach of the nation state, governments are not able to administer rights in an efficient matter. This happens, according to Matten and Crane (2005) because some of the rights are associated to global entities such as the ozone layer or global markets. In regards to my thesis, I saw that this was not the most relevant situation in regards to INGOs. It was however, pointed out by Emergency director in StC, Svein Beksrud, that INGOs sometimes contribute to the rights of the individuals on a more international level. For instance, he told me about a situation where INGOs had been contributing to the making of a new constitutional law in Nepal, and where the Nepalese government presented it to the international community. This contributed to the Nepalese government feeling proud of the accomplishment, but also getting the government to explicitly say that they were committed in following the constitution themselves. The administrating of rights in this situation can also be related to the developing of standards for good conduct and human rights. Several INGOs are concerned with human rights issues and work in order to keep this challenge on the international agenda. This is something that for instance NPA does as they are often invited to political arenas to express their opinion (Beate Thoresen, leader of developmental politics). By doing this, INGOs might 'represent' citizens and governments in situations where they themselves might not be able to because it is out of their reach. The INGOs also work to create standards for responsible action (for instance UNGC).

The above mentioned arguments indicate that the three situations where corporations might contribute to the administrating of citizen rights also could be relevant for INGOs. In the following section, I will explore closer which of the rights NPA, StC, the Norwegian RC and NRC fulfill, and in what way. I will start with their role as providers of social rights and thereafter explore if they enable civil rights. Lastly, the role as a channel for political rights will be reviewed.

5.1.1 The role as providers of social rights

When the government ceases to administer these rights, humanitarian INGOs often steps in to fulfill the vacuum that arise, and meets the basic needs of the citizen's trough immediate healthcare, water and food distribution and shelter if that is needed. StC, NRC and RC all gives this kind of emergency aid, all though NRC only works with emergency aid when the crisis affect the area where they already have refugee camps. They do not, as opposed to StC and the Norwegian RC, go into crises hit areas with the sole purpose to give aid.

Save the children Norway (StC)

When it comes to StC, they first and foremost work with children in long- and short-term humanitarian crises. They work with providing education, protection, food water and shelter. According to StC, children are the most vulnerable victims when disaster occurs, and over 60 million children are caught up in emergencies every year. StC have been in over 30 countries the last year, among this we find Vietnam, Afghanistan, Gaza, Democratic republic of Congo, Pakistan, India, Sudan, Chile, Kenya, Myanmar, Niger, Sri Lanka and Haiti.[27] The providing of social rights is materialized concretely by distributing food and water or giving children a place to live. My informant at StC told that providing emergency aid is something they are well prepared on; "*Most times we come in with food and water, medicine, and of course, if it is needed, shelter in one form or another. This is things we have prepared in advance and it is ready to go out. A part of this equipment is already in stocks around the world and can be sent out on very, very short notice*". In Haiti, they distributed food, clean water and shelter supplies and they also ran mobile health clinics. But StC's humanitarian assistance regarding situations where the government ceases or retreats from providing social rights does not only mean providing emergency aid in natural disasters. Beksrud also told me about a situation in Kosovo, where the United Nation and representatives from several humanitarian organizations had provided locals with emergency-aid. Another important task StC has is giving children under eighteen a possibility to go to school when this is not offered by the government. This is considered a cultural right. In Sudan, StC, are providing education, food security and child protection to approximately 150 000 young and children and in Haiti they have given scholarships so children can stay in school;

---

[27] http://www.reddbarna.no/vaart-arbeid/barns-rettigheter/slik-jobber-vi-med-barnekonvensjonen

Education and the understanding of a situation [...] is essential for a democratic development and for protection of rights, of human rights and especially children's rights.

The Norwegian Red Cross (RC)

RC and Red Crescent is the largest humanitarian organization in the world and they work mainly through national organizations in over 186 countries. They work in four main areas in their international operations. The first one is concerned with the developing of the sister-organizations, and training them in regards to international laws, routines, democratic leadership, finances and accounting. Secondly, they work with health, water, sanitary, *thirdly* with disaster reduction, risks management and preparation and lastly with emergency response in crises.

In relation to social rights, RC works with health trough providing water, sanitary conditions, first aid and vaccinations and information regarding hygiene and deceases such as Malaria and HIV/Aids. They also give emergency aid in natural disasters or armed conflicts through field hospitals, health clinics, food and shelter. Health is one of RCs main areas because of failing healthcare in countries creates a situation where many citizens no longer have access to treatment and medicines. In my interview with Erling Kvernevik, senior advisor for Disaster Risk Reduction and Climate Change Adaptation, he pointed out that RC only take over the responsibility of the state as a last resort. He referred to this situation as substitution, where they:

> replace the states or publics responsibility for a certain service. But that is the last thing we do. Call it the last resort. In some situations where [...] healthcare doesn't work at all, and we see a desperate need for medical care, the Red Cross can go in and take over or finance a hospital, or support it in another way. But that's the last thing we do. Because we know that if we do this, it's extremely hard to get out of it again. And that is a responsibility one must be very aware of.

This shows that also RC has taken over some of the responsibility of the government when it comes to healthcare, but as they say, only as a last resort

Norwegian Refugee Council (NRC)

As mentioned earlier, The NRC provides emergency aid only in situations where they

already have refugee camps. However, my informant Oddhild Günther, special advisor at the NRC, told me that they provide long term-aid and have five specialties; (i) Education for children in war or war-like circumstances, (ii) food-security, (iii) shelter, (iv) running refugee camps and giving out food to internally displaced people (IDPs) or refugees that has fled from their own country, and (v) trough running Information, Counseling and Legal Aid (ICLA). ICLA is a specialty where they contribute to refugees return to their property and/or give them new identification papers. The first three might be considered to be social rights, whilst the latter two might be more of civil/political rights, and will be discussed later on. In my interview with Günther, she told me that they work with a mandate to protect and promote rights for refugees. The first category Günther mentioned; education for refugees, IDPs and returnees, is considered a social right. The reason why they provide education is partially because it will facilitate access to basic education and training, and partially because it becomes a protection tool in giving information regarding to conflict management, human rights and reconciliation and peace building (Norwegian Refugee Councils Education policy).

Another social right NRC provides regards food and water. She told me that when the flood hit Pakistan in July of and their refugee camp was affected, they experienced that women did not come to the place where they were distributing food. They found out that this was due to cultural reasons; it wasn't allowed for women to go there when they were not accompanied by men. Thus they had to find a way to get food to those who had no men to send. In answer to how they solved this, she answered that; "*we can do this in many ways. One way is that we find someone who can accompany the women or another way is that we make sure the food gets closer to other things that they are allowed to get".* This shows how important it is, in crises situations, that the INGOs are well aware of the cultural and social context in the country they operate.

Norwegian People's Aid (NPA)
The NPA's relation when it comes to providing for citizens social rights is somewhat different from the three humanitarian organizations mentioned above. Whilst RC, StC and NRC provide for social rights directly through their organization as well as through partner organizations, NPA usually work trough partner organizations, and they have gone from doing operational projects themselves to being a partner organization and thus; " *changed [their] role essential".* Thoresen told me that they don't work with social

rights directly or service delivery as she referred to it, but believes that the right way to secure citizens social rights is by working with civil and political rights;

> we're concerned with equal distribution, so we want the government to conduct a
> fair distribution policy so that people can fulfill their social and economic rights. But
> we see political and civil rights as fundamental to be able to do that. Everything runs
> through political decisions [and] if you haven't got the political will to implement
> something, nothing will actually be done

In that way, NPA does not work with social rights directly, but more indirectly trough strengthening citizen's civil and political rights.

Providing for social rights in INGOs?
Thus, I can conclude with that StC and RC provides citizens with some of their social rights in situations where the government does not fulfill this responsibility. In relation to NRC, they only give emergency aid in situations where they already are in the area, but they do however provide refugees with healthcare, education, food, water and shelter in situations of wars between nations or civil wars. When it comes to NPA, their work is mostly done trough partnership-organizations, and thus they do not provide social rights directly, but indirectly trough financially supporting partners such as local NGOs, women-movements, farmers, and so on.

5.1.2 The role as enablers of civil rights
The civil rights include as mentioned in chapter four protecting the freedom of speech, the right to own property, and the security of the individual. When it comes to situations where actors enable civil rights when government has not yet administered citizenship, this is most relevant in developing countries (Matten and Crane, 2005). However, in a crises situation such as the earthquake in Japan, many people were left without a home and the fulfilling of the right to property can thus be an issue when the state ceases to administer rights. Matten and Crane (2005) also argues that civil rights might be partially offset by corporate action when they are already active in the territory. This is often the case with the INGOs because most of them have partner-organizations that already are active in the country. Especially the NPA tells about this in the interview; that they work with enabling civil rights through their partners. However, even though

they work in different ways, all the International humanitarian organizations I interviewed do something to enable the civil rights of citizens,

Norwegian Refugee Council (NRC)

NRC is one of the organizations where their specialty is concerned with enabling the right to property. They assist, through their work at ICLA, refugees and IDPs with Information, Counseling and Legal Assistance so that they can fulfill for example the right to property. They also construct homes for refugees who have returned to their country, but that have no homes. This is due to that *"Refugees and IDPs face legal obstruction, abuse, discrimination [and the] lack of access to housing and property, to legal identity, or discrimination in accessing labour or education rights, constitute frequent legal obstacles to durable solutions[28]".* In this statement one can see that they also work with social rights such as education through the ICLA-program. However, in relation to civil rights, Günter told me that the NRC usually starts working with one individual at a time. Through the individual cases they often see patterns that they use when they work in a larger scale, with rights education and in influencing the government. She also tells me that their organization works with providing new identification-papers to those who lose them when they have to run from their home.

