



LUND UNIVERSITY
School of Economics and Management

The Manager of Volunteers – Privileged or Powerless?

A case study on motivating volunteers

Maaza Gebremedhin

Malin Ghanem

Master Thesis

Program: Managing People, Knowledge and Change

Advisor: Sverre Spoelstra

Lund, 2009

Abstract

Title: The Manager of Volunteers: Privileged or Powerless?

Seminar date: June 2, 2009

Course: Masters thesis in Business Administration,

Program: Managing People, Knowledge and Change

Authors: Malin Ghanem & Maaza Gebremedhin

Advisor: Sverre Spoelstra

Five key words: motivation, nonprofit organization, volunteer, retention, and management.

Purpose:

The purpose of this research is to explore the everyday processes of motivating volunteers. By considering managers' and members' perceptions, we try to get insight of how managers attempt to motivate members in practice and whether their efforts are perceived (by members) to influence the members' motivations to participate in the organization's activities.

Methodology:

A case study of AIESEC Lund using a qualitative research method consisting of semi structured interviews and analyzed using an interpretative approach.

Theoretical perspectives:

The concepts of motivation and volunteerism are the core concepts in our research and we have also looked at two similar studies undertaken in the field; the first one conducted by Jäger et al. (2009) on leading volunteers and a second study on managing volunteers with a relationship marketing approach conducted by Bussell and Forbes (2007), which are used for comparison and inspiration in relation to our findings.

Empirical foundation:

Our empirical material is based on 12 semi-structured in-depth interviews with members and managers in AIESEC Lund. We also looked at secondary sources, such as the organization's website and other internal documents.

Conclusions:

Planned activities intended to motivate members did not have desired effects in most cases, based on the members' perceptions. Socialization was important for most members. However there was a difference how the mandatory social activities and the informal social activities were perceived, where the members would not attend a social event because they had to. The position of the manager of volunteers resembles that of the manager of knowledge workers, who have limited influence on the workers and the manager's role is to facilitate and support, rather than to lead and control activities. Hence, the managers are privileged to have a valuable workforce, but somewhat powerless to the extent they are able to influence the workers.

Abbreviations

CSR - Corporate Social Responsibility

EB - Executive Board

LC - Local Committee

NPO - Nonprofit Organization

PM - Project Manager

RE - Renewable Energy

VP - Vice President

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	2
ABBREVIATIONS	4
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION.....	7
1.1 PROBLEMATIZATION.....	9
1.2 RESEARCH QUESTION.....	11
1.3 PURPOSE.....	11
1.4 RELEVANCE.....	12
1.5 DISPOSITION	12
CHAPTER 2: METHODOLOGY.....	14
2.1 THE CHOICE OF A CASE STUDY APPROACH.....	14
2.2 DATA COLLECTION	15
2.3 SAMPLING	16
2.4 INTERVIEWS	17
2.4.1 <i>Limitations of interviews</i>	18
2.5 ANALYSIS.....	19
2.6 RELIABILITY & VALIDITY	19
CHAPTER 3: FRAMES OF REFERENCE.....	21
3.1 WHAT IS MOTIVATION?.....	21
3.1.1 <i>The complex nature of motivation</i>	21
3.1.2 <i>The perceived significance of motivation at work</i>	22
3.1.3 <i>The meaning of motivation</i>	23
3.2 THE CONCEPT OF VOLUNTEERISM.....	25
3.2.1 <i>What is a volunteer?</i>	25
3.2.2 <i>Motivation in the voluntary organization</i>	26
3.2.3 <i>Literature on volunteerism – a brief overview</i>	28
3.3 BALANCING ACTS – A STUDY ON LEADING VOLUNTEERS	30
3.4 RELATIONSHIP MARKETING AND THE VOLUNTEER LIFE CYCLE – A STUDY ON MANAGING THEATRE VOLUNTEERS.....	32
3.5 SUMMARY	34
CHAPTER 4: THE CASE OF AIESEC LUND.....	36
4.1 THE CASE OF AIESEC LUND	36
4.2 WHAT’S THE CATCH? – ATTRACTION OF MEMBERS AND THE MOTIVES TO JOIN.....	39
4.3 WHO IS FIT FOR AIESEC?	41
4.4 HOW DO MEMBERS BECOME ACTIVE MEMBERS?.....	44
4.5 SOMETHING FOR EVERYONE? TEAMS, ROLES AND TASKS.....	46
4.6 MEETINGS EFFECTIVE AND INTERESTING OR BORING AND A WASTE OF TIME?.....	49
4.7 CONFERENCE IS THE KEY OR IS IT?	52
4.8 SOCIAL CIRCLES: DO PEOPLE GET PEOPLE GOING?	56
4.9 CREATING CHANGE AGENTS– PERSONAL DEVELOPMENT	57

4.10 THE INCENTIVE OF INTERNSHIP	60
4.11 SUMMARY	62
CHAPTER 5: ANALYSIS	64
5.1 A MOTIVATED WORKFORCE JOINING AIESEC, IS THERE A NEED TO MOTIVATE?	64
5.2 THE AIESEC–MEMBER FIT, THE START OF AN ENDURING RELATIONSHIP	65
5.3 THE CRITERIA OF AN ACTIVE MEMBER - A TOOL FOR INFLUENCING MEMBERS?.....	67
5.4 TASKS & TEAMS - THE FOUNDATION FOR WORK	69
5.5 LC MEETINGS EFFECTIVE OR NOT?	70
5.6 CONFERENCES: MOTIVATING OR DEMOTIVATING?	72
5.7 SOCIALIZATION: A CREATION OF MANAGEMENT?.....	73
5.8 PERSONAL DEVELOPMENT AND INTRINSIC MOTIVATION	74
5.9 INTERNSHIP – A MOTIVATOR OR JUST A REWARD?.....	76
CHAPTER 6: CONCLUSION	77
6.1 IMPLICATIONS	79
REFERENCES	81

Chapter 1: Introduction

Motivation is a hot topic in the corporate world. Companies are generally very interested in this area as they can try to use this knowledge and apply it to their employees for the ultimate goal of increasing profits. "...companies have always been about the generation of profit, but people can't get excited about that" (Baines qtd. in Bunting, 2005: 266). Hence the need for some form of motivation. Profit seeking organizations will typically try through a variety of ways to affect the motivation of their employees. One reason why this is possible is that normally employees are dependent on organizations for monetary reasons (Sayer, 2007). Sayer says that because the organization is usually in a position of higher power, and because of its relentless urge to boost profits, it has the capacity to control the motivations and actions of the employees.

Whereas motivation is a key to increase profits in companies, motivation may seem to be of less significance in nonprofit organizations (NPOs), which essentially do not seek to maximize profits. However, performance in nonprofit sector is of vital importance, as the NPOs serve our society and contribute to the economy, and thus a motivated workforce is of no less significance in NPOs.

The nonprofit sector can make up a considerable part of a country's economic activity. According to Lakdawalla and Philipson (2005), in the USA approximately 20% all firms are nonprofit ones. Mook et al. (2007), reveal that in Canada this sector employs approximately 2 million people, which is about the same amount employed in their manufacturing industry. Out of this 2 million, roughly 33% are volunteers. Typically nonprofit organizations depend more on volunteers. Statistics Canada (2004) estimated this sector's value to be 6.8% of the country's total economy in 1999 and in the year 2000, they recorded 1,056 million hours of volunteer work. "There are reasons abound for people to work in a certain organization besides financial considerations, as volunteers prove every single day" (van Vuuren et al., 2008: 315).

It is estimated that about half the population in the UK participate in some voluntary activity (Bussell and Forbes, 2002), whether it is in education, culture, human services, sports, religion or any other activities.

In addition to the economic contributions, voluntary work also fills a gap that communities have overlooked (Stukas et al., 2008: 6) and without the volunteers many of the public services and charitable, cultural, educational and other activities would not be available to us (Freeman, 1997). Volunteering also brings together people from diverse backgrounds and thus improves social understanding and contributes to the harmony in our communities. Finally, voluntary work contributes to the psychological well-being of individual, as it has been found to increase self-esteem, increase energy levels and reduce depression (Shin and Kleiner, 2003).

Volunteering has gotten so widespread that the UN declared the year 2001 as the “International Year of Volunteers” (United Nations, 2009a). The United Nations Volunteers Mission Statement is as follows

“Volunteering brings benefits to both society at large and the individual volunteer. It makes important contributions, economically as well as socially. It contributes to a more cohesive society by building trust and reciprocity among citizens” (United Nations, 2009b).

Because volunteering can be said to reward the individual intrinsically one would think that volunteers are already motivated in their roles, and would not need to partake in a selection process, especially if they don't actually *have to* contribute to anything. The very definition of a volunteer is that they are actually willing to contribute their time and effort to something, which benefits others for no monetary rewards (e.g. Handy et al., 2000). Wouldn't that be motivation itself? Wouldn't organizations jump at the chance and take anyone who is willing to volunteer? One would think so but not necessarily. For instance some corporations actually work with nonprofit organizations and provide them with volunteers, better known as “corporate volunteering” (Cihlar, 2004: 4). These people may not be looked at as volunteers per se, if the company demands that they partake in such a program. In the case where

they are required, an influence on their motivation might be necessary in order to keep them going. There are volunteer agencies providing volunteers to other organizations, in which case they will need to be selective of the candidates because the volunteer chosen will be looked at as a representative of the volunteer agency. In addition, if the selected candidate's motivation changes negatively, it could be reflected with the client, and hence thwart the volunteer organization-client relationship. Motivation is thus vital in both paid and non-paid work.

1.1 Problematization

We think it is fascinating that so many people invest their time and energy to help others for no monetary compensation in a society where it seems our lives are steered by money and where 'time is money'. The phenomenon of volunteerism has intrigued many researchers throughout the years, who have studied which individuals are likely to engage in voluntary activities in terms of demographics and what drives these people to 'work for free'. Whether the reason for volunteering is the belief in a good cause, to gain experience or because a friend asked, volunteers are presumably motivated to become and to continue to volunteer since they choose to do it. This seems to be an ideal scenario for a manager, where so many people are willing to help out in our society and managers are blessed with an already motivated workforce, which is something managers in other organizations would be very grateful for as motivated employees are believed to lead to better performance.

However, the harsh reality is that volunteers are a scarce resource and the competition is growing, thus human resource practices are becoming increasingly important in these organizations in order to attract and retain members (Connors in Jäger et al., 2009).

Furthermore, according to Pearce voluntary organizations are often faced with the reliability problem of non-attendance and non-performance of volunteers, where the volunteers are in a position to choose how much and when to get involved, and when to withdraw since there is no legal or monetary contract (Jäger et al., 2009). It is therefore in the interest of the organization to try to overcome this problem and to try

to run the organization as efficiently as possible, hence the need to manage and motivate volunteers. But managers in voluntary organizations lack conventional means to motivate its workforce such as pay, rewards, provision of training and promotional opportunities (Boezeman and Ellemers, 2007), so how can they influence volunteers' motivations to participate?

Existing literature on volunteers provides us with extensive knowledge on volunteers' motivations and there are models and theories available to managers on how to assess and identify their motivations. It is suggested that by understanding what motivates current volunteers, managers can more effectively appeal to volunteers by addressing the motivations that are perceived important, and by trying to satisfy the goals and needs of volunteers, retention can be improved (Clary et al., 1996).

These theories provide knowledge on how managers can understand volunteers' motivations, but do not provide knowledge on whether managers can influence members' motivations or how it actually works in practice, which is what we are interested in finding out.

We are also somewhat skeptical towards the idea of using a framework to assess motivations, where the response to pre-designed questionnaires does not necessarily reflect the respondent's actual experience. Firstly, because there is a social desirability bias where individuals will report what they believe will put them in a favourable light in a society which favours altruism and secondly, they may not know exactly what motivates them (Serow, 1991).

The management of volunteers remains an under-researched field and Jäger et al. refer to this area of research on volunteerism as "the black box" (Jäger et al., 2009: 80). Boezeman and Ellemers (2007) suggest that commitment can help overcome the reliability problem and managers can influence commitment by providing support for pride and respect. However, their study was conducted by interviewing volunteers and it did not focus on managers in practice.

There is literature on how managers could lead volunteers, written mainly by practitioners, however, there is a lack of empirical evidence to support the theories and Jäger et al. (2009) argue that their research is a first step towards opening up 'the black box' on leading volunteers in everyday practice. We are curious to explore what goes on in the 'real life' and we will build on their research also including the members' voices, which were not taken into consideration in their study. The members' voices can give us a good insight on how managers' practices are received by the subjects.

1.2 Research Question

The research question which will guide our research is:

- To what extent are managers' attempts to motivate members perceived to influence members' motivations in a voluntary organization?

The following sub-questions will help us to gather relevant information for answering above question:

- Do managers perceive there is a need to motivate members?
- From the managers' perspective, do managers attempt to motivate members and if so, how?
- What is perceived to motivate members?
- Do members perceive the managers to have an influence on their motivations?

1.3 Purpose

The purpose of this research is to explore the everyday processes of motivating volunteers. By considering managers' and members' perceptions, we try to get

insight of how managers attempt to motivate members in practice and whether their efforts are perceived (by members) to influence the members' motivations to participate in the organization's activities.

1.4 Relevance

By investigating the process of how managers motivate members and how members perceive to be motivated, we believe we can gain a deeper understanding of the concept of motivating workers and our research can contribute by, firstly, filling a gap in research, where there is a lack of empirical research on the process of managing volunteers. Secondly, our research will contribute to a deeper understanding on how motivation functions in real life, rather than in theory. Thirdly, our study can help practitioners to reflect on their practices from the perspective of members, which could provide them with a better understanding on motivation and management practices. Furthermore, we think that research on motivating volunteers could perhaps be valuable to managers in for-profit and public organizations too, by providing them with a different perspective on motivation where pay is not an issue, which could possibly inspire new ideas for motivating paid workers.

1.5 Disposition

This thesis is structured as follows:

Chapter 1: Introduction

In this chapter we have introduced our research topic of motivation in a voluntary context. We discussed the significance of our research, as well as we presented our research question, purpose and the relevance of our study.

