

Before the Skype conversation with the former director, the investigator received a document briefly describing what happened at the end of 2013 and during 2014 in connection with Y. No verbal warning was issued but there are emails etc. that describe various perceptions and activities that were carried out at the time. During the interview, it is also mentioned that there is a history of Y being keen to have "disciples".

Analysis

On the basis of the material available in text messages, messenger texts, etc. between X and Y, it is clear how X tried to delimit her involvement with Y. When she ended the relationship, Y lost something that he valued highly. His emotional reaction is expressed in various control strategies/master suppression techniques through which he tried to limit her contact with other male colleagues. Victim behaviours also occur in various forms, such as laying guilt on her for his deteriorating state of mind. The hacker events are a matter for the police in which it is her word against his as to what happened. There is as yet no factual proof, so this aspect cannot be considered in the present report. However – in the light of X expressing that she had lost trust and wanting to change supervisor – the entry in the EU portal can be seen lacking in judgement and a reinforcement of X's perception that she is being harassed. Based on what has been described above, the investigator's assessment is that Y's behaviour towards X constitutes harassment in the form of stalking. (See appendices 3-7)

That both parties started a friendship initially seems to have led to advantages for both of them. What the investigator sees as problematic is Y's self-appointed role as a helper of others (even before X) and that X chose to become intimate with Y. It is easy to end up feeling that one has a debt of gratitude and in a position of dependency, even though the agreement that she was not his girlfriend was explicitly stated. At the same time, it is natural and important that postdocs and other people in similar professional roles may need a hand with things like social contacts, projects, etc. to progress in their research careers. If the social support remains within a professional framework, this can bring advantages for both parties. The investigator perceives that Y now feels exploited by X who wants to move on without his assistance. Meanwhile X has felt guilty about the fact that she initially received a lot of both practical and social support from Y, which reduced her ability to act and contact the management before the situation escalated into a work environment problem.

The events mainly took place outside working hours. But as they led to changes in their work relationship as well, e.g. the change of supervisors and that other colleagues became involved, the relationship turmoil has spilled over into the workplace. The psychosocial work environment and various colleagues are thereby negatively affected by a relationship that was initially private.

The parties currently have no ongoing work that requires collaboration. In view of this, conflict management aiming to repair their work relationship is thus not necessary. However, both parties need to know that the report and this investigation will lead to measures that are felt to be relevant to ensure that the vilification ceases. This will be achieved most simply through the experience of fairness and dignity.