> Right now we are in Uganda, and the conflict is mostly over, but there are still people who have lived in crowded camps for a long time and there has happened a lot with their land in the meantime. Some of them have stayed in the camps longer than others, and they are worse off than others. Then we go in with legal aid to see if there are anyone of those less fortunate who needs help to maintain their rights, and if they can get access to property. And also in Palestine, we have legal aid that regards the right to property. Everyone knows how they lose their land to settlers and becomes displaced.

Regarding discrimination between men and women, the NRC don't explicitly say that they work for equality, but when they give assistance to refugees they take into consideration that men and women might have different needs and that the cultural contexts they work in means different approaches. This shows that NRC works to enable civil rights for refugees and Internally Displaced People (IDPs), especially when it comes to the right to property.

---

[28] http://www.nrc.no/?did=9221023

Save the Children Norway (StC)

StC on the other hand, do not work so much with rights to property. They do however work with protection of children in war and disasters. And also, their work involves securing that children are not discriminated because of religion or belief. Beksrud told me that he was working for Danish Refugee Council in Georgia in 2008 in relation to the war between Georgia and the breakaway republic Abkhazia. The republic wanted the organization to renovate schools and to do something to keep the children from dropping out of school, but the authorities only wanted them to work with specific schools where the majority was Abkhazians. Beksrud told me in relation to this that they met a dilemma in protecting the rights of minorities in that area (Georgians), and that "*they wanted only Abkhazian to be used and that Georgic should not be accepted. So when we said we wanted to protect minorities and their right to receive education in their primary language it was quite controversial. I could get a call from the Minister of Education and be yelled at. And that happened".* This shows that enabling for civil rights such as freedom from discrimination can be quite challenging because the organizations become drawn between the need for cooperation with the government on one hand, and the need to protect civil rights on the other hand: "*it's terrible, really hard, and I've twisted in my chair a few times because I cannot say anything".* He did however also explain that this is mostly the case when there are cameras involved, and that "*in a more relaxed atmosphere we can sit and laugh a little and be a bit more relaxed [...] I've had many pleasant conversations with the refugee minister in Georgia where we can sit and laugh and smile".*

Norwegian People's Aid (NPA)

In question regarding if NPA contribute to enabling civil rights, Thoresen answered that "*Yes I would say that. In many situations we are one of those contributing to that you can actually practice it [civilian rights] trough for instance developing organizations that can help to develop society as a whole".* As mentioned earlier, the NPA does not operate directly with the people in need. They do however work with rights promoting activities and training of different organizations that already are located in the community. Trough this work they teach for example woman-organizations, organizations working for the indigenous population, or more professional NGOs how to defend their civil rights

We've had some cases where people have been evicted from the land they either have lived on or grown crops at. Then we show them how they can defend their rights in order to either get compensation or another soil. [This is partially done] through funding, […] it can go to rights education, or it can be used to help ensure that the organizations actually operate in good way.

The Norwegian Red Cross (RC)

When it comes to the RC, they work from a need-based approach. Hence, they enter countries when they see that there exists a need which they can fill through their operations. Kvernevik explains that ensuring the rights of people affected by crises is one of the most important aspects of RCs work. This entails that RC work towards governments and states in to get them to provide soldiers and civilians a worthy treatment. In a question how they work to ensure this, he informs me that they work through what they call humanitarian diplomacy, which means that RC guard the state-government through reminding authorities of their legal obligations warranted in the Geneva conventions. He draws on an example of the situation in Abu Gharib where RC had been in conversations with the government for some time before the situation leaked to the press. Here RC had called attention to the Geneva Conventions and the government's obligation to protect war prisoners from being tortured and abused. The RC also works with protecting civilians from mines trough increasing the society's safety and resilience in vulnerable areas. They further give victims support and acts as a driving force in national and international processes to make sure war do not affect civilians randomly. Thus, the RC participates in enabling civil rights such as the freedom from abuses. RC does not however work to enable the freedom of speech or the right to property, so in this regard RCs activities are different from the above mentioned organizations.

Enabling civil rights in INGOs?

Enabling for civil rights in crises-situations vary in relation to which of the organizations reviewed. In regards to NRC, one of their main objectives is to contribute to refugees' possibility to have somewhere to live. They also work toward the host-government in order to enable this and give new identification papers to those who have lost this. I thereby argue that NRC, in certain aspects of their activities, works with enabling civil rights. As for StC, they do not work with enabling right to property, but rather through protecting civil rights such as non-discrimination and the security of the individual

(worthy treatment and protection against torture and mines). NPA was the organization who was most explicit in saying that they enabled for civil rights to be executed. However, as with the social rights, they work more indirect through their partner organizations. As such, I conclude that all the interviewed INGOs in one way or another contributes to the enabling of civil rights.

5.1.3 The role as channel of political rights

Political rights include for instance, as mentioned in chapter four, the right to join a union, to vote and participate in public matters trough the right to hold office. These rights are based on the idea of democratic societies, where the public participate in deciding what is best for the country through democratically elected officials. In relation to corporations, Matten and Crane (2005) argues that corporations play a more indirect role when it comes to political rights, and that they perform as a channel trough facilitating, enabling or block certain political processes. They do not directly take over the government's role, but rather play a part in the political arena through lobbying and party funding. In regards to INGOs party funding is not relevant, due to the organizations principle of being neutral. However, in regards to being a part of a political arena being a channel for political rights can be mostly relevant.

Norwegian People's Aid (NPA)

The NPA main objective is to teach and train their partner-organizations so that they can be able to protect their rights. Their philosophical foundation is to work for equitable distribution of power and recourses through influencing political decisions and changes. In regards to lobbying they

> do not go into a country and lobby for political rights in, but work with
> organizations that do. For us, the right to organize is very central, but that is often
> something one doesn't consider when one think about political rights. [...]But it is a
> very central right and we try to promote it through influencing Norwegian [foreign]
> policy" (Thoresen).

In light of Matten and Cranes (2005) perspective on being a part of the political arena, one can see that this is relevant at the NPA. Thoresen also explains that a fundamental idea they work with is that it is necessary to have strong organizations in society to be

able to make political changes and that they are *"concerned with establishing political and civil rights, but also giving the citizens a possibility to exercise their rights* [and that] *we want to promote democratization, especially in regards to the right to organize and the right to participation"*. Thus, there can be little doubt that NPA works with political rights. However, in regard to whether the organization perform as a *channel* for political rights or not, the answer from Thoresen is more nuanced. Even though she says that "*we are a political actor in Norway who influence political processes,*" she also state that they are not working towards the host-governments in relation to enabling rights, but only through their partner-organizations. Thoresen considers one of their main objectives is that the state in the end takes the responsibility to protect citizen rights, and in order to make this happen, the education and funding of partner-organizations is the most effective tool. So in a way, one might say that NPA is a channel for political rights in the way that they help their partners to be aware of their rights and teach them how to influence the political sphere in their own country.

Norwegian Refugee Council (NRC)

Through their spokesman-work the NRC sees to that the voice of refugees IDPs are being heard. When one become a refugee or internally displaced, one might lose a lot of one's rights as a citizen. However, the whole refugee law and IDP Guidelines are based on Human Rights, which mean that the rules regarding their entitlement to vote still applies. In question regarding if NRC is a channel to promote political rights towards local authorities, Günther answers

> We are absolute behind the Human Rights declaration, but there are many things
> that must be taken into consideration. The most important consideration is that one
> must be careful not to step on the toes of the authorities to that extent that we are
> not allowed to work there anymore. But we place ourselves quite close to the line

Regarding political rights, Günther also mentions the security of the refugee or IDPs. In relation to the refugees; people who have fled from their own country, the responsibility of protecting individual rights are transferred to whatever country they have fled to.

However, according to reports on Internal Displaced People (IDPs), refugees do not have this protection. Because they are refugees within their own country, they are not

protected by the law for refugees. This makes, according to NRC, the IDPs more exposed to violations from the nation-state government;

> It is clear that we enter and cover the basic needs of a population that should have had this covered through their citizenship. Or at least that the state should have been providing for their safety so they could cultivate the land, work or stay safely where they belong. When people have to flee, […] there are some needs that must be covered. The state might not have the responsibility to meet these needs, but the government has the responsibility to provide for their security - they are not able to do it themselves.

In these situations the NRC protects their rights through their spokesman-work towards the government.

Save the Children Norway (StC) and the Norwegian Red Cross (RC)
When it comes to StC and RC they work little with the political rights of citizens. In regards to StC the reason why is because several of the political rights do not come into question before one turns at least 18 and the objectives to StC is working with children under that age. However, even though they are not a channel for political rights, Beksrud told me about a situation in Abkhazia where they were asked to take a political stand. They had been asked to officially support the breakaway republic Abkhasia, and

> [They] repeatedly tried to get me to say that we recognize their authority and that we are working with them because they are the true representatives of the authorities in that area. That cannot be done. Then we will be thrown out of Georgia by the host government where we are.

The above quotation attaches focus on a dilemma that many INGOs meet in crises; when can they speak up without risking that it has consequences for their operations, and risking being kicked out. In regards to RC, they have a strong mandate of being neutral in a war- or crisis situation. Their main objective is also to protect civilians in war or conflict, and thereby they sometimes experience a dilemma between speaking up to protect or be careful with what they say in order to stay neutral. However, as Kvernevik mentioned, the RCS mandate is also to be a guardian in regards to the Geneva Convention. They often point it out when the convention has been breached, usually

outside of the public eye in order to make sure they are not thrown out of the area.

Channeling political rights through INGOs?

I have shown that StC and RC rarely function as a channel for political rights. However, by working in order to influence Norwegian foreign policies and in training partner organizations how to gain influence in the political sphere in their country, this is not the case with NPA. Neither is it the situation with NRC, who through spokesman-work in regards to the promotion of human rights and the refugee-law places the rights of refugees on the international agenda. Since both NRC and NPA knows what the needs are in the field, and thereby are included in the political sphere when debating on subjects concerning political rights, they perform as channels for political rights. When beneficiaries' needs and situations are presented trough INGOs, this places their situation on the political agenda, and makes the INGOs a channel for the information.

