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Background: In recent years, the nonprofit sector has grown and charitable organizations have become more important. HRM has got a more significant role and it is no longer enough to build an organization on the perception that “doing good is good enough”. Since charitable organization often have both employees and volunteers and they have different needs, goals and competence levels it is crucial to manage both groups in a suitable way in order to achieve the organizational goals. For that reason we will focus on how charitable organizations can use Human Resource Management to motivate their staff in order to get a desirable performance and a better outcome.

Aim: The purpose with our research is to see how HRM is used in order to manage the volunteers and employees in a charitable organization and what consequences this design has for the organization. Since previous research has not focused on both employees and volunteers our research will fill an important gap and therefore our ambition is to contribute to the research society by acknowledging this phenomenon.

Methods: In this research we have done a single qualitative case study of Rädda Barnen and conducted two interviews.

Completion and results: We have discovered that both groups are managed differently in the four areas of HRM (flows, performance, involvement & development) since they have different needs, goal and competence levels. Furthermore, we found that Rädda Barnen has been struggling with retaining (and recruiting) volunteers.
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1. Introduction

1.1. Background

Charitable organizations have existed for many years and for decades they have helped and saved people’s lives all over the world. These organizations do not only save lives, every charitable organization has a different purpose; some help people and fight for human rights and others preserve our nature and environment. One of the organizations that fight for human rights is Rädda Barnen\(^1\) which is active in Sweden. RB in Sweden focuses mostly on helping exposed children and to raise awareness about children’s rights. Apart from local issues they also cooperate with their counterparts in other countries with ongoing issues like poverty or diseases and more urgent issues like the Tsunami in South East Asia 2004 or the earthquake and tsunami in Japan 2011. These disasters affected a lot of people, but if charitable organizations would not have been present these disasters could have taken many more lives than they did. Therefore, these organizations have a very important role in our society and they work with issues that concern us all.

Charitable organizations are an interesting type of organization. They work in a sector that is different from many other and which have specific characteristics. Charitable organizations are classified in the third sector (also called the nonprofit sector); they are neither belonging to the public nor the private sector (Foote, 2001). According to Fenwick (2005) they are not private since they do not have the purpose to make profits, but they are not public either since they generally are non-governmental. In the nonprofit sector the main objective is to focus on social rather than economic issues and the organizations in the sector are often established and managed by people with strong ideological beliefs (Foote, 2001). The nonprofit sector also has a unique mix of people involved in the organization. They often consist of a large number of both profession-

---

\(^1\) From now on Rädda Barnen will be called RB
Volunteers differ from paid employees in many ways and are also treated differently. One of the most apparent differences is that they are not being compensated financially; they are working for altruistic reasons or to gain skills and experience (Wisner et al., 2005).

Since the two workforces (i.e. employees and volunteers) have different needs, goals and competence levels it is crucial to manage both groups in a suitable way in order to achieve the organizational objectives. For that reason we will focus on how charitable organizations can use Human Resource Management\(^2\) to coordinate their staff in order to get a desirable performance and outcome. Akingbola (2006) mentions three reasons why HRM is important for nonprofit organizations; (1) the human resources cannot be replaced with physical capital since charitable organization provide personal services, (2) people in these organizations are more motivated by values and beliefs than anything else and this is important to consider when recruiting, retaining and motivating employees, (3) in order to receive funding these organizations need to deliver high quality services and therefore the staff is one of the most important stakeholders in the organization. Parry & Kelliher (2009) have also emphasized that human resources are one of the most important assets that charitable organizations have and they therefore also have to be carefully managed. But, in reality, how does a charitable organization manage two workforces which have different characteristics?

### 1.2. Problem discussion

The central function of the HR department is to strategically manage the people in the organization in order to secure a competitive advantage compared to other organizations. HRM is a very large concept with many parts, but it has traditionally been divided into “soft” and “hard” HRM. The “hard” version of HRM assumes a more rational approach to managing human resources which mainly benefits the organization. It is achieved through optimal use and deployment of employees (Cunningham, 1999). The hard version of HRM is not suitable for a charitable organization since they do not have

\(^2\) From now on Human Resource Management will be called HRM
the primary goal to benefit the organization (i.e. they are nonprofit), but instead a goal to benefit their cause. Charitable organizations mainly use a “softer” version of HRM instead which has a different focus; its main emphasis lies on securing commitment and motivation of the workforce in order to meet the long-term goals of the organization. This is achieved through individualized practices like communication between management and employees, employee involvement, empowerment and training & development (Cunningham, 1999). Bredin & Söderlund (2011) also mention that many of these factors are parts of HRM. According to them an HRM system consists of four different areas; flows, performance, involvement and development. Flows include managing the movement of people in, out and within the organization and Performance covers ways to make people motivated to perform through for example appraisal, feedback and reward systems. Involvement is practices to make the employees involved in decision making and/or to have an influence over their own working conditions and Development gives them the opportunity to develop both personally and professionally. These different areas appear in any organization, but they have traditionally not been actively managed in charitable organizations.

Cunningham (1999) mentions that prior to the 1980’s Human Resource Management were not considered important within the nonprofit sector and this might also be the reason for why there is a lack of research. In this field charitable organizations have traditionally based their management on informality, principles of goodwill and commitment. They have mainly been working under the perception that “doing good is good enough” and the volunteers have resisted control. Recently this trend has changed, mainly because the nonprofit sector has grown and become more important. HRM has got a more significant role and it is no longer enough to build an organization on good intentions only. Today, donors require good management practices and greater attention to HR issues in order to provide the organizations with funding. Despite this, Cunningham (1999) in his article acknowledges that there is a risk and fear among many charitable organizations that management practices, like HRM, will undermine the autonomy, values and distinct working methods of the organizations. For them it is to a large extent associated with the pursuit of profits and competitiveness and therefore do not always coincide well with the values of charitable organizations. On the other hand, Armstrong (1992, cited in Foote, 2001, pp. 26) argues that there are many similarities
between HRM in the nonprofit sector and in other sectors because charitable organizations have the same need to recruit, develop and retain staff as any other organization.

Since HRM is still relatively new and unfamiliar for charitable organizations there has not been much research done in the sector within the four areas (i.e. flows, performance, involvement, development). The interest of researching HRM in the nonprofit sector have increased in recent years, but it still only covers a very small part of the total HRM-literature. Some scientific articles discuss specific aspects of HRM in the sector, such as commitment (cf. Alatrista & Arrowsmith, 2004; Cunningham, 2001) or recruitment (cf. Nickson et al, 2008; Akingbola, 2004), but they are primarily focusing on specific contextual problems (e.g. in the contracting industry or health care provision in Ireland and Britain) and the reasons behind them and not the implementation of HRM in the sector. Furthermore, most of the previous research has a main focus on the employed workforce and not the volunteers (cf. Parry & Kelliher, 2009; Nickson et al., 2008; Cunningham, 2001) and we have not found any studies that take both groups into account. The only study with a specific focus on volunteers is Cuskelley et al.’s (2006) research about HRM in sports clubs, where they find a link between HRM and volunteer retention.

Although both volunteers and employees are “working” for the organization they have different roles, power, needs and goals. These differences between the two groups influence the way HRM is implemented in the organization and creates a need for designing two HRM systems instead of one. Using two different systems (i.e. for volunteers and employees) might be necessary and important for the organization, but it might also create problems, confusion and an extra workload. Cunningham (1999) also highlights that charitable organizations cannot treat both volunteers and employees exactly the same, but they cannot put more emphasis on one group either since they are both important for the organization. Kellock Hay et al. (2001) mention that it is difficult to coordinate employees and volunteers, but that there are also other factors that increase the complexity and hinders the implementation of the HRM system. These factors include, for example, strong commitment to organizational values (i.e. resistance to change), resource scarcity, multiple and vague objectives and diverse stakeholder interests. If all
these different factors are not taken into account when designing the HRM system this can cause problems with managing the dual workforce.

There are a few studies that have mentioned different problems that can arise when having both paid and unpaid staff in the organization. Hatten (1982) mentions that problems can arise because of the fact that professional paid staff and (voluntary) board members share similar responsibilities. Tension might therefore be created because of different priorities and views of who is responsible and how things should be done. Wilson & Pimm (1996) agree with this to a certain extent and say that employees and volunteers often feel like they are being treated unfairly and that the other group is being favored. Employees might think that the volunteers are favored and allocated the more interesting tasks while they have to do the more unpleasant work and they might also fear being replaced by volunteers if the organization has the opportunity to do so. Volunteers, on the other hand, see themselves as the ones doing all the hard operational work meanwhile the employees get the more rewarding and attractive tasks handed to them. Wilson & Pimm (1996), further emphasize that the difference in motivations is a serious problem. They acknowledge that the employees in the nonprofit sector are similar to employees in other sectors because they are bounded by contract and receive financial rewards, but the special circumstances in the sector influence the way employees are managed. Employees cannot be offered the same competitive terms and conditions (e.g. high salaries, overtime compensation) as in other sectors since charitable organizations have restricted access to funding. This can lead to problems with recruiting and retaining employees in the organization since they are drawn to other sectors. Since volunteers cannot get financial rewards it is in their case more important to focus on understanding their needs and motivating them with other types of rewards like growth opportunities (cf. Parry et al, 2005; Wilson & Pimm, 1996). According to Robinson (1994) motivating volunteers is not difficult since they are already committed to the cause, but they do expect a lot of space, autonomy and personal say in the organization. Cunningham (1999, pp. 21), on the other hand, sees this as a greater problem and acknowledges the difficulty with managing volunteers and say that “... there are doubts whether a more formalized approach to managing volunteers is appropriate for people who freely give their time for altruistic and religious reasons, as well as self-interest”. We believe it is indeed important to manage volunteers, even though they give their
time freely, since the organization needs to direct their staff towards the goals. If the volunteers are not managed it is difficult to coordinate the operations and to have an effect to organizational performance.

As we can see, there is a lot of controversy with managing volunteers and employees, but either way it is important to understand their needs and design an HRM system that is adapted to both groups. We will develop our research from this and study how the HRM system is designed to fit both workforces. In the next sections we will develop our research questions and further explain the purpose of this study.

1.3. Research questions

As we have seen in the problem discussion there are issues with the use of HRM in charitable organizations and that it is difficult to manage both employees and volunteers. Furthermore, we do not know how charitable organizations practically manage both groups simultaneously. This has not been acknowledged in traditional HRM research, but we think that it is worth highlighting. Our main research question is:

*How does a charitable organization manage employees and volunteers in the four areas of Human Resource Management: Flows, Performance, Involvement and Development?*

And our sub-question is:

*What consequences do this have for the organization?*

1.4. Purpose

The purpose with our research is to see how HRM is used in order to manage the volunteers and employees in a charitable organization and to develop a better understanding of what consequences this design have for the organization. Since previous research has
not focused on both employees and volunteers our research will fill an important gap and therefore our ambition is to contribute to the research society by acknowledging the management of two workforces.

1.5. Limitation and criticism of sources

Our focus will lie on charitable organizations in particular and not on other organizations in the nonprofit sector (e.g. sport clubs). We have furthermore decided to concentrate on project-based charitable organizations in particular since they have some additional factors that they need to consider when implementing HRM. Their human resource management needs to be adapted to fit both in a charitable organization and a project-based one. We also chose this organizational structure to limit ourselves and to facilitate our reasoning and make a better analysis. Furthermore, we will not cover all areas within human resource management. It is impossible to do this since it is a very large field and we only have limited time, space and access to information. We will focus on four different areas (i.e. flows, performance, involvement and development) that we think are relevant to our type of organization in order to get a general picture of HRM.

Our study will be limited by the fact that we have only been able to conduct a small number of interviews and only in one organization. We are aware of the fact that the interviewees have subjective opinions and that organizational documents might be biased. To minimize the negative effects of this we have carefully selected objective data and compared the information from the interviews with the organizational documents. Moreover, the interviews were long (one 60 min & one 90 min) which to some extent can compensate the fact that they were few.
2. Methodology

2.1. Science and research

It is impossible to find a common definition of science; neither methodology books nor encyclopedias give a generally accepted view of the concept. According to the Merriam-Webster dictionary (2011) science is “Knowledge or a system of knowledge covering general truths or the operation of general laws especially as obtained and tested through scientific method”. Kvale (1997) also give two different definitions in his book. His first example is a more simple definition. He defines science as “…the activity of, and the knowledge produced by, scientists” (pp. 61). In his second definition he mentions that a study is scientific if it produces “…methodologically secured new and systematic knowledge” (pp. 61). These definitions are rather vague and it is difficult to come to a conclusion on what constitutes a scientific study. On other hand these definition still have one thing in common: science is knowledge produced with the use of some kind of method. Therefore in this chapter we will describe the research method we have used to conduct this study and argue for in what ways it is scientific and producing valuable knowledge.

2.2. Research design

We have chosen to conduct a case study of Rädda Barnen since we wanted to study a large, well organized charitable organization that operates in Sweden. Rädda Barnen is an organization that is politically and religiously neutral and non-governmental and we think this is important since they can act independently without a strong influence from different parties. We have chosen to use interviews when gathering our empirical data and as a complement we have used empirical material from secondary sources such as annual reports and other organizational documents. Furthermore, we have also used interview material from a previous study of RB. We have conducted one interview with an employee in the organization and one with a volunteer. The employee we inter-
viewed has worked as an organizational developer in one of RB’s regional offices for eight years and has an education within the field of Human Resource Management. He is also an employee representative on the national board of directors. At the office the employee is specialized in organizational issues and education and has frequent contact with both volunteers at the local level and employees at the head office. The volunteer we have chosen has been president on the board of directors both in a local association and in a district association since 2004. As president the volunteer has the utmost responsibility of everything that happens in the district and has to be informed of what happens both on high and low levels of the organization. Her local association is one of the most active in Sweden and the district is one of the largest districts. For that reason we consider the employee and the volunteer to be suitable interview subjects. They both have insight into what happens on all levels of the organization and they are also directly involved in the HRM system. By interviewing them we could get their view on how HRM functions in practice and a greater understanding of the system.

In later sections we will further explain why a case study and interviews are the most suitable methods to use in this study and how we have ensured that the study is scientific, but first of all we will start by looking at some different perspectives of science and relate them to our study.

### 2.2.1. Quantitative and qualitative research methods

A common way of dividing research methods is between quantitative and qualitative studies. There are many factors that make qualitative studies different from quantitative ones. A qualitative study has a focus on presenting results in words and arguments rather than numbers. There is more emphasis on empirical data; theory and analysis are built upon the empirical findings. Quantitative studies, on the other hand, are generally based on “hard facts” (e.g. statistical and objective data) whereas qualitative studies are based on a deeper contextual understanding (Bryman & Bell, 2005). In our opinion a qualitative study is the most appropriate choice for our study since we want to develop a

---

3 From now on the organizational developer will be called OD
4 From now on the board president will be called BP
A deeper understanding of how a charitable organization work with HRM today, how the systems are structured and how the two different workforces are handled. Furthermore, we will also build our analysis on empirical findings and arguments and not on statistical methods and numbers.

Quantitative studies have generally been granted more support and are claimed to be more “scientific” than qualitative studies. Kvale (1997) argues that this characterization of qualitative studies as being less scientific depends entirely on your definition of science. As we have already mentioned, science is a concept with many different definitions and there is no way of generally characterizing qualitative methods (e.g. interviews), or any other method, as being scientific or non-scientific. Other authors have similar opinions (cf. Gummesson, 2000; Gustavsson, 2003) and state that the most important is that the method used is suitable for the study and for answering the formulated research question. If it is not suitable it could hardly be called scientific whether it is qualitative or quantitative. Different research questions will require different research methods in order to give reasonable answers. Case study research can be both qualitative and quantitative, but they are more likely to be qualitative (cf. Gummesson, 2003; Bryman & Bell, 2003). We think that a qualitative method is the most suitable for us to use and we do not think our study would be scientific if we would use a quantitative study. Our research question would be very difficult to answer with statistical methods since we would not get the detailed information that we need to analyze the situation. Neither would we get a deep and contextual understanding of how an organization deals with two different workforces.