Chapter 2: Methodology

In the next chapter we present the methods chosen for our research and discuss the reasoning behind our choice, including methodological considerations and limitations to our study.

Chapter 3: Frames of Reference

In chapter 3 we firstly discuss the core concepts of motivation and volunteerism and the relevance of these concepts for research. We then give an overview of previous research in the field, where we highlight how our research can add to the existing knowledge. Finally, we look at two studies in more detail which are similar to our study and which we use for inspiration and comparison for our research.

Chapter 4: The Case of AIESEC Lund

In this chapter we firstly introduce the case of AIESEC Lund, followed by a rich account of our findings including numerous quotes. It is structured into interesting themes, which appeared to be significant in the interview statements.

Chapter 5: Analysis

In Chapter 5, we discuss our findings following the same structure of themes as presented in chapter 4, although we have changed the headings to relate better to our research question. This is where we shed some light on whether managers are perceived to influence the members' motivations.

Chapter 6: Conclusion

This chapter includes a summary of our analysis, followed by implications of our findings, limitations and finally, suggestions for further research.

Chapter 2: Methodology

In this chapter we present the methodology for our research. First we will discuss the choice of a case study approach. Then we will discuss the methods we used for data collection, followed by sampling, interviews and analysis. Finally, we will discuss the reliability and validity of our research.

2.1 The choice of a case study approach

Having secured an organization with which to work we were very excited by the idea that it was not your typical company, but rather it is a nonprofit and student run organization. We felt that this might make our situation more enjoyable and unique, and be able to lead us to very interesting research. In addition, we liked the idea of having a chance to experience more informal, yet personal encounters with individuals from the organization.

Our research is based on a case study of AIESEC Lund. “What distinguishes a case study is that the researcher is usually concerned to elucidate the unique features of the case” (Bryman and Bell, 2003: 54). This is a nonprofit organization, where the leaders currently put in a lot of effort into selecting, and motivating their members. We felt this represented a unique situation and we wanted to focus on analyzing how the members felt about these efforts.

We then started to formulate our research question, taking into consideration our knowledge of the distinctiveness of the organization. Once it was determined, we decided on a qualitative research method since we are interested in gaining a deeper understanding of our topic, which is built on perceptions. Bryman and Bell (2003) state the definition of qualitative research “is a research strategy that usually emphasizes words rather than quantification in the collection and analysis of data” (Bryman and Bell, 2003: 279). This we felt was more appropriate and aligned with our interest in using an interpretative approach. We are interested in finding individual

perceptions, essentially how individuals understand and construct their worlds. Our goal is to uncover how managers perceive their attempts to motivate members in practice and whether their efforts are perceived (by members) to influence the members' motivations.

2.2 Data Collection

Our primary data results from resulting from a series of interviews with people in the organization. Because of the nature of the organization, observations are not easily arranged since much of the work is done remotely or virtually. However because one of us is actually a member of this organization, some reflections have been made and were taken into consideration. We believe this helps to give us a good pre-understanding of the organization. We have also gathered secondary data from articles, internal documents within the organization, as well as from the organization's Internet sites.

We looked at secondary sources first. This enabled us to broaden our knowledge and get a deeper insight into the relevant theory available. We were able to see what research had been done already, so we do not make attempts to 'reinvent the wheel'. Because we are studying a nonprofit volunteer organization, we chose from a selection of articles on volunteers and NPO's to help form our literature framework. Theories were taken from both articles on volunteerism as well as from management literature, since we believed it would give us a broader repertoire where some motivation theories are appropriate in both fields. Although the literature on volunteering is quite vast, we felt that it was lacking research on our topic. Much of the literature is positivistic and quantitative which tries to generalize findings from one voluntary organization to another. We believe a close-up study taking volunteers perceptions into consideration, can provide a richer account on the topic in question. Volunteerism is too broad to be treated as one concept and there is a need to distinguish one volunteer organization from another. For example, a humanist organization has different characteristics from an art organization, and a member organization differs from a non-member organization. Secondly, because each

individual's motivations are unique, and motivations can be psychological and complex. We felt focusing on in-depth interviews with several individuals can provide a richer account than trying to identify variables that explain motivations. Therefore we chose to do an in-depth idiographic case study on a nonprofit organization, which is a local committee of the world's largest student organization.

2.3 Sampling

We chose to interview 12 people in total from this organization of about 45 members. We felt this was a good sample representation due to the time restraints in our study. They were all willing participants in our study and no one was obliged to participate. We used a sampling method for selecting our respondents by ensuring they came from different positions and teams in the organization. We used purposive sampling method (Neuman, 2003) for selecting members from different positions and teams for the purpose of our research. We chose the respondents from the full list of members, which we believed could help give us an understanding of our research questions. We wanted to ensure that members came from different teams and formed a well-balanced mix. Because we are interested in finding out how management attempts to motivate members, we asked to interview 5 leaders and the rest were regular members. Out of the leaders some of them led a team and others were leaders without teams. There were 7 regular members in total. They all were either classified as an old member, a new recruit, or an ex-member. A new recruit refers to members that joined the organization a very short time ago in February 2009. Old members were classified as having joined in September 2008 or before. An ex-member was classified as a person who is no longer with the organization. We felt interviewing ex-members was important because they could speak to us as to *why* they were no longer with the organization and help us to discover if it was related to motivation. Because one of us is a member in this NPO we felt this was an advantage in our study and made the contact with ex-members quite easy as compared to contacts in a regular corporation. Also we felt that we needed to see if there was a distinction between members who recently joined as opposed to members who had joined some time ago. Initially, we had planned to interview 3 *new* members, but only 2 people

were available and willing to participate. In addition we selected 3 old members and finally, we interviewed 2 ex-members. Moreover, the members and managers were selected from 3 different project teams, in order to help provide a representative sample.

2.4 Interviews

Interviews were chosen, as we were interested in the attitudes and perceptions of individuals, which are not easily observed or measured through quantitative methods. We chose to conduct semi-structured interviews that allowed for individuals to freely express their views with little or no restriction. Although there was somewhat of a structure used, we kept it fairly open as to, not try and pin down their responses and steer them in one direction. All the respondents were aware of the general idea of our project and topic, however they were encouraged to answer the questions based on their interpretation and that there were no right or wrong answers.

In order to encourage our respondents to speak truthfully, we explained to each of them that although everything in the interview was being recorded, all the information was to be used amongst us researchers and they would remain completely anonymous. We wanted to assure them that no information was going to be used against their will. In addition because one of us is a member of the organization, the respondents were informed to think of that person simply as a researcher and not as a member of the organization. Our goal was to ensure that they felt comfortable in answering and that one of us was not there to judge them, as a peer.

Each of us took turns when leading the interviews, in order to help prevent assumptions that could occur once several interviews had been made. The other researcher was able to interject at any time and ask questions, and also to clarify anything that was previously said. It was very helpful that one of us was a member of the organization, who had already developed a rapport with almost all of the respondents. We felt this helped to make the interview process go more smoothly and make them more personal.

We designed an interview guide with some broad topics that we thought would help to obtain interesting material in order to answer our research question. Different interview guides were designed for the respondents depending on their position and rank in the organization. The questions were open-ended which left room for their interpretation.

The interviews were mainly conducted in places that were convenient to the respondents, yet neutral and quiet to allow for some privacy. We used some follow-up questions and some probing to get deeper answers. Since we could go behind conscious desires to more fundamental aims of the individual (Maslow, 1954: 64), we avoided leading questions. In the interviews we aimed for open-mindedness and listened to the respondents' perspectives, without focusing on chasing a phenomenon.

2.4.1 Limitations of interviews

However, it is important to acknowledge the limitations of the interview and to consider these in the analysis. Firstly, the accounts do not mirror reality and should be treated as indirect representations rather than real experiences. With regards to our topic motivation is especially complex and to a large extent subconscious and may be beyond comprehension for people (Serow, 1991). We are aware of the social desirability bias, where altruistic motives are ideals and selfish goals are condemned by society and respondents seek to boost their self-esteem and hence we cannot know precisely what the respondents' motives were (Jäger et al, 2009). Moreover, respondents might fall back on conventional talk and the interview may be a reproduction of the discourses the in which the respondent is engaged. Finally, the interview situation is a construction between the interviewee and the researcher, where both parties influence and shape the outcome. We have tried to avoid romanticism, where respondents are believed to express authentic experiences (Silverman, 2006), by acknowledging the variations and inconsistencies in the language and by comparing the discourses for different respondents.

2.5 Analysis

Once the interviews were transcribed we each started the process of analysis and picked out key themes that we felt stood out from the all of the accounts. We then compared notes and compiled a list of key themes, in which we displayed and further discussed the findings. This information is sectioned by theme and can be found in Chapter 4 - The case of AIESEC Lund.

Hermeneutics is an interpretative approach, where the hermeneutic circle is formed by the connection between the whole and its parts (Alvesson & Sköldberg, 2007).

“The interpretation of the whole text is successively developed by the interpretations of its parts, and conversely the views of the parts are illuminated by the view of the whole. On the other hand, a similar alternation between preunderstanding and understanding is also taking place during the interpretive process ”(Alvesson and Sköldberg, 2007:66).

The analysis of the findings were done with an interpretative approach trying to understand the phenomenon from the interviewee’s perspectives. Their understandings were put into a wider context of a whole and its parts, as well their as our pre-understandings influencing our understanding. The combination of these occurring simultaneously was how we analyzed what we found; the full analysis is illustrated in Chapter 5 – Analysis.

2.6 Reliability & Validity

Because qualitative research deals mainly with lengthy expressive accounts, reliability can be an issue (Silverman, 2006). In qualitative research it is the problem of how “a researcher goes about categorizing the events or activities described” (Silverman, 2006: 46). We had taken several steps in order to minimize this issue. First prior to the interviews, we conducted a pilot interview. This enabled us to evaluate how each of us interpreted and analyzed similar data. Then we wanted to

test and see if the data collected was relevant and sufficient, and we made changes accordingly in order to obtain better accounts to support our research question. We ensured that all the interviews we conducted were in person, and audio-recorded. Immediately after each interview we took some time to discuss among ourselves some key things that stood out in the interview to allow for internal reliability (Bryman and Bell, 2003: 288). Afterwards we each transcribed the audio-recorded interviews, where we had the leading role. We divided it in this manner to make the whole process go smoother, as it was much easier to transcribe one's own voice. During the transcribing we made sure to include symbols for pauses and different tones, which are otherwise lost in a text, but if included can be vital to the interpretation. Finally, we included these some of these texts and questions in our findings section to illustrate our interpretation.

Validity can be defined as "...the extent to which an account accurately represents the social phenomena to which it refers. (Hammersley qtd. in Silverman, 2006: 289). We are using an interpretative approach and we are interested in the individual perceptions of our respondents. Therefore the ability for validity to completely affect our study negatively is not as much of a main concern as it could be. Because reality can be seen as constructed in the minds of individuals, it doesn't necessarily mean that what our respondents are saying is not true, and doesn't reflect reality. We are interested in finding out their reality, how they actually perceive the situation, hence what they believe to be true.

Chapter 3: Frames of Reference

We have been diving into the vast literature on motivation, both management literature and literature on volunteerism, in order to gain a broad understanding of the topic and to explore what research has been undertaken in the field and in this chapter we will present the reader with a concise and useful framework for our research.

Motivation is the focus of our research and we will begin by introducing the concept of motivation and how we use motivation in our study. Secondly, we will discuss volunteerism and why managing and motivating volunteers is important. Following is a brief overview of the literature in the field, where we discuss how our research can add to the existing knowledge on the topic and finally, we will focus on two studies which are used for inspiration and comparison for our research.

3.1 What is Motivation?

3.1.1 The complex nature of motivation

The concept of motivation is complex, where an individual's motivations are multiple and changing (e.g. Clary et al, 1996; Maslow, 1954), and the influences on motivation are endless, including culture, identity, values and life priorities (Watson, 2002), "nature of work, quality of relationships, and inner needs and drives" (Denhardt et al., 2002: 153) and style of leadership and personal orientation (i.e. autonomous orientation or controlled orientation) (Gagne and Deci, 2005). Furthermore, motivations are to a large extent subconscious (Cnaan and Goldberg-Glen, 1991) and sometimes too complex for the individual to comprehend (Serow, 1991). Since motivation is an internal state, motivations are invisible (Denhardt et al., 2002) and we have to rely on the individual to report his or her motivations. This is

problematic since we cannot be certain if the reported motives were the experienced ones, where the “actors may find it advantageous to report motives other than those they truly experienced” (Serow, 1991: 545). Watson (2002) also emphasizes that motives are often made to explain an event in hindsight and are not necessarily what triggered the action.

These characteristics make research on motivation very difficult and we do not attempt to provide an explanation of what motivation is or to find out exactly what motivates members. Our aim is to get an insight into individuals’ perceptions on motivation and we are interested in exploring if and how management attempts to motivate members and whether this is perceived to influence members’ motivation in practice. *But why get involved in researching a topic that is so complex to study in the first place? Why is motivation so important?*

3.1.2 The perceived significance of motivation at work

In the corporate world, motivation is a central aspect of a manager’s role and it is perceived to be linked to performance and organizational success (e.g. Denhardt et al. 2002).

“Within this world of work, motivation is an important concern. For organizations to thrive, indeed in many cases even to survive, members of the organization must be motivated to perform well” (Deci and Ryan, 1985: 294)

Being such an important aspect in the work context, there are innumerable motivation theories suggesting best practices for managers to motivate workers. However, there is some skepticism towards the success of these practices, where for example performance-related pay has been found to be problematic in practice (Leopold et al., 2005) and Beardwell et al. (2004) point out there is a lack of empirical evidence to support the claim that motivation is linked to performance. Considering that each individual is motivated in different ways, best practices are unlikely to be successful.

Despite the lack of empirical support, motivation remains a central aspect of managing and working with people in the organizations.

In a voluntary organization motivation is possibly of a different concern, where volunteers are assumingly already motivated to work since they choose to do it and we will discuss the importance of management and motivation in voluntary organizations in more detail in the section on volunteerism.

So it seems that motivation is an important tool for management and we are curious to learn more about it. We will now explore the meaning of motivation and how it can be used in our study.