5.1.4 Building on local capacities when providing humanitarian assistance

When providing humanitarian assistance, INGOs are expected to involve local capacities in order to build more resilient societies and reduce the likelihood of doing harm (Anderson, 1999; Murshed, 2004, CoC). All the interviewed organizations saw their activities as contributing to a better society. For instance, Thoresen in NPA told me that; *our core-activities are performed in order to contribute to a better society. […]This makes it important how we perform our activities, so it does not get negative consequences".* In order to limit negative consequences of their activities, and thereby contribute to a better society, Anderson (1999) holds that INGOs must build on local capacities. Kvernevik from RC pointed out that

> It is the ideal that we, in an emergency situation, involve locals, but the procedures are often followed automatically. For instance, in an earthquake, we already know the phases of the emergency relief; first there is search and rescue, and then it is water, food and shelter. We have so much experience with these situations that we can establish the sequences and what to do beforehand

This shows that RC in emergency situations often does not involve locals in the initial response even though this is the ideal. This was also argued by Beksrud from StC; the inclusion of locals is often set aside because of the pressingly need to give out aid as

quickly as possible. He argued further that this is an aspect INGOs need to be better at. If they include locals immediately when they enter an area, the humanitarian assistance might be more effective and sustainable. However, when it comes to the long-term assistance, the INGOs strive to involve locals in the decision-making. Especially NPA, who by working trough partner-organizations involves the local community and local organizations when they give aid. Also RC informed me that they, in long term assistance, always thinks about how to retreat from the country without doing harm, and that building on local capacities can facilitate easier transition to a national or local takeover.

Andersons (1999) also claims that aid given in conflict can reinforce and prolong the conflict (do harm), but it can also reduce tensions and strengthen people's ability to find peaceful solutions and disengage fighting (do less harm). In order to do less harm, the INGOs must know of the context and culture that exists in the society where they are providing aid. Kvernevik spoke of the preparations in order to get to know the community before they enter crises-situations;

> When we are working in a disaster, there has already been done an assessment
> analysis of what the humanitarian needs are; water, health, etc. This is performed
> by voluntaries that already are in the area, so we are counting on that they have
> uncovered society's needs. However, there is an ongoing discussion regarding if
> we are actually managing to include those who know what the needs are.

Kverneviks comment shows that even with the best intentions, it isn't always easy to meet the expectations and the needs of society due to time-pressure. This means that INGOs need to be able to adapt to unexpected situations. An example of this was given to me by Beksrud from StC. In Kosovo, where the INGO knew much about the situation, they still needed to adapt. Due to time-pressure when handing out food, they were not able to stay in the area to make sure the aid was given to the right people (and thereby ensure aid not causing harm). However, by simply asking the locals what the most efficient way would be, they were told to give the aid to the elder men, who would distribute it forward to those who needed the help the most.

5.1.4 The role of the state and the role of the INGOs

When INGOs provide humanitarian assistance in crises areas, they do so in order to fill a vacuum that the state is unwilling or unable to fill. As explained in chapter two, it is the state's primary role and responsibility to provide for its citizens. However, in situations where this role is not being played out and the responsibility not taken, INGOs step in. All the interviewed INGOs explained that securing citizen rights is only supposed to be a temporary solution and that the INGOs are not supposed to take over governmental roles in the long-run. As Kvernevik from RC pointed out,

> It is important to take into consideration that this is only a temporary solution. It is the responsibility of the INGOs to make sure that the local community or government is prepared to take over when humanitarian organizations retreats. They are not supposed to be there forever. That said, INGOs often stay in crises-hit areas for a very long time.

This statement places a focus on that INGOs role in crises-hit areas often last longer then they want it to, despite the awareness of them being a temporary solution. NPA argue that their assistance is a mix of filling an urgent vacuum, and of being aware that their main objective is to make sure that the state manages to provide for citizens rights. Thoresen also says that:

> It is important to separate between who holds the responsibility to be a guarantor of the rights, and those who can contribute to fulfill the rights [...] Even though the state in many aspects has become less sovereign, I do not think there exists any other institutions who can carry that obligation. [...]We cannot take over the responsibility, but we can help to pressure the state to take one. [...] We can contribute to the right and possibility to organize by working together with partner-organizations, but we cannot take over the responsibility of the state.

Thoresen thereby argues that INGOs can *contribute* to the fulfilling of rights, but that they in no situations should become the *guarantor* of them. This shows that, while the INGOs might take over some of the state's role in periods of time, their opinion is that the final responsibility lies with the state and should not be transferred to other

organizations or institutions.

5.2 INGOs role as administrators of rights

My intention with this chapter has been to explore the role of INGOs when they provide assistance in situations where the government, for some reason, is not fulfilling the rights of its citizens. In order to do this, I presented the following research question in the beginning of the chapter; what is the role of INGOs in crises' when it comes to the fulfillment of social-, civil- and political rights of the individual? Are they administrating citizen rights, and thereby becoming an alternative to the state? In the above discussion I have demonstrated how INGOs have become actors who play important roles in humanitarian crises. I have also shown that this role varies according to the situations they are confronted with, and differ in relation to the INGOs objectives. In regards to the NRC, who works with refugees and IDPs, their core-activities involved education, food and water, constructing homes and schools, running refugee-camps and information and legal counseling (ICLA). This means that they are providing social, enabling civil and performing as a channel for political rights. As for NPA, they work mostly with supporting partner-organizations in order to make them more able to protect and carry out their civil and political rights. However, by doing this, NPA also creates a foundation for the social rights (Thoresen). As for StC and RC, I argued that they did not perform as a channel for the fulfillment of political rights. They did however, through providing food, protection, water and shelter for children (StC), civilians and soldiers (RC). Thus, I argue that NRC, StC, RC and NPA, with the above mentioned variations, provides, enables and/or act as a channel for social-, civil- and political rights, respectively. Thereby I conclude with that INGOs have become administrators of citizen rights, although they explicitly argue that they are not to do this for ever. They are also explicit in that they are not to take over the role of the state. However, when these organizations operate in foreign countries over many years, as most of them do, they will inevitably become a part of the society. Even though they are not taking over the state's role and responsibility as being the primary guarantor of citizenship, they have most certain become an alternative to the state. This is because when the rights are not being administrated and a vacuum occurs; the INGOs step in to fill it. Even though INGOs do not replace governments completely, they take on some of the roles and responsibilities previously assigned to governments, and consequently becoming an alternative to the state.

As such, the role INGOs play when providing humanitarian assistance is quite significant. They are very aware of this role, and by including locals and working towards the state, they try to do as little harm as possible and make sure the humanitarian assistance do not become a permanent solution. As this analysis has show, the role INGOs have in administrating social-, civil- and political rights makes the conceptual framework of corporations role presented by Matten and Crane (2005) 'transferrable' to INGOs. Thus, the notion of exploring their responsibility in a CSR perspective also becomes relevant. In the next chapter I therefore tie the concept of CSR to INGOs by exploring what the social responsibility of INGOs is in relation to four different perspectives of CSR; the classical- , the stakeholder-, the social demandingness- and the social activist perspective.

6. Discussion; Exploring Social responsibility in INGOs

INGOs that enter conflict areas of areas struck by natural crises play a pivotal role in society as they fulfill social-, civil- and/or political rights. Through providing health supplies, education, food, and water for citizens and refugees (social rights) they have in many aspects become an alternative to a non-functioning welfare state. When enabling for civil rights, this is primarily done by enabling refugees' right to own property (Norwegian Refugee Council), by securing antidiscrimination of children (Save the Children), teaching locals how to defend civil rights on their own (Norwegian People's Aid), and secure freedom from abuses of war-prisoners and civilians (Red Cross). As for being a channel to promote political rights, this is done primarily by lobbying and influence national and international policies (Norwegian Refugee Council and Norwegian People's Aid). Thus, even though INGOs do not wish to be an alternative to the state in the long run, INGOs do in several situations take over the role and responsibility primarily "belonging" to the state.

The role INGOs have in the area of citizenship indicates that there is necessary to explore INGOs social responsibility when providing humanitarian assistance. In relation to the using the term CSR to explore what kind of responsibility the organizations carry, this question is one with no obvious or easy answer. It is however, an important question that needs to be closer addressed. If corporations are to have a CSR when playing the role as administrators of rights, this might be the case for INGOs as well. This chapter therefore explores the question presented in chapter three; *"Given that INGOs play a pivotal role in regards to fulfilling citizen rights through humanitarian assistance, what is their classical-, stakeholder-, social demandingness- or social activist responsibility?*

The meaning of CSR varies according to the perspective one has, and the four perspectives presented in the research question have different implications for INGOs responsibility (Brummer, 1991). The following sections thereby consist of a discussion of each perspective (classical, stakeholder, social demandingness and social activist) in regards to the role of INGOs as administrators of rights in humanitarian crises'.

6.1. The Classic perspective; doing business as usual?

When viewing the social responsibility of corporations in a classical way, the primary responsibility is to that of its shareholders (Freeman, 1970). Business activities are seen as separate from all other spheres in society, and corporations have no moral or ethical responsibilities to society (this is the responsibility of other institutions). This means that their responsibility is limited to provide goods and services for customers in a way that creates dividend to give to the shareholders.

If INGOs have a classical way of viewing their responsibility this means that as long as INGOs are performing their core-activities, this will contribute to a better society. Where there are negative consequences of their actions, this does not concern them, but is the responsibility of other institutions of society (such as the state). Thus, the moral and ethical responsibilities in INGOs are non-existing. In a classical perspective, INGOs will only have a responsibility towards its 'shareholders'[29] and they will be separate from all other spheres in society. In the following section I explore whether or not this is the case in order to see if INGOs have an explicit classical responsibility.