Gummesson (2003) and Yin (2003) are some of the authors who argued that qualitative data is frequently used in case study because the phenomenon is often unclear and complex and it cannot be expressed precisely in a quantitative manner. Although, the authors note that this does not mean that a quantitative approach is never appropriate for a case study. Almost in all case study research individual interviews are used and they are usually the main source of data gathered, but this will be further described in the section about interviews.
2.2.2. Inductive and deductive research

Within science there are two different views that can be used to describe the relation between theory and research; the inductive and the deductive approach. The latter one is considered to be the most common way to describe the relation. The deductive approach originates from a theoretical perspective where concepts, models or theories are used to state one or several hypothesis that will transfer into real life (Bryman & Bell, 2005; Gummesson, 2003). This view is often associated with quantitative research. In contrast to deductive research, the inductive strategy is most of the time connected with qualitative research (Bryman & Bell, 2005). An inductive approach has its starting point from empirical observations and not existing theories (Gummesson, 2003). It is also possible to combine these approaches by, for instance, having a deductive perspective at the start with a feature of an inductive perspective by changing or modifying the existing theory with the empirical data that has been gathered (cf. Gummesson, 2003; Yin, 2003). Gummesson (2003) argues that case study research does not necessarily have to be either inductive or deductive, but it is still important to clarify which of them will be used as a starting point. In our research it is natural to have an inductive approach since we are doing a case study. It is inductive because before we started this study we went through the previous research and observed that our research area has not been fully covered yet. For this reason we decided to examine this area in real life and used the theoretical framework as help to interpret the phenomenon.

2.3. Case study research

“Case study research means that one or several cases from real life are used as empirical data for research, especially when knowledge of an area is sparse or missing, and when a complex phenomenon is studied” (Gummesson, 2007, pp.87).

As Gummesson (2007) has expressed in the quotation above case studies will help the researcher by providing primary data. The main reason for using case studies is because a phenomenon that is often entirely or partly unknown is being studied. Yin (2003, pp.
has defined case studies in a similar way as Gummesson (2003) and say that a case study is, “[...] an empirical inquiry that (1) investigates a contemporary phenomenon within real-life context, especially when (2) the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident”. Both authors have two common points in the definition of case studies; that they are empirical research of a real-life phenomenon and that the phenomenon is complex. Gummesson (2003) further explained that many times it consists of a great number of variables that are linked together and thereby makes the phenomenon very complex. The author also pointed out that this complexity often makes it difficult to overview and predict the phenomenon, and it is not unusual that it is ambiguous or confusing. A case-study researcher is not satisfied with only doing simple interpretations of causalities they rather want to know the mechanism of the whole phenomenon (Yin, 2003). Case studies can facilitate the understanding of a phenomenon since the researcher finds empirical data, interprets and analyzes it and finally illustrates the results in a case to describe reality (Gummesson, 2003).

While designing a case study the primary distinction is between single and multiple case studies with a holistic or embedded perspective. A holistic perspective means that only a single unit is the object of analysis, while an embedded perspective not only focuses on one unit but also gives attention to several subunits. We will be doing a single embedded case study since we want to examine all four areas within the HRM system for both volunteers and employees. An embedded case will allow us to analyze more than one unit simultaneously and not need to focus within one specific area. By doing this we can also avoid a common critique that the holistic design often gets; the researcher easily slips away from the subject area. At the same time there is also a pitfall for embedded case studies where there is a risk that subunits will get a greater importance than the main subject/case. We are fully aware of this problem and have avoided this by careful planning during the progress of this research and we have focused evenly on the two workforces and the four areas within the HRM. We have multiple times reflected over the relevance of different theories and empirical data uses, and in the end highlighted the most important and interesting points to study in this research.
2.3.1. Conditions for case study research

Case studies are one of the many ways that can be used when conducting scientific research. Yin (2003) has identified three conditions which show if case studies are the appropriate method to use when executing a research study. Yin’s (2003) first condition is that the appropriateness of a method depends on what kind of question is stated. According to him a research question which begins with “how” or “why” is more appropriate for a case study. The second and third conditions imply to what extent and degree the researcher has control over actual behavioral events and contemporary events. The researcher of a case study will observe contemporary events while actual behaviors are not possible to manipulate. In this study we have followed and assured that the three criteria of Yin (2003) were met before we executed the case study. First of all we formulated our main question with “how”. Furthermore we knew that we had many options when observing a charitable organization and that there is a lot of information sources that can be used. We also knew that the strong ideological culture of charitable organizations is not easy to change or manipulate, which means that we have better control over the phenomenon. For that reason, we think a case study is a suitable research method for our study.

2.3.2. Misunderstandings and criticism against case studies

According to Yin (2003) the greatest problem with case studies is the lack of rigor in the research. In his opinion the researcher can sometimes be perceived as sloppy since they do not follow a systematic process and fail to be unbiased which influences the direction of the research. Another frequent concern is that a single case study is not enough to generalize the results. Flyvbjerg (2006), on the other hand, argues that this is a common misunderstanding about case studies. According to him case studies should be used as a supplement or an alternative to other methods since it contributes to and develops the research community (we will discuss this more in generalization). A third criticism of case studies is that it is a very time-consuming process and often results in enormous and unreadable data. This is a common misunderstanding as well that is not
true in all cases and that can be avoided if the research is written and conducted in a proper way. Depending on the kind of case study chosen the time perspective can be affected. In general ethnographical case studies need a longer time-period in order to gather the details and observe the evidence, while participant-observational case studies are not as time-consuming, but it still required a lot time because the researcher has to get involved in the case themselves.

Despite these critiques against case studies we think we have clarified some of the misunderstandings. We have carried out our case study with the participation-observation method. Because of our circumstances we have not been able to directly participate in the case study (i.e. be involved in the actual organizational work) and therefore it will be more of an observational case study. We are confident that we carried out our research successfully and have achieved the criteria of good quality (see the section research quality).

2.4. Interviews

Qualitative interviews are, in contrast to questionnaires, loosely structured and more open to what the interview subject and the interviewer think is relevant to discuss (Alvesson, 2003). According to Kvale (1997) the goal of the qualitative interview is to describe qualitative aspects of the interviewee’s world and work with words instead of numbers (in contrast to quantitative studies). He argues that interviews are a valid method to use when gathering data since the precision of the data collected in an interview correspond well to the exactness of qualitative material. In order to answer our main question we need to learn how employees and volunteers are managed; this requires extensive information and a deep understanding of RB’s HRM system which is difficult to achieve with any method other than interviews. We could of course have complemented our study with questionnaires, but they would be of limited applicability to us, since we had questions that demand more detailed answers than can be given in a survey.
According to Kvale (1997) interview research is a process which can be divided into seven phases. Going through these phases helps the researchers facilitate the process and keep the motivation throughout the study. These seven steps are: thematizing (formulating the purpose of the study before the interview takes place), designing (plan all stages of the process and gain necessary theoretical understanding before the interview), interviewing (conduct the interview following an interview guide, but with a reflective approach), transcribing (preparing the material for analysis by transforming it from oral speech to written text), analyzing (analyze the material based on the purpose of the study and the nature of the empirical data), verifying (making sure that the material is valid, reliable and in some cases generalizable) and reporting (communicate the findings in a scientific and readable way). In making this study we have gone through these different steps and put effort into careful preparation before conducting the interviews.

In the thematizing phase we started with thinking about the purpose of our study and what we wanted to research, making a time schedule and deepen our theoretical knowledge about the main topic. After we had gained a sufficient theoretical understanding we started to formulate the interview questions and adapted the questions to the specific interview subject (i.e. we did not ask exactly the same questions to the employee and the volunteer). We asked questions related to all four of our theoretical areas (flows, performance, involvement and development) in order to get answers related to our topic and to get an overview of all four areas. We have also chosen to do this in order to have a red line and a common structure that go through all parts of our study (the frame of reference, the empirical data and the analysis). This, we hope, will make the study more understandable and clear to the reader. Furthermore, we sent the interview questions to the subject a couple of days before the interview took place in order to give them the chance to prepare themselves. During the interview we followed the main structure we had prepared, but the interviews were loosely structured (i.e. we discussed the answers given and added new questions as we found it appropriate). The interviews took place in the interview subjects’ respective offices and lasted 60 minutes for the employee and 90 minutes for the volunteer. We transcribed the interview as soon as possible afterwards to ensure it was still fresh in our memory and sent the transcribed material to the interview subject in order to get approval and in some instances clarify misunderstandings. After we had gone through all these steps and made sure that it was
all accepted by the interview subjects we started to write it down and analyze it in our report.

According to Alvesson (2003) it is easy to regard qualitative interview as superior in finding out about the subject’s knowledge and experiences, but it is also important to note that the interview is a complex situation. In the ideal interview situation the interviewee would be both competent and telling the truth or as Alvesson (2003, pp. 14) states in his article: “...acting in the service of science and producing the data needed to reveal his or her ‘interior’ (i.e., experiences, feelings, values) or the ‘facts’ of the organization.” This is of course not always the case and therefore it is important that the interviewer is cautious, has a reflexive approach, a theoretical understanding and consider different viewpoints. We have taken this into account and been aware of these problems when conducting our interviews. In our opinion we have been able to collect relevant data about the organization (‘hard facts’), but also about the interviewee’s experiences and feelings and we do not think that their subjective view of the organization makes this information useless. We rather think that it gives a wider, more nuanced picture of the organization and the employees’/volunteers’ opinion of the HRM system. As mentioned earlier, we have also been careful to compare information from different sources and to primarily use information which is more objective in its nature in order to avoid a biased result.

2.5. Research quality

In the two previous sections, we have described the procedure of conducting case studies and interviews, but we have not in detail described what constitutes a good case study. The quality of a specific research study depends on how well it meets three different criteria: generalizability, validity and reliability. In this section we will explain these further and discuss the quality of our study. In our opinion we have achieved these three concepts to a certain extent, but it should be noted that this is a small study and because of limited time and resources it is difficult to ensure a high level of validity, reliability or generalizability. Despite this we have chosen a method that has enabled us to find what we were looking for and that led to correct conclusions being drawn.
2.5.1. Generalizability

In real life we constantly generalize and draw conclusions from our previous experiences, but in scientific research there are certain criteria that need to be fulfilled in order to be able to generalize the results of a study. Kvale (1997) discusses three different types of generalizability that can be related to case-study research; naturalistic, statistical and analytic. Naturalistic generalization is built on personal experience and tacit knowledge about a situation. It leads to expectations about future outcomes rather than precise predictions. In many ways our study is naturalistically generalizable since we can expect certain aspects of our results to be the same in similar contexts (e.g. other charitable organizations or other organizations with both employees and volunteers). Statistical generalization is primarily related to quantitative studies since statistical methods are used to confirm generalizability (e.g. probability coefficients are used to calculate if the results are limited to the group studied). Our study will not have statistically generalizable results since we have not used a quantified and random sample. Analytic generalizability consists of a reasoned judgment about the extent to which the results can be generalized and transferred to a different situation. In this case similarities and differences between situations are analyzed and generalization is based on reasoning, logic and strength of arguments. Our study is mainly analytically generalizable since we have reasoned about the transferability of our results and made judgments about what is context-specific and what is transferrable to other contexts. Since we have only looked at one single case though it is difficult to assure that our conclusions would be the same if we looked at different charitable organization. We can only assume that there is a resemblance between RB and other similar organizations.

As mentioned before, according to Yin (2003) generalizability is not the main goal of case studies. Case study research does not have a large enough sample to generalize over different populations. They should instead be used to expand the theoretical knowledge of a phenomenon and this is also the main goal with our study. We do not intend to generalize our results into other contexts, but we hope we can contribute with knowledge and insights about HRM in charitable organizations. In order to draw general conclusions we would have to look at more than one organization.
2.5.2. Validity

The validity of a text depends on the arguments’ accuracy and correctness. The validity of a study therefore depends on the validity of arguments put forward in the analysis and conclusion, but also on the interview subjects’ statements. A valid conclusion emanates from correct information and is well-founded, defensible and convincing. A broad definition of a valid study is that it measures and researches what it is supposed to do and that the observations reflect what they were meant to do (Kvale, 1997). This is achieved in our study since we have answered our research question and fulfilled the purpose of the study. Furthermore, we have focused on using arguments and information which is objective and in those instances where we have used subjective opinions we have avoided using them to draw general conclusions.

In his book, Yin (2003) mentions three kinds of validity; construct validity, internal validity and external validity. Construct validity is achieved through creating a study in the most suitable and correct way for the concepts/problems studied. Internal validity, on the other hand, is not as important in single case-studies; it is generally related to experiments. External validity has many similarities with generalizability and is many times problematic to achieve in case-studies. Because of the fact that we are conducting a case study it is difficult for us to achieve internal and external validity, but we have been able to assure a higher level of construct validity. This has been reached since we have used the method that is most suitable to answer our question (see previous sections). By using the right method we have been able to find the information necessary to fulfill our purpose and to draw correct conclusions.

2.5.3. Reliability

Reliability relates to the consistency of the research results and reliable results are generally considered to be results that are objective and that have not been influenced by the researchers’ subjective view. An example of a situation that decreases reliability is when researchers ask the interview subject questions that lead them to a certain answer (Kvale, 1997). According to Yin (2003) a study is reliable if it would show the same
results if it was repeated by someone else using the same method and procedure. One important way of increasing reliability is to carefully document how the study was conducted. Thereby it is made clear for the reader how the study was conducted and it will be possible for someone else to do the same study over again if they wish. It is of course difficult to claim that any results are reliable, but we have taken measures to ensure that our results are as objective and reliable as possible. As an example we have used different sources and compared the information between them. The fact that we are two persons conducting this research also increases reliability since we are able to see things from different perspectives and viewpoints and thereby ensure less subjective opinion. We have also carefully gone through each step of the process before moving on to the next step (e.g. by reviewing the interview questions several times both before and between interviews) and we have documented and reported how our study was conducted (in this chapter).
3. Frame of reference

In this section we will look at the four different areas within HRM; flows, performance, involvement and development. We have chosen this structure in order for there to be a clear red line that follows throughout the report. These four areas are not a theory in themselves, but purely a way for us to sort the extensive information and many theories that exist within HRM in a logical way. We will explain these areas separately in the following sections.

3.1. Flows

Flows is an area within HRM which deals with the management of in- and outflows of human resources across the organizational boundaries, but also the management of internal flows in the organization (Bredin & Söderlund, 2011). This flow of people in and out of organizations is becoming more and more important to have control over since people today are more mobile than before; it has become more accepted in today’s society to jump between jobs and organizations and the relationship between companies and employees has thereby changed. Employees are craving more and more in terms of growth opportunities and favorable work characteristics and are not afraid to change jobs if they are not satisfied (Rodriguez, 2008). We have chosen to illustrate the organizational flows with figure 1 which describes the way employees flow through the organization and across organizational boundaries. The figure illustrates three different processes in which flows need to be managed; selection & recruitment, internal flows and release (exit selection) (Huemann et al., 2007; Bredin & Söderlund, 2011). In the next three sections we will go more in depth into these flows and how they are managed.
Recruitment and Selection

Every organization uses some sort of staffing procedure and Windolf (1986) acknowledges the fact that organizations have more control and autonomy over recruitment and selection than they have over managing the outflows from the organization (i.e. since there are more laws controlling the organization’s ability to release employees). Ployhart (2006) also mentions that it is a very important part of an organization’s human resource management since it directly influences the quality of the workforce and consequently the possibility to meet organizational goals. Even though recruitment and selection are interrelated processes they are not the same; recruitment is the first step focused on expanding the pool of candidates for a job by attracting them to the organization whereas selection is the next step which focuses on reducing the number of suitable applicants and selecting the right candidate for the job (cf. Orlitzky, 2007; Rodriguez, 2008; Rynes & Barber, 1990). According to Huselid (1995) both these practices are important since both a large pool of possible candidates and a reliable selection procedure together will ensure high quality and skills of human resources. The reason for this is that when careful recruitment and selection are used the organization will be able to find the candidates that are best suited for the specific job opening. Huselid (1995) fur-
ther argues that finding the most suitable candidate will in turn increase both employee motivation and retention.