3.1.3 The meaning of motivation

Where research on motivation is already complex due to its nature, it gets even more complicated, since definitions are many and varied. Motivation can, for example, be summarized as: "what causes people to behave as they do" (Denhardt et al., 2002:156) or "a matter of why people do what they do" (Watson, 2002: 291).

These definitions are very broad and according to Watson (2002: 291), if this is what a motivation theory tries to explain, then it is "nothing less than a general theory of human behaviour!" We are certainly not interested in exploring all aspects of human behavior, so let us have a closer look at what motivation is to see how it can be used for our research.

Denhardt et al. (2002) highlight some aspects that are commonly found in motivation theories. Firstly, motivation is a goal-directed behavior, and refers to the voluntary choice to accomplish a goal. Not all behaviors are explained by motivation such as reflex or instinct (ibid), although "these [behaviors] probably constitute a rather small proportion of the total behavior of adult human beings" (Vroom, 1964: 9). Secondly, motivation theories seek to explain the process in which goals are pursued. A third aspect is that motivation is context-dependent, where the context hinders or directs

motivation and behavior (Denhardt et al., 2002), hence the working environment is important for the workers' motivations.

“At a basic level it can be seen that motivation is about motives and needs”, where motives are energies that direct behavior (Beardwell et al., 2004: 505). Individuals will also act in order to satisfy needs. According to Maslow, the needs are physiological, safety, belongingness, self-esteem and self-actualization in that order, although it has been questioned whether individuals satisfy needs in a particular order and Maslow's hierarchy of needs has been criticized for being a simplistic model of a complex phenomenon (Watson, 2002).

Gagne and Deci (2005) suggest that the psychological needs for competence, autonomy and relatedness underlie intrinsic motivation. Intrinsic motivation means that the activity itself is interesting and satisfying, where extrinsic motivation is based on instrumentality and refers to a separate outcome of the activity, such as verbal or tangible rewards. Intrinsic factors associated to the work task could be achievement, recognition, challenging work, responsibility and growth. It is suggested that if an individual is intrinsically motivated, he or she will be more creative and more engaged in the task (Denhardt et al., 2002). However, if the task is not interesting, extrinsic motivation is needed in terms of what the task could lead to, such as pay or promotion (Gagne and Deci, 2005). Hence where tasks are repetitive and mundane, managers need to make use of extrinsic rewards (if it is not possible to create a more challenging and interesting task of course). However, rewards are not always appropriate as they can undermine intrinsic motivation (ibid) and when people are rewarded for carrying out a task, they may think that the task is not worth doing for its own sake (Denhardt et al., 2002). Herzberg refers to extrinsic factors as hygiene factors, which can cause dissatisfaction, however satisfaction of the hygiene factors does not lead to motivation, thus for the workers to be motivated the work itself must be satisfying (ibid).

An alternative approach to needs theories are the expectancy theories, which explain that the motivation to act depends on the individual's belief that his or her effort will lead to a desired outcome, and that the outcome is perceived to be valuable. The expectancy theory originally developed by Vroom based on valence, expectancy, and

force, was expanded by Porter and Lawler to incorporate the individual's ability and role clarity, where "effort does not always lead to task accomplishment", but it also depends on the individual's ability. (Denhardt et al., 2002: 163)

There are of course many other motivation theories, which we have chosen to exclude for the purpose of our paper. We have chosen to present the theories on motivation that can help us to make better sense of our findings. Our aim in this review of motivation is to gain a better understanding of motivation and why it is important.

Since motivation is what directs an individual's voluntary behavior, we feel that it is an important aspect in finding out how managers can influence subordinates to carry out tasks. In our study we refer to *motivation* as what drives volunteers to act in terms of joining the organization, participating in activities and remaining in the organizations and we will discuss the factors influencing their motivation. We feel that individuals' perceptions can give us a good understanding of what influenced them to act or what hindered them from participating.

3.2 The concept of volunteerism

3.2.1 What is a volunteer?

Before moving on to discuss why motivation is important in voluntary organizations, it is useful to define the concept of the volunteer, which is by no means an unequivocal concept. Volunteer is derived from a word in Hebrew meaning "to willingly give" or "charitable donation", indicating an expectation of altruism (Cnaan et al., 1996: 366). A volunteer is someone who chooses freely to act, does not receive remuneration and the act benefits others (Handy et al., 2000). However, Cnaan et al. (1996) stress the importance for further clarification as volunteering is not a monolithic activity and they classify the extent a person is a volunteer based on four dimensions consisting

of the extent the act is voluntary, the nature of reward, being a member in a formal organization and who the beneficiaries are.

At one end of the continuum, the purists do not define an individual who is obligated to volunteer (e.g. someone doing community service) or relatively uncoerced to volunteer (e.g. a person volunteering as part of school program or club) as a volunteer, whereas on the other end of the continuum, the broadest definitions would classify the individual as a volunteer. (Ibid)

In our case the members choose to join, they do not receive monetary compensation for their work, they are part of a formal organization and the beneficiaries are the members of the organization, thus they fall under the category of volunteers. Although, the beneficiaries also include themselves, their contribution also benefits others, so the members still 'qualify' as volunteers in our opinion and hence the theories on volunteerism are relevant in our research.

3.2.2 Motivation in the voluntary organization

Since volunteers join an organization by free will and are presumably motivated by the work of the organization, one might question if there is a need to motivate volunteers. Firstly, voluntary organizations face tough competition for volunteers, who are a scarce and a valuable resource (Bussell and Forbes, 2002). It is suggested that by understanding what motivates volunteers, managers are able to effectively appeal to new volunteers and also to retain them by satisfying their needs and goals (Clary et al., 1996), although we are interested in exploring if managers can do more than just understanding motivations and also influence volunteers' motivations. We will return to this later, but the point we want to make here is that motivation is important for the recruitment and retention of volunteers.

Secondly, voluntary organizations are often faced with the so called 'reliability problem' according to Pearce, which means that the attendance and performance of

volunteers are unpredictable, where volunteers have the freedom to choose when and how much to engage and can withdraw from participation at any time since there is no legal or monetary obligation to keep them in the organization (Ellemers and Boezeman, 2007; Jäger et al., 2009). Hence the need for effective management, but to what extent and how can managers influence volunteers to attend and participate in voluntary context?

We think it is important to consider the distinct characteristics of voluntary work and the implications for managers in these settings, which will give us a better understanding of the manager's role and its challenges when conducting our research.

The most fundamental difference in managing volunteers as opposed to paid workers is the lack of resources, which means that tools available in other organizations to direct and control behavior such as pay, rewards and promotion are not available (Boezeman and Ellemers, 2007), which makes managing volunteers a different 'ballgame'. Of course volunteers do not join for pay or material rewards, however the lack of resources has implications for induction and training for example, which are important for the volunteer to be able to carry out their tasks. (Haski-Leventhal and Bargal, 2008)

Since there are no contractual obligations, the manager may be seen to be lacking power to demand workers to follow orders and suggestions, a situation that can be referred to as "leading without formal power" (Milofsky in Jäger et al., 2009: 79). However, control of resources is not the only source of power, where for example knowledge, hierarchical position, the ability to manipulate the language to create meaning, and use of interpersonal alliances are others (Morgan, 2006), but we do agree that the relation between the manager and the volunteers is probably more delicate than in other work contexts, since the manager is not exactly in a position to demand the volunteer get the job done.

Voluntary work is often ambiguous, and volunteers often find their roles and tasks confusing. Contributing to the confusion is the lack of training, and the absence of job descriptions in many cases. Moreover, the volunteers sometimes find themselves to

be the producer and the client at the same time. The organization also faces ambiguity, where membership is uncertain in terms of numbers, level of involvement and the fact that the volunteer can at any time abandon the organization according to Pearce (in Jäger et al., 2009).

Finally, volunteers tend to be more relational than transactional-oriented, since the benefits sought, tend to be social rather than economic in nature (Bussell and Forbes, 2007) and this has implications for the management in terms of what support to provide (Farmer and Fedor, 1999). Farmer and Fedor suggest that managers provide support in terms of recognition and appreciation, personal interest in the life and well-being of the member, timely and helpful feedback on the results, and providing a supportive social network of other volunteers. Moreover, volunteers' motivations are often value-based and are interested in knowing how they contribute to the overall mission and goal of the organization (Farmer and Fedor, 1999).

3.2.3 Literature on volunteerism – a brief overview

A great deal of research has been undertaken on motivation of volunteers. Jäger et al. (2009) summarized and categorized the literature in the fields of demographics, motives for volunteering, organizational behavior and recommendations for effective volunteer management.

The former two fields have been explored to a large extent and it is suggested that the identification of volunteers' motivations can help predict commitment (Clary and Snyder 1999) and by understanding volunteers' motivations, the organization can appeal more persuasively to potential volunteers (Cnaan and Goldberg-Glen, 1991). A function approach provides a framework for assessing motivations and categorizes motivations into six functions; values (to express important values), understanding (to better understand the world and its people), enhancement (for positive self-enhancement), career (to obtain career skills and opportunities), social (to fit into one's social reference groups) and protective (for protective effects against guilt, self-doubt, and other negative feelings) (Clary and Snyder, 1999).

Stukas et al.'s (2009) matching theory draws upon the function approach and links the volunteer's motivations with the environment. Volunteers are more likely to engage, to be satisfied and to continue service if the volunteers' specific motives are combined with the social and physical environment. Omoto and Snyder (2002) also developed a model based on the function theory to include the wider context of the community and different stages of volunteering.

Some authors distinguish volunteering motives based on altruistic or egoistic reasons, however motivations are likely to be a combination of the two (Clary and Snyder, 1999; Cnaan and Goldberg-Glen, 1991). Furthermore, Serow (1991) found that there may be a systematic methodological bias against altruism, where researchers search for egoistic or rational patterns of motivation, since they have been warned against the social desirability bias.

It would be nice to simply use a framework to assess motivations and then the manager can target the potential volunteers with the right recipe in regards to what motivates current volunteers, but the question is how does it work in practice? Because of the complexity of motivation, we are somewhat skeptical towards the practicality of this approach, since individuals have a unique set of motives which are constantly changing and are influenced by a number of factors, although the six functions framework does consider the changing nature of motivation according to Clary and Snyder (1999). Although the needs and goals can be identified to a certain extent, where needs are often subconscious (Maslow, 1954), there are so many factors influencing an individual's complex set of motives, so how can we determine a scenario in which an individual is likely to volunteer? Jäger et al. (2009) also highlight the fact that it is very difficult for managers to know exactly what motivates the volunteers.

The other two fields of literature; organizational behavior and effective volunteer management, are less researched. We have already touched upon the distinct characteristics of voluntary work in the previous section and we do not feel there is a need to explore the literature on organizational behavior any further for the purpose of our research. The literature on management is mainly written by practitioners and

lack empirical evidence. According to Jäger et al. (2009) the studies on leading volunteers in practice is a 'black box' and their research is a first exploratory step towards opening it. They suggest that more research is needed in this field, and we will explore their study in more detail, since this is related to what we are interested in finding out.

3.3 Balancing Acts – a study on leading volunteers

Jäger et al. define leading somebody as “purposefully and instrumentally influencing his or her actions” (Jäger, 2009: 86) and they conducted a study on how leaders influence volunteers in everyday practice, which is similar to our research in which we are trying to find out how managers can influence members to act. However, their study specifically focused on the interactions between CEOs and volunteers and for the purpose of our research, we feel that there is much more to take into consideration when looking at what influences individuals to act. According to Watson (2002: 301-302) “to motivate people managers lead, build relationships, develop understandings, train people, devise promotional schemes and design jobs” and he argues that motivation should not be treated separately from leading and shaping tasks as they are all interlinked in influencing workers’ behaviors. For the purpose of our research, however, we feel it is appropriate to refer to motivation, since we are only interested in those aspects of a leader’s job which relate to influencing members to act and other aspects of leadership such as forming strategies, creating change, representing the organization and any other activity which is part of a leader’s job are not relevant to our research.

Because of the different focus in Jäger’s study and our research, the comparisons we can make in supporting or contrasting their findings are limited.

It was concluded in Jäger et al.’s (2009: 91) study that “leading volunteers comes down to a delicate balancing act”, between respecting volunteers’ different opinions and needs and focusing on organizational goals.

Volunteers are highly regarded for their good intentions, that is, freely dedicating their time to the organization. Managers do not feel comfortable to say to a volunteer that their performance is not up to standard and they would put the individual before results. The leaders respect the volunteers' different needs, opinions and interests and it was found that charismatic leadership can create resistance as it enforces one opinion and direction. The key is to relate to followers' different motives and try to integrate different opinions. (Jäger et al., 2009)

When managing volunteers, personal contact was found to be important. Praising volunteers as well as providing indications of the importance of their work is important, but rather than criticizing the volunteers, leaders chose to withdraw from recognition, which is perceived to be an effective influence on behavior. (Ibid)

Whereas Jäger et al. (2009) conducted interviews with CEOs in a number of nonprofit organizations, we will include the members' voices in order to find out if and how they perceive managers to influence their actions. Jäger et al. highlighted that one of the limitations to their study was that only CEO's voices were heard and they suggested further research that also included volunteers' perceptions. In contrast to Jäger et al.'s research, we have chosen to study one single organization in-depth, which will provide us with rich material, whereas their sample consisted of several different organizations. We acknowledge that our findings are therefore more limited to the context in which they are studied, but it may be possible to find some common trends and patterns across organizations.

Although this study is a useful starting point for our research, it is different to our research in its focus on interactions and it is therefore difficult to make comparisons. We will therefore complement this study with a study by Bussell and Forbes (2007).

3.4 Relationship Marketing and the Volunteer Life Cycle – a study on managing theatre volunteers

A study of theatre volunteers sheds some light on how managers can influence members to join the organization, participate in activities and remain in the organization (Bussell and Forbes, 2007). We acknowledge that the unique context of theatre volunteering imposes limitations to the extent that allows us to compare and support our findings, but meanwhile the findings may be unique to the theatre. The theories of relationship marketing and volunteer life cycle are not.