6.1.1 Is the administrating of citizen rights INGOs core activity?

By looking at INGOs responsibility in a classical way, this would mean that they only are to perform their core activities. As outlined in chapter five, the core activities of INGOs will vary between the organizations. Whilst NRC worked with educational programs, distribution of food and non-food, shelter-activities (constructing homes and schools), refugee camps and information work (ICLA), NPA's core activities included the support of partner-organizations through funding and rights-education in order to enable their partners to work for a just distribution of power and recourses. Save the Children's core activities was providing education, protection, food, water and shelter for children and the Red Cross educated sister-organizations (in aspects of law, democracy and finances), provided health, food, water, and sanitary, and worked with disaster reduction and emergency response. The INGOs administration of rights was done trough performing the above mentioned activities and that this contributed to a better society even though the primary responsibility of fulfilling these rights belonged to the state. As such, this is an indication of INGOs having a responsibility in the classical perspective.

Another characteristic of the classical way of viewing the responsibility of INGOs

---

[29] See 6.1.3

involves that they do not have a responsibility to consider the impacts of their core activities. This would mean that as long as for instance Save the Children provides children with education, protection, food, water and shelter, any other consequences of their activities is not their responsibility. The notion of 'doing less harm' disappears. However, as argued in chapter two, aid can have both negative and positive consequences. Today, rather than seeing aid as always neutral and exclusively positive, the impacts of aid (negative and positive) is a well discussed phenomenon[30]. Also, the INGOs that were administrating social, civil and political rights were very aware of the implications their assistance could have, and took several measures in order to prevent any negative consequences (such as involving locals, performing needs assessments). They also regarded themselves as actors who were in many ways interlinked with other spheres in society, with political influence and economic effects at the societies at hand. As such, since the INGOs are considering the possible positive and negative effects of their core-activities, and are interlinked with other spheres society, their responsibility is not that of a classical perspective.

6.1.1 The shareholder dividend of INGOs

Since one of the main points in the classical perspective includes that the primary responsibility of business is to create profit for its shareholders (Friedman, 1970; Melè, 2008), the classical perspective is not a perspective that can easily be seen regards to INGOs. When one talks about shares, stocks and dividend, one is usually talking about profit-seeking corporations. As INGOs by definition are non-profit seeking organizations, it can be difficult to see that they have shareholders to give dividend to. However, even though one refers to INGOs as non- profit organizations, this does not necessarily mean that they do not have a focus on the "bottom-line" or that they don't have any shareholders. In INGOs the bottom line can reflect the demands of for instance donors such as NORAD, Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA) or the general public instead of economic, quantitative profit. The difference between the ones who buy shares in a company and the ones who donate money to INGOs might not be as distinct as one think initially. When people or governments donate money to the organizations they might expect something in return; one form of *dividends*. In INGOs the dividend will not be handed out as economic profit, but rather by giving the donors a feeling of investing in a

---

[30] For discussions of the dependency aid creates (or not), macro- and microeconomic impacts of relief, the way aid can enhance war or peace, See Knack, 2001; White, 1992a, 1992b; Mosley, 1987: Anderson, 1999; Harvey and Lind, 2005.

"good cause" or in order to "give something back". For NORAD and MFA dividend can mean that they want to gain a positive reputation in the international aid-milieu or in the UN, by appearing as someone with a political will to provide aid and contribute to development. For the general public dividend can mean reading about the good causes they have donated money to in the newspaper. As such, giving out dividends might also be a responsibility in INGOs. However, in the classical perspective, the giving out dividends is seen as the *primary* responsibility of corporations. When talking about INGOs, it can hardly be argued that their primary responsibility is to perform their activities in order to give the donor-government a good reputation, or to give the public a good feeling for donating money to a good cause. As such, in regards to the aspect of dividend and the primary responsibility towards its shareholders, I argue that the INGOs do not have a classical responsibility.

6.1.3 INGOs with a classical responsibility?

When INGOs have a role in administrating social-, civil- and/or political rights and these activities are their core-activities, it could indicate a classical responsibility. However, as I have argued, the classical perspective presupposes that the core-activity is performed with only a responsibility to the 'shareholders' whilst obeying the law and without any responsibilities to consider negative impacts of their actions. Having a classical view would entail that INGOs are not responsible of upholding decent working conditions for the locals they hire, for to cooperating with host-governments, the UN, or other aid-agencies. As such, when the INGOs explicitly have said that they consider positive and negative impacts of aid, it cannot be argued that their responsibility is a classical one. Even though they argue that the state has the primary responsibility to protect its citizens, they do not disregard their responsibility as actors with a social and economic influence. By suggesting that INGOs have a classical CSR, I would remove many of the responsibilities the organizations themselves have argued that they should have. Therefore I conclude that the administrating of rights is not a social responsibility in the classical term, and INGOs do not have an explicit classical social responsibility.

6. 2 The Stakeholder Perspective; Power, Legitimacy and/or Urgency.

The stakeholder perspective goes beyond the classical perspective in the way that it includes a responsibility to other actors than the shareholders, and the motives must be more then legal or economic. In this perspective the corporations have a responsibility

to make sure stakeholders are able to carry out their distinct stakeholder roles or functions (Brummer, 1991). As argued in the theory chapter, the stakeholders need to hold two or more attributes (power, legitimacy, urgency) in order to be prioritized by corporations. Whilst the *definitive* stakeholder (holds all attributes) is guaranteed influence, the *dominant* stakeholder (legitimacy and power) has more influence in the corporation then the *dependent* (legitimacy and urgency) or *dangerous* (power and urgency) stakeholders (Mitchell, Agle and Wood, 1997).

If INGOs have a stakeholder responsibility, this means that the stakeholders who are definitive stakeholders have a substantial influence in the INGOs decision-making process. It also means that stakeholders with power and legitimacy will be prioritized over others. In order for INGOs to have a social responsibility in the stakeholder perspective, their role in administrating rights must contribute to making stakeholders able to carry out their stakeholder roles or functions.

To explore if INGOs have a stakeholder-responsibility, it is necessary to discuss what attributes the stakeholders hold and I limit the number of stakeholders to mainly host-government[31], donor-government and beneficiaries. Even though the UN, competing INGOs, the military and warlords might have the attributes of power, legitimacy or urgency, their claims as stakeholders will be more indirect. As for beneficiaries, they are the INGOs raisôn d'etre. They are directly affected by the decisions made because they are the ones receiving the humanitarian assistance. The donor-governments finance the INGOs operations, and even though they might not be directly affected of INGOs decisions[32], they affect how much money the INGOs receive. In regards to cooperative host-governments, they are seen as stakeholder of INGOs because they are actors INGOs need to cooperate in crises-situations. Even though INGOs can enter the country without permission from the host government[33], non-cooperative host-governments can make it difficult for INGOs to conduct their activities. The next section presents a discussion on each attribute (power, legitimacy and urgency) in regards to beneficiaries, donor-governments, and host-government.

---

[31] Non-cooperative and cooperative host-governments. By Non-cooperative I mean governments who are unwilling to provide for its citizens, and by coperative I mean governments who are unable, but willing.
[32] They might be indirectly affected through media;
[33] See chapter 2.4.1 and the right to give humanitarian assistance without the consent of the state.

6.2.1 Actors with power

Mitchell, Agle and Wood (1997) describes a stakeholder with power as (i) someone who can be coercive based on physical resources of force, (ii) someone who have great material or financial resources or (iii) someone who can contribute through symbolic resources such as prestige, esteem, acceptance. The first category, *coercive trough force,* can be related to soldiers[34] who want to control aid resources since it represent economic wealth and political power. For instance, Anderson (1999) tells about an aid worker who experienced the challenge of getting through areas in order to reach the beneficiaries

> because we have to cross the border controlled by one faction to reach one of the
> groups we serve, some of our aid supplies are routinely taken by the soldiers at the
> crossing. This distresses us because we know these things are being sold to buy
> weapons or to feed soldiers" (Anderson, 1999: 38)

Also non-cooperative host-governments can affect INGOs activities. An example of this was told to me by Günther in Norwegian Refugee Council: they were thrown out of Sudan because they publicly criticized the unbearable conditions for the citizens. In this situation the host government used force to get them out, and thus the Sudanese government could be seen as a stakeholder with the attribute of power.

In relation to actors who have significant financial recourses, the second way a stakeholder can gain the attribute of power; this can be seen in relation to donor governments of INGOs. The Norwegian governments gives around 27 billion Norwegian kroner every year towards 10 000 different developing activities over the world, which means that the allocation of aid is an important part of Norwegian policies (Lie, 2006). During my research I found that all of the interviewed organizations are being funded by the Norwegian government, either through MSF or Norad. Save the Children for instance, received 35, 5 % of their total funding from the Norwegian government in 2009. In regards to NRC, Günter told me that *"We receive money to reach certain goals, or we apply for money to certain areas. And through that, I would say that the government has power in relation to that they can choose to pay for whatever they want and not give money to what they don't want to support".* NRC received a total of 57 % of their total

---

[34] Soldiers of hostile host governments and rebellion groups

finances from Norwegian donors in 2008, whilst the numbers for the Norwegian Red Cross was 41, 8 % in 2010 and 69 % for Norwegian People's Aid in 2009. As this represents a significant part of the INGOs funding[35] it is quite clear that the Norwegian government can be counted as a powerful stakeholder due to a financial position.

The third way an actor can become a stakeholder of power is by contributing through symbolic resources such as prestige, esteem or acceptance (Mitchell, Agle and Wood, 1997). Even though beneficiaries are important actors for INGOs and might be perceived as stakeholders who bring acceptance to the role INGOs have, they have little control over how[36], when and where the distribution of aid is given. This decision is often up to INGOs or other actors such as the host- or donor-governments. Therefore I argue that beneficiaries do not hold the attribute of power.