According to Windolf (1986) the recruitment process consists of three distinct steps (see figure 2). The first step is to create a job description and profile of the ideal candidate for the job. The precision of the profile varies, but it can for example contain requirements for age, sex and education. A more precise description will reduce the number of potential applicants. The second stage of the recruitment process is to choose the channels that will be used to find the candidate described in the profile. The organization has many different options here; they could for example advertise in newspapers, journals or on the internet, recruit internally or use their employees’ social networks. The internal labor force and social networks are closed channels with restricted access and therefore also reduce the number of potential applicants. At the third stage of recruitment the applicants will pass through specific filters that the organization has chosen (at this stage the process change from recruitment to selection). These filters could be for example interviews, application forms or tests. Interviewing is the most common filter, but different firms use different filters. There are no recruitment practices that are right or wrong, but in Ployhart’s (2006) opinion it is important to use structured procedures where job descriptions are detailed and where the recruitment is consistent and coherent. He argues that if recruitment is carefully managed the most suitable employees will be found and this will increase organizational effectiveness.
The selection process starts when enough applicants have shown interest in a specific position. The goal of this process is to find the most suitable candidate by testing their potential for a certain job, but also by testing their compatibility with the organization (Harel & Tzafrir, 1999). Selection is an important phase in order to find the best candidate, but it is important that the recruitment phase first ensures that there are a sufficient number of applicants. Ployhart (2006, pp. 870) highlights this fact and mentions that “Selection will only be effective and financially defensible if a sufficient quantity of applicants apply to the organization”. As mentioned earlier, the most common and prevailing selection method is the employment interview. According to Barclay (2001) one of the reasons for why employment interviews continue to be the most common selection method is because they cost less time and resources than other methods. There are many other methods that could be used and that are being used to a varied extent in different organizations, but we will not cover them in this report. Some of these different measures are personality tests, cognitive ability tests, assessment centers and situational judgment tests which all, in different ways, measure how the applicant would behave on the job (Ployhart, 2006).

3.1.2. Internal flows

When a candidate has been selected and becomes an employee in the organization another phase starts for the HR department; the flows in this part are internal flows (e.g. assignment and release from projects or job rotation) (Bredin & Söderlund, 2011). Job rotation has similarities to career development and will be further discussed in that section of this report. Huemann et al. (2007) has divided the project: (1) assignment to project; the organization has the responsibility to compose the project team, (2) employment on project; project managers develop the project, (3) dispersement from project; when the goal of the project is accomplished the team disperses.

Assignment to projects is similar to the recruitment into the organization and Huemann et al. (2007) highlight that this is a strategically important area for the organization. The reason for this is that it can, for example, influence the organization’s ability to retain personnel; if the “right” individuals are chosen the organization is more likely to be able to retain them. Fabi & Pettersen (1992) further argues that selecting team members is
important since a good choice will increase performance whereas a bad choice will waste both time and money and possibly reduce the image and reputation of the organization. They especially mention the importance of selecting a project manager with the right skills, qualities and personal attributes for the job (e.g. management-, decision-making- and communication-skills). The employment phase takes place during the project and in this phase it is the responsibility of the project manager to develop the project (Huemann et al., 2007). According to Packendorff (2002) project work will be enhanced for the individual (and performance thereby raised) if there are realistic expectations on them, if they only work in one project at the time, can control their own working hours and if the project is not too short or too long. In order to keep the staff motivated their task should also be interesting and important. When dispersement from projects occur there are several options for coordinating and managing flows; (1) some employee may start with a new project immediately (a new project process is started), (2) some may be assigned to a future project that has not started yet and (3) for others there will be no suitable positions and they will have to wait for future projects. This is the stage where the organization is most likely to lose employees and therefore it has to be properly managed both on the individual level to ensure employee well-being and on the organizational level to retain key personnel (Huemann et al., 2007). In figure 3 is an overview of the whole project process.

![Figure 3. The project process, Huemann et al., 2007](image-url)
3.1.3. Release

If employees, for example, misbehave or want to quit voluntarily the organization advances to the last phase of flows which is release of employees (Huemann et al., 2007). Windolf (1986) also calls this exit selection (as opposed to entry selection) and this is an area where the organization is more restricted than in recruitment since they are prevented by laws to dismiss staff because of reasons such as their age or their productivity. There are of course natural reasons for releasing employees as well, but under some circumstances the organization have to lay off people that are not misbehaving and do not wish to quit their job. This can happen for example when the organization is under financial constraint, when industries are experiencing a decreasing demand or when there is a merger with another organization.

In a study by Lee et al. (1996) they conclude that voluntary turnover can depends on many different factors and sometimes these are not in the management’s control. In their article they argue that it is too optimistic to believe that managers can have a great influence on turnover simply by increasing employee satisfaction or commitment. What they instead found was that people were more influenced and encouraged to stay in the organization by various contextual factors such as supervision, training and job design. They also acknowledged the interesting fact that compensation was rarely an issue that contributed to voluntary turnover. In Another study made by Batt & Valcour (2003) they looked at different HRM practices and their influence on the propensity to quit. What they found was that factors such as flexible work schedules, supportive supervisors and job security were factors related with low turnover. These factors are similar to those found in Lee et al.’s (1996) study since they both mention different contextual factors as most related to low turnover. There are several other authors that have also mentioned factors that can reduce turnover and influence the retention of personnel. Examples of these factors are challenging and meaningful work, opportunities to advance, empowerment, responsibility, learning opportunities, good relationship with colleagues and work-life balance (cf. Goaverts & Kyndt et al., 2010; Hytter, 2007). More about these different factors will be covered in the coming sections performance, involvement and development.
In figure 4 there below is a summary of the most important theories and points made in the area of flows. It is an important area since flows are constantly present and need to be actively managed in all parts of an organization. Flows into the organization are represented by the recruitment and selection processes (e.g. descriptions, channels, filters) chosen by the organization to find the best candidates for an open position. Internal flows consist mainly of the project process (i.e. assignment, employment and dispersement from projects) which is primarily handled by the project manager. Release is the flow the organization has least control over; voluntary turnover is not always in management’s control and it is more related to contextual factors than, for example, commitment and satisfaction.

Figure 4. Management of organizational flows, Huemann et al, 2007; Bredin & Söderlund, 2011; Windolf, 1986; Lee et al., 1996
3.2. Performance

For management it is important to develop work settings that encourage high performance of employees and procedures that give the employees the drive to continuously improve. This can be done through, for example, motivation, feedback and reward systems (Latham et al., 2005). These factors are depicted in figure 5. As Huselid (1995) also mentions HRM practices are important in order to encourage employees to work both harder and smarter since even highly skilled employees will not work efficiently if they are not motivated to perform. On the other hand, Lebas (1995) acknowledges the fact that performance can be difficult both to measure and to manage because of its ambiguity; it can be defined as anything from efficiency to resistance or return on investment. Furthermore, the problem is not only defining what performance is, but also to be able to transform the complexity of reality into something that can be measured and communicated.

![Figure 5. Factors influencing performance, Latham et al., 2005](image)

Performance management is one of the core requirements of leadership. It is about the desire to motivate people to improve their performance, give them feedback related to organizational goals and continue doing so until the goals are attained (Latham et al., 2005). According to Daniels & Daniels (2004) the essence of performance management
is to create a workplace that brings out the best in people at the same time as it generates the highest possible value for the organization.

### 3.2.1. Rewards and Motivation

A way of encouraging people to perform is to increase their satisfaction by rewarding them either financially or non-financially. Usually a difference is made between intrinsic and extrinsic rewards. Intrinsic rewards are internally driven and linked to, for example, self-actualization (e.g. personal development), work satisfaction and motivating job tasks. Extrinsic rewards are externally provided monetary (e.g. salary, bonuses) or non-monetary (e.g. access to gym, company car) rewards (Kessler, 2001).

Both intrinsic and extrinsic rewards are used on a regular basis in order to motivate people to perform well, but Guthrie (2007) acknowledges that the incentive/motivational effects of extrinsic rewards are a highly debated topic. That is not to say that extrinsic rewards are not important; according to Nohria et al. (2008), which have made a study based on research on the human brain, people have a built-in drive to acquire scarce goods (i.e. extrinsic rewards) in order to increase the sense of well-being. When this drive is not fulfilled we feel displeased. This drive is most easily satisfied by an organizational reward system and Nohria et al. (2008) further argue that performance may actually be increase since people are motivated to acquire higher extrinsic rewards. Even though there are different opinions on this it is still safe to say that both intrinsic and extrinsic rewards play a role in motivating employees, but in order to keep them motivated in the long run intrinsic motivation is crucial.

According to Gagné & Deci (2005) there are three basic needs that have to be satisfied in order to achieve high intrinsic motivation; autonomy, competence and relatedness (i.e. to have a connection to others). If the organization can create a work climate that fulfills these needs then it will lead to work outcomes such as efficient performance, job satisfaction and positive work attitudes. Nohria et al. (2008) also argue that we have a drive to bond (equivalent to the need for relatedness mentioned above) which can be satisfied by fostering a positive organizational culture with friendship, collaboration and
teamwork. Hackman & Oldham (1980, cited in Gagné & Deci, 2005) further argue that the best way to increase intrinsic motivation is through optimal job design (e.g. by providing variety & freedom and meaningful performance feedback). Nohria et al. (2008) agrees with this and argue that job design one motivational factor. According to them people have a drive to comprehend; to make sense of the world and make a meaningful contribution. This drive is best satisfied by designing jobs that are meaningful, interesting and challenging. Furthermore they also mention a drive to defend which is best satisfied if the organization uses fair and transparent processes in, for example, performance management.

Herzberg (1968) argues that the factors influencing motivation are not the same factors that influence dissatisfaction in a job; improving something that is dissatisfying does not automatically improve motivation among workers. He argues that satisfaction and dissatisfaction are not opposites of each other either; if something is not satisfying this does not mean that it is automatically dissatisfying. He calls the motivating factors motivator factors and the factors used to avoid dissatisfaction hygiene factors. The hygiene factors are company policy and administration, supervision, interpersonal relationships, working conditions, salary, status and security. In some respects his theory is thereby contradicting theories of other authors who argue that interpersonal relationships and salary have motivational qualities. Herzberg (1968) mentions the factors that should be used to increase employee motivation are achievement and recognition of achievement, job design, responsibility, growth and advancement.

In figure 6 below we have summarized the main theories mentioned we have that have an influence over performance. These theories are the two different types of rewards (i.e. intrinsic and extrinsic), but also Gagné & Deci’s (2005) and Nohria et al.’s (2008) different needs and drives that has to be fulfilled in order to achieve high motivation and performance. There is also the theory of Herzberg (1968) where he mentions a number of motivating factors (e.g. job design, growth opportunities) which he distinguishes from the factors that influence satisfaction (e.g. supervision, working conditions). As you can see there are many factors that can influence motivation and performance and we will look more in depth into some of these in our next two sections involvement and development.
Involvement

This section is about to which extent the employees are involved in the organization. Bredin & Söderlund (2011) explain it as the degree of employee influence in the decision-making processes as well as their individual influence of their own work and working conditions. The authors also add that the most important with involvement practices is not the mutual benefit for the both parties obtain (i.e. the organization and the employees); but if the organization is allowing the staff to exploit their knowledge in order to contribute and feel like they can develop. Furthermore, Kim et al. (2010) believes that by giving employees greater influence over their work and encourages them to have an opinion in the decision-making process is beneficial for both the employee and the organization.

**Figure 6.** Summary of theories relevant to performance, *Gagné & Deci, 2005; Nohria et al., 2008; Herzberg, 1968*

### 3.3. Involvement
There are several reasons for why organizations want the personnel to get involved. Beer et al. (1984, cited in Holden, 1996, pp. 59) argue that if the employees get involved in the organization can this enhance empowerment among the staff and encourage them to become more creative and motivated, which will in turn increase organizational efficiency. Raiden et al. (2008) have a similar idea that in order to increase organizational efficiency the managers and employees need to collaborate and share the power. The authors further noticed a relation between increased employee voice and power in decision-making process and greater participation and staff commitment. In the article of Pyman et al. (2006) it is mentioned that making use of employee voice can raise the employees’ position through facilitating the communication channels where they can express their opinions, solve problems and participate in the decision-making process. Furthermore, Torka et al. (2008) recognize that employee involvement can have a significant improvement on both products and processes.

As we can see the term involvement is very confusing and it is difficult to understand its genuine signification. Heller (2003) is one of those who acknowledge this and mentions that involvement can appear in different forms. He exemplified that one aspect of involvements is participation which can create confusion and is difficult to understand the real meaning of. Tannebaum (1968, cited in Heller, 2003) defined participation by saying that everyone can participate and nobody will lose out. Heller (2003) partly agrees with this but counters that this is only true for discussion or consulting issues, but it does not covers anything about giving away power or influence. In his opinion this kind of pseudo or inauthentic participation is well observed by several researchers. In many cases when inauthentic participation is used, it shows some positive effects that resulted in people feeling satisfied with their work or reduced resistance for change. On the other hand, he also noticed it has its consequences in the long-run if it continues at this rate. March and Simon (1958, cited in Heller, 2003) indicated that inauthentic participation is not possible to maintain for a longer period of time. They argued that the organization will soon notice behavioral changes; employees will start to become frustrated and skeptical which will also make them feel distrusted. To avoid the problem of inauthentic participation the organization should signalize serious intention on meetings, instead being satisfied with just giving the impression that employees can participate when this is not the true. Heller (2003) further argued that employee involvement is a vague term.
He explains that it is easy to tell the difference between someone who is involved in a play or in a football game, but that it is quite unclear in a workplace context since everyone is involved in an act of working. Instead of these vague concepts he suggested the term influence-sharing. He has made a study called the “25 year program of research” where he looked at influence in work settings and found out that influence implies the distribution of power-related activities between people by for example organizational democracy and power involvement. In the report examined the degree of influence-sharing since it is easier to associate with the quality and effectiveness of decisions than other definitions of participation (Heller, 1998).

Greasley et al. (2005) have a similar idea as Heller (1998), but instead of calling it influence-sharing the authors prefer the term employee participation where the concept is related to influence power. They argue that employee participation can exist in different forms, but its foundation is to develop practices that affect employee involvement and participation in decision-making and this can be viewed from a perspective of empowerment. The authors defined empowerment as something that “…involves the workforce being provided with a greater degree of flexibility and more freedom to make decisions relating to work” (Greasley et al., 2005 pp. 354). Heller (2003) has also commented that the term empowerment is also somehow related to employee involvement. According to him empowerment is when people are ”...given power to carry out activities that had eluded them previously and thus reduce their dependence on other people” (Heller, 2003 pp.147). He explained if we adapt this to a work context it will imply a degree of self-determination and independence. Walton (1985) further argues that if the organization wants the employee to perform creatively and be a fast responding, then the employees must have certain responsibilities and be encouraged to contribute more to their job. This cannot be achieved if the organization implements too rigid management control and employees are misplaced into narrow jobs. Flexibility and good control over the work is important for the staff, and especially in project-oriented organizations, since they often work in dynamic environments where multiple projects are carried out simultaneously and strict deadlines must be followed (Hovmark & Nordqvist, 1996; Zika-Viktorsson et al., 2006; Turner et al., 2008). The content, uniqueness, size and scope of a project can also contribute to project overload. Furthermore, lack of time, opportunities to recuperate between projects and lack of authority over assignment to projects can
also lead employee to feel they are losing the control over the work situation, work overload and a difficulty to sustain work-life-balance. Zika-Viktorsson et al. (2006) mean this will induce psychological stress and reduce performance. If the organization can successfully avoid this workload and stress, Hovmark & Nordqvist (1996) argues that the organization has potential to improve the organizational efficiency, employee commitment and solidarity.