Bussell and Forbes (2007) suggest a relationship marketing approach is appropriate for voluntary organizations with its emphasis on creating an enduring relationship between the organization and the volunteer, where relationships have been found to be a key factor in volunteer retention. By strengthening the ties between the organization and the identities that volunteers find important, organizational identification can be enhanced, which in turn may enhance altruism, commitment and loyalty (ibid).

The Volunteer Life Cycle Model highlights the different stages the volunteer goes through in developing commitment to the organization. At each stage of the life cycle there are different aspects that the management needs to consider in relation to building and maintaining a relationship with the volunteer. In the first stage, the *volunteering determinants*, volunteers become aware of the organization and the management is engaged in attracting the volunteer, and identifying the needs of the volunteer. The second stage, the *decision to volunteer*, involves the matching of the volunteer expectations with those of the organization and the third stage refers to *the volunteer activity*, involving the establishment of relationships. The cycle also highlights the importance of managing the exit of volunteers. (Bussell and Forbes, 2007) Other researchers have also emphasized the importance of different stages of volunteering (e.g. Omoto and Snyder, 2002; Haski-Leventhal and Bargal, 2008), where volunteers' costs and benefits, perceptions and attitudes, emotions, relationships, and activities change over time (Haski-Leventhal and Bargal, 2008).

The findings from Bussell and Forbes' (2007) study indicated that motivation came from social identification as volunteers proudly associated themselves with the theatre. Although, the findings showed that the theatre was distinct from other arts organizations in terms of level of social identification and commitment, it was not known whether it was due to the theatre environment, the charismatic manager or the group of volunteers.

The management practices were found to be effective and contributed a great deal to the successful retention rate. It was also highlighted that the charismatic manager played an important role in the success of recruiting and retaining volunteers (Bussell and Forbes, 2007), which is contradictory to Jäger et al.'s (2009) findings which indicated that charismatic leadership could cause resistance in enforcing one opinion or direction and a more intransparent leadership was found to be more appropriate. However, because of the strong identification with the theatre based on shared values and interest (Bussell and Forbes, 2007), it may be that the charismatic leadership style is suitable in this particular context. Adding to the difference in findings could be the cultural context and Jäger et al. (2009) pointed out the limitations of extending their results to other countries without further inquiry.

In contrast to Jäger et al.'s (2009) findings that managers were reluctant to criticize volunteers for their performance, the theatre manager was in a position to set performance standards and if the performance was not adequate, the manager would talk to the individual. However, important to note is that the theatre provided extensive training and support for their volunteers in performing their duties (Bussell and Forbes, 2007).

We are aware of the limitations of using this study for our research. Firstly, Bussell and Forbes (2007) emphasized that the study focuses specifically on theatre volunteering and thus it is questionable to what extent it is useful to compare the findings. However, we think there are aspects that can be applicable to other organizations, since for example the importance of relationships was also highlighted in Jäger et al.'s (2009) study. The different stages that volunteers go through is not specific to the theatre environment, although the particular findings in relation to each

of the stages may be specific to the case that Bussell and Forbes (2007) studied, e.g. the affiliation with the arts was very strong and the volunteers were like-minded individuals with a shared interest and similar backgrounds.

Due to time-constraints, we were only able to collect data at one point in time, so the extent to which we can apply the volunteer life-cycle to our case is limited. Indeed, our aim is not to apply a model to our findings, but rather to understand the phenomenon from the members' perspectives, however the life-cycle is a useful guide for our research as it emphasizes the changing nature of a volunteer's motivations to join and to remain in the organization. We have considered the different stages a volunteer goes through when conducting our interviews and the volunteer life cycle can also guide us in comparing our findings to that of Bussell and Forbes' case.

Furthermore, we think it is important to acknowledge that the organization that Bussell and Forbes (2007) studied was very successful in terms of retaining members and thus it does not highlight any particular challenges that managers face. The manager in this case was found to play an important role to the effective running of the organization, but it is difficult to determine to what extent it was because of the manager or other factors. We consider members' voices in our research as we believe they hold the answer to whether managers' attempts to motivate members actually are perceived to influence the members' motivations.

3.5 Summary

In this chapter we have discussed theories in relation to our research. Firstly, we discussed the concept of motivation and why motivation is perceived to be important in organizations. We concluded that motivation is an important aspect in finding out how managers can influence subordinates to carry out tasks. In our study, we refer to *motivation* as what drives volunteers to act in regards to joining the organization, participating in activities, and remaining in the organizations. We feel that individuals'

perceptions can give us a greater understanding of the topic. The theories of motivation are also used to enhance our understanding of our findings.

Then we discussed motivation in a voluntary context, briefly introducing the concept of a volunteer, followed by a discussion of whether managers can or need to motivate volunteers. The distinct characteristics of the voluntary organization were looked at, as we felt it would give us a better understanding of the manager's role in these settings.

Although the literature on volunteers' motivation is extensive, there is a gap in knowledge in regards to motivating volunteers. Literature on motivation suggests that managers can effectively appeal to, and retain volunteers simply by understanding what motivates volunteers. However, we are interested in finding out if managers can do more and also influence motivation, and we wanted to find out how it works in practice. According to Jäger et al. (2009), their study was a first explorative step of research in the field of leading volunteers, in terms of influencing them to act in everyday practice, and they suggested that further research, taking into account the members' views could enhance the knowledge in the field.

Jäger et al.'s (2009) study was discussed in more detail as a starting point for our research. However, this study focused specifically on the interactions between leaders and volunteers and we felt there are other important aspects of a manager's job that can influence the members' motivations than just interactions.

To help us filling this gap of theory, we turned to Bussell and Forbes' (2007) study on theatre management. Although it was emphasized the study was specific to the theatre context, the theoretical approach of relationship marketing and volunteering life cycle is not context-specific. However the purpose of our research is not to test a specific model or approach, but the findings and theories can be used for comparison and inspiration in relation to our findings in order to enhance our understanding on motivating volunteers, although we are aware of the limitations.

Chapter 4: The Case of AIESEC Lund

In this chapter we present the empirical findings from our interviews and secondary sources. Firstly, we will provide the reader with an introduction to the organization in focus, followed by a presentation of the findings structured into nine interesting themes, which kept recurring in the members' interview statements. In each theme, we present the managers' perceptions first, followed by the members' perceptions, which allows the reader to easily follow and contrast the different views. We use a rich account of quotes from the respondents to illustrate our interpretations.¹

4.1 The Case of AIESEC Lund

“AIESEC is a global, non-political, independent, not-for-profit organization run by students and recent graduates of institutions of higher education. Its members are interested in world issues, leadership and management. AIESEC does not discriminate on the basis of race, colour, gender, sexual orientation, creed, religion, national, ethnic or social origin.” - (AIESEC Lund, 2009)

“AIESEC provides its members with an integrated development experience comprised of leadership opportunities, international internships and participation in a global environment” – (AIESEC International, 2007: 24)

AIESEC Lund is referred to as an LC, and a part of a larger global network, a division of AIESEC Sweden and then AIESEC International. AIESEC International has been around for approximately 60 years and is known to be “the world’s largest student-run organization” (AIESEC International, 2009), which encompasses all LC’s in many

¹ The management in AIESEC Lund consists of both leaders and project managers. We do not make a distinction between leaders and project managers for the purpose of our research, and treat them both as part of the management group. We use the term managers and leaders interchangeably.

countries worldwide. Because it is an international organization AIESEC uses English to facilitate communication worldwide. The Lund LC consists of approximately 45 members.

The activities of AIESEC Lund mainly revolve around the idea of *selling*, which entails essentially contacting companies in Lund in order to raise as many student internships as possible. By partnering with a company, it gives the chance to other LC members outside of Sweden to apply for the internship and gain professional experience while living life in Lund for the duration of the internship. Although it is a nonprofit organization, AIESEC Lund requires sponsorship from companies to keep some of these activities going. AIESEC Lund acts as a placement agency, in the sense that they take care of all the 'legwork' and paperwork to place the chosen intern. The partnering company is assured that the chosen intern will reflect AIESEC's quality and values. At the same time members of the LC, if they are interested and meet the criteria are also able to apply to go on an exchange abroad.

Recruitment and Selection

AIESEC Lund has a rigorous recruitment process twice a year at the beginning of each university semester in order to attract more members. The first step is to attend one or more information sessions. If the candidate is still interested they then must fill out an application to join, then attend an "assessment center" which provides different simulations to get a better understanding of what AIESEC is really about and the different project teams they can join. At the end of that day candidates are interviewed with members of management to determine the right fit. Candidates will get a phone call from management in the following days informing them of the final decision. Once they are chosen they should immediately start attending the weekly meetings.

Project Teams

The members of AIESEC Lund are divided into small project teams, which usually consist of no more than 6 or 7 members. The following are the main ones, which are ultimately sales focused: Corporate Social Responsibility, Renewable Energy and Sales. Although all these teams focus on sales, what distinguishes them is that the CSR and RE, focus on sales but deal with companies within the CSR and RE

spectrum. The rest of the teams are Marketing, Human Resources, Communications, Malmö Project, and the China Project.

Leadership Roles

Members are also encouraged to apply for a management position. Elections are held twice a year and all the members get a chance to vote provided they show up on Election Day. In addition, if a member had an idea to start a project, they may do so by submitting a project proposal, finding members to join their project team, and going through the election process to be voted in as a Project Manager.

Conferences

AIIESEC national and international conferences are organized several times a year and it allows for members within different LC's to get together while attending workshops, seminars, and social events.

4.2 What's the Catch? – Attraction of members and the motives to join

Catching members

AIESEC Lund is facing tough competition when it comes to recruiting members in Lund, but the leaders do not particularly find it difficult to attract members per se, as there are several appealing aspects such as internship, leadership development and an international atmosphere which creates a lot of interest. The tricky part is keeping the members once the interest has been raised, since the 'concept of AIESEC' is perceived by managers as difficult to explain. The 'concept' was often referred to by the management in the interview accounts and we understood it as the purpose of the organization. The concept is difficult to explain because there are different aspects of the whole AIESEC experience which are interlinked, and it is not possible just to go on an internship, without helping to raise internships and leadership skills are developed through participation in core activities. It takes time to understand what the whole AIESEC experience is about.

“Well it takes a while as well to really understand that it's the internship thing and leadership and everything that goes around at the same time. It's not that you are doing one thing and then exclude the other thing.”

So in the end it comes down to using what attracts most people: the internships, and although the leaders are aware of that, it does not give new members a completely realistic view of what AIESEC is.

“The easiest thing to attract people with internships (...) that's usually what you catch them with and once they are in the organization it might be something else.”

The managers do not seem comfortable with attracting the members with just the internship as it does not reflect the whole experience and they seem to think it could affect the members' decision to join, even though the managers say the organization offers a great experience.

Being caught

While managers find it hard to explain the concept of AIESEC, the recruitment is in full progress and members spread the word about how great the organization is and some of the members got to know AIESEC from another country before coming to Lund, so in most cases the managers 'only' need keep the members interested.

Of those interviewed, there were three members (all of whom are currently or have been in leadership positions) who became aware and interested in AIESEC during the marketing campaign, because of the diversity aspect, the opportunity to gain leadership skills, or the international internships. However, most of the members had been introduced to AIESEC through friends who told them how great the organization was.

"I was curious I think (...) why people are so excited about it. I mean there must be something behind it if everyone is going crazy about it and telling me how much fun it is and stuff like that."

The main attraction of internships has certainly created a lot of interest among the members, and most of the respondents mentioned internship as one of the reasons they joined, although in many cases it was not the only reason and if it was the only reason then other things were discovered after they joined.

"Well first thought was about internship, but I think that I can learn a lot of other things"

With the exception of two members who were clear on what they wanted and on what they could gain from AIESEC, (which in these cases was project management experience), most people did not really know what AIESEC was about, how they could develop in AIESEC and what was expected from them.

"I was just thinking it was more like, you know, get together and have fun"

“I did also not know about how it works in AIESEC, that you had to be involved and that you had to come to meetings and that you had to do stuff”

Most members joined mainly for social reasons and many being new in the country, saw it as a great opportunity to make new friends, learn about other cultures in an international atmosphere and it was a bonus that the organization was also known internationally as it could enhance future career prospects.

“I think this is very important for foreign students because we came here to make friends and the other point is interns and I think this is attractive point for students who will soon or later join the job market...”

The concept of AIESEC is certainly ambiguous and although managers understand the concept, they find it difficult to explain, and it is clear from the members’ perspectives that they do not really know what the AIESEC is all about before they join. Although, the members’ expectations (or the lack of expectations) did not match what AIESEC is about, it does not seem to affect the members in a negative way, where some discovered more than what they ‘bargained’ for and others reflected back on the situation with a giggle. There was however, one person who initially joined to make friends, who soon dropped out since this ex-member did not find anything interesting in AIESEC, but still really likes the organization.

4.3 Who is fit for AIESEC?

Selecting the right members

Once the members are caught, whether it is by internship, leadership or the social activities, it is time to select the *right members* who can keep the organization running and eventually become change agents. The idea is that members should be *active* and contribute to the organization and passive members, who just wait to go on an internship, are not wanted.

“We’re not looking for an influence by the number of people we have, that doesn’t matter, what matters is the people who are in it.”

A needs-analysis is done to see what kinds of members are needed, whether it is for sales or leadership positions. The leaders are particularly looking for members who can stay long-term (more than a year in this case), and want to be developed to take up leadership positions in order to maintain the continuity of running the organization. However, it was pointed out, the talent management in the local committee was under-developed, and the selection was based on personal feelings rather than on the competency model, which is supposed to aid the managers to match the person’s skills and attributes to the need of the organization.

It seems that a great deal of effort is put into matching the member with the organization. The recruitment is a two-way process, where managers learn about the candidates to find out if they have the time and the motivation to be active members, but at the same time it is also to provide potential members with an understanding of what AIESEC is about, which is perceived to be important for retention. As well as having information meetings, LC Lund has started with a simulation exercise to give the members a better understanding of the work.