In regards giving INGOs acceptance or prestige, I argue that media is an actor. This is because the degree of media coverage given to a crisis can have an effect on the amount of support and aid the crisis receives. Høyen et al (2003) claim out that in crises of dramatic or emotional character, media has an impact on how much aid is being financed by donor-governments. They draw on an example of this; a comparison between a flood in Mozambique and a cyclone in India where Mozambique received seven times as much aid as India. They argue that this was because Mozambique received four times more attention from American and western-European media (Høyen, 2003). Even though the media do not directly affect INGOs, they are an actor who report to the public on INGO-activities which in turn might influence the decisions of the public and donor-governments (who are elected by the public), and thus indirectly affect INGOs financial situation. If for instance Norwegian media claims that the Norwegian Red Cross is doing a poor job in helping beneficiaries, this can have negative consequences since a good reputation is crucial in order to receive funding, both from the general public and from donor-governments (Beksrud, Kvernevik). Based on these arguments I claim that the media can be powerful stakeholders because the coverage of INGOs handling of a situation can contribute to acceptance, esteem and prestige for the organization - or the opposite.

---

[35] Numbers are gathered from annual reports from the different INGOs.
[36] For instance through the inclusion of local capacities

6.2.2 Actors with legitimacy

As for the legitimacy of the stakeholders, it relates to a generalized perception or assumption that stakeholder actions are desirable, proper or appropriate within socially constructed systems of values, norms and beliefs.

In regards to host-governments, the fact that all the INGOs works towards the host government to able them to take the responsibility in fulfilling rights in the end, might imply that INGOs see them as appropriate stakeholders. Since the objectives of humanitarian assistance is to provide for those in need, though with some variations within the different organizations, host governments that are willing but unable to provide for its citizens can be seen as desirable and appropriate stakeholders because they are important for the INGOs to cooperate with. In relation to governments who are unwilling to provide for their citizens, or soldiers in rebellious groups who claim to have the right to govern, they cannot be seen as legitimate because they operate outside of accepted norms and values (not fulfilling rights of citizens). As to donor-governments, I have argued that they are stakeholders with power due to their financial position in regards to INGOs. In regards to them being desirable, appropriate or proper stakeholders, the aspect of cooperation is also relevant here. During my interviews, the INGOs informed me that they all cooperating with the Norwegian government in one way or another, not only related to financial support but also in relations to political discussions and lobbying. The debates regarded peoples living conditions, working for more democratic societies, the situations of refugees or poor, health and diseases. As such, it seems that INGOs perceive the Norwegian government as a stakeholder who is an appropriate partner in which they need to cooperate with in international questions such as improving the living standard of citizens. Lastly, the legitimacy of the beneficiaries needs to be addressed because without their existence there would be no INGOs. As the same way as costumers are seen as legitimate actors of corporations, (Mitchell, Agle and Wood, 1997) beneficiaries can be legitimate actors of INGOs. This is because they are the reason why INGOs exist; they are what make the "business" go around. Within constructed norms and values there is little doubt that beneficiaries are the appropriate actors of INGOs. Thus, they hold legitimacy in INGOs, because the beneficiaries are the ones the objectives of INGOs are related to.

6.2.3 Actors with urgency

The last element, urgency, includes stakeholders that are calling for immediate attention. These stakeholders need to have time-sensitive and critical claims towards the INGOs (Mitchell, Agle and Wood, 1997). In regards to host- and donor-governments, I argue that they do not hold the attribute of urgency. In regards to donor governments, there few activities of INGOs can create critical and time-sensitive claims from the donors. Even though cooperative host-governments also are affected by a crisis, their urgent claims are most likely to be related to their citizens needs, not the government itself. Thus, in situations where humanitarian assistance is provided by INGOs, it is the beneficiaries who hold the attribute of urgency. When beneficiaries are not having basic needs such as food, water and shelter covered, their claims are both time sensitive and critical.

6.2.4 Powerful, legitimate or urgent stakeholders of INGOs

As described in chapter three, stakeholders who hold *all* of the attributes are seen as *definitive* stakeholders. This results in INGOs attending to, and prioritizes to the stakeholder's claim. Even though no of the above mentioned actors hold all three attributes of power, legitimacy and urgency, they hold two of them. Whilst donor-governments hold the attributes of power and legitimacy the beneficiaries hold the attribute legitimacy and urgency. I also argued that media and hostile governments and rebellious groups have the attribute of power, and cooperative host-governments are seen as legitimate. However, although the media, hostile governments and rebellious groups will receive *some* attention because they have the attribute of power, they won't, in the stakeholder perspective, be prioritized by INGOs if their claims come in conflict with claims of other stakeholders. Returning to donor-governments and beneficiaries, having a stakeholder perspective on CSR has two implications for the responsibility of INGOs. The first implication is that INGOs can become donor-governed because of donors position as <u>dominant</u> stakeholders and INGOs primary responsibility will be to provide them with benefits to carry out their role as donors. The second implication regards the <u>dependent</u> stakeholders, the beneficiaries. Even though beneficiaries might be the ones who need it the most, they can risk not being included in the decision making process due to that their lacking power to get their will through in INGOs.

Returning to the first implication, the responsibility towards donor-governments as dominate stakeholder, this can be seen in relation to what I in chapter two discussed as the independence of INGOs. When donor-governments become dominate stakeholders this can result in a dilemma for the INGOs because it means that the will of donors should influence what INGOs prioritize in their activities. However, as donors may prioritize different than INGOs (Keen, 2008) the dominant position of donors can contribute to INGOs not being able to fulfill their main objectives. Lie (2006) mentions an example that indicates that INGOs might be torn between the need to "please" donors and their own interests. At a conference at The Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation (Norad) concerning poverty, an employee in one of the INGOs explained a challenge with donors:

> "They [Norad] are our main donor, and we don't want to be seen in a bad light and risk losing support. The balance between our own interests and the guidelines given from the government regarding finance is very hard to find" (Lie, 2006: 152).

This indicates that the line between INGOs responsibility towards own interests and objectives can become blurry when donor governments are dominant stakeholders. This brings me to the next implication; the responsibility towards the beneficiaries as stakeholders. Since beneficiaries hold the attributes of legitimacy and urgency, they do not have the power to get their claims through and thus they are dependent on the will of INGOs. As such, having a responsibility in the stakeholder perspective can result in beneficiaries not being included in decisions and activities that directly affect them and where the responsibility towards donor-stakeholder are prioritized over dependent beneficiaries. This places the stakeholder perspective closely to the classical perspective, where the "shareholders" are the ones the INGOs have a primary responsibility towards.

6.2.5 INGOs with a stakeholder responsibility?

By administrating citizen rights INGOs are responding to beneficiary's urgent and time-sensitive claims. Also, through including locals in decision-making processes the INGOs are taking a stakeholder responsibility towards the beneficiaries. However, this perspective holds that the dominate stakeholders (donors) will be prioritized over the dependent ones (beneficiaries/citizens). Even though I have argued that donors have some influence over INGOs, the INGOs interviewed are very aware of the principle of

independence from donors and strive to uphold this. Also, the fact that INGOs seek to involve locals in the decisions they make, indicates that the donors are not the ones being prioritized. Therefore, I conclude that INGOs do not have an explicit social responsibility in a stakeholder perspective.

6.3 Meeting the expectations of society; Social Demandingness perspective

When having a CSR in regards to the social demandingness approach, this means that corporations not only are to provide services and goods, but also limit the negative effects of its activities and solve social problems (Brummer, 1991: Melè, 2008). The corporation here has a responsibility to meet the expectations[37] of society in regards to the direct and indirect impact they have. However, as the society changes, so will its expectations and thereby the responsibility of INGOs will vary over time.

In regards to INGOs and their responsibility this means that when they provide humanitarian assistance in crises-situations they must prevent or limit aid from having a negative impact on society, include local resources when giving long- and short term relief (expected from the Norwegian government and the UN), and being able to adapt to different situations. In order for INGOs to have a social responsibility in the social demandingness perspective, their role in administrating rights must be what is expected by them from the society. In the following section I explore whether or not this is the cases in order to see if they have an explicit social demandingness responsibility.

6.3.1 Preventing or limit the negative impacts of aid and including local recourses

A growing expectation to INGOs is that they are to prevent aid from having negative impacts on society. As stated by Anderson (1999), the need to be aware of culture and norms in communities that receive humanitarian assistance is of great importance in order to limit or eliminate negative activities. Through including local actors, using already established structures to hand out aid, and be aware of how they might be perceived as holders of economic power, aid-agencies can contribute to doing less harm (Anderson, 1999). Since the responsibility in social demandingness perspective is based

---

[37] In the theory chapter, I distinguished between demands and expectations. However, in this discussion I will use only expectations. The term expectations thus includes both demands (non-performance results in corporations being looked upon as evil) and expectations (what is good and beneficial to perform, but the non-performance doesn't necessary mean doing harm or evil

on expectations, it is also relative to time, place and culture. For INGOs this means that they need to have the ability to adapt different situations and change their activities in order to meet the society's expectations. The last 20 years has seen increasing focus on the way INGOs use their own labour from the "west" and overriding local knowledge in emergency situations. Whilst it earlier was expected from INGOs to be quick and efficient in emergency relief, and the way to do this was by bringing western technology and experts to the affected areas, it is now, as mentioned, an expectation to build on local capacities. However, Crewe and Harrison (2002) and Duffield (2001) claims that there still exists a technocratic way of thinking in regards to western knowledge and technology being viewed as "the right one". Crewe and Harrison (2002) further holds that the way of seeing locals as underdeveloped and as someone who don't know have the knowledge to make the best decisions, still exists in several spheres in the development-discourse.

As discussed in chapter five (5.1.5), The Red Cross performed assessment analysis' before they entered a crises-area which made them more aware of the urgent needs. Also, all the INGOs cooperated whit national NGOs in order to get to know the culture and norms before they entered the country. Another example of the expectation to include local capacities can be seen at the Red Cross' website. Through the Red Cross' Code of Conduct[38], principle six, this expectation has been made explicit and states that INGOs must; "attempt to build disaster responses on local capacities". If we see the above mentioned aspects in regards to the social demandingness perspective, one can see the responsibility of INGOs are that of a social demandingness; they perform their activities in relation to the expectation of doing as little damage as possible and build on local capacities when giving humanitarian assistance.