Despite that employee involvement and participation seem to have a difference in meaning there are similar tools to achieve these concepts (cf. Raiden et al., 2008 & Budd et al., 2010). Budd et al. (2010) explain that the HRM literature has highlighted the importance of participation and voice; often in detail on how to get the employees to contribute efficiently to the organization by using their skills and knowledge. Corbridge & Pilbeam (1998, cited in Raiden et al., 2008), highlight five different ways to get employees involved. These are **downward communication, consultation and representatives, upward problem-solving, task participation and financial participation**, whereas the first three are also mentioned by Marchington and Wilkingson (2005, cited in Budd et al., 2010). They explain that direct communication and upward problem-solving is focused on direct individual influence. It is often a face-to-face operation that involves an interaction between the supervisor (and/or first line manager) and the subordinates. The **direct** form of employee voice takes place between employees and management, through the organization’s involvement practices. Direct employee voice refers to the degree which an individual or a group of employees can directly affect the decisions that in turn affect the employees’ day-to-day work (Purcell & Georgiadis 2006, cited in Marchington, 2007, pp. 232). This type of participation can take form in verbal participation as well as other more formalized ways of written information. Representative participation is aiming to have the employee in the center. Indirect forms of employee voice imply that there are representatives (e.g. unions, work councils, employee representation on company board of directors etc.) who will bargain and discuss with the mangers about the employees and their work (Levine & Tyson, 1990). The major issues raised in these meetings are primarily about the distribution of power and influence within the organization. **Task participation** is focused on encouraging the staff to undertake a great range of tasks through letting them get involved in job rotation, job enrichment, teamwork etc. In this case, the organization allows a greater authority among em-
employees and reinforces initiatives such as empowerment and semi-autonomous work groups (Pilbeam & Corbridge, 2006). Corbridge & Pilbeam (1998, cited in Raiden et al., 2008) stress that some of the involvement tools are more common than others and it is rare that organizations only utilize one of them; it is more likely that these types coexist in the organization. More of these explanations are summarized in table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Downward communication</strong></td>
<td>in the form of reports, videos, presentations, newspapers etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Upward problem-solving/ Direct communication</strong></td>
<td>in attitude surveys and suggestion systems and in face-to-face interaction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Task participation</strong></td>
<td>through job rotation, teamwork, semi-autonomous work, job enrichment etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Consultation and representative participation</strong></td>
<td>joint consultation and informal discussion between managers and employees, or employee representatives, trade unions, board of directors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Financial participation</strong></td>
<td>in the form of profit sharing schemes or employees sharing ownership</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 1. Involvement tools, Corbridge & Pilbeam, 1998; Marchington and Wilkinson, 2005*

Shown in table 1 are some of the few ways in which employees can express their opinion and have an impact on the organization. Besides these categories Torka et al. (2008) suggest that employee involvement practices have to be supported by several factors to achieve its purpose. They for instance mention that managers need to invest more time and money into these practices and to determine and describe the degree of influence the employees should have (e.g. the extent employees can raise their voice and make decisions together). Furthermore, time is an important factor to consider as well, since it will let the employee know the time-spans of different involvement processes (e.g. from the expression of an idea to feedback).

To summarize this section, we have seen that employee involvement is about participation either with or without power related activities (as we can see in some of the examples in table X). It is important for the organization to allow flexibility for the staff so that they will not become stressed and feel worn out. In addition, the organization needs
to show a genuine interest to involve the employees to avoid a pseudo effect. On the other hand, if the organization succeeds with implementing involvement practices, according to several authors this will create an empowered workforce and this in turn will enhance organizational efficiency. In Figure 7 is a summarization of the consequences of involvement.

\[\text{Figure 7, Summary of the effect of involvement}\]

3.4. Development

Development concerns both individual development as well as development at an aggregate level (i.e. for a specific unit or the whole organization). The organization should provide long-term development of competence and career development to the extent that it is beneficial for both employees and the organization (Bredin & Söderlund, 2011). Rodriguez (2008) also acknowledges that development does not only benefit the organization, but it is a motivational factor for the employees and important in order to retain them in the organization.

Cappelli (2000) emphasizes that the organization cannot control the movement of employees because this is determined by the market. Even if the organization offers a decent compensation and prevent staff from leaving they cannot fight against the pull of the market and avoid attractive offers from competitors and aggressive recruiters. It is also hard to attract talented people when they are highly demanded in the marketplace and often have several options to choose between. There is no insurance that employees will stay in an organization and for that reason it is important to focus on retaining the talented employees. Cappelli (2000, pp. 104) acknowledges that there is a difference between managing retention in the past and the present and illustrates this with saying that, “If managing employee retention in the past was akin to tending a dam that keeps
a reservoir in place, today it is more like managing a river. The object is not to prevent water from flowing out but to control its direction and its speed”. The author argues that the organization should not focus only on minimizing the employee turnover rate, but also think about how the organization can influence those that are leaving when they are doing it. Waterman et al. (1994), on the other hand, mention that employees need continuous learning opportunities and to reinvest in themselves in order to stay employable. In the past it was more about lifetime employment, but this view has changed and at the present it is all about lifetime employability. The employee has the responsibility of their own career management, e.g. their own task to maintain and obtain new knowledge and to stay “updated”. It is therefore a precondition for the organization to provide opportunities for competence development and career development among employees.

3.4.1. Competence development

In previous research there are several researchers that have identified training and learning opportunities as having an indirect influence on employees by encouraging them to stay in the organization (cf. Hytter, 2007; Kyndt et al, 2009). Rodriguez (2008) has recognized that talented people tend to seek jobs that offer them growth and learning opportunities. To enhance their employability they need to obtain and improve their skills in order to have a chance to follow the movement of the labor market. Waterman et al (1994) further argue that the opportunity to obtain multiple skills is healthy both for the organization and the employees (e.g. by letting the employees work with different duties; both normal ones as well as special projects). As mentioned before the circumstances of working in a project-oriented environment can induce stress and work overload, but in that case why are people still working there? In a study by Turner et al. (2008) it is recognized that people enjoy working in projects because their temporary nature provides a great variety of assignments. Working with too routinized tasks tends to attract only temporary workers. Rodriguez (2008) also noticed that organizations that do not offer sufficient training and development opportunities often have difficulties in attracting talented staff. In his study Rodriguez (2008) showed that applicants who per-
ceived a lack of learning opportunities felt that the organization were not really caring about the personnel growth of their staff.

The main objective of training is to ensure that all employees have the skills necessary to perform their tasks, as well as providing new entrants sufficient training and introduction to their job. Organizations can provide training and development internally, externally, or in different combinations of it in order to save money on training expenditures. The decision of buying vs. training (external vs. internal) depends on several factors, like for example national or organizational culture and state policies on education and training etc. While making these decisions organizations have to be careful since many times they think that “training is good” and therefore more training must be “better”. This statement does not need to be true in all cases; it is necessary to make an assessment of the costs and benefits of training and to adapt it both to the individuals and the organization before implementing it (Winterton, 2007).

There is a slight difference between training and development, even though they are often mistaken to be the same. Training an employee implies that the organization strives for a specific learning outcome, but when employees are developing this implies a broader range of activities where the outcome is indefinable. The intention of development is to focus more on long-term personal growth and career development. It is not only about training and education, but also about job rotation, working in projects and learning by experience. The organization will provide the employees with tools, open environments, training and opportunities to develop their skills in exchange for better productivity of the organization.

The employees have the primary responsibility of their own careers, but it is the organization that will have to provide employees with career and development opportunities. The managers’ roles here are to show that the organization cares about their employees (Winterton, 2007). Waterman et al (1994) has a similar idea and say that by giving the employees authority to shape their own profile and expand their skills they can stay competitive in the labor market. On the other hand, there are also expectations on the employees that their competence development will contribute to greater benefits for the organization.
3.4.2. Career development

In many cases, comparatively high financial compensation is used to retain personnel (Heller, 2003). Cappelli (2000) recognizes as well that the most common way to keep employees in the organization is to attract them with compensation such as bonuses. On the other hand the author also points out that compensation only has a short-time effect and it does not retain personnel in the long-run. Tang et al (2000) points this out as well and argue that earning more money only has an indirect influence on employee retention. Furthermore, Rodriguez (2008) has similar ideas and in his research he found that the relationship between compensation and retention is not always coherent. While top talent expects compensation, they do not only strive for financial compensation; they rather prefer other things that money cannot buy, like for example growth and development opportunities. If employees feel that they cannot grow, learn and/or advance in their career they tend to look externally for new job opportunities (Rodriguez, 2008; Turner et al. 2008).

Creating career opportunities is not always simple. The choice to advance is highly individual, but it is still important that the organization successfully connects, for example, project tasks with the requirements for career development. At the same time personal needs has to be matched and employees need to feel satisfied with their development opportunities (cf. Turner et al., 2008; Fabi and Pettersen, 1992). According to Sveiby (1997, cited in Huemann et al., 2007), the key to retain personnel in a project-based organization is to ensure that the employees have the opportunity to work with interesting and challenging projects and that it is possible for them to build their own career path. The employees in this type of organization do not have the same opportunity to “climb up the ladder” as in other organizations. Keegan and Turner (2003, cited in Bredin & Söderlund, 2011) also acknowledge this and mention that project-based organizations do not primarily view careers in terms of promotion, but there is rather a focus on achieving continuous learning and to successfully carry out projects. Huemann et al. (2007) also mention that “in today’s dynamic organizational environment” a flexible career development is needed and they present the “spiral staircase career”. This theory is based on Keegan & Turner’s (2003, cited in Bredin & Söderlund, 2011) idea
that a career can be created by carrying out a great variety of projects in order to obtain knowledge. In the same article the authors also found that managers in project-oriented organizations tend to stay longer with the same organization than other managers, since they often feel committed to a company where they can achieve career development.

To sum up, career and competence development benefits both the organization and the employees. By providing these opportunities the organization will be more attractive and employees can sustain their employability. Furthermore, several researchers have identified that development has significance for retention. Organizations will often provide development opportunities, but at the same time the employees have the main responsibility of their own employability.
4. Presentation of organization

We think it is important to give the readers a presentation of organization before we start with the empirical data. In this section we will describe who Rädda Barnen is and what their purpose, the other part we will describe the different level of the organization and what function they have.

4.1. Rädda Barnen Background

Rädda Barnen was founded 1919 in Sweden soon after the first organization was established in England. RB is an organization that is based on democracy and not bounded to any religious or political parties. Their main task is to fight for children’s right in Sweden, but since they are also a member of the International Save the children Alliance they cooperate with their counterparts in 120 different countries to help children all around the world. This type of structure is called an umbrella organization and it ensures that every national Save the children organization is working autonomously and develops a greater insight into the problems at their national level.

The values and beliefs of the organization are based upon the UN Convention on the Rights for Children (CRC) and RB uses it as a guideline and to direct their work. The beliefs and values of RB are that (1) all persons are equally valued, (2) children have special rights and that (3) everyone has a responsibility, but that the state has binding obligations to children. The organization do not intend to help any specific children (e.g. financially) nor to help all children; their focus instead lies on helping those who is exposed and most in need and they strive for a long-term improvement of these children’s rights and conditions. To achieve this they have specific objectives that they strive to reach:

- Children should not be exposed to discrimination, exploitation, violence or other assaults
• Children should be able to raise their voice and have an influence over their own situation
• Assured safety, a healthy childhood and learning opportunities will lead to a greater self-reliance and knowledge among children

The working methods of the organization are to collect materials and facts about children in order to analyze their situation. This is important since all personnel need the same knowledge base to perform their work satisfactorily. By learning they can also transfer their knowledge and influence the perception of society. This organizational learning ensures that everyone in RB has a better understanding of the children’s problems and in turn this helps them develop appropriate methods to solve the problems. As representatives of the children everyone in RB also need to have knowledge of the issues in order to be able to mediate for them and fulfill their needs. RB also helps children through direct contact; especially in times of disasters or crisis.

4.2. The organizational structure

Figure 8, Organizational chart of RB, Rädda Barnen, 2010
RB has around 86000 members\(^5\), and among them there is around 4600 volunteers\(^6\) that are operating together with the employees at three different levels; national, district/regional and local. The local level includes all 210 active local associations (as well as RBUF\(^7\)) and they are connected to 25 different districts. Every unit at the local and district level are run by volunteers and they all have their own board of directors working autonomously arranging annual meetings, managing and coordinating the work. They also have the responsibility over the operational plans and finances since every unit is a juridical person. The 231 employees in RB are working at the head office (in Stockholm) as well as in 19 regional offices, 11 in Sweden and 8 abroad. At the regional level, the employees’ main task is to support the volunteers work at the local and district level.

National meetings are arranged every other year where a number of representatives from local and district levels, the Secretary General and the national board of directors participate. The national meeting is the essential decision-making body in the organization and at this time policies will be discussed and the preliminary plan for the next year will be formulated. They also discuss, for example, issues regarding the collaboration with International Save the children, license and sponsor agreements, the management of capital and property and salary, manpower and budget policies etc. The board of RB (which is composed by volunteers) has the responsibility to develop, support and coordinate the organization. The Secretary General with the head office (in Stockholm) has the accountability for that the daily operations are working according to the plan and will guide the employees at the regional offices. Most of the policies (kompassen, stadgar, etiska riktlinjer etc), reports (i.e. annual reports and goal achievement) and the RB magazine *BARN* are published in public so they are available for the members and employees.

---

5 A member is a person who pays a member fee to the organization, but not necessarily participate in the actual operations

6 Volunteers refer to those members who are active in the organization

7 Rädda Barnens Ungdomsförbund (RBUF) is a youth association where children and youngsters fight locally for their own and other children’s rights
4.3. The future

For the moment a lot is changing in the organization. For instance RB has a goal to increase the number of volunteers to 9000 by the year 2012. Furthermore, RB is preparing for an organizational change where they will change the structure of and extend the international collaboration. This implies that from 2013 International Save the Children will be directed from the head office in London. The main purpose of uniting the national associations is to make sure that capital and resources are used efficiently and to become more responsive to donors and supporters.
5. Empirical data

In the following section we will present the empirical data and this will be presented in the same order as we in the theoretical framework, i.e. through flows, performance, involvement and development. The sources we have used in this part and the previous one can be found under *Empirical sources* in the bibliography.

5.1. Flows

5.1.1. Recruitment and Selection

Rädda Barnen consists of two different workforces; one employed and one voluntary. Since the two groups have different characteristics the organization also has two different recruitment processes. When it comes to volunteers it is the job of the local associations to attract, recruit and retain members and volunteers in the organization. There are two main ways used by the local associations to recruit new volunteers to the organization. First of all students are recruited directly from college. This is implemented in projects such as Ellen and Allan, which are discussion groups for 8th graders. The second way of recruitment is when members interested in volunteering contact their local association themselves, ask what they can do to help and thereby get recruited. At times RB also contacts interesting candidates themselves and ask if they are interested in participating in a certain project. The BP gives an example of this when she says *“In some instances I contact someone I find interesting if they, for example, have written an interesting letter to the newspaper”*. The main goal is to reach the broad public, but since already active volunteers have a greater understanding of the organization the recruitment is most often internal.