“What we started now is to have the simulation of how AIESEC as an organization is functioning, at the second information meeting, and with doing this we hope people will get a clear view of what actually is doing (...) and with that we can see a big, big difference, people have a much more clear view what the organization is about”

New members can join a project team, or start up a new project. During the assessment day they get information on the different projects running and they get to choose their preferred team subject to availability. Usually members start projects in March/April, but they can also create a project in September if they have an idea.

“...start your own project (...) that’s usually in March/April, but then we opened the possibility of starting a project in September too (...) and if someone says I have a great idea and I can start, they are welcome to do that, but usually it’s in March April.”

Letting members choose the team can be important for their motivation, since they will have an interest in the project and hence be more motivated.

“None of the members from my team were pushed to be in the project, but they chose to be in the project. So in this way maybe it’s a little bit easier for me to motivate them, since they already had motivation to be in the project from the beginning.”

Although the members are asked for their preference they do not always get the team of their choice as it depends on availability, but then the management will let them know and suggest for an alternative project instead.

Being selected

The managers’ intentions are to make members understand what AIESEC is about, and to match them with a team, while the members struggle to understand what AIESEC is. For those members that did not know what AIESEC was before they joined, the simulation and team allocation were rather confusing.

“I was in a meeting, you know, like a presentation and the assessment centre and it was all very blurry, I mean what we did was very unclear. “

In some cases, the members were not exactly sure why they were put in a particular team.

“People just tell me that (...) that you are in that team, but I don’t know why I’m in that team.”

Although, the members choose a team, they choose from the available projects, so it does not necessarily mean they are interested in the project and they do not really perceive it to be a choice.

“I joined this project not because I like this project, because they give me the task, no other choices (...) there is just a few projects there so I chose that one.

This member was really interested in another subject, but there was no project team related to this particular subject at that time. Others were allocated a team depending on which simulation task they had taken part in.

4.4 How do members become active members?

The requirements of an active member

The term *Active member* was touched upon by most interviewees and we felt it was interesting to explore what it meant. From the perspective of the management, the organization is ideally for people who really want to develop, are proactive and take responsibility for their development. An active member is:

“Someone that really wants to develop and sees like a way that AIESEC can help them to develop, because everything that they do is kind of driven by themselves, like they’re the ones driving their own development”

It appears that there is a criterion for an active member and it is someone who attends both project and local committee meetings, goes to one conference a year (at least) and is active in the team. And if someone does not adhere to the standards, they may actually be asked to leave.

“If you don’t show up for a few weeks, someone will be calling you asking what’s going on”

The managers perceive there are ways to influence members to become more active, for example by giving members new tasks or allocating them to a different team, delegating tasks, having one-to-one talks, sending them to conferences, but they do not feel it is worth the energy to motivate all members.

“It has been discussions going on who we should actually motivate. Is it, can we kind of see this benefit in the long-term motivating him or her.”

Sometimes members are not active because of other priorities or lack of time, but sometimes the organization is simply not what they want. Sometimes it is a matter of different expectations of members and managers, which can be problematic.

“Sometimes maybe they expect us to lead them more than we want to (...) it’s up to them to take responsibility, but it’s such a hard balance to, sort of, if you want people to take responsibility by themselves you can’t just take them by the hand.”

The managers acknowledge that the organization is not to everyone's taste and it is natural that some members will drop out.

The members’ interpretations of active member

It is clear from the members’ statement that to be a good member, one should be active, but from the members’ points of view, an active member is somewhat different from the above criteria. The members are all quite clear about the expectations of an active member in regards to attending meetings, being part of a team and attending a conference, but in addition, an active member is someone energetic, outspoken and visible. A couple of members did not feel they met the criteria of being active members, because they lacked confidence or were not open and were not sure how or if they could be active.

“Because in my job I didn’t need to show, I just show my results, people will know that I did a good job, but in AIESEC sometimes because you cannot say what’s the results, maybe some people show-off very active, very social so the can say. If you are very quiet (...) people will say you are not active”

For this particular member, who did not perceive to have a task to do, and did not want to speak unless asked, it was difficult to live up to the expectations to be an active member.

“You don’t know what to do, but when you do nothing people will say that you are not active. That’s the problem”

The reason that this member dropped out was partly because she was not interested in anything in particular in AIESEC and joined initially to meet friends, so it is difficult to say if her feelings of not living up to the expectations of being an active member affected her decision to leave.

However, there are ways that managers can change these perceptions and in one case, by sharing their experiences.

“I am surprised why other people are so active and how they are active more than me (...) I could see there is a big change with her (...) I am not shy anymore. I could talk.”

A personal story of how one of the managers started off as a shy member and developed to become a confident leader in the organization. This opened the member's eyes to the possibility of changing her personality to become an active member.

4.5 Something for everyone? Teams, Roles and Tasks

Leading by example and making it all work

AIESEC Lund has several different teams within its organizational structure that allows for the members to work together in groups being led by a Project Manager. In addition there are roles for the people in management who have a leadership role, but are not leading an actual team.

Roles for management appear to be more structured and offer more guidelines as to what they can do in the organization. However lack of experience and not having had enough time to get properly trained in their new roles can cause uncertainty for them.

There was a manager who spoke about having a lack of experience, yet doesn't use the uncertainty as a reason to hold back.

“...the thing is the truth is you grow into the role it's not like I had huge amount of knowledge about ('X') but it's something, that's the whole idea of AIESEC you're supposed to grow in the process of doing things...”

At the same time project managers are also dealing with the challenge of multitasking, managing their project, while trying to manage their team members.

“...it's always more difficult when you're a project manager and you actually created this, you know it's kind of your baby...”

“...making them work together and have a final result of the project I think that's the big challenge of it...”

One of the managers thinks bringing the team together helps them work better,

“...we tried to have team bonding is one thing I think it's a very big aspect of AIESEC on the whole, like the whole team thing.”

This manager pointed out that nothing is set in stone and that they also can rearrange tasks for members.

“...to see kind of connections between what if someone wants to do something, you might know that okay, but this is actually going on there and then maybe we can, get this together, or (...) we have a very big need for this, it happens that might suit you very good (...) “

Essentially the manager can try to find out what the member wants to do or would rather be doing and try to make it happen. Or they can try to find a member to help with new tasks or roles that are created.

One of the managers reflected back to when they first started in AIESEC Lund as a member. The ambiguity of AIESEC made the member unsure of what they could do.

“Because I didn’t really know what I was really supposed to do. It was more of (...) I threw myself into cold water basically then”.

It was the people that kept this manager in the organization until the person understood what it was all about. The managers feel it’s important for the members to give it time, for them to get the most out of the organization.

Team players

Within the project teams roles, for members can be unclear, and some of them don’t seem to know what to do next. Only one of the members that we interviewed had made *sales* calls while the rest have not. Almost all of those that haven’t were still able to contribute to the team in other ways. This particular member has contributed to the teamwork and made the calls but still felt it wasn’t structured enough.

“I don’t have my part yet, I don’t have assigned role yet. Just following the meeting and making some phone calls.”

This ambiguity also can affect the members’ attendance in project meetings.

“I’m not clear about what I should do. I just go to the meeting and listen to the managers but there’s no specific things that are assigned to me and I’m not clear what I can do, what I can contribute. Sometimes confused. That’s why I didn’t go there sometimes.”

When asked if this member made it clear to management how they felt, the member said no.

Priorities and/or time can also affect the level of a member's involvement in their given role. Two of the respondents had mentioned this as a reason why there were not able to partake in the *sales* calls, although they did contribute to some teamwork. One particular member has contributed to the team but didn't get to make the *sales* calls.

"I don't have time to take part in training so I don't go to the calling session."

One of the members mentioned they were too scared to make calls and they made up for it by contributing in other ways to the team.

"Because other members called the companies, but I couldn't cause I have a resistance to call the company, but ('X') told me probably you can do ('X')..."

The member was still able to contribute and felt needed despite not actually taking part in selling activities.

4.6 Meetings effective and interesting or boring and a waste of time?

The art of planning LC meetings - time for fun

AIESEC Lund has weekly LC meetings with all the members, individual project meetings within different teams, and then weekly EB meetings, which is simply meant for the management. Management acknowledges that there is an issue to get the members to attend all the LC meetings and project meetings. In addition they try to make the LC meetings more interesting and less boring in order to try and increase the attendance of the members. Weekly e-mails are sent out to members providing them with the details of the following LC meeting. The e-mails are crafted in a very colorful and cheerful format to encourage interest and attendance.

"...the LC meetings is really a challenge because, everyone wants to do different things and what should we do and what we should not do and should it be very

interactive or shouldn't it be very interactive or how do we balance this? I know that some people want to have a different amount of things to contribute with and to do during those meetings. I mean it's a perfect forum for everyone, all members to actually to kind of you know interact and share what they're doing so it could be used very, in a very better way than what it's doing. What it is now. And then it's hard to, pre do it too much cause you never know how much people that will attend, and if you have planned something you need maybe 20 people and there's only 12..."

This same person felt that a change was needed,

"...at least do something maybe a little more colorful if I could, can say it in that way. Or not so boring maybe".

Another manager acknowledges how they try, but it's not always perceived by everyone in the same way.

"I don't know we plan it and we try to do stuff that's relevant and as much as we can what we think will be good or fun or nice and sometimes some people like some people don't like it depends."

Hard at work or hardly working

A low level of productivity in project meetings was something else that came up from a couple of respondents. Ambiguity also plays a role in the LC and project meetings. The LC meetings can be seen as very social and generally covers a broad span; some members don't always see the relevance of going to the LC meeting. Some members expressed being unclear about their role in a project team.

From the members perspective the LC meetings were mainly perceived, as boring or too social, or they were indifferent.

"I don't know why I should spend 1hr in that meeting. I cannot find the reason..."

Although this particular member did mention that they do make more of an effort to attend an LC meeting *if* there was something that appealed to them.

Another member feels they are too social.

“Each Wednesday there’s meeting and we meet for what? To talk, [giggle] gossip?
No.”

This particular member thought the LC meetings were originally boring having the members of management speak. Then afterwards when the management supposedly changed the format and style of the meetings, the member felt that they became much more interesting.

How they felt before the changes:

“...I’m not, always go to the meetings. The meeting I think it’s so boring. [laughter].
Because the leader always talk...”

How they felt after the changes:

“...I think it’s a big surprise for me actually it is interesting because the leader change their style. Yes they talk more about their own experience and then I find ok...”

For the project meetings, one of the members felt they were simply unproductive.

“I remember we only have several uh meetings of ('X') but it’s always not so productive. Not much.”

Another member felt the project meetings were just not occurring often enough and expressed that they have very little time together.

Although this member was not able to attend them all, they actually enjoyed the meetings and saw the relevance of each type.

“...I thought it was very interesting because, actually when you are working for a project. You know your project reality, your project needs and all of this, but then you get kind of detached from the whole AIESEC LC. So these meetings I thought that

they were very good because then you can know what's going on in the different areas and the results and the plans for the future and the conferences. So. I mean it's good if you have the time of course you should go there because, if you don't go then you start somehow, yeah detaching from AIESEC”.

Because AIESEC is a student organization, one would think that most members would express schoolwork is reason for not attending. However that was not the case in our study. We found it interesting that surprisingly only two of the members had expressed a reason for not attending some of the LC and project meetings as being school related.

4.7 Conference is the key or is it?

Shall we conference you in

Conferences were another thing that kept recurring. National conferences are organized by different local committees in Sweden. The conference is usually several days long with an intense yet extensive schedule.

The general view from the management is that once you attend a national conference you get a better idea of what AIESEC is. It puts AIESEC in a broader spectrum and you will be more motivated and have a greater affinity to the organization.

“...but usually the members go to a conference pretty much like a month or 2 after they join and that's really good because they get the bigger picture that there's AIESEC in other cities in Sweden too. That you have the international perspective. (...) you learn more about the organization in general, that you get to know the people in your local committee, yeah you just make friends basically...”

Another manager even illustrated a case where they felt it had an effect on a specific team member.

“so like ('X') for instance went to the conference and I can really feel that ('X') is as committed as much as I am to the project itself (...) that's why I said that ('X') went to the AIESEC conference and I now have a feeling that they understand much more what it is all about (to be an AIESECer) and you can start talking the AIESEC talk. You know what I mean?”

This leader acknowledges that it can have an impact, but it also can have reverse effects they don't enjoy it.

“But then also the conference is, a really really good energizer I think. (...) I think that this conference can work really the opposite, if you don't find it interesting, if you don't find that it's your thing then it's (...) I've discovered this during the conference. (...) I had one girl this time who realized that no, it's not really what I expect or what I can, like live in.”

This manager thinks the opposite, that it is very necessary and people might actually leave because they didn't attend one.

“...another thing is that in order to really understand AIESEC you have to go on an AIESEC conference, but without people going to that conference they don't get motivated to continue because at that conference usually you find out so much more, because you spend 4 days intensive doing AIESEC. We've had some trouble motivating people to go to the conferences and then eventually they don't really understand what AIESEC is and then they sort of drop out so it could be like an evil circle you know like if people don't go they don't understand then they drop out.”

This member of management sees how it can be tough for some members.

“I mean, if you're not very energetic person, if you cannot wake up like 5 am in the morning and like go to bed like 5 am then, then it might be a little too tough”

The general view about the conference from the management's perspective is that, *it is* a motivator. One manager even thinks not attending a conference will actually demotivate you. At the same time, one particular leader thinks it works, but has only

recently learned it can also have reverse effects. Another leader sees how it's not for everyone and how it can be hard on some members.

Conferences bring you closer or push you further

From the members' perspectives, some members felt that the conferences were too much for them to handle, while a couple of others felt it had made a difference and were very enthusiastic about them. A couple of members were more or less indifferent, and another had not attended but didn't like the idea of going.

One member acknowledges that the management believes going to a conference will help you learn more about AIESEC and 'the spirit of AIESEC'. However this member didn't focus on talking about those aspects but rather the member remembers the negative aspects of the event, like feeling cold while having to sleep on the floor.

This member had said "the schedule there is so tough" because of having to attend their training daily and having to be up "around 6:30am or 7:00am" while the parties at night afterwards go up until 2:00am. This member expressed that "my body is not so strong". They explained that the conference maybe involved some level of "brainwashing", and they do this "to put everything in your head and to get good impression of that organization". The member felt overwhelmed with all this information, and felt forced to listen. As a result the member didn't want to listen anymore.