6.3.2 The challenge of meeting the expectation of involving local capacities

In natural disasters, all actors are faced with uncertainty because these crises often are unexpected. This means that those who work in the field in INGOs need to manage stressful situations characterized by time-pressure. In regards to meeting expectations, this can pose as a challenge, because one might not know what everyone is expecting, and the needs can change from hour to hour. In situations where time is of the essence

---

[38] The Red Cross and Red Crescent Code of Conduct has been signed by 289 organizations and is a well used document (Hilhorst, 2005)

(as in the earthquake in Haiti or Japan, or the flood in Pakistan), employees in INGOs might act more in response to what they have previously experienced in crises than to meet the actual expectations in the society. This is what Blandford and Wong (2004) and March (1999) refers to as natural decision making, where decisions are made based on experiences, rather by considering all alternatives in order to make the "best" decision. This brings us back to the notion of understanding custom and culture. In order make decisions based on experiences and at the same time meet expectations of the local community, it is important know the culture. As mentioned, all the INGOs cooperate with local communities and Red Cross also performs assessment analysis. However, as also mentioned in chapter five, this is not always sufficient due to time-pressure and urgent needs. However, by adapting to the situation by asking the locals what they need and what the most efficient way of giving assistance is, the INGOs can meet their expectations. After all, it is the local community who best know their own history and needs.

6.3.3. Is administrating of rights expected from society?

The discussion so far indicates that INGOs have a social demandingness responsibility in the sense that they, by including local capacities, preventing harm, and adapting to different cultures, meet the expectations of society. As they administer rights, they provide for citizen rights when the state is not taking this role. Since it is expected that INGOs protect citizens (R2P; see chapter two, ICISS and Geneva Convention) in situations where the state is unwilling or unable, INGOs are meeting the expectations of society, no matter if it is with or without the consent of government. However, in regards to chapter five, and the role they play in administrating social-, civil- and/or political rights, the meeting of expectations does not mean taking over the state's role and if being an alternative to the state results in the state not taking its role and responsibility itself, it can mean that the administration of rights becomes a long-lasting solution. If this happens, INGOs are not meeting the expectations of society, as the expectation is that INGOs humanitarian assistance is a temporary solution. Thus, I conclude that INGOs have a social demandingness responsibility as long as their administrating of rights does not become a long-term solution.

6.4 The social activist approach; the universal, independent standard

When having a responsibility in the social activist perspective, Brummer (1991) holds that time, place and the current opinions of actors do not have an influence on what lies in the notion of CSR. This separates the perspective distinctively from the three above mentioned perspectives and presupposes that there exists a universal standard with a stabile set of values in which one can measure social responsibility. It also means to optimize the welfare of every human being, work against infringement of the rights of individuals, actively examine the impacts of their actions, develop codes of conduct, and lobby governments in order to make laws with positive social impact (Brummer, 1991).

In regards to INGOs this means that they responsible in the social activist perspective if they base their activities on universal standards such as the declaration of human rights. In order for INGOs to have a responsibility in the social activist perspective, their role in administrating rights must be based on universal standards and be performed in order to optimize the welfare of all human beings. It also means that INGOs must be active in assessing the impacts of providing humanitarian assistance. In the following section I explore whether or not this is the case in order to see if INGOs have an explicit social activist responsibility.

6.4.1 Human rights as standard for performing activities

When humanitarian assistance is provided this is usually because citizens are not getting their rights fulfilled. This is because conflicts and natural disasters often results in abuses and breaking the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (The Norwegian parliamentary White Paper nr 9, 2007-2008). In regards to the social activist approach, how INGOs follow the universal standard determines the responsible action. The International Bill of Human Rights[39] is such a standard that the INGOs work towards. Over time, this bill has become widely accepted in the world, and the rights are seen as something all human beings are entitled to, it is universal, interdependent and inalienable (Taroor, 1999)*.* The state has the primary responsibility to make sure the bill is obeyed, and the state are to respect, protect and fulfill the political, civil, economic, social and cultural rights of the individual. However, as argued in chapter five this is not always the case and INGOs thereby step in to fill the vacuum;*"Humanitarian assistance will always be given in situations where human rights are not being fulfilled because it is a*

---

[39] http://www.ohchr.org/EN/ProfessionalInterest/Pages/InternationalLaw.aspx

fundamental right for all human beings (Kvernevik in RC). In the social activist perspective, organizations that on ethical and voluntary grounds follow the sets and values of a universal standard, acts in a social responsible matter (Brummer, 1991). Thus, when INGOs contributes to the administrating of social, civil and political rights of individuals on the basis of a universal standard, INGOs are being responsible in a social activist perspective.

6.4.2 Exploring the impacts of aid and optimizing the welfare of human beings

In order to be responsible in the social activist perspective, the impacts of the organizations activities need to be considered (Brummer, 1991). As such, the fact that the INGOs performed assessment analysis and explored how their assistance had an impact on society, indicates them taking this responsibility. When administrating rights, some of the rights they provided were food, water, shelter and healthcare. Often this was seen in a long term perspective and the INGOs are hoping to render themselves superfluous in the end. However, administrating rights means that they are working in order to optimize the welfare of citizens. The INGOs also lobbied governments to make laws with positive social impact. The NRC lobbied in order to place the rights of refugees on the political agenda (in donor-countries and host-countries), the NPA worked towards the Norwegian government to secure the civil and political rights of their beneficiaries and Save the Children worked with creating an ombudsman for children in countries who don't have this (the ombudsman deals with children rights, and works to ensure that they are not being exploited). As for Red Cross, their mandate as 'watchdogs' for the state following the Geneva Convention entails that they also work in order to make or uphold laws with a positive impact.

6.4.3 INGOs as social activists?

Having a responsibility in the social activist perspective entails that INGOs perform their activities by following a universal standard. Through administrating rights, the INGOs are working to promote welfare and they work against infringement of the rights of individuals. Their activities are based mainly on the International Bill of Human Rights, which is a universal standard independent of current opinions, time and place that provides a stabile set of values one can use to judge current social demands. As the social activist perspective asks INGOs to be moral leaders and taking an ethical responsibility when it comes to for instance welfare, this also entail that the perspective

presupposes that the state is not already taking this responsibility itself. If all states in the world already fulfilled every individual right in accordance to The International Bill of Human rights, there would be no need for INGOs to take the responsibility. However, in the absence of this responsibility being taken by the state, seeing INGOs as social activist determines a responsibility they already explicitly say that they have. I therefore conclude that INGOs have an explicit social activist responsibility.

6.5 CSR in INGOs: A matter of course or a contradiction?

As INGOs are by definition non-profit organizations with a 'mandate to help' and corporations' existence mainly is to create profit, the objectives of the two entities differ in a fundamental way. When hearing the sentence Corporate Social Responsibility in International Non Governmental Organizations, the first thing that might spring to mind is that this must surely be a contradiction. However, as I have argued, the bond between INGOs and CSR is definitively an existing one. So what is the social responsibility of INGOs? Is it a classical responsibility, a stakeholder responsibility, a social demandingness responsibility or a social activist responsibility?

In part 6.1, I concluded that INGOs who are administrating rights do not have a explicit classical social responsibility. This is because they take measures in order to reduce the negative consequences of their core-activities. They are also actors with social, political and economic influence with a responsibility beyond that of keeping their 'shareholders' content. As for the responsibility in a stakeholder perspective (6.2), I argued that donor-governments should have more influence then beneficiaries if one were to view their responsibility through these lenses. However, as INGOs (as often as possible) involve local capacities in decision-making processes when administrating rights, INGOs do not have a stakeholder responsibility. The social demandingness perspective was discussed in 6.3, and I concluded that INGOs have such a responsibility when it is expected by society that INGOS are administrating social-, civil- and/or political rights for citizens. Even though I argued INGOs are becoming an alternative to the state, this does not mean that it is expected from society that INGOs take over the role of the state. INGOs are expected to be a temporary solution, and thereby they will only have a social demandingness responsibility when administrating rights does not become a long-term solution. The last part of this chapter concerned INGOs responsibility as social activists. In this section (6.4) I concluded that since they are performing their activities in order to

ensure individuals rights according to The International Bill of Human Rights, a universal standard, they have a responsibility in the social activist perspective. Thereby, if I repeat the research question presented in the beginning of this chapter, *Given that INGOs play a pivotal role in regards to fulfilling citizen rights through humanitarian assistance, what is their classical-, stakeholder-, social demandingness- or social activist responsibility?*, the answer will be**;** by administrating rights when providing humanitarian assistance INGOs have a responsibility in a social demandingness perspective as long as they are not becoming a long term solution. As for the social activist perspective, the answer is a definitive yes. By saying that INGOs have a responsibility in the social activist view, one is only determining a already existing responsibility they have when administrating the social-, civil-, and/or political rights.

7. Conclusions and implications

Trough interviews with representatives from NRC, NPA, RC and StC, I have explored INGOs role in the administration of citizen rights. I have also, trough a theoretical discussion, explored what the responsibility of INGOs is in regards to different perspectives of CSR. This chapter consists of the conclusions to these elements, and the answers to the two research questions presented in chapter three. It also calls attention to some implications of INGOs role when administrating rights and of INGOs social responsibility.

7.1 Conclusions

Chapter five explored the role of INGOs when it comes to their role in fulfilling citizen rights by using Matten and Cranes (2005) conceptual framework of corporate citizenship in INGOs. The chapter showed that INGOs try to involve local recourses in order to limit the negative effects of their activities, but that they do not always succeed in emergency situations due to time constraints. The discussion resulted in the conclusion that the interviewed INGOs have become administrators of social-, civil-, and/or political rights in situations where the state is unwilling or unable to do so. I also concluded that even though INGOs do not wish to take over the state's role and responsibilities, INGOs are in today's crises' becoming an alternative to the state.