“We often start with going out broad, but in the end recruitment is most often internal since those that are already active in the organization have a greater insight into the organizational work and know what is expected of them. But these volunteers in their..."
"turn sometimes brings relatives or other contacts into the organization" (BP, 2011-03-07)

The reason why open positions, to a great extent, are not being advertised is mainly because of financial reasons. The “cheapest” channels are used when recruiting volunteers since RB cannot afford and does not have the right to spend money on, for example, expensive advertisements. On a local level the most common channels are the homepage, posters and through “face-to-face” meetings and “word-of-mouth”. The BP mentions that she personally prefers to use emails as the primary recruitment channel; “For example, I usually send mass emails to everyone on my contact list of active volunteers asking if they want to participate in a specific project and they in their turn spread the message to their contacts”. The selection process for volunteers is rather simple; there are no interviews or other selection procedures, everyone who is interested is welcome and encouraged to participate. As a volunteer it is easy to get into the organization and to reach a leading position. First of all, anyone who supports the values of RB can become a member by paying the determined member fee and every member can participate in the organizational work if they are interested. There are no specific requirements for volunteers in RB; interest and devotion to the cause is enough. The BP acknowledges some problems with this system:

“In practice there are no demands on those that want to volunteer in Rädda Barnen. This is both good and bad since some are not genuinely interested and only want to process problems they have from their own childhood, like for example if they had parents that were alcoholics” (BP, 2011-03-07)

For members of the board the recruitment and selection process is different. There are no official channels used in this instance; the choice of board members follows strict rules and regulations and the organization cannot have a high influence on the selection process through their HRM system. On the other hand, they do control the demands and requirements put on prospective board members. For the positions on the board the requirements are significantly higher than for other volunteers and controls are even made in criminal records (e.g. to ensure their suitability to work with children) for the president of the board and the treasurer.
“On the board we want broad competences and persons from different areas of children’s rights like for example teachers, social workers, police, psychiatrists or lawyers. For that reason we also sometimes demand people with certain professions or key competences for board positions” (BP, 2011-03-07)

The national board of directors in Rädda Barnen (which consists of volunteers) is supported by a national office (head office) which consists of employed personnel and is led by an employed Secretary General. The national board appoints the Secretary General and decides on the personnel needs for the head office. Personnel are also employed in accordance to the budget decided by the board. Rädda Barnen has regional offices throughout the country as an extended arm of the head office. These offices consist of employees that constitute a support for the local and district levels of volunteers.

The channels that are primarily used to recruit personnel to the organization are advertisements in local papers and the homepage. Local papers are commonly used for job openings in regional offices, but for positions at the head office the homepage is the most common, and often only, channel used. For management positions a recruitment agency is sometimes used to facilitate the process, but for managers on the middle level recruitment is primarily internal. There are generally a high number of applicants for most positions in the organization even though many jobs are only recruited internally.

“There is a high pressure on most of the jobs within the organization and it’s not unusual that there are 100 applicants for only one position. In many cases positions only go out to internal recruitment, especially if it’s urgent to fill the position, but even in those cases the pressure is high and ‘external’ persons apply” (OD, 2011-03-14)

The process of employee selection depends a lot on the specific position, but most often it is the appointing manager that is responsible for the recruitment and selection. When there is a job opening at a regional office with few colleagues then they are often invited to say their opinion about the candidates as well, but it is the manager that makes the final call. Usually 2-5 persons are selected from the pool of applicants and summoned to an interview, after which the manager selects one person to hire. For most of the posi-
tions in RB a college or university education (e.g. law, psychology, finance etc.) is demanded, except for the purely administrative tasks. The educational level within Rädda Barnen is high, but the educational background also depends a lot on the specific position. If a person lacks the required education there are still possibilities to get a job if the person has relevant experiences. It is especially beneficial if a person has worked in the nonprofit sector previously or if they have been involved in voluntary work. RB acknowledges that competence is one of their most important success factors. They need to build their work on both knowledge and practical experience because without it they will be less credible and have less opportunity to influence the society.

5.1.2. Internal flows

RB’s volunteers mainly work in different projects (with the exception of board members) and internal flows are therefore also an important area for the organization to manage. The most common way of recruiting to new projects is through internal recruitment from the already existing pool of volunteers. As mentioned earlier, RB tries to go out wide to find applicants for new projects, but they usually end up recruiting internally since the already established volunteers know what is expected of them. It is very flexible being a volunteer within RB and everyone has the possibility to influence how they want to work and how active they want to be. The volunteers generally work on one project at the time, but they do have the possibility to decide for themselves what projects to participate in, how active to be, how to work and how long to be active in the organization. It is easy for volunteers to move within the organization and it is possible to choose how many projects to work in at the same time.

“It is very easy to jump between functions and projects in the organization, but in some cases there are formal demands. You cannot ‘sit on two chairs’ like for example be both board president and on the nomination committee. But other than that you can work in as many projects as you wish and have time for” (BP, 2011-03-07)

As mentioned earlier, there are generally no high demands on volunteers. If any specific knowledge is required for a project then education will be provided by RB before the project starts (e.g. a course in project management). If we take the Ellen/Allan projects
as an example there are no demands on those interested to volunteer and a (free) education is offered before the project starts. It is even possible to become a project manager without any prior knowledge or experience. A lot of trust is put on the volunteers; a project manager is fully responsible of developing the project in their own way as long as they follow the initial project plan decided by the board. Volunteers in many instances stay for a long time in the same project, but they usually stop volunteering when the project is finished. The BP acknowledges this:

“Perhaps around 5 out of 20 stays after the project is finished. I think that the reason for this is that many are only interested in a specific project and not the whole organization and therefore don’t want to continue volunteering when the project is finished. Some might also think that, for example, the Ellen-project is a valuable experience to have and something to put in their CV” (BP, 2011-03-07)

The decision about projects that will be started during the coming year is decided on the annual meetings. The direction of the organization’s operations is decided on a national level, but decisions concerning specific projects are made in operational plans on district and local levels. Everyone who is a member of the organization is welcome to participate in the annual meetings where they can voice their opinion about future projects. Plans are only made for one year to come, but these plans might change if something urgent appears.

“At the annual meeting it is decided in the operational plan what projects will be carried out during the coming year. Normally we follow this plan, but it is also strongly dependent on what happens and is being discussed in society, like for example the debate about immigrant children. And if a catastrophe like the earthquake in Haiti happens then all plans are of course changed” (BP, 2011-03-07)

The employees do not work in project form to the same extent as volunteers do. The reason for this is that the employees are mainly hired as a support function for the volunteers and do not participate in the organization’s actual operation. In 2009 there were 22 employees that were employed on certain projects, often as project managers. The employees have great possibilities to affect their own projects (and their operational work as well) and it is also easy for employees to move between projects and tasks if they want to. As an employee it is possible to move up in the organization, but also to
change direction and function within the organization. Since recruitment is often internal it is relatively easy to change function and rotate among jobs as long as there is an open position somewhere in the organization. Employees also have the possibility to take on international assignments and travel to other parts of the world to work for a period of time.

5.1.3. Release

It is very rare that a volunteer is asked to leave the organization and the main reason for this is that they are working for the organization on a voluntary basis and are therefore usually motivated and genuinely interested in what they are doing. If necessary, it is possible for the national association in consultation with the local, district or youth association to exclude a member from the organization. This can only be done if they do not conform to the values, ideas or working principles of RB or if they hurt the organization in other ways. A member will also be excluded automatically if they do not pay the member fee on time. On the other hand, as we have mentioned, many leave the organization voluntarily after participating in a specific project. It is easy for any member to quit supporting RB or to stop volunteering; if they do not want to be a member anymore all they have to do is to inform the organization. The number of volunteers is relatively constant between years even though the total number of members changes a lot (see diagram 1). In the table we can see that the number of volunteers is only changing slightly between years whereas the number of total members can increase or decrease with thousands of people between years. For the moment it is especially important for RB to increase the number of volunteers since they have a goal to have 9000 volunteers in the year 2012.
Being employed in RB is similar to being employed in the private or public sector since the employees have obligations to the organization and are bounded by their contract. The number of employees has grown during the last couple of years and the organization has not had to lay off any people during the last couple of years.

### 5.2. Performance

RB states that it is important to ensure that the work they do keep a consistently high quality. They have high demands coming from themselves, members, donors and other stakeholders and it is imperative that they can show that the money they receive and the work they do actually make a difference. For that reason RB also acknowledges that their whole business stands and falls with their credibility, ethics and internal control. To increase credibility and to make improvements in their work they document their own experiences and conduct their own studies and evaluations. If they would not evaluate their work in comparison with their goals they would not be able to develop and to improve quality. RB has long-term goals that are currently running from the period 2009 until 2012. Different goals are set for different areas of operation and a differentia-
tion is also made between goals in Sweden and internationally. RB works hard to achieve their goals and even though some of them are delayed they expect all of them to be fulfilled or exceeded in 2012. For employees the work is supervised and supported by managers and evaluated on a regular basis. In general, a performance appraisal is held every year, but there is also a constant dialogue between managers and subordinates. Feedback is received almost daily from different sources both for employees and volunteers. For volunteers achievements are for example recognized on the annual board meetings.

“Feedback comes mostly from the national association, but also from the local board. In the board meetings we bring up ideas, discuss them, give feedback and then follow through with them together. On the national annual board meetings they also acknowledge if a local association has done something good, even if it’s something really small” (BP, 2011-03-07)

After the Swedish government in 2009 put increased focus on the content and results of foreign aid, RB have noticed that SIDA\(^8\) is also demanding more from them. Some of the demands are that RB should present their results in a clear way, secure high quality of operations and have a system for planning, follow-up and evaluation. The competition for receiving financial resources has also been increasing at the same time as the money RB receives from SIDA has been diminishing and this further increase the need for high performance in order to attract finances. Since volunteers are not bound by contract to the organization it is of course difficult to control them and to ensure that they keep high performance, but in the BP’s experience the volunteers are always very motivated to work hard since they are there voluntarily and are interested in what they are doing.

“In my opinion volunteers are more motivated than employees since they have an idealism that the employees don’t share in the same way. They are also prepared to work hard since they work with something they really love and during a limited period of time they are prepared to work a lot” (BP, 2011-03-07)

\(^8\) The Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency
The BP further mentions one issue that hinders the performance of the organization; that
the conditions of the volunteers in the organization are not being acknowledged. In the
BP’s opinion the national association needs to get a better understanding of how im-
portant the local associations and the volunteers that work there are. In some ways she
thinks there is a “we and them” mentality in the organization and that employees are
considered to have a higher value than volunteers. Both groups are different, but they
should still be valued equally since they both have important roles within the organiza-
tion. The volunteers are the ones that do the actual work on the “grass root level”, but
there still seems to be a perception that the employees are more important.

5.2.2. Rewards and Motivation

Since the volunteers of the organization are naturally there on a voluntary basis they do
not receive any monetary extrinsic rewards. They generally have other jobs and only
work for RB in their own spare time. The only volunteers that do receive monetary re-
muneration which size depends on their position on the board (e.g. president of the
board: 20 000 SEK/month, other board members: 1 700 SEK/month). For members on
the local and district boards no financial compensation is received. Even though the
majority of the voluntary workforce does not receive monetary rewards they still receive
non-monetary extrinsic rewards. The philosophy of RB is that no member should have
any costs for being part of the organization (except for the member fee). Thanks to that
philosophy members can receive indirect benefits through, for, example attending one
of many different courses that RB offers their members. Except these courses RB also,
from time to time, organizes parties or get-togethers for the active volunteers which can
also be considered to be a non-monetary benefit.

RB did a study where they revealed that the main motivation for volunteering is social
heritage (i.e. the volunteer’s parents have been active in charitable organizations, poli-
tics or something similar). Because of a person’s social heritage it feels natural to volun-
teer and help those that are less fortunate. Furthermore, the BP mentions that volunteer-
ing is motivating since it is something that develops you personally and it is rewarding to feel that you affect and change society and see that your efforts really make a difference.

In contrast to the volunteers there are monetary rewards for the employees of the organization. The salaries in the organization are in general lower than in equivalent positions in the private sector, but they are average for the nonprofit sector. An organization like RB (i.e. nonprofit) cannot spend more money than necessary on their employees. They need to pay their employees in order to keep them in the organization, but both resources and time need to be managed carefully so that any costs do not affect the work for children’s rights. Since the volunteers make the decisions in the organization they are, in practice, also in control of the wage levels. The salaries are set according to the characteristics of the organization (i.e. its nonprofit nature) and are based on the policy and principles that the board has decided upon. In diagram 2 below are the salary levels at the head office (divided between women and men). As you can see the largest group of employees has a salary between 30 001 and 40 000 SEK.

![Salary levels at the head office of Rädda Barnen in 2009](Diagram 2, Salary levels at the head office of Rädda Barnen in 2009, Rädda Barnen, 2009)

Pension depositions are made according to collective agreements, but no pension is paid in addition to that. There are no extra benefits (monetary or non-monetary) that the em-
ployees receive (including the Secretary General) beyond their salary. The only benefit that they are entitled to is competence development. If an employee needs to take a specific course in order to do their job then that is possible and, as long as their manager approves, it is free of charge. Except from the employees already mentioned benefits there is also a staff party once a year and a few planning days where there usually are some activities in the evenings that the employees can participate in.

In the OD’s opinion employees have the same intrinsic motivation as volunteers since they have applied to a job in the nonprofit sector instead of any other sector. On the other hand the employees are mostly interested in the sector as a whole and not the specific organization per se; for many it does not matter if they work for RB or for another organization in the sector.

“I think that the employees are just as motivated as the volunteers or else we would not have applied for a job in this sector. [...] For me it’s very motivating to be able to work with and get paid for doing something that you really like and if I quit working here I would most certainly stay active in the organization” (OD, 2011-03-14)

5.3. Involvement

As mentioned earlier there are several different levels in the organization. The volunteers work in three different levels; local (and RBUF), district and national associations. All the local associations and RBUF are connected to a district and the districts in their turn are unified as the national association. Understanding how these different levels are linked together will facilitate the explanation of the decision-making process and how power is shared among and between employees and volunteers.

5.3.1. The decision-making process and power influence
The volunteers are the only ones who make decisions and perform the operational work. Every member in RB have the right to attend and give an opinion at all annual meetings, but they only have the right to vote in the local association they belong to. At the local level a number of representatives are elected who have right to vote at the district meetings and the same procedure is repeated for the national meetings. All members can be chosen as a representative, as long as they are not employed by the organization. The boards of directors always have the right to vote with some specific exceptions (e.g. when the issue concerns the management of the board) and the Secretary General have the right to speak freely at the national level.

Despite the fact that the members have the right to raise their opinion, it is rare that they take advantage of this opportunity. The BP acknowledged one possible explanation for this: “We encourage and appreciate their opinion […], but the reason could be that they aren’t used to being in an association” (BP, 2011-03-07). The BP further added that it could be so that the volunteers do not think that their suggestions will get through the board. If the members and volunteers have ideas or suggestions they can give them directly to any of the board members personally and/or at the local association’s homepage. Although the employees do not have the right to vote about the core operation they do have a great influence over the practical parts of the work. The employees are working internally to support, stimulate and develop the organization (i.e. the local associations, RBUF and districts). They have the responsibility to coordinate the courses for members and also act as a support function responsible of contacting the media and assist with influencing politics. Furthermore, they also need to stay updated about changes happening around the world in order to inform and facilitate the volunteers’
work. The employees at the head office primarily work with issues in Sweden, but they also cooperate internationally with other affiliates.