Another member had mentioned the conference, so when asked if they attended one, this was the response.

"No. I never went to an AIESEC conference. I know it's supposed to be like very important too and everything..."

The member explained that:

“I mean spending a lot of money going there and then I have to sleep in awful things. And then having these parties that I’m not really interested in, and so I felt it was, not my interest.”

For this particular member the conference was the key.

“I only started liking AIESEC because I saw the overall. There’s something much bigger than local activities. It’s a big organization, it’s a global organization, so there’s a lot more things that are happening in another country like Denmark. Then like you could go to conferences that encompass Western Europe and North America, so you’re actually networking. So I think I saw, all those advantages, like being able to network with different people from all over the place, and seeing the different country realities, how they do things, so you actually learn more being away from these local activities here in Lund...”

Part of the reason this same member wanted a management position in AIESEC was due to the conference,

“...was because of that event or that conference, I gave back to it, because you know it changed my life. Quote, unquote.”

Another member as well mentioned, they learned more and was able to see a future for themselves as a more senior person in AIESEC Lund.

For this member the conference did help them learn more about AIESEC, but remained more or less indifferent.

“I learned more about AIESEC from the conference, then it was fun. The people were good, they are really, friendly. Yeah. And the conference, the theme of the conference a part of it was interesting, some parts was boring”.

The conferences from the members' perspectives were varied, and for some it had made a difference, but overall they were either indifferent or had negative feelings towards them.

4.8 Social circles: do people get people going?

For the people

Most people seem to join AIESEC Lund because they heard something about the organization through a friend. The goal of AIESEC Lund is mainly to raise internships yet they, like any other organization want to promote a good social atmosphere for all the members. Most of the people in the management team when asked what motivates them in their role; they refer to the people in the organization.

“Yeah, I think the main motivation are people who are around me”

Ambiguity can play a role here because some of the members join; yet they still don't know exactly what to expect. This social aspect is also a part of the reason why some of the members will stay and work despite the ambiguity.

“The thing that kept me in the organization was the people I met, in it. That was the main thing. Because I didn't really understand the structure or what was the AIESEC core work to be honest.”

This was an account of a manager who reflected to when they first joined AIESEC Lund.

The project managers try to also emphasize the social aspects, in working together which can help create harmony and motivate their team.

“...what's always works good is social activities, that you have team bonding, that you go out with your team mates, you have dinners together stuff like so that...”

However one of the leaders felt otherwise regarding the social interaction with the members.

“...for me the people there are really quite young, so I don't feel you know a very strong connection with them to be honest, because we're in very different stage of life, (...) so their mentality is at a different level.”

Social-work

The members' perspective was a little different. For most members the emphasis on the social part works great and they enjoy it very much.

“Oh when I go to the meetings, before the project meetings, we always talk. And I think we can share information, know each other our members. I like all the members in my project.”

Another member does not enjoy it so much, as they feel a social bond already exists there and is no need to push it further.

“Because people attract people like themselves. Party persons, attract party persons and that is how it is...”

For this particular member when referring to the overall organization they felt,

“...the bond of the students who work in the organization is really, really strong. I've never seen any, student organization that, that is strong before.”

Although this particular member really likes their team, they expressed how they wished their team was even a little stronger.

In general most members are quite positive about the social interaction that occurs within AIESEC Lund.

4.9 Creating Change Agents– Personal Development

The endless opportunities for development

The purpose of AIESEC is to develop leaders or change agents who will in future “go out and rock the world” and development is a major drive for the leaders in AIESEC.

“The more you are involved the more you want to do and the more you see you can actually change and achieve as well. I guess that is the kind of factor that drives us.”

In the process of developing their own leadership skills, the leaders also support and encourage the members to develop by providing reflection sessions where they talk about how the members want to develop and they empower members to take responsibility. The idea is that the members take responsibility and drive their own development, without too much direction from leaders. Managers try to empower and engage the members as much as they can and play down their role as leaders.

“..so we’re on the same level, so we want it in the same way, and it’s not just me trying to push the project to them”

Leaders inspire development by talking about their own experiences, so that members can see where the leaders started and how much they grew and learned along the way. However, talking about their own experiences could also work in the wrong direction, where people feel that they do not get as much out of it as they expected when learning from the managers’ experiences.

“Maybe you don’t get the same experience as someone in a leadership position, so maybe we make it sound like they get a lot more because that’s how we feel”

The managers feel that there are a lot of opportunities available, and the members are free to choose their own development path. They try as much as they can to get the members involved by delegating tasks and matching them with activities they can and want to do, but for some members the development talk is too much and the AIESEC platform is simply not for everyone.

However, one of the leaders thinks there could be more done to help the members develop, since some of them are lost and do not know how to develop. As a student organization they owe it to the members to give them something back, by providing them options that are found to be meaningful and interesting.

“I think the members are pretty lost. I mean if they cannot see something concrete and you ask them like ‘oh so in which area do you want to develop in’, I mean, they don’t understand it”

The leaders encourage members to take responsibility for their own development, but as pointed out by one leader the concept of AIESEC takes some time to understand, which is probably one of the reasons why the members are perceived to need some guidance from the leaders.

What about development for members?

Almost all of the members are looking to learn and to gain practical experience from AIESEC to enhance future job prospects. One member spoke about wanting to learn how it all works from the contact with company to the matching of the intern. This member was specifically interested in gaining accounting experience and aspired to a leadership position within AIESEC Lund. Although, most members were interested in the learning aspect, the talk about *development* was not a prevalent topic in the members' accounts, like it was in the managers' statement.

Development is not just about learning from practical experience, but it is also about learning from other members and leaders.

“I want to be a person like them. They are talkative, they are friendly and they can make friends with everybody and they are confident. A lot of things that I can learn.”

There seems to be a lot of success stories shared in AIESEC about how people have grown, what they have achieved and although inspiring and motivating for some members, it can also create skepticism as to whether success and development is for everyone.

“They always emphasize leadership, you remember it's a good platform, but actually they just have the president and the vice people for leadership”

This person then reflected upon this and acknowledged there were opportunities to create projects, but the member felt that not everyone wants to create a project and that not enough information was provided at the beginning how to set up a project.

The members may not realize that anyone can run a project and that experience is not necessarily required.

4.10 The Incentive of Internship

More than just internship – you get the whole AIESEC experience

Internship is one of AIESEC's main attractions, where students are given the opportunity to go on internships worldwide, but where other organizations also offer internships, AIESEC is unique:

“it's not the internship that we're selling, but the whole AIESEC experience”

Members are part of the organization and are expected to contribute to the whole process in order to keep the organization running. Throughout this process the member develops and gains an overall AIESEC experience, but it takes time to understand what it is all about. The way it functions is that the local committee in Lund raises internships for international members to come and then members of Lund can go on internships abroad. Members cannot simply apply to go on an internship, without first participating and being an active member, but the aim is that everyone can go on an internship.

“...it is to raise internship and to make people all go on exchange and come to Lund and doing an exchange here”

As mentioned previously, managers acknowledge that it is problematic to attract members with internship in regards to retention as it raises false expectations, but if members give it time, then they will be able to understand it and gain much more.

“...but attract them with corporate relations might be a conflict in between what we are actually going to say and to keep those people”

One of the leaders does not agree that the organization focuses on raising internships, since it is a nonprofit student organization and think that they should rather focus on developing members. Although some members are interested in sales and want to improve their sales skills, many are not interested in sales.

“The first reason for people to join is really to learn something and not to sell something. I mean if you’re really into selling that’s fine, but I know that a lot of people don’t like selling”

However, the other leaders did not emphasize the selling aspect and referred to core work or company calls and it is possible that they portray it in a more appealing way or they simply do not perceive selling as a focus for the organization.

Internships as experienced by members

Many of the members that were interviewed mentioned internships as one of the reason that attracted them to AIESEC. The members find out that the internships are not automatic or guaranteed after they join. Most members do not seem to mind if they do not get to go on an internship, as there are other reasons to stay.

“At the beginning I felt that maybe I will find internship there, but I think it’s so hard for me because my ability, my communication skills or something and there are many more active than me (...) so my aim there is making more friends probably”

However, not being properly informed of the process of going on internships could also cause frustration. Although we did not interview anyone who felt this way, a member pointed out to us that she knew some people that felt this way and that she would have felt the same had she been in their position.

“They should carry details [in the advertisement] that it’s not automatically that once you’re in AIESEC you will be able to get internship because I know some people that they are pissed off that”

For some people calling companies to raise internships could be motivating in terms of getting results, improving communication skills or wanting to give the opportunity to others to go on internship. A couple of members (one being a leader), who had been on internships were motivated to give the opportunity to others.

"One of my goals was actually to raise at least one internship, since it was such a good experience for me"

However it is difficult to see the contribution made, where most of the calls do not lead to a sale, especially in the current climate.

"To create the internship (...) I believe it is so hard to during the financial crisis"

It is difficult for the members to see any results from sales calls and this can be overcome by providing the members with additional tasks. In this particular case the team changed its focus and the member was given another task.

4.11 Summary

The managers put a great deal of effort into motivating the members, which they perceive as important for the retention of members in order to keep the organization running. However, our findings indicate that the managers' planned attempts to motivate the members, such as the selection process, meetings, conferences and personal development plans do not appear to have the intended effect on the members' motivation. The managers were found to be more successful when it comes to encouraging individuals on a personal basis and providing them with a suitable task that matches their abilities, which was the case for one member.

However, some of the members were confused about their tasks, which resulted in the members' feeling that they could not contribute at times.

In regards to what motivates the members, our findings suggest that socialization is important for almost all the members and one of the main reasons for deciding to join and to remain in the organization. Gaining experience is another motive for members, and we understood this aspect to be the purpose of 'working' in AIESEC. Internships appeared to be a main attraction for members to join, however, it is not the main reason to stay since internships are not guaranteed.

Some of the challenges for managers are the ambiguity of the concept, and the part time nature of volunteering, as members would put the work aside for other priorities, and dealing with the members' different expectations and motivations.

On a final note, we would like to add that all the interviewees really like the organization and think it offers a great overall experience. There are several aspects of the organization that motivate the members, which cannot be looked at in isolation from one another. Is the management one of the main factors that keeps the members active? We will explore the findings in more depth in the next chapter in relation to our research question.

Chapter 5: Analysis

In this chapter we discuss the findings in relation to our frames of references. Guided by the research sub-questions we will explore *to what extent managers' attempts to motivate members are perceived to influence members' motivations in a voluntary organization*. The discussion follows the structure of themes in chapter 4, although we have amended the headings slightly to relate to the research question.

5.1 A motivated workforce joining AIESEC, is there a need to motivate?

When it comes to attracting members, AIESEC Lund is no different from many other voluntary organizations, where most members join because of friends. AIESEC Lund effectively appeals to new members mostly because of the internships.

It is recommended in literature that voluntary organizations can effectively appeal to volunteers by understanding their motivations, (e.g. Clary et al., 1996). Our findings suggest that the managers are somewhat wary about sending out a message, which does not provide a completely realistic view of what AIESEC is about, and which is perceived to have implications for keeping the members. The messages sent out can form the individual's attitude towards the organization (Bussell and Forbes, 2007). If the message deviates too much from reality, then it could be assumed that some people may be disappointed when they turn up.

However, in our case the members' attitudes towards the organization were not negatively affected by the fact that they did not exactly know what they got involved in. Even the ex-member we interviewed, who dropped out because of lack of interest in the core work, still really likes the organization. The members that decided to stay, found a benefit worth staying for, and like in Bussell and Forbes' (2007) study on theatre volunteers, the social benefit was also a main reason for the members to stay

in our case. Some members discovered new interesting aspects of the organization, like opportunities for learning. Others stayed because of the people they met until they discovered the meaning of being in AIESEC.

We acknowledge that our findings are limited to the members who decided to stay, and we do not know how the discrepancy between the messages and the reality affect the decision for those who chose not to stay. Some members mentioned that they knew people who were frustrated because they were not initially told what they had to do before going on an internship. It is a concern for the management that they are not able to make it clear what AIESEC is. This is important for keeping the members interested. However, what we found out was that even though the members did not initially know what AIESEC was about, some members probably did not even know that they joined as 'volunteers', (i.e. to willingly give time and effort for the benefit of others (Handy et al., 2000)), it did not seem to affect their attitude towards the organization in a negative way. But since the members don't exactly join for the core work itself, does it mean that the managers need to motivate the members and can they?

5.2 The AIESEC–member fit, the start of an enduring relationship

The matching of the individual and organization is thought to be crucial for the decision to volunteer (Bussell and Forbes, 2007) and the selection process in AIESEC is taken very seriously and appears to be serving two purposes; firstly, selecting the right members and secondly, providing new members with a better understanding about AIESEC.

It is important for managers to know if the candidates have time to participate, if they can stay more than a year and if they are interested in development. Although it is easy to gather this piece of information, in practice it is difficult to predict who is likely to stay in the organization, since individuals' circumstances change or they will say what is needed in order to be selected, referred to as impression management

(Leopold et al., 2005). For these reasons it is questionable whether formal tools such as application forms and competency models are effective in predicting the right person. Bussell and Forbes' (2007) case highlighted that organizations do not need to have a formal selection process for successful matching of member and organization, nonetheless it was recommended that the theatre formalizes the process despite the success in retaining members.

Despite the formality of AIESEC Lund's selection process, it was pointed out to us that in the end it comes down to subjective judgment, and the feeling about a person, rather than using the competency model to match the person with the needs of the organization. This does not mean that the selection process is less valid, where even the most carefully designed application form or model cannot obtain completely accurate information and make a reliable prediction anyway for the reasons we have already mentioned. On the contrary, personal feelings could be advantageous for establishing a relationship and where people often select those similar to themselves. It could enhance the homogeneity of the group. However, it could also limit the possibility of bringing in people with different views, personalities, and interests, which can contribute to more creative teamwork (Newell et al., 2002). The member base in AIESEC Lund is diverse and a number of members are involved in the selection process, which overcomes the problem of selecting one kind of individual to some extent. Although one member pointed out: "party persons attract party persons" and it is perhaps inevitable to overcome the personal bias of selecting members like themselves.