In chapter six I explored the social responsibility of INGOs by using four different perspectives of CSR. The first and second perspective, the classical- and stakeholder-perspective does not represent the responsibilities of INGOs when administrating rights. As for the third perspective, I concluded that INGOs are taking a social demandingness responsibility when administrating rights as long as it is a temporary solution. This is because INGOs are expected to provide humanitarian assistance when citizens are not getting their rights fulfilled by the state. In regards to the social activist perspective, the last perspective presented by Brummer (1991), I concluded with a definitive yes. When INGOs administer rights, they do so in order to contribute to peoples welfare and the International Bill of Human rights (a universal standard) is the foundation for their activities.

7.2 Implications and further research

When INGOs have become an alternative to the state in crises situations, it can result in local communities finding themselves in a situation where they have to deal with external actors as the ones with authority. The administration of rights can also result INGOs joining governments, partially or fully, in governing citizenship. This raises a question of INGOs capacity to govern, as the organizations were not initially created to take this role. Whilst governmental constitutions in liberal democracies emerge from a representative process, INGOs do not. They are not democratically elected, which in turns means that citizens have no actual power if INGOs where to 'do harm'. If the state is not functioning (which often is the case when humanitarian assistance is provided), citizens have little means of holding INGOs accountable for their actions. Viewing INGOs as administrators of rights, and as an alternative to the state, calls for further research. Applying the notion of CC has contributed to a new way of exploring their role, and it is a notion that needs to be explored closer.

As I have concluded with that INGOs have a social responsibility, and viewed INGOs responsibility through the lenses of CSR, I have tied the two concepts together. However, there is a need to explore further how INGOs perceive their own social responsibility and how do they relate to the notion of becoming an alternative to the state. As INGOs role in society has many connotation as for instance politics, poverty, development, the 'west and the rest', aid dependency and conflict resolution, their responsibility becomes complex and sometimes difficult to grasp. This thesis has been an attempt to give an account of how CSR can be used to explore the role of INGOs. However, while writing this thesis, I have become aware of the need to explore each responsibility more thoroughly.

List of references

Andersen, S.S. (2006) "Aktiv informantintervjuing" in *Norsk statsvitenskapelig tidsskrift*, Vol. 22, 278-298.

Anderson, M.B. (1999) *Do no harm. How aid can support peace – or war.* Lynne Rienner Publishing. London

Annan, K. (1998) "Peacekeeping, Military Intervention and National Sovereignty in Internal Armed Conflict" in Moore, Jonathan (ed.) *Hard Choices. Moral Dilemmas in Humanitarian Intervention*. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Anheier, H. K, Seibel, W. (1990) *The Third Sector: Comparative Studies of Non-Profit Organizations.* Berlin

Arenas, D. Lozano, J. M. and Albareda, L. (2009) "The Role of NGOs in CSR: Mutual Perceptions Among Stakeholders" in *Journal of Business Ethics*. Vol. 88, No. 1, 175 – 197.

Ayoob, M. (2002) "Humanitarian Intervention and State Sovereignty" in *The zInternational Journal of Human Rights.* Vol. 6, No. 1. Frank Cass. London.

Blaikie, N. (2000) *Designing social research.* Polity Press. Cambridge.

Blandford, A and Wong, B.L (2004) "Situation awareness in emergency medical dispatch" in *International Journal of Human-Computer Science*. Vol. 62.

Bouchet, Saulnier, F. (2006) *The Practical Guide to Humanitarian Law,* Rowman and Littlefield

Bowen, H. R. (1953) *Social responsibility of the Businessman.* Harper. New York.

Brummer, J.J. (1991) *Corporate responsibility and legitimacy. An interdisciplinary analysis.* Greenwood Press. New York.

Bryman, A. (2006) "Integrating quantitative and qualitative research: how is it done?" in *Qualitative Research*, Vol. 6, No. 1, 97-113.

Burke, R. J. and Onwuegbuzie, A.J. (2004) "Mixed Methods Research: A Research Paradigm Whose Time Has Come" in *Educational researcher*, Vol. 33, No. 7, 14-26.

Carroll, A. B. (1979) "A three-dimensional conceptual model of corporate social performance" in *Academy of Management Review*. Vol 4, 497-505.

Carroll, A. B. (1998) "The Four Faces of Corporate Citizenship" in Business and Society Review. Vol 100, No. 1, 1 – 7. Center for Business Ethics at Bentley College. Blackwell Publishers. Oxford.

Carroll, A. B. (1991) *The Pyramid of Corporate Social Responsibility: Toward the Moral Management of Organizational Stakeholders*, Business Horizons 34.

Crane, A., Matten, D. and Moon, J. (2008) *Corporations and Citizenship.* Cambridge Univercity Press

Creswell, J.W. (2003) *Research Design. Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches.* Third Edition. SAGE Publishers.

Crewe, E and Harrison, E. (1998) *Whose Development?: An Ethnography of Aid*. Zed Books. London.

Danemark et al. (1997) "Generalisering, vetenskapeliga slutledningar och modeller för förklarande samhällsvetenskap" in Danemark et al. (1997) *Att förklara samhället.* Studentlitteratur. Lund.

De Coning, C. (2007) "Civil-military coordination practices and approaches within UN peace operations" in Journal of Military and Strategic Studies. Vol. 10, No. 1.

Donini, A. (1995) "The bureaucracy and the free spirits: stagnation and innovation in the relationship between the UN and NGOs" in *Third World Quarterly*, Vol 16, No 3.

Duffield, M. (2001) *Global Governance and the New Wars. The Merging of Development and Security.* Zed Books. London.

Ellefsen, B. (1998) "Triangulering – eller hvorfor og hvordan kombinere metoder?" in Lorensen, M. (red.) (1998) *Spørsmålet bestemmer metoden. Forskningsmetoder i sykepleie og andre helsefag*. Universitetsforlaget. Oslo.

Friedman, M. (1979) "The social responsibility of business is to increase its profits" in *The New York Time Magazine,* September, 17, 1979.

Gond, J. P., Palazzo, G, and Basu, K. (2009) "Reconsidering Instrumental Corporate Social Responsibility through the Mafia Metaphor" in *Business Ethics Quarterly*. Vol. 19, No. 1, 57 – 85.

Harvey, P. (2010) *The role of national governments in international humanitarian response to disasters.* Meeting Background Paper from the 26th ALNAP Meeting in Kuala Lumpur, 16 – 17 November 2010.

Hillhorst, D. (2005) "Dead letter or living document? Ten years of the Code of Conduct for disaster relief" in *Disasters*. Vol 29, No. 4, 351 – 369. Blackwell Publishing.

ISO/DIS 26000. International Organization of Standardization 2009. Guidance on social responsibility.

Jakobsen, D.I. (2005) *Hvordan gjennomføre undersøkelser? – Innføring i samfunnsvitenskapelig metode*. Høyskoleforlaget. Kristiansand.

Keen, D (2008) *Complex Emergencies.* Polity Press. Cambridge

Kent, R. (1987) *Anatomy of Disaster Relief. The International Network in Action*. Pinter Publishers.

Knack, S. (2001) "Aid Dependence and the Quality of Governance: Cross-Country Empirical Tests" in *Southern Economic Journal*. Vol. 68, No 2, 310-329.

Kourula, A. and Laasonen, S. (2010) "Nongovernmental Organizations in Business and Society, Management, and International Business Research. Review and Implications from 1998 to 2007" in *Business and Society* Vol. 49, No 1. SAGE Publications.

Kruke, B.I. and Olsen, O.E. (2005) "Reliability-seeking networks in Complex Emergencies" in *International Journal of Emergency Management*. 2005, Vol.2, No.4.

Lie J. and Sande, H. (2006) *Utvikling, frivillige organisasjoner og utenrikspolitikk i norsk utenrikspolitisk praksis. Aktører og prosesser.* Cappelens forlag, 2006

McIntosh, M. Thomas, R. Leipziger, D. and Coleman, G. (2003) *Living Corporate Citizenship. Strategic routes to socially responsible business.* Prentice Hall. London.

March, J (1999) *The Pursuit of Organisational Intelligence*. Blackwell Publishers Ltd Oxford

Margolis, J. D and J. P. Walsh (2003) "Misery Loves Companies: Rethinking Social Initiatives by Business" in *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 48, 268-305.

Matten, D. and Crane, A. (2005) "Corporate Citizenship: Towards an extended theoretical conceptualization" in *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 30, No 1, 166 – 179.

Matten, D. and Moon, J. (2008) ""Implicit" and "Explicit" CSR: A conceptual framework for a comparative understanding of corporate social responsibility" in *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 33, No. 2, 404–424.

McWilliams, A. and Siegel, D.S. (2001) "Corporate Social Responsibility: A theory of the firm perspective" in *Academy of Management Review*. Vol. 26, 117 – 127.

Melè, D. (2008) "Corporate Social responsibility Theories" in Crane, McWilliams, Matten, Moon, and Siegel (Eds.) *The Oxford Handbook of Corporate Social Responsibility*. Oxford University Press.

Mills, K. (1997) "Sovereignty Eclipsed? : The Legitimacy of Humanitarian Access and Intervention" in *The Journal of Humanitarian Assistance*. Feinstein International Center.

Mitchell, R.K. Agle, B.R. and Wood, D.J. (1997) "Toward a Theory of Stakeholder Identification and Salience: Defining the Principlle of Who and What Really Counts " in *Academy of Management Review* Vol. 22, No. 2, 853 – 886.

Moon, J. Matten, D. and Crane, A. (2005) "Can Corporations be Citizens? Corporate Citizenship as a Metaphor for Business Participation in Society" in Business Ethics Quarterly. Vol. 15, No. 3, 429 – 453.

Murshed, Z. (2003) "Community Capacity Building for Risk Reduction in South Asia" in *Sahni*, Pardeep and Ariyabandu (edt.) *Disaster Risk Reduction in South Asia.* Pretice Hall. India.