It sometimes happens that the volunteers do not like the decisions that have been made. The OD explains that volunteers sometimes come to him at the regional office asking “Why have you (i.e. the employees) decided this?” In his opinion the reason for this is that not all of them are familiar with the decision process. He mentions that there is still a misunderstanding among the volunteers that the employees are the ones making the decisions, “[…]they are the ones who decides what they want to do and sometimes they don’t understand the consequences of the decisions that they have made” (OD, 2011-03-14). Furthermore, it is neither volunteer that decides over employees nor vice versa. The only who can control the employees is their manager and they need to act according to their working plan and report to their manager. Despite the misunderstandings about who is making decisions the OD’s thinks that the decision-making process is well functioning and well balanced between volunteers and employees. On the other hand, it is sometimes too long and drawn out since the volunteers require several meetings before they determine what they want to do.

5.3.2. Communication and Feedback

Both the employees and their closest managers think communication is important and that it does exist to a certain extent. Some of the employees express that when communication is functioning well it is a two-way communication, but there are sometimes a lack of this. Another employee exemplified that all the information does not reach everyone in a working unit. Some of the managers did mention that lack of time is a common reason for why communication does not always work perfectly. One of the managers expressed that he/she already has invested a lot of energy into maintaining a dialogue and have let his subordinates participate in the decision-making process, but that there is still a need to improve in this area. Furthermore, he/she argued that there is a mutual responsibility to maintain communication, but that the main responsibility lies on the managers.
Both employees and volunteers get feedback from many different directions. The employees get coaching and performance evaluations in the form of discussions with managers and they also get feedback from both colleagues and volunteers at the local associations. There is a frequent contact between the local associations and the regional offices and they often discuss ideas back and forth via email or phone calls. Since the OD is in charge of certain courses (e.g. for new project managers) he as well gets a lot of direct feedback from participants in the courses together with a course evaluation in written form at the end of each course (e.g. concerning the structure and content of the course). The situation is likewise for the volunteers and the boards of directors get feedback and coaching both from higher levels of volunteers and from employees. The volunteers can get positive feedback even with very little effort and this is something very motivating to them. As mentioned earlier, they for example acknowledge local associations that have done something positive during the year at the national annual meetings.

5.3.3. Workplace and work conditions

The actual physical workplace is not highly important for the volunteers. Their work and mission is often conducted outside “on the field” and do not spend much time at RB’s office. What is important for them is instead the factor of time and it is also something they have a lot of influence over. As mentioned earlier, a volunteer can choose to work as much or as little as they want and they can also control what they want to work with. There are no constraints on how many projects they are allowed to join. Board members or project managers have a degree of accountability and need to follow certain regulations, but beyond these the work is very flexible and they can have a great influence over it. They also have the possibility to decide how active they want to be or how much they want to delegate. As an example the BP explains that, “To be on a board does not actually mean that you have to do much. The only thing you have to do as a board member is to be present at the monthly meetings, but despite that not everyone actually does attend them.” On the employees part there are also great possibilities to have an influence over your own work and working hours and especially when choosing what activities to carry out. They do not need approval from the manager for everything they do and can act freely within certain boundaries. The OD gives an example of this
and mentions that he can decide to start a new course without asking permission for it. Even though the employees do have this freedom and flexibility the OD also mentions that there is too much work to be done and that they often have to work overtime; “Even my manager tells me not to work too much”. The reason for this work overload is the preparation for the upcoming organizational changes and the fact that RB tries to double their number of volunteers.

5.4. Development

5.4.1. Competence development

RB is setting high standards for the organization itself and for their partners and this is necessary in order to improve the quality of their work. It is important for society to perceive the organization as serious and reliable since they are working for a charitable cause. To make society aware of children’s right it is important that RB shows that they are professional and that they can demonstrate their knowledge to society and to, for example, influence those in power to apply or at least encourage the use of the CRC. Since it is the volunteer, employees and RB’s partners who carries out their work it is important for the organization to identify the kind of competence they have. This is important for RB because they will then know how to best support their staff so that they can succeed in their respective areas. By doing this RB defines which competence and knowledge the organization has and they then work with improving the existing knowledge and competences and simultaneously acquire missing and desirable knowledge.

There is no mandatory education for members or volunteers in the organization, but the organization does offer courses which those that are interested can attend. As the BP explains, “It should not cost anything to be active in Rädda Barnen [...] the members can attend courses for free and the organization will also pay travel and accommodation expenses”. The organization offers a great variety of courses; like for example “Rädda Barnen intro”, courses about the organization, about children’s rights and CRC
or “Hur har man där du bor” which is about children’s conditions in specific cities. Most of these courses take from a few hours to two days and can be in the form of lectures, seminars or workshops. For those who want to be more active and work with children (e.g. as a volunteer) there are courses like the CRC informant education where you at the end of the course get entitled to inform about CRC in schools. As we have also mentioned earlier, those who want to become a project manager (i.e. in the Allan and Ellen projects) it is required to take a project manager course where you are provided with practical information on how to prosecute a project, handle the finances, coordinate etc.

The BP explains that since she is active in many different areas she is also forced to learn more things. She is not forced in the sense that someone told her she has to learn something, but it is more of an obligation to obtain more knowledge within the major fields. Any volunteers who want to work within a specific area (e.g. the CRC), has to know everything there is to know about it and thereby you will also develop and get a specialization. Sometimes there is a need to obtain more education like, for example, in the “tjej till tjej” (girl-to-girl) project where female volunteers visit immigrant girls who have recently arrived to Sweden. The girls do activities together, and sometimes these volunteers have a heavy workload and a tough mission and for that reason continuous education is necessary. For example, these volunteers “… should know when they need to contact the social services, counselors or the social insurance officer” (Rädda Barnen, 2009, pp. 8).

For the employees it is arranged a 1-2 days common education every year within the organization. Except from that RB does not offer “standard” courses to the employee in the same way as it is offered to the volunteers. If an employee needs to improve their skills (i.e. related to their job) then there is great opportunity for them to take a specific course as long as the manager approves it. In that case the organization will pay the course expenses. If it is demanded an employee can also get the right to take, for example, take a course at the university.
According to OD there are great career opportunities in the organization, but it depends on how much you are personally willing to give, as he explains: “If you want to build a career then you must go to the head office in Stockholm, because there are limited opportunities at the regional offices”. For those who want to work abroad it is possible to accept a mission from the international department. It is quite common that someone takes time off from their normal job and does such a mission. To climb up in the organization by aspiring for a manager position or to change direction of your own work is not impossible within RB. As mentioned before, it is possible to change job within the organization and it is not difficult if there are posts available.

It is not difficult for volunteers to enter into the organization and to reach a decision-making position; for instance the BP herself started volunteering in RB 2004 and directly became as a member of a board and one year later she became president of her local association and one district. Volunteers can advance very fast within the organization, but RB emphasizes that volunteers do not build careers in the same way as employees do. The reason for this is that volunteers often have their own jobs besides RB and prefer to say that they are taking a mission from RB rather than working for them. It is not common that volunteers become employees in RB, but it happens from time to time. Both the BP and the OD are satisfied with the development opportunities that RB offers them. The BP has attended some of the courses for members and is satisfied with the content. The OD expressed, “I would never have stayed 8 years if I didn’t felt happy to work here […], it feels motivating and I’m satisfied that I can change the path of my work or affect it”.
6. Analysis

6.1. Flows

6.1.1. Recruitment and selection

According to Windolf (1986) there are three distinct steps of recruitment and selection. In table 2 you can see a compilation of these for both volunteers and employees in RB.

As we can see in the table above recruitment and selection differs between employees and volunteers in RB. Even within the group of volunteers different procedures are being used. It is clear that recruitment and selection is conducted more carefully for employees than for volunteers. The only similarities lie in the recruitment channels and the
reason for this is that RB needs to use the cheapest channels possible both for volunteers and employees so that they can spend as much money as possible on their cause. For that reason it is also suitable with using internal recruitment, but it also has an advantage for ensuring that people with the desired knowledge of the organization and the cause are recruited.

Ployhart (2006) mentions that recruitment is more effective when it is structured with, for example, detailed job descriptions and when it is consistent and coherent. For the employees recruitment is effective and their number is steadily growing. The procedure for them is also more structured. Requirements are higher and detailed, recruitment is made by the appointing manager who has knowledge about the needs of the organization and recruitment is consistently made in the same way for (almost) all positions. For volunteers there is a lack of all these three factors. Since the volunteers are actually the ones making the decisions in the organization one would think that there should be more careful consideration about who the right candidates are. On the other hand it is understandable that the organization puts more effort into the people they are about to hire since they will be bounded to the organization by contract. For board members there are demands or wishes about experiences and professions in order to assure that the board has as broad knowledge about RB’s cause as possible. When it comes down to job description, profile and requirements volunteers and employees are managed in fundamentally different ways; with much higher demands put on employees than volunteers. This has consequences for the organization since there will be volunteers coming into the organization with a lack of relevant experiences which forces RB to spend more resources on competence development instead. On the other hand, this lack of experience has also led the organization to have a primary focus on internal recruitment.

For volunteers the goal is to go out broad to find new people, but this usually does not have the desired effect since recruitment is basically always made among the already active volunteers. RB does not reach everyone with the message of their open positions and to a large extent this stems from the fact that RB does not have the financial resources to spend on, for example, advertisements. The problem is that if the message only reaches out to the active volunteers then we cannot expect there to be a large amount of new volunteers coming into the organization. For volunteers the recruitment
channels used are primarily word-of-mouth, the homepage and emails to contacts (who sometimes also bring friends or family with them into the organization). This internal focus, as mentioned, also depends a lot on the fact that the active volunteers already know what is expected of them and have the right experiences to be able to perform well. The same goes for employees where it is valued if you have volunteered before, worked in the sector or have experience from another position within the organization. As we can see, both volunteer and employee recruitment has a large focus on internal resources (i.e. if you are already in the organization you are more likely to be considered for a position) and very few channels are being used in both cases. The recruitment process is also highly affected by the fact that the organization is financially constrained and using internal resources and/or cheap recruitment channels reduce costs. Even though this internal focus increases the chance of RB finding persons with right competences for the job it also affects their ability to get new people into the organization. In practice, it is actually very easy for volunteers to get into the organization, but since RB does not reach out to new prospective volunteers they will basically have to contact RB themselves if they are interested. At this point, more focus should lie on external recruitment since RB has a current goal to increase the number of volunteers to 9000 by the year 2012. Consequently, even though the internal recruitment within RB ensures a high quality of staff it also has negative effects on the possibility to reach the goal.

RB states that competence (i.e. skills and qualities) and experience are extremely important for the organization and crucial in order for them to stay credible. Huselid (1995) also mentions that a large pool of applicants together with a carefully conducted selection procedure ensures that the human resources have the right skills and qualities for the job. Logically RB should therefore also spend a lot of time on their selection, but for volunteers recruitment and selection is basically the same step and there are not really any official procedures. As long as you are a member of the organization you are welcome to volunteer and instead of spending money on selection RB has chosen to spend more on competence development. In practice, it is not complicated to get recruited to RB as a volunteer and it is very easy both to get into the organization and to reach a leading position. In general, RB has more control over recruitment and selection than over release since they cannot exclude someone from the organization (employees or volunteers) without legitimate reasons. But when it comes to selecting volunteers
there is as mentioned no process, everyone can participate and for that reason RB’s control over selection is relatively low as well. As we have mentioned earlier this can also lead to volunteers coming in that are not genuinely interested in the cause and these people will, in general, not stay long with the organization.

There are no specific selection procedures for volunteers, but more effort is put into selecting employees. On the other hand, the organization does try to save money in this step as well since the only selection filter is employment interviews. This is in line with what Barclay (2001) says as well; that one of the main reasons why interviews are used is because they save the most time and resources. RB would not be able to put much more effort into selection since this is not defensible for an organization that is non-profit and whose primary goal is to spend money on their cause. Furthermore, there is no need for more extensive selection procedures among employees since there are already high requirements on them in the job description/profile and resources can therefore be devoted to the cause instead. Instead of spending money on recruitment/selection RB have decided to put more effort into competence development for both volunteers and employees and they are able to take the courses necessary for successfully doing their job. For employees this cost is also minimized since the demands for education and experience are very high to begin with and by thereby they have already decreased the number of possible candidates and can make their selection faster. Thereby they also ensure that they will not have to spend a large amount of money on developing employees.

According to Ployhart (2006) the efficiency of recruitment and selection also influences the possibilities to reach organizational goals. It is understandable that RB does not put too much effort into selection since they do not have the time and resources to spend, but the problem is that the lack of selection leads to RB using less qualified volunteers which reduce the efficiency of work. Since internal resources are used to a large extent and volunteers are provided with education this problem can to some extent be avoided, but it leaves RB spend time and money on education (money they could spend on selection). Despite the negative aspects of not using selection RB still chooses to put less effort into it, both for financial reasons and to encourage as many as possible to volunteer. If they would have too high requirements to begin with it would be difficult to find
enough people. On the other hand, this does not work as desired since RB mostly ends up using their internal resources. A conflicting situation is created when they choose not to have high requirements, but in the end select those with the most experience anyways. On the other hand, it is in some cases smarter to spend the money on education than selection since, as Ployhart (2006) mentions, selection will only be financially defensible if there are many applicants. In RB’s case there are not many applicants and a low possibility to use selection procedures since their “policy” is to let everyone with a devotion to the cause participate.

Huselid (1995) further argues that extensive recruitment and selection procedures can increase both motivation and retention. Motivational aspects will be analyzed later in the analysis, but there are problems with retaining volunteers since the majority leave after they have participated in the project of their interest. If recruitment and selection would be conducted in a more efficient way RB could find volunteers that are interested in the mission of the whole organization and not only one project and they would thereby have better possibilities to retain them. Harel & Tzafrir (1999) also mention that the purpose with selection is to test the applicants’ potential and compatibility with the organization. When less effort is spent on selection it is apparent that some volunteers will not be suitable to work in RB. For the employees there are more extensive selection procedures and also fewer problems with retention. We can assume that they have selected the people that are most suited for the open position and thereby also more likely to stay a long time with RB.

Despite the differences in recruitment and selection between employees and volunteers there is also an important similarity; the large focus on saving money. This is something that the organization has to deal with, but it does create certain problems. The problem in RB does not lie in retaining the employees or the “loyal” group of volunteers, but in retaining the new volunteers coming into the organization. There is a problem with reaching and choosing anyone other than the already loyal volunteers. And when they do come into the organization they usually leave very soon. These issues could be resolved by putting more effort into recruitment and selection, but as we have seen, this is in some ways against RB’s policy. RB’s extensive use of internal recruitment and loyal volunteers decrease the risk of under-qualified workers, but it does not help RB with
their goal to almost double the number of volunteers in the coming years. Instead of putting more effort into recruitment and selection RB has to use other methods to retain their volunteers and this will be discussed further in coming sections of the analysis.

6.1.2. Internal flows

The internal flows in RB are different for employees and volunteers, but they are managed in a similar way. Internal flows are highly existent for volunteers since they primarily work in project form (except for board members who have a more functional role). So the main internal flows for volunteers are between projects whereas the employees are mainly a support function and do not primarily work in projects. There are some project managers that are hired employees, but they are few. For employees the internal flows are instead occurring by job rotation, which is rather common and easily achieved in the organization since a lot of the recruitment is internal. Employees have the possibility to move both sideways and up in the organization similar to the volunteers. They also have the opportunity to take on an international assignment if they are interested. So as we can see, it is relatively easy for both groups to rotate and change positions within the organization. The system in place is very positive for both employees and volunteers since they have a lot of control over what to work with and the opportunity to be flexible and change roles, functions or projects. This is also positive for the organization since they can easily move around people with relevant experiences and competences in the organization (compare with the discussion about internal recruitment in the previous section).