The second function of the selection process is to make the new members familiar with AIESEC and its work. Matching members with a team of their interest and getting them to understand the relevance of the work, seems to be a sensible approach in theory. Choosing a team of interest could increase the individual's motivation. Being involved in a task because one wants to, and because it is interesting, and thus being intrinsically motivated, the individual is more likely to fully engage in the task and approach the task more creatively (Denhardt et al. 2002).

However, our findings suggest that this aspect of the selection process was not as successful in practice as the theory promises. In some cases the members found the simulation task confusing. Also some did not know why they were put in a particular team and those who chose a team did so based on availability rather than interest.

This is not to say that the selection process was not successful, since the members decided to stay despite the ambiguity, but the perceived outcomes were not what the managers intended. Since 'people' was often mentioned as a reason to stay, it is possible the members developed affiliation with the group during the recruitment process, which could also be seen as an initial socialization process. It was found in the study on theatre volunteers that group affiliation and relationships between the members is a key factor in retention (Bussell and Forbes, 2007).

Our findings are not sufficient for commenting on whether the formal selection process is successful in finding the right members, but in regards to providing the members with a clearer view of what AIESEC is about, and matching members with a team, the selection process does not appear to be very effective. However, the members in our case decided to stay for a social reason and we suggest that the selection process could be a first step in developing an enduring relationship with the members, who become affiliated with the group.

5.3 The criteria of an active member - a tool for influencing members?

Pearce found that volunteers are often not subject to the same performance criteria as paid workers (in Jäger et al., 2009) and Jäger et al. (2009) found that managers are in a difficult position to demand volunteers to follow orders and would put the individual before performance. However, in Bussell and Forbes' (2007) study, the manager was in a position to set performance requirements. It was emphasized that the method of handling the volunteers, as well as supporting them (e.g. providing training) in meeting those performance standards were important. AIESEC also has standards for members and members are checked upon if not attending meetings, but consistent with Jäger et al's (2009) findings, AIESEC leaders treat each member

as an individual and the performance depends on the individual's ability. However, evident from our findings is that standards are not sufficient when it comes to managing volunteers, where members do not always attend meetings or participate if they have other priorities or if they do not see the relevance of the meeting. This implies that the choice of freedom gives the volunteer a powerful position in relation to the manager, who cannot influence the volunteer to do something unless they want/choose to do it. We will discuss how managers attempt to motivate members to go to meetings and participate in activities, and whether the managers were perceived as successful in the subsequent sections. Firstly we will touch upon another important finding in relation to the criteria of an active member as interpreted by the members.

Our findings suggest that members' perceptions of an active member can negatively affect their self-esteem. Self-esteem is one of the individual's psychological needs (Gagne and Deci, 2005) and thus it is important that individuals are supported in satisfying this need. A couple of members felt that they did not possess the personal traits required to qualify as active members and they compared themselves to the ideal of energetic, outspoken and outgoing persons. It is perceived that to be a good member one has to act in a certain manner, which is not easily achievable for an individual who is quiet, shy and lacks confidence. In the end this could affect their motivation to participate in meetings for example, and some members felt they could not contribute, since they were not outspoken.

However, we also found that managers can support an increase in member's self-esteem, by giving the members encouragement allowing their abilities to grow and making them feel useful. This is not to suggest that all members are affected in this way, but it highlights the important need for self-esteem, which the managers can influence by providing a supportive and encouraging environment. It also illustrates the different interpretations that the manager has to deal with.

5.4 Tasks & Teams - the foundation for work

It is normally important for people in organizations to have a task to work on or a team to work with, and it's especially important for volunteers. Without this they would have essentially no contribution to the organization... So what would be the point in even having them volunteer?

The management in AIESEC Lund tries to have something for everyone to do because they split all the members into teams. The members of management mainly spoke about trying to do team bonding activities in order to bring the team closer together, which in turn can help boost their morale and increase their motivation. We are not sure if this works completely in the way that management expects, however, with regards to what we found from the members perspectives. The members' roles are not as structured like the roles are in management. Similarly to when Jäger et al. (2009) speaks of Pearce who found it is common practice not to have volunteer job descriptions. The ambiguity in their role as members can be confusing, and can be shown to sometimes hinder their motivation. The respondents who mentioned they did not know what to do next, were all willing to work but they wanted to be led, by being given some kind of guidelines or specific tasks to help. One of the respondents even mentioned that they did not go on a few occasions because they did not even know what to do next, or how they could help. Most of them still contributed to the work but not as much as maybe they could have, had they been given more specific tasks by management. Management was not aware of this however, because the members who felt this way did not communicate their thoughts and feelings about this.

Also other commitments and priorities have come in conflict for some members. This means that management does not get as big a chance to try and affect the members in this sense. Because this is volunteer work, the members are not actually obliged to show up and work. This is similar to the idea "there is no 'stick of a paid contract' to keep them in line " (van Vuuren, et al., 2008: 315). If they have other and more important priorities going on at certain times, their level of commitment and motivation will be lower, as they too would like to achieve some kind of work-life

balance. The members have shown they were still motivated to work despite these other priorities, but they were not able to contribute as much, at times.

For AIESEC Lund the *sales calls* are deemed to be very important because these activities sustain the organization, by gaining sponsorships and a chance to create internships other students. In one specific situation the respondent did not want to partake in all the activities related to their role, due to fear of making sales calls to companies. Their manager was able to understand how the member felt, and still encouraged that person to contribute in another fashion, rather than let them continue to feel worthless. This enabled the member to contribute to the team regardless of fear and resistance. Management was effective in this case, and had they not taken the time to encourage, motivate and listen, it is possible that the member might have walked away from the organization feeling less worthy. In this last case the manager was well aware of what was happening with the member. It seems that communication played an important role in resolving the situation. Perhaps if there was better communication between the members who felt lost, and the managers, they might have been able to have an impact on those members as well.

5.5 LC meetings effective or not?

It seems that for any organization to function, meetings must take place. AIESEC Lund's view is that there should be some type of forum for all the members in the organization to get together and share experiences, hence they have weekly LC meetings. More importantly there should also be project team meetings for all those working on a particular project.

We can see from the empirical data that sometimes some people do not show up to LC meetings because they do not enjoy them and do not see the relevance. At the same time one of the respondents did not like the LC meetings because they were too social and not productive enough. The goal of LC meetings it seems is, not to be productive. Therefore some members might not be influenced by management to attend all the time, or enjoy them since essentially it can be seen as a conflict of

interest. But it could also be that the member has other priorities at times and is just not able to make it, as two of the respondents mentioned, schoolwork to be an occasional issue. Most of the members did not have any time conflicts with meetings. Jäger et al. (2009) speaks of Pearce who points out how it can be hard sometimes to make a clear boundary between volunteer work and other aspects of life.

Management is aware of the attendance issue for LC meetings and believes they can influence the member's ability to show up. Perhaps this is why they put so much work into improving the format, sending out e-mails, and trying to arouse interest and appeal for members. The change in the style of the meetings did have a positive effect on one of the respondents. By making the LC meetings more personable they were able to reach out to this particular member. This member perceived it to be influential.

Also, in another case, one of the members mentioned that although they enjoyed the LC meetings, they saw how it could be possible for others who do not attend sometimes, to start a pattern of not showing up to LC meetings and end up detaching from the organization.

It's interesting that management uses this practice, as a forum to share and discuss, not the core work to be done but as a motivator for the members. In turn about half of the members we interviewed are either indifferent or did not like them. They did not perceive them to be motivating.

Management can also have an affect on the productivity level in a project meeting to a certain extent. Lack of productivity can be a de-motivator if members do not feel like they are accomplishing a task or if most of their team is missing. Management has the ability to provide tasks for those members that require one. In addition, the lack of project meetings can also cause those that are already motivated, to wonder about the future of their role in AIESEC and the future of their team.

5.6 Conferences: motivating or demotivating?

Conferences are supposed to be one of the main motivators according to most of the management team in AIESEC Lund. It seems that in general, management tries to use the conference setting to their advantage, where members return from the event more motivated. We felt they tried to use these events indirectly as a form of motivation. Our empirical material shows that sometimes it works but most times it does not. For one of the members, the conference was not actually seen as a motivator, but rather as a form of brainwashing and hence it became a demotivator for that person. For other members when they think of the conferences, it did not bring up any happy thoughts of being closer to understanding the meaning of AIESEC, but rather they spoke of the high cost and having to sleep in a common area, under poor conditions. One of the leaders reflected on a recent experience with us (regarding another member), and acknowledged that for the first time the conference can also be seen as a de-motivator.

Most of the members of management generally rely on the conference as a form of motivation. Our study shows that it is really not the case for everyone. If a member is turned off from AIESEC as a result of the conference, it could actually hinder their motivation to continue in the organization. However had they not attended a conference it is possible, that they would still have the same level of motivation. One of the members of management believes that not attending a conference is a reason why some people drop out. This may be the case, but it may not be. What also needs to be taken into consideration is the other factors that could affect a volunteer's motivation. They should not simply rely on the conference as one of the main motivators, as we can see, it can also have reverse effects.

However a few of the members actually spoke highly of the conference. It made a difference in their views on what AIESEC is, and how they have the ability to do more in the organization, and strive for other positions. Both of those members had been elected to senior positions after the conference. In these cases the members perceived the conference in a positive light. Hence management was able to effect motivation of the members, indirectly by having them attend the conference.

5.7 Socialization: a creation of management?

Organizations will benefit if a social bond exists between people in the organization. “Creating social ties with the organization encourages supportive behaviour as does developing the shared values between an organization and it’s volunteers (Wymer and Starnes 2001 qtd. in Bussell and Forbes: 18). Essentially AIESEC Lund tries to create and encourages this social bond between the members.

The member (now manager) who was a little confused by the ambiguous nature of AIESEC when they first joined, perceived the social aspects to be important in retention and motivation. It seems that forming social ties with members who are confused, might actually have a positive effect. According to Bussell and Forbes (2007) the relationships which unfold between members in a voluntary organization have been influential in their retention. This is shown to be similar in our case, from the empirical material we found that almost all the members of management have said that they were mainly motivated by the people in the organization. So in turn, using what works for them, the project managers try to set aside some time and encourage everyone to interact with each other on a social level. This has been perceived to work with the majority of the members. Some of the members have specifically stated that they really enjoy this time spent together; it’s not only *work* that they do, and that they really like the other members in the organization. One of the respondents who spoke about the strong bond in AIESEC Lund, also wanted his/her actual team’s bond to be stronger. The respondent sees the socialization across the organization as positive, and wants their experience to be similar.

Is it perceived to work for them because the members actually like each other? Would it be the same case if they didn’t like each other? Do they like each other as a result of this socialization? Or does it not make a difference and they would like each other regardless.

We saw that it is not perceived to work for everyone, as one of the members felt there were too many social activities going on already. This member would not be

influenced by any additional socialization attempts, and appears to be more focused simply on the tasks at hand.

5.8 Personal Development and Intrinsic Motivation

Most AIESEC members were found to seek practical experience to enhance their future job prospects. Although only a few members were clear on what AIESEC could offer in terms of development when they first joined, most members remained in the organization partially for this reason (the other reason being social) and this appeared to be the main purpose for being a member in AIESEC.

We gathered from our findings that while development is a drive for the leaders, the members do not get the same experience. Intrinsic motivation is what distinguishes the managers' devotion to AIESEC from the members' level of engagement. The leaders get satisfaction from reflecting on their achievements and personal development, which drives them to want to do more. One major reason for the difference in experience is that the leaders have more challenging tasks and more responsibility than the members, where the nature of the task is essential for intrinsic motivation (Denhardt et al., 2002).

Our findings suggest that managers try to support the members to develop to some extent, however, the idea is that members take responsibility for their own development. Each member has a personal development plan, but none of the members mentioned the development talks in their statements, so it does not seem to be of great importance to the members and it is questionable to what extent it is effective. Even the leaders themselves acknowledged that some members did not appreciate the development talk or they simply did not understand it, and it was suggested that managers could do more to help members to develop.

We also found that managers can *support* members in their development, although development is intrinsically motivated. For one particular member, the achievement

and belief that she could do something made her feel useful and increased her confidence, which could possibly motivate her to take on new challenges in future.

It has been argued that the manager in voluntary organizations lacks resources and thus the manager does not have access to conventional tools for motivation, like those available in other organizations such as rewards and promotion (Boezeman and Ellemers, 2007) or so it seems. This is not the case in AIESEC, where leadership opportunities are available and internship could be seen to serve as an extrinsic reward. The idea of AIESEC is to get members to step up to leadership positions in order to keep the organization running. Leadership development is one of the major benefits that students could gain from AIESEC. The skills gained, give the leaders a better chance of getting an internship, and it equips them with valuable skills for the future jobs. However, in agreement with Pearce's findings, that volunteers often do not aspire to leadership roles as the costs are too high (Jäger et al., 2009), the leaders in AIESEC perceive that it is difficult to get members to step up to leadership positions. They might find the task too daunting, they think it takes too much time or it is simply because the time with the organization is limited to one year, in sync with their educational program. However, for those members that did step up to leadership positions, it has been very rewarding. At least one of the members we interviewed aspired to a leadership position.

Gaining experience is a main reason for the members to stay in most cases; in addition there is the socialization. However, the management seems to have limited effect on the members' development and it has more to do with what the organization offers rather than the actual managers' influence. There are opportunities to apply for leadership positions in AIESEC Lund. This has been found to motivate at least one of the members, although the managers perceive the difficulty in getting members to step up. It is questionable how powerful this 'reward' is to motivate members.

5.9 Internship – a motivator or just a reward?

Although, internship is a major drive for members to join AIESEC, it was not evident from our findings to what extent internship played a role in motivating members once they were in the organization, where most members were motivated by learning and socializing.

In our case it seems, in accordance with the expectancy theory (see for example Denhardt, 2002), that in order for an internship to work as a motivator, members must believe that their efforts will lead to a desired outcome, and that the outcome is valued. There were instances when the member did not think that his or her efforts were sufficient for achieving the desired outcome, due to lack of skills. Another case illustrated that internship is not valuable to everyone, because of the member's previous experience and their future plans to apply for a permanent job.

