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ABSTRACT

This is a case study, within the field of Education and Human Resource Development. The subject is handover in a non-profit organization. The organization studied is the Uppsala Student Union (US). US is a politically run Non-profit organization (NGO), with the objective to work for better study- and living conditions of the 35 000 students at Uppsala University, Sweden, who are its members. Four people active within US have been interviewed, and the empiric material has been analyzed mainly based on the theories of Organizational Learning and Continuity Management. Some other theories are presented as well, as an orientation with relation to handover in organizations and organizational development.

The questions asked are:
1. How is transfer of knowledge perceived in US – as a significant problem, a small problem or no problem at all?
2. If transfer of knowledge is perceived as a problem, what are thought to be the causes?
3. In US, as a NGO, how is handover managed? Which problems arise with respect to handover?
4. What else of interest and relevance can be found?

The answers are:
1. A small problem. Transfer of knowledge is much thought of, but there are problems which are viewed as more important.
2. The causes for problems with handover are mainly referred to a heavy workload for the actives, high turnover and insufficient handover routines.
3. Routines for handover is a well integrated part of the work at US. And the conditions in terms of resources are good compared to other student unions. Some problems still arise, and a selection of these are presented in the study.
4. Additional findings have been defined under the following headlines: Representation on Boards – an area for improvement Changing the roles On Actives-mentality (