In table 3 below you can see RB’s project process (i.e. for volunteers) in the three phases mentioned by Huemann et al. (2007); Assignment, Employment and Dispersement from project.
According to Huemann et al. (2007) assignment to projects is important because it influences the organization’s ability to retain personnel. In RB some volunteers do stay a long time in the same project, but generally most volunteers quit after their project is finished. One reason they stay such a short time is because they are only interested in a specific project and not in volunteering per se. RB does not put a lot of effort into the assignment phase; if more effort were put into finding those genuinely interested in volunteering then more would also stay and continue volunteering in other projects. This is as mentioned difficult though since RB cannot really control the volunteers to a large extent; anyone who wants to volunteer have the possibility to do so. According to Fabi & Pettersen (1992) it is important to make the right choice of project members in order to save time and money and ensure that the reputation of the organization is upheld. We do not think that RB wastes a lot of money though since they ensure that the project members get the skills necessary to do their job through education. It is of course problematic that RB does not have much control over the volunteers and this can decrease work quality and affect reputation, but there is not much to do about this since they are there on a voluntary basis. More effort could instead be put into finding the most qualified project managers who then will be able to motivate the volunteers to the greatest extent. This is also in line with what Fabi & Pettersen (1992) say, that project managers with the right skills are especially important when developing a project.

Table 3. RB’s project process, Huemann et al., 2007
can become a project manager in RB, without any prior skills. One option can be to have more hired project managers in order to increase quality of work (i.e. for larger projects) or to have volunteers with more relevant experiences (e.g. leadership experience).

According to Packendorff (2002) project members will be more satisfied and perform better if expectations on them are realistic, if they only work in one project at the time, if they can control their own working hours, if the project is of average length and if their tasks are important and interesting. In RB there are realistic expectations on the volunteers because they are not hired and controlled by RB and therefore no official demands can be put on them. They also have the ability to influence their own working hours, how long they work for the organization and how many projects they participate in at the same time. It is also very easy for volunteers to get in (and out of) the organization and they, in general, do not work on more than one project at the time. Their work is also important since they are working for a good cause. If we consider all these points the volunteers are managed in a satisfying way and one would assume that they would be more encouraged to continue volunteering than they actually are. This problem might actually originate from many different factors, but it can for example depend on the lack of qualified project managers, but also on a lack of motivation, involvement or career development. These issues will be considered in coming sections of the analysis.

According to Huemmann et al. (2007) there are three options after a project finishes: (1) assign to new project: since it is basically the volunteers themselves that choose the project they can go directly to another project and they can do it whenever they want to, (2) assign to future project: not likely since they assign to projects immediately before they start them, they do not have projects planned for more than a year to come (3) wait for future project: a common option since volunteers often choose projects out of their own interest. The volunteers might stop volunteering after a specific project, but they will most probably stay as members in the organization and can be available to volunteer again in the future when an interesting opportunity appears. It is important that RB takes careful care of this phase in the project process since they are most likely to lose their volunteers at this step. Apparently RB does have problems with retaining new volunteers and at this time retention is especially important for RB (i.e. since their goal is to
increase the number of volunteers) and they have to take effort to ensure volunteers start in new projects and stay with the organization. Because of their policy to let everyone participate their focus should primarily lie on retaining employees (rather than on assigning more new volunteers) and encouraging them to participate in new projects. This will be done best during the employment phase because if the volunteers are happy and satisfied in one project they will be more encouraged to participate in a new one.

6.1.3. Release

Volunteers cannot really be controlled by the organization and it is very rare that they are asked to leave. Since they are there on a voluntary basis they do not have to do more than they want to and they, in practice, do not have to be high performing. Of course volunteers cannot behave in any way, they can be asked to leave the organization if they do not conform to the values, ideas or working methods of the organization or hurt them in some other way. But this decision has to be made by the national association in consultation with the local, district or youth association it concerns and this very seldom happens. A member will also be automatically excluded if they do not pay the member fee.

The turnover among volunteers is very high since most of them do not stay longer than one specific project. Even though so many stay such a short time in RB there is still a constant number of volunteers between years which implies that there are new volunteers coming into the organization at the same pace as those who leave. So even though there are difficulties reaching out to prospective volunteers it is not a great problem; the real problem lies in retaining them when they do come into the organization. When it comes to employees the situation is different. Since they are hired on a contract they have obligations to the organization and cannot come and go as they wish. They have to behave in certain ways so that they do not violate the contract. RB has increased the number of employees the last couple of years and do not have any apparent issues with release of employees. At the moment or in the last couple of years there has not been any involuntary turnover such as layoffs in the organization.
According to Lee et al. (1996) people are more willing to stay because of contextual factors rather than by, for example, increased satisfaction and commitment. As we can see the employees are more willing to stay than the volunteers are which can be considered a little odd since the employees do not have the same benefits as in other sectors and most likely not the same intrinsic motivation as the volunteers. One possible explanation is that the employees are offered more in terms of contextual factors than the volunteers. Since the volunteers are basically not controlled at all this seems to be true. There is a risk that their job is actually too free and autonomous and thereby their long-term encouragement is reduced. Batt & Valcour (2003) also mention that low turnover is related to support, security and job design and these factors are more present among employees than among volunteers. The employees are controlled to a larger extent by supervisors and are bounded by their contract and therefore have a higher level of support and security. Since the volunteers only work with RB in their spare time and have limited time to spend on their RB projects they need more structure and control than they get today in order to feel the energy to keep on working. When they have too much own control and autonomy they might not know what to do and where to start their work. Lee et al. (1996) also mention the important fact that compensation is rarely an issue that leads to voluntary turnover. This is important in the context of RB since the risk of employees (or volunteers) quitting for a lack of financial benefits is small.

Several authors mention factors that can increase the retention of employees and reduce turnover. Some of these factors are: challenging & meaningful work, advancement opportunities, responsibility, learning opportunities and work-life balance. Some of these factors will be covered in later parts of the analysis, but it is apparent that these factors are present in RB to a great extent. Despite these efforts there are still problems with retaining volunteers, but as in many other areas RB puts more effort into managing employees than volunteers and there are more factors increasing retention of employees than there are for volunteers.
6.2. Performance

Achieving high performance among both employees and volunteers is very important for RB and they even say that high performance is a must for the organization to survive and especially since competition for funding is higher than ever. Performance can be enhanced both by rewarding and motivating the staff, but in RB’s case it is difficult to manage and increase performance with anything other than intrinsic motivation (i.e. since they are financially constrained). It is also hard to measure performance since we cannot count the number of children they have helped (like you can count the number of products you sell), but since they, to a large extent, work with goals performance can be monitored through checking how well the organization reach their goals. Furthermore, Latham et al. (2005) also mentions that an important part of performance management is to give staff feedback related to organizational goals. Consequently, one important way for RB to increase performance is to put focus on organizational goals. This is also acknowledged by RB who put a lot of effort into achieving their goals and is careful in documenting their experiences and making evaluations and studies to ensure higher success in reaching goals.

Both volunteers and employees do receive extrinsic rewards, but it is only employees (and members of the national board) that receive any monetary rewards. Both groups also have access to competence development as a non-monetary reward and from time to time socializing activities. Even though the employees in the organization receive extrinsic rewards there must also be intrinsic benefits since they settle for lower salaries than they could get in another sector. The employee representative also mentions this and says that if the employees were not intrinsically motivated then they would not stay in the sector since they receive lower extrinsic rewards (they receive nothing apart from the salaries, which are lower than in other sectors). It is a little controversial though that RB says that they cannot spend money on high salaries when the largest group of employees has between 30 000 and 40 000 SEK in salaries. It is understandable that they have to pay their employees, but is that the lowest they can go? On the other hand, according to Nohria et al. (2008) it is important with extrinsic rewards because without them employees feel displeased. If we look at it that way the salary levels are on an ac-
ceptable level since employees will be displeased if their salaries are too low compared to other sectors. The level is already lower than in for example the private sector. The volunteers do not have the same need to get extrinsic rewards from RB since they have other jobs, but for employees it is necessary since it is their primary income source.

Intrinsic rewards are defined as being internally driven and linked to self-actualization, work satisfaction and motivating job tasks. We can assume that the volunteers’ work tasks are motivating and satisfying and that they are self-actualizing in some way (since it is not a basic need to volunteer for others) or else they would not be there giving their time voluntarily. As the BP said it is also personally developing to volunteer since you feel that you as an individual can affect society. For employees, on the other hand, this intrinsic motivation is not necessarily present. Their job is motivating since they are doing something that is good for others, but they do not reach the same degree of self-actualization as volunteers and it is very probable that some of them only think of it as “just a job” (even though they receive lower salaries than in other sectors). On the other hand, as the OD says, the employees would not choose to work for a lower salary in the nonprofit sector if they were not motivated to be there. Other theories also define intrinsic rewards/motivation in other ways and it is impossible to conclude that employees are not intrinsically motivated just because they do not have the same level of self-actualization as volunteers.

Lebas (1995) states that it is difficult to manage performance and this is especially true for RB since the volunteers are not officially bound to the organization and often have other jobs. The volunteers do not really have anything to lose and therefore do not have to be motivated to work their hardest. The organization cannot really demand anything from the volunteers and therefore it is even more important to keep their motivation high since it is the only thing that will actually make them work hard. It is positive that they are offered competence development, but that in itself does not ensure high performance (cf. Huselid, 1995). If they are not motivated in themselves then they will not work efficiently despite being skilled in their specific area. It is easy to think that effort does not have to be put into motivating volunteers since they are already in the organization on a voluntary basis (i.e. since they show up they are already motivated to be there), but in order to retain them and to ensure high performance the organization has
to keep the motivation high. Even though the volunteers have motivation for the cause they will not stay if they, for example, are treated poorly or have mundane, unsatisfying work tasks. According to a study by RB the main motivational factor for volunteers is their social heritage. This is also a reason for why volunteers do not always have high intrinsic motivation to begin with; they might feel like they have to volunteer rather than want to. Therefore RB cannot take the intrinsic motivation of volunteers for granted.

According to Hackman & Oldham (1980, cited in Gagné & Deci, 2005) one way to achieve higher intrinsic motivation is through optimal job design (meaningful, interesting and challenging jobs), variety & freedom and meaningful feedback. For volunteers this intrinsic motivation is upheld because they choose themselves what, how and when to do things. They have a lot of autonomy and can choose exactly what they want to do. We can assume that they also think their job is meaningful, interesting and challenging since they have chosen to volunteer and because they are doing something good for society. On the other hand, if their job were more structured they would be less likely to lose sense of what they are doing and they could keep their motivation high. For the employees these factors are also upheld to a certain extent. What they do is meaningful, but since they are a support function their job is not always as interesting and important as the volunteers’ work and this can decrease their motivation. They do have a lot of freedom and work relatively autonomously; everyone is in charge of their own work.

Gagné & Deci (2005) state that there are three needs to fill in order to achieve high intrinsic motivation and to increase the efficiency of performance: autonomy, competence (i.e. drive to comprehend) and relatedness (i.e. drive to bond). Autonomy is, as mentioned, high for both groups and competence is very important for the organization and provided to anyone who needs it. Relatedness (equivalent to the need to bond) shows in the form of positive culture, collaboration and teamwork. This seems to exist in RB, but since there is a separation of the two groups (they are working with different things) the feeling of relatedness is lowered. This argument is strengthened by the fact that the BP mentions that there exists a kind of “we and them” mentality in the organization and that the employees are often seen as having higher status than volunteers. Furthermore,
relatedness for volunteers is also lowered because of the fact that they do not spend as much time with their “colleagues” as employees do.

According to Herzberg (1968) the factors influencing satisfaction (hygiene factors) on the job are different from those influencing motivation (motivator factors). The hygiene factors are: company policy & administration, supervision, interpersonal relationships, working conditions, salary, status and security. The motivator factors are: achievement and recognition of achievement, job design, responsibility, growth and advancement. For the volunteers the hygiene factors are not high and this will increase dissatisfaction and can be a contributing factor for why there is high turnover of volunteers (compare to the discussion on contextual factors influencing retention). They do not have much supervision, no salary and no high status (i.e. there is a perception in the organization that employees are more important). On the other hand their security is high since they are themselves in charge of their work and cannot be excluded without legitimate reasons. It is difficult to tell if their working conditions are good or bad since the volunteers on one hand is in control over how they work, but on the other hand they do not have a stable office or colleagues. As mentioned before, the interpersonal relationships are for that reason not necessarily sufficient since they do not meet on a regular basis as they do in other jobs. The motivator factors among volunteers are on the other hand higher. The volunteers are achieving something important and achievement is recognized at the national annual meetings. The job design is free and the volunteers can work with what they like and in the way that suit them best. They can choose to take on a lot of responsibility and take charge of a project with no prior experience; they are trusted and get the education they need from RB. They also have the opportunity to reach a leading position both quick and easy. There are many contradictions in this case; the volunteers might stay in RB because they are highly motivated, but they might also leave because they are dissatisfied because of a lack of hygiene factors. The problem of retaining volunteers therefore does not come from a lack of motivation, but it is more likely influenced by a lack of factors such as structure and control.

For employees there is a clear focus on the hygiene factors. The employees have managers who supervise their work and who support them. They also work in offices and meet their fellow colleagues every day, which improves their interpersonal relation-
ships. The employees are also paid, have high security and to certain extent higher status than the volunteers (at least in the BP’s opinion). The motivator factors are also relatively high for employees. Since they primarily work as a support for the volunteers they cannot “achieve” in the same sense as volunteers can, but they have satisfactory growth and career opportunities (which we talk about in later parts of the analysis). They also have a lot of responsibility and a chance to influence their job. With the system that is in place today many factors that increase intrinsic motivation are present among both volunteers and employees, but also some that might decrease motivation. In table 4 and 5 below you can see a summary of these factors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employees</th>
<th>Volunteers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Satisfactory salary level</td>
<td>Self-actualizing, meaningful and motivating work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freedom, autonomy and responsibility</td>
<td>Autonomy, variety and freedom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High competence among employees</td>
<td>Competence development is provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good growth and career opportunities</td>
<td>Achievement is recognized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High trust and responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Opportunities for advancement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 4. Factors that increase intrinsic motivation in RB*
6.3. Involvement

6.3.1. Degree of participation

Below we have modified table 1 (pp. 34) and this will help us conclude if there are any signs of involvement in the organization and these are marked in table 6. We have skipped the category financial participation since this type of participation is not suitable for a charitable organization that is nonprofit.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Volunteers</th>
<th>Employees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Downward communication</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Upward problem-solving/Direct commu-
  nication                         | Yes        | Yes, but with some limitations |
| Task participation                  | Yes        | Yes       |
| Consultation and representative pa-
  rticipation                       | Yes        | No        |

Table 6, Summary of the involvement tools that have been used
Downward communication: There are a lot of reports present in the organization; annual reports, goal-achievement, decision plans etc. that are published for everyone and which keeps the workforce updated. For this reason we can say that downward communication exist in the organization and is available for employees as well as volunteers.

Upward problem-solving/Direct communication: There exists a very detailed suggestion system (i.e. decision-making process) for volunteers and they thereby have the possibility to affect their daily work and core activities. At the local level all members have the right to vote and they can also raise their opinion in the meetings at higher levels. Furthermore, they have decision power over certain policies that affect the employees working conditions (e.g. salaries). The members can also give suggestions in written form at RB’s homepage or in direct contact with board members. Despite the fact that the employees do not have the right to vote and decide the core activities of the organization, they do have great control and influence over the implementation process and the actual practical work. Furthermore, there exists a lot of communication and discussions between managers and employees. Although there are some flaws in the communication the managers have the attitude and the intention to improve this. There is also a constant dialogue between the volunteers and the employees where they discuss ideas with each other and thereby the employees can have an indirect influence over their work. For this reason we will say upward problem-solving/direct communication exists for employees, but with some limitation since they cannot influence the core activities of the organization.