Our findings indicated that having been on an internship could enhance altruism, where members who had experienced an internship wanted to give others the opportunity. For example, having been on an internship, a member was motivated to make calls to raise internships to give something back. The internship experience also worked as a motivator in a sense that these members are inclined to motivate others by telling them about their great experiences.

Raising internships is the 'core work' in AIESEC and generally constitutes the members' tasks. Raising internships can be a motivator for members who want to contribute to others. The task could also be motivating for members to improve on their skills and for a sense of achievement. Referring to the expectancy theory (ibid), for members to be motivated they must feel that their efforts will lead to the desired outcomes. Raising internships is very difficult, and members rarely get results. In most cases the task of raising internships is not motivating in itself. Thus there is a need for other benefits that will make up for this particular task, such as other tasks, aspiration to a leadership position, internships, or socialization. Internships could be seen as a reward for those members that are fortunate to go, but it is not the main motivation for members to remain in the organization, as it is not guaranteed.

Chapter 6: Conclusion

The management in AIESEC Lund puts in a great deal of effort into motivating members to participate and to remain in the organization. However, our findings indicate that often, planned activities such as the selection process, conferences, LC meetings and personal development plans are perceived as ineffective in influencing the members' motivations. Each of these practices had mixed outcomes, where the selection process was ambiguous for members; the majority of the members did not particularly like or were indifferent to the conferences. Members would only go to the LC meetings if they had time and if they felt they were meaningful, and finally, the personal development plans were not mentioned by the members. It is questionable to what extent these were effective. The planned attempts do not seem to work according to plan, so what does?

Social activities, perceived to be important for the members, is an aspect that managers have high on their agenda and put a lot of effort into planning. So does it mean that the managers were able to influence the members' motivations to some extent?

Our case illustrates that there is a difference in perceived success between the optional social aspects, and forced activities like having to attend conferences and LC meetings.

The emphasis on the social practices seems to work with the majority of members we studied. Most of them enjoy the socialization that occurs, whether it is through group talks or parties. One of the members even wanted it to be more apparent in their team. This helps to add some balance to their roles in AIESEC Lund and makes the volunteering more enjoyable, as it creates the idea that *it's not all about work*. It is important to distinguish that it is not forced behavior and completely optional for members to partake in these activities. As Bussell and Forbes (2007) have pointed out in their study the importance of the social practices for volunteers. In our case we are skeptical as to if this is something that is directly influenced and controlled by management. The management team of AIESEC Lund seems to act more as a facilitator for the social practices to occur. They want to encourage an exemplary

social atmosphere so they set the stage for this to occur. However it is not directly in their control, if this will actually work for the members. There are no guarantees it will work. It might just be that members get along, and would be doing this naturally on their own, without help from management. It also might be that management has selected candidates who they feel will *fit well together* and subsequently get along. We can question if the members get along, as a result of the socialization, or the socialization is a result of them getting along. It's not an easy task to distinguish, to what extent this was *directly* influenced by management.

We conclude from our findings that the managers are *privileged* to have these members willing to work, but they are somewhat *powerless* to influence the members' motivations, as standards and motivation attempts, including socialization, are not always sufficient to keep the members active. The members have the freedom of choice to participate and if the members have other priorities or they do not see the relevance of a task or a meeting, they may simply choose not to, and abandon the work.

This scenario resembles the knowledge-intensive context, where the managers are in a weaker position than the valuable knowledge worker, the so called gold-collar worker. The manager in these contexts have limited influence on the workers, and their role is more of a facilitator and supporting role than leading and managing the workers (Newell et al., 2002). Indeed there are major differences, where some of the members in our case are looking for the managers' directions and guidance, whereas the knowledge-workers demand autonomy and do not appreciate the manager's interference (Alvesson and Sveningsson, 2003). However the point we are making is that the manager's influence, as perceived by the members, is limited.

This is not to say the manager is completely hopeless. It is important that they create support for the members, which they do by creating a social atmosphere, encouraging and matching members with tasks they can do, and thus providing the right conditions for the members.

According to Sayer (2007), employees are often dependent on the organization for monetary reasons and thus it is possible for the organization to control the motivations and actions of employees, because the organization is usually in a higher position of power. Perhaps it is the case that without a monetary contract, the manager will continue to struggle to influence the voluntary workers or is there another route to power in the voluntary organization?

6.1 Implications

We have provided an in-depth account of how managers influence volunteers in practice, which is an under-researched field. We have shed some light on the effect of management practices in motivating members, by exploring the members' perceptions.

It is often recommended that managers of volunteers carefully plan and implement human resource practices for effective management (see for example Shin and Kleiner, 2003). Based on our findings, we question the extent these practices contribute to the success of an organization, as we found that planned attempts to motivate volunteers were not perceived to have the desired outcome. This is not to suggest that the organization would be better off without these practices, as they might facilitate and support the volunteer, but rather to point out the limitations. To rely solely on these practices can be problematic.

As in Bussell and Forbes' (2007) case, socialization was also found to be an important aspect for the members' motivation in our case. But where Bussell and Forbes suggested that the success of the theatre was due to effective management and the charismatic manager, we are skeptical to what extent the manager is the key to success. Our findings show that the manager is in a weaker position than the volunteer, and thus has a limited impact on the volunteer's actions. This agrees with the CEOs perceptions in Jäger et al.s (2009), who treated the volunteers with high respect and found themselves in a difficult position to demand the volunteers follow orders.

The aim of this paper is not to provide any recommendations, but rather to contribute to a better understanding of motivation. By presenting this case, we provide the managers with a different perspective of motivating workers, which can help them to reflect on their practices and possibly inspire new ideas. This case illustrates the challenges that the manager faces when motivating members, and perhaps more importantly, our case highlights that the members do not share the same perceptions of what motivates them, as what the managers perceive as motivating.

This is an in-depth case study and we acknowledge the limitations of applying our conclusions to other organizations. Furthermore, we focused on the local committee in Lund and we have learned from the respondents that every LC is structured and functions differently. However, we believe that our case has added to the knowledge of motivating volunteers by illustrating what goes on in real life and it may offer some material for thought and reveal some challenges also encountered in other voluntary organizations.

We suggest that a longitudinal study can be conducted on motivating volunteers. This may provide a more conclusive account as to how members are affected by the different management practices over time, and in relation to what the volunteers actually do, and not just how the members' think about it when reflecting upon it. We also think it would be interesting to explore the aspects of socialization and affiliation with the organization in more depth, which appeared to be salient especially among the managers in AIESEC.

References

- AIESEC International (2007) The AIESEC Way Toolkit 2007 - Internal Document
- AIESEC International (2009), AIESEC International, The Netherlands, [Online] (cited 11 May, 2009) Available from: <http://www.aiesec.org/>
- AIESEC Lund (2009), AIESEC Lund, Sweden, [Online] (cited 11 May 2009) Available from: <http://www.aieseclund.se/>
- Alvesson, M. (2003) Beyond Neopositivists, Romantics, and Localists: A Reflexive Approach to Interviews in Organizational Research, *Academy of Management Review*, 28(1): 13-33
- Alvesson, M. and Sköldböck, K. (2007) *Reflexive Methodology: New Vistas for Qualitative Research*, Sage Publications Ltd, London.
- Alvesson, M. and Sveningsson (2003), Good visions, Bad Micro-management and Ugly Ambiguity: Contradictions of (Non-)Leadership in a Knowledge-Intensive Organization, *Organization Studies*, 24(6): 961
- Beardwell, I., Holden, L. and Claydon, T (2004) *Human Resource Management: A Contemporary Approach*, 4th ed, Harlow: FT Prentice Hall
- Boezeman, E.J. and Ellemers, N. (2007) Volunteering for Charity: Pride, Respect, and the Commitment of Volunteers, *Journal of Applied Psychology* 92(3): 771-785
- Booth, W.C., Colomb, G. and Williams, J.M (1995) *The Craft of Research*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, pp 37-71
- Bryman, A. and Bell, E. (2003) *Business Research Methods*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bunting, M. (2005) Missionary Management. in Salaman, G., Storey, J. and Billsberry, J., eds. *Strategic Human Resource Management: Theory and Practice*. London: Sage Publications Ltd., pp 251-268.
- Bussell, H and Forbes (2002) Understanding the Volunteer Market: The What, Where, Who and Why of Volunteering, *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, 7(3): 244-257
- Bussell, H and Forbes, D (2007) Volunteer Management in Arts Organizations: A Case Study and Managerial Implications, *International Journal of Arts Management*, 9(2): 16-28
- Chinman, M.J. and Wandersman, A. (1999) The benefits and costs of volunteering in community organizations: Review and practical implications. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 28(1): 46-64.
- Cihlar, C. (2004). The State of Knowledge Surrounding Employee Volunteering in the United States. Washington D.C.: The Points of Light Foundation.
- Clary, G and Snyder, M (1999) The Motivations to Volunteer: Theoretical and Practical Considerations, *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 8(5):156-159

- Clary, E.G., Snyder, M. and Stukas, A.A. (1996) Volunteers' motivations: Findings from a national survey. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 25(4): 485–505.
- Cnaan, R.A. and Goldberg-Glen, R.S. (1991) Measuring motivation to volunteer in human services, *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 27(3): 269–84.
- Cnaan, R.A., Handy, F. and Wadsworth, M. (1996) Defining who is a volunteer: Conceptual and empirical considerations, *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 25(3), 364–83
- Creswell, J.W (1998) *Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design: Choosing Among Five Traditions*, Thousand Oaks: Sage
- Deci, E and Ryan, R (1985) *Intrinsic Motivation and Self-Determination in Human Behavior*, New York: Plenum Press
- Denhardt, R.B., Denhardt, J.V., and Aristigueta, M.P (2002) *Managing Human Behavior in Public & Nonprofit Organizations*, Thousand Oaks: Sage
- Denzin, N., and Lincoln, Y (eds) (2003) *Collecting and interpreting qualitative materials*, 2nd ed, Thousand Oaks: Sage
- Farmer, S.M. and Fedor, D.B. (1999) Volunteer participation and withdrawal: A psychological contract perspective on the role of expectations and organizational support. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*, 9(4): 349–67
- Freeman, R.B. (1997) Working for Nothing: The Supply of Volunteer Labor, *Journal of Labor Economics*, 15(1): 140-166
- Gagne M. and Deci E. L. (2005): Self-Determination Theory and Work Motivation, *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 26: 331-362
- Handy, F., Cnaan, R.A., Brudney, J.L., Ascoli, U., Meijs, L.C.M.P. and Ranade, S. (2000) Public Perception of 'Who is a Volunteer': An Examination of the Net-Cost Approach from a Cross-Cultural Perspective. *Voluntas*, 11(1): 45–65.
- Haski-Leventhal, D and Bargal, D (2008) The volunteer stages and transitions model: Organizational socialization of volunteers, *Human Relations*, 61(1):67-102
- Jäger, U., Kreutzer, K. and Beyes, T. (2009) Balancing Acts: NPO-leadership and Volunteering, *Financial Accountability and Management*, 25(1), 79-97
- Lakdawalla, D. and Philipson, T. (2006) The nonprofit sector and industry performance. *Journal of Public Economics*, 90: 1681– 1698.
- Leopold, J., Harris., L and Watson, T (2005) *The Strategic Managing of Human Resources*, Harlow: Pearson Education Ltd
- Maslow, A.H (1954) *Motivation and Personality*, New York: Harper & Row
- Mook, L., Handy, F., and Quarter, J. (2007) Reporting Volunteer Labour at the Organizational Level: A Study of Canadian Nonprofits. *Voluntas*, 18: 55–71.
- Morgan, G (2006), *Images of organization*, Updated ed, Thousand Oaks: Sage
- Neuman, W.L (2003) *Social Research Methods: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches*, 5th ed, Boston: Allyn and Bacon

- Newell, S., Robertson, M., Scarborough, H and Swan, J (2002), *Managing Knowledge Work*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan
- Omoto, A.M. and Snyder, M. (2002) Considerations of community: The context and process of volunteerism *American Behavioral Scientist*, 45(5): 846–67
- Saunders, M., Lewis, P. and Thornhill, A. (2007): *Research Methods for Business Students*, Harlow: Pearson Education Limited
- Sayer, A. (2007) Moral economy and employment. Searching for the Human in Human Resource Management. Ed. Bolton, Sharon C. and Houlihan, M., pp 21-39.
- Serow, R.C. (1991) Students and Voluntarism: Looking into the Motives of Community Service Participants, *American Educational Research Journal*, 28(3): 543-556
- Shin, S. and Kleiner, B. (2003) How to Manage Unpaid Volunteers in Organisations, *Management Research News*, 26(2-4): 63-71
- Silverman, D (2006) *Interpreting qualitative data: methods for analyzing talk, text and interaction*, 3 ed, Thousand Oaks: Sage
- Statistics Canada (2004) *Satellite Account of Nonprofit Institutions and Volunteering*. Ottawa: Ministry of Industry. [Online] (cited date) Available from <http://www.statcan.ca/english/freepub/13-015-XIE/13-015-XIE2004000.pdf>
- Stukas, A.A., Worth, K.A., Clary, E.G., and Snyder, M (2009) The Matching of Motivations to Affordances in the Volunteer Environment: An Index for Assessing the Impact of Multiple Matches on Volunteer Outcomes, *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 38(1): 5-28
- van Vuuren, M., de Jong, M.D.T., and Seydel, E.R. (2008) Commitment with or without a stick of paid work: Comparison of paid and unpaid workers in a nonprofit organization. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 17 (3): 315 – 326.
- United Nations (2009a). Press Release GA/9990 [Online] (cited May 25 2009) Available from: <http://www.un.org/News/Press/docs/2001/GA9990.doc.htm>
- United Nations (2009b). UN Volunteers mission statement. [Online] (cited May 25 2009) Available from <http://www.undp.org.lb/unv/>
- Vroom, V. H. (1964): *Work and Motivation*, John Wiley and Sons, New York, NY
- Watson, T. J. (2002) *Organising and Managing Work*, Harlow: Pearson Education