Norwegian Parliamentary White Papers:

> **Stortingsmelding 9. (2007 - 2008)** *Norsk politikk for forebygging av humanitære katastrofer*. Det Kongelige Utenriksdepartement. Oslo.

> **Stortingsmelding 10. (2008 - 2009)** *Næringslivets Samfunnsansvar i en global økonomi.* Det Kongelige Utenriksdepartement. Oslo.

> **Stortingsmelding 17. (2001 - 2002)** Samfunnssikkerhet. Veien til et mindre sårbart samfunn. Det Kongelige Utenriksdepartement. Oslo.

Nustad, K. (2003)*Gavens makt. Norsk utviklingshjelp som formynderskap.* Pax Forlag A/S.

Olsen, G. R. Carstensen, N. og Høyen, K. (2003) "Humanitarian Crisis: What determines the Level of Emergency Assistance? Media Coverage, Donor Interests and the Aid Business" in *Disasters* Vol. 27, No 2, 109 – 126. Blackwell Publishing. Oxford.

Olsen, O.E. Kruke, B.I. and Hovden, J. (2007) "Societal Safety: Concept, Borders and Dilemmas" in *Journal of Contingencies and Crisis Management.* Vol. 15, No. 2, 2007.

Quarantelli, E.L. (2000) "Disaster planning, emergency management and civil protection: the historical development of organized efforts to plan for and to respond to disasters" (preliminary paper) Disaster research center. University of Delaware.

Quinn, M. (2002) "More than Implementers: Civil Society in Complex Emergencies" in *International Alert* 2002.

Rosenthal, U. and Boin, A. (2001) *Managing Crises. Threats, Dilemmas, Opportunities.* Charles Thomas Publisher. US.

Rosenthal, U. Charles, M.T. and 'T Hart, P. (1989)*Coping with Crises! TheManagement of Disasters, Riots and Terrorism.* Charles Thomas Publishers. US

Scherer, A. G. and Palazzo, G. (2007) "Toward a political conception of corporate responsibility – business and society seen from a habermasian perspective" in *Academy of Management Review* Vol 32.

Simmons, P.J. (1998) "Learning to live with NGOs" in *Foreign Policy*. No. 112, 82 – 96. Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.

Sims, R. R. (2003) *Ethics and corporate social responsibility: Why giants fall.* Praeger Publishers. US.

Stewart, A. (1998) *The Ethnographer's Method*. Sage Publications.

Tharoor, S. (1999) Are Human Rights Universal? *World Policy Journal*

White, H. (1992a) 'The Macroeconomic Impact of Development Aid: A Critical Survey', *Journal of Development Studies* 28(2): 163-240.

White, H. (1992b) 'What Do We Know About Aid's Macroeconomic Impact? An Overview of the Aid Effectiveness Debate', *Journal of International Development* 4(2): 121-37.

Wheeler, D., Fabig, H., and Boele, R. *Paradoxes and Dilemmas for Stakeholder Responsive Firms in the Extractive Sector: Lessons from the Case of Shell and the Ogoni*. Journal of Business Ethics, Vol 93, nr 3: 297-318

Wood, D.J., and Logstdon, J.M., (2001) "Theorizing business citizenship", *Perspectives on Corporate Citizenship:*83-103. London: Greenleaf Publishing

Zadek, S. (2001) *The Civil Corporation. The New Economy of Corporate Citizenship.* Earthscan. London.

Reports and internet references

– **Norwegian Refugee Council. Annual rapport 2009.**
http://www.flyktninghjelpen.no/arch/_img/9114742.pdf

– **Norwegian Peoples Aid. Annual rapport 2008.**
http://www.norskfolkehjelp.no/filestore/NF_rapport_2008_web.pdf

– **Norwegian Red Cross. Annual rapport 2010.**
http://www.rodekors.no/Global/HK/Media/Rapporter/110609%20aarsrapport%202020
10.pdf

– **Norwegian Refugee Council. Education Policy.**
http://www.nrc.no/arch/_img/9567622.pdf

– **United Nations International Strategy for disaster reduction 2009.** www.unisdr.org

– **The International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Society. World Disasters Report 2010; Focus on urban Risk.** www.ifrc.org

– **International Commission on intervention and sovereignty of the State (ICISS). Report 2001.** http://www.iciss.ca/pdf/Commission-Report.pdf

– **United Nations International Covenant on economic, social and cultural rights.**
http://www2.ohchr.org/english/law/cescr.htm

– **United Nations International Covenant on civil and political rights.**
http://www2.ohchr.org/english/law/ccpr.htm

– **UN resolution 46/182, 1991. Principles and framework for humanitarian assistance.** http://daccess-dds-ny.un.org/doc/RESOLUTION/GEN/NR0/582/70/IMG/NR058270.pdf?OpenElement

– **UN-OCHA orientation handbook on complex emergencies.**
http://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/3D153DA3049B322AC1256C3
0002A9C24-ocha_orientation_handbook_on_.html#1

- **OECD guidelines for Multinational Enterprises .**
  http://www.oecd.org/department/0,3355,en_2649_34889_1_1_1_1_1,00.html

- Good Humanitarian Donorship 2003.
  http://www.goodhumanitariandonorship.org/gns/principles-good-practice-ghd/overview.aspx

- **UN Global Compact, Global Reporting Initiative (GRI)**
  http://www.unglobalcompact.org/news/34-05-28-2010

- **International Committee of the Red Cross. Code of Conduct**
  http://www.icrc.org/eng/resources/documents/misc/code-of-conduct-290296.htm

- **UN Human rights, Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights**
  http://www.ohchr.org/EN/ProfessionalInterest/Pages/InternationalLaw.aspx

- The Non-Governmental Organization Section of the Department of Public Information at the United Nations Headquarters;
  http://web.archive.org/web/20021002044536/http://www.un.org/dpi/ngosection/brochure.hm

- **World Food Programme**. www.wfp.org

- **UN Agenda for Development.** http://www.un.org/Docs/SG/ag_index.htm

- The Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation (Norad).
  http://www.norad.no/Om+Norad

Appendix A - Interview guide

Innledende spørsmål

1. Navn, stilling og ansiennitet i organisasjonen.
2. Kan du fortelle kort om det arbeidet organisasjonen gjør i utlandet og hva du ser som hovedansvaret deres? (*Gir innsikt i hva informanten mener er kjernevirksomhet*).
3. Hvilke prinsipper arbeider organisasjonen ut fra?

Endret rolle til INGO

4. Har rollen til INGOer endret seg de siste to tiårene?
5. Har INGOer fått mer makt og innflytelse?
6. Hvilke krav til ansvarliggjøring av humanitære operasjoner stilles det til INGOer? Har kravene endret seg de siste tiårene?
7. I hvilken grad vil du si at INGOer har økonomisk, sosial og politisk innvirkning i de landene der de opererer?
8. Hvilken rolle mener du utviklings- og sikkerhetspolitikk spiller i forhold til Donorenes og INGOers prioriteringer av bistandsmidler?
9. I hvilken grad tror du omdømmet til INGOer i Norge påvirker hvor mye støtte de får fra UD og NORAD?

Samfunnsansvar generelt

Utgangspunktet her er at det i dag har blitt vanligere å snakke om alle organisasjoners
CSR og ikke bare bedrifters

10. Hva anser du som INGOers samfunnsansvar i dag?
11. Vil du si at dere tar et samfunnsansvar, og hva innebærer dette?
12. Hvem er INGOene ansvarlige ovenfor dersom de gjør noe galt?

Statens rolle

13. Har rollen til staten endret seg de siste 20 årene? Er stater er blitt mindre suverene på grunn av globalisering?
14. Er staten i dag fortsatt den eneste garantisten for å opprettholde borgerrettigheter?
15. Hvordan samarbeider dere med host-governments?
16. Kan det – i situasjoner hvor myndigheter ikke ivaretar borgeres rettigheter – bli INGOers ansvar å dekke dette gapet?

Administrering av rettigheter

17. *Sosiale rettigheter: INGOs as provider of social rights*
    – Er organisasjonen tilbyder/medforvalter av sosiale rettigheter som for eksempel utdanning, bygge skoler og helse?
    – I hvilke situasjoner vil du si at INGOer *bør* være en tilbyder av sosiale rettigheter?

18. *Sivile rettigheter: INGOs as enabler of civil rights*
    – Vil du si at INGOer bidrar til å muliggjøre borgeres utøvelse av sivile rettigheter?
    – I hvilke situasjoner vil du si at INGOer *bør* tilrettelegge for sivile rettigheter?

19. *Politiske rettigheter: INGOs as a channel for political rights*
    – Vil du si at INGOer er en kanal for å fremme politiske rettigheter?
    – I hvilke situasjoner vil du si at INGOer bør være en kanal for å fremme politiske rettigheter?

20. Hva tenker du om følgende påstand;
    – INGOer tildeler, tilrettelegger og kanal for henholdsvis sosiale, sivile og/eller politiske rettigheter når det oppstår et vakuum hvor myndighetene ikke tar på seg denne rollen.

21. Hva tenker du om at INGOer overtar rollen og ansvaret til staten?

22. Er organisasjonen en medforvalter/bidragsyter i forhold til sosiale, politiske og sivile rettigheter for borgere? Hvis ja, på hvilken måte. Hvis nei, hvorfor ikke?

Avsluttende om samfunnsansvar og administrering av rettigheter

23. Gitt at det er slik at INGOer av og til er tungt inne som medforvaltere av sosiale, sivile og politiske rettigheter, hvilke implikasjoner tror du dette kan ha?

24. Synes du det er en god ide å snakke om INGO'ers samfunnsansvar på samme måte som vi etter hvert har begynt å snakke om bedrifters samfunnsansvar
    – Hvis ja, hvorfor? Hvis nei, hvorfor ikke?

25. I lys av de overnevnte spørsmålene, vil du fortsatt beskrive INGOers samfunnsansvar på samme måte?