Task participation: Because of the project-oriented nature of the organization volunteers are allowed to carry out a variety of projects and assignments and this contributes to job enrichment. Besides this the volunteers have great control over their work and it is very flexible in terms of working hours. The volunteers can choose what and how much they want to work, which allows them to coordinate their work freely. Members of the boards and project managers also have great authority and can chose to delegate if they find it appropriate. As Zika-Viktorsson et al. (2006) also mentions flexibility and control is very important for staff that works in project-based organization. In RB the volunteers can chose their projects and get enough with time to recuperate between projects.
and the authors argue that this will lower the risk of physiological stress and work overload.

The employees’ situation is similar to the volunteers. They also have flexible working hours and a great influence over their work. As we already have mentioned, the employees can act freely within certain boundaries and do not need to get constant permission from their managers. They can also achieve job enrichment by changing their path of work or by job rotation (this will be discussed further in the analysis of development). After seeing the situation from both perspectives we consider task participation to be present and used in the organization.

*Consultation and representative participation:* The entire decision system is built upon this form of participation since the volunteers need representatives that deliver their ideas and suggestion to a higher level. The board members in the local association are representatives and others are the persons that attend the annual meetings at a higher level. For the employees it is not obvious if there are any representatives that bargain for them since most of the policies are decided by the volunteers at the national meetings. We do not have enough evidence to say that consultation and representative participation exist among employees, but for the volunteers it does. On the other hand we want to emphasize that the employees do have frequent contact with the local associations and they often discuss ideas and give feedback to each other. This implies that the employees can always give their opinion and influence the volunteers indirectly. In addition, they already have great influence over their work, so they are not totally powerless. Furthermore, there are also employee-representatives present at the board meetings that make sure that the employee’s opinions are being heard.

By now we think we have made it clear that the volunteers are the ones who have the “power” to determine the core activities of the organization, meanwhile the employees are the ones who support and assure that the operations are running according to plan. It is interesting that the employees are not in the position to decide as in other organizations in the public and private sector. In this case the situation is reverse and the volunteers vote and decide the annual plan and they also influence some of the employees’
conditions (e.g. salaries). On the other hand, the employees do have great power over the implementation process and can influence their own work.

In our opinion both workforce have the possibility to influence the organization and their own work and working conditions and all the involvement tools do coexist among the workforces. Some are more used on volunteers than employees, but as Corbridge & Pilbeam (1998, cited from Raiden et al., 2008) stress some of the categories are more commonly used than others; it does not mean that all of them need to be used. The point is that the organization does use all the involvement tools to allow employees and volunteers to participate in the organizational decision making process. The decision-making process is totally based on the volunteers’ will and furthermore, we also think that the authority that the workforces have are enough to get them empowered. From this we can also conclude that there is no inauthentic participation present among employees or volunteers. We also think that the power that is distributed between the two groups is well balanced. Despite this, there is something that hinders the decision process or creates misunderstandings. The volunteers are under the false perception that the employees are the ones that decide that something should be in a certain way. This might, as the BP mentioned, stem from the fact that not all of the volunteers are familiar with being in an association. This also explains why they do not always take advantage of the giving their opinions. We believe that if the organization clarifies the role of the volunteers and encourage them to come with suggestions this will solve both of these problems.

6.4. Development

6.4.1. Competence development

RB provides a great variety of courses internally for the members of the organization. They can attend a course out of pure interest and/or because they need to obtain knowledge in order to facilitate their work or to carry out a new project (i.e. to become a
The organization encourages the volunteers to attend courses by paying all the cost of the course and even travel and accommodation. The organization does not provide standard courses for the employees as they do for the volunteers, but the organization assures that the employees have the opportunity to obtain knowledge by providing courses externally. This is understandable since (as mentioned in recruitment & selection) the organization often do not require much from the volunteers and instead choose to train them afterwards whereas the employees have more knowledge to begin with. This is in line with what Marchington (2007) mentions that the main reason for training staff is to ensure that they have the skills to perform their task as well as offering new entrants a sufficient level of training. Furthermore, the volunteers do not actually have any obligation to join and work for the mission of the organization. Therefore it is also more convenient for the organization to offer courses for those who want to be active and are interested.

We can also see this from another perspective; to provide courses for the workforce is not the only way to ensure they obtain skills and knowledge. As Waterman et al (1994) mentions the same objective will be reached and multiple skills will be obtained through working with different tasks. This is something that runs through RB’s operations since they are a project-based organization and as Turner et al. (2008) also show the nature of projects allows a great variety of assignments. As we have seen in the empirical part the volunteers can choose what projects and how many they want to participate in. For the employees their work is not project-oriented, but they do have different tasks to work with. From the evidences presented we can draw the conclusion that the organization does give the employees and volunteers enough development opportunities both to develop their competence through, for example, courses and by obtaining skills from working with different tasks.

One interesting aspect we have seen is that those who have a heavier workload need more knowledge in order to carry out their mission (e.g. in the girl-to-girl project). A heavy workload does not necessarily mean something bad. First of all it is in itself a driving force to learn more and to improve performance. Secondly, it can feel challenging and fun to overcome a “problem”. Thirdly, the more knowledge they obtain the broader the choice of missions they are qualified to carry out. Of course, as with every-
thing there are disadvantages as well. Their situation may imply that they need to attend courses “against their will” and it is also time-consuming to attend these classes. On the other hand, we do not think this will be greatly hindering since many of the courses only last a few hours or days and are therefore not unbearable. We believe that most of those who want to be active are volunteering because of their genuine interest and many of them understand that it takes some effort on their part if they aspire to make changes in society. Moreover, the organization cannot force the volunteers to work; as we have emphasized the volunteers choose themselves how much they want to work. So we do not think the need to develop the competences will have a demotivating effect on the volunteers, to the contrary with this force to learn will motivate them and make them feel as a role model for others.

### 6.4.2. Career development

The attitude towards building careers is fundamentally different between the two workforces. The employees have the opportunity to advance in the organization and there are several options that they can choose from. As we have described earlier they can change jobs within the organization (assuming there is a vacancy), they can move to the head office in Stockholm and also take time off for working abroad at one of the Swedish regional offices in other countries. By looking at these factors we can draw the conclusion that the employees have the possibilities to build a career in a traditional way (i.e. by climbing up the ladder). On the other hand, the volunteers in general have fulltime job besides RB and therefore making a career in the organization is not in their primary interest. This is understandable since they cannot anyway make a living on volunteering. On the other hand this is not necessarily a bad thing; Keegan and Turner (2003, cited in Bredin & Söderlund, 2011) mention the “spiral staircase career” and that it is possible to have a kind of career through learning by experience and carrying out projects successfully. The volunteers can thereby experience a similar feeling of achievement as the employees and have an opportunity to advance in the organization.

Despite that the volunteers do not necessarily care about building a career within the organization, there still exist opportunities for them to advance. With this we mean that
they can enter the organization easily and also aim to advance upwards by becoming a member of a board at different levels (i.e. local, district and national). With advance we do not mean the same as building a career because the difference is that the volunteers will not get more power the higher the level they reach (in contrast to the employees). We also doubt that the volunteers actually see this as an opportunity, because to jump between boards signify that they probably need to move to another city, which is not likely since they have a job and family. Although it is a possibility to commute between cities they will likely skip monthly meetings because it is not worth it travelling to another city. As the BP expressed every board member is expected to attend the meetings, but not everyone does that. Our point is that the volunteers do not have the chance to advance in the same way as the employees; by feeling that they get more power, a motivation to strive for higher status or by earning more money. Of course, by advancing, the volunteers can feel good about themselves and feel like they are accomplishing something important and this may be the only reason for them to be motivated to advance. By this discussion we do not mean that the organization have a bad career system design. The employees have their career opportunities and this can motivate them to strive for further opportunities, meanwhile for volunteers it is not important to be able to build a career in RB. On the other hand this low focus on advancing may explain why the turnover rate is high for the volunteers. If they are not interested in advancing in the organization then they are probably not interested in staying a long time there either. Since the advance system already exists for the volunteers why not try to exploit it further? For example RB makes it more prestigious to be a member on the board and make them feel important for the organization. It can result in a higher motivation for the volunteers to continue moving forward. Giving the volunteers a further driving force to stay active can help them double the number of active volunteers.

In table 7 below summarized what we have discussed in this section. The employee can employee and volunteer have same competence development; for the volunteers the courses are provided internal and the other external for the employees. The view of the career development is also different. The employee can build career as any employees in other organizations, meanwhile volunteers do not care about it but the “spiral staircase career” is more adaptable for them.
Table 7, Summary of RB’s development for the employees and volunteers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employee</th>
<th>Volunteer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• External competence development</td>
<td>• Internal competence development in form of lecture, seminars and workshops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• &quot;Climbing up the ladder&quot;</td>
<td>• &quot;Spiral staircase career&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. Conclusion

In many instances RB manages volunteers and employees in fundamentally different ways, but since they do have different characteristics, goals and needs this is also necessary. The main difference is that employees are managed to a much greater extent than the volunteers. Of course there are similarities as well and especially in the way the organization focuses on saving money at all stages. Furthermore, the organization has a clear focus on achieving high performance and having high competence among their staff and this greatly influences the management of both employees and volunteers.

The recruitment and selection process is managed differently among employees and volunteers, but the processes are similar in some ways since there is a clear focus on using the cheapest recruitment channels and selection filters for both groups. The process of selection is more careful for employees and high requirements are put on the candidates. For the volunteers it is rather the other way around; the organization wants to let everyone be able to participate therefore they spend less on selection and more on competence development. This lack of prior experiences and competences among volunteers often lead the organization to choose internal resources in the end. In some aspects this is positive for the organization since they will have staff with the most experience, but with a goal to almost double the number of volunteers this has negative consequences for RB. This goal is especially difficult to reach since the turnover is very high and RB therefore needs to put more effort into retaining the new volunteers coming into the organization. For employees the selection is well conducted and there are no apparent negative consequences. It is logical that there are high demands on them since they are bound to the organization, but on the other hand, these higher demands give an impression that the employees are more important than the volunteers. A gap is thereby created between volunteers and employees which damages cohesiveness and relatedness among the two groups.

The internal flows (i.e. between projects for volunteers and job rotation for employees) are managed in a positive way for both groups. There is a lot of freedom and flexibility and the large focus on internal resources makes it easy to move around in the organiza-
tion. On the other hand, it has created a vicious circle where the organization has to use their internal resources primarily since they are not able to make new volunteers stay longer than for one project. One reason mentioned for why volunteers are leaving is that they are only interested in a specific project, but RB needs to think about if there is something they can do to encourage them to keep volunteering. For the employees the situation is not much to discuss, they have opportunities to rotate among jobs and they have advantages for being internal resources, but it is not the same thing as for volunteers since the employees are not primarily working in projects.

RB has very little control over release of volunteers and it is basically impossible for them to “fire” a volunteer unless they do something very inappropriate. Employees are also difficult to release since they are bounded by contract (as in any other organization) and have both rights and obligations. This is positive since it gives them a sense of security and it also ensures that they perform well since they can be fired if they violate their contract. Despite this, the organization in general has more control over employees than they have over volunteers. The organization controls the volunteers to a very small degree and offers the employees much more contextual factors such as support and security which also influences turnover. Their retention of employees is not affected by the low compensation they receive since it is instead increased by many other factors such as support, supervision and feedback (factors that the volunteers do not have to the same extent). Efforts are done to retain staff, but not enough is done for volunteers.

RB has a clear focus on achieving high performance and even though it is difficult to measure and manage they have found a way to do it by working with organizational goals and constant evaluations of the work done. They cannot offer employees or volunteers any high monetary rewards or any large amount of non-monetary extrinsic benefits. Their focus has to lie on intrinsic motivation as the only way to make volunteers perform since they have no formal control over them. The volunteers are affected by the system because of the fact that they cannot get extrinsic rewards (except for competence development), but on the other hand the nature of their work makes them intrinsically motivated instead. Despite this, when the organization does not put enough effort into maintaining the intrinsic motivation then people will eventually leave. The motivating factors are relatively high for volunteers, but as mentioned contextual and hygiene fac-
tors are lower and this increase their dissatisfaction. The employees receive extrinsic rewards that are lower than in other sectors, but their hygiene and motivator factors are relatively high and there are no apparent problems with retaining employees.

The organization does a lot to involve both groups and especially volunteers since the entire decision-making process is mostly based on their will. On the other hand, the influence and power is evened out since the employees have responsibility over the implementation process. As we have discussed in the analysis, the organization publishes a lot of organizational documents that are available for both groups and this ensures that they stay updated. There is also extensive communication among and between the workforces and discussions, exchange of ideas and feedback happens at a regular basis. Although more involvement tools are used for the volunteers than the employees the organization has assured that everyone have flexibility in terms of working hours and a certain authority to coordinate their own work. Furthermore, the organization has done enough to empower and motivate the workforce in order to retain them, but as mentioned this has not had the desired effect on the volunteers. Moreover there are also delays in the decision process that can be linked together with the fact that the volunteers do not understand their role and therefore misunderstandings are created. In order to avoid this problem the organization needs to clarify the role of the volunteers.

In our opinion the organization has provided development opportunities for the volunteers by offering them a great variety of courses. There are courses that are offered for those who want to know more about the organization and their work, but also courses where volunteers can obtain new skills to ensure that they can perform well on their assignments. The organization invests a lot into developing the volunteers and attracts them to the courses by paying the course fee, travel and accommodation costs. Since the courses are not mandatory it is up to the volunteers to decide if they want to attend them or not. Despite the fact that some of the volunteers have been “forced” to develop and learn more they are motivated and while they are involved in a mission they need to obtain more knowledge in order to accomplish the mission and improve their performance. We discussed around this in the analysis and our conclusion is that this kind of force is positive and driving them to strive forward. On other hand, the organization does not offer the same standard courses for the employees, but they do have a great
deal of competence development as well. For the employees the organization offers external courses and they can attend these courses as long as their manager approves and thereby the organization will also pay all expenses.

As we have seen, the employees can build their career as employees in any other organization. The employees in RB can change position (assuming there are jobs available) and it is possible to strive for a manager position. The volunteers on the other hand do not care about career opportunities to the same extent as employees since they have their ordinary job besides RB. Even if they do not build a career in RB they can achieve a “spiral staircase career” through learning by experience and carrying out projects successfully. Despite the fact that volunteers usually are not interested in building a career there is still space for them to advance in the organization by, for example, becoming a board member/president.

As we have mentioned, there are more problems with retaining volunteers than employees. This is perhaps not so strange since volunteers are not bounded to the organization, but it is a consequence of their HRM system and something they have to consider if they want to increase the number of volunteers. The system they have in place today does not encourage the volunteers enough to stay and keep volunteering for RB. There seem to be no clear focus on how they should keep the volunteers motivated, it is rather taken for granted that they have the motivation to stay. On the other hand, a lot has been done in terms of giving the volunteers power, authority, involvement and growth opportunities, but they are still not encouraged to stay. It is apparent though that there is a lack of certain contextual factors such as supervision and control and this can make volunteers dissatisfied with their situation. Perhaps the volunteers’ work is too autonomous and there is a need to provide them with more structure and control?

Finally, we think that even though we have made a case study our main results can be transferred to other charitable organizations as well. Many of the volunteers and employees working in the nonprofit sector have similar conditions (e.g. salary levels, autonomy and freedom) and therefore their situation should be similar to the one in RB. On the other hand, some organizations might have designed their HRM system in a slightly different way, but the main conclusions should still be the same. Furthermore,
our conclusion concerning volunteer retention problems is also relevant since these problems have been mentioned and acknowledged to a great extent in previous research as well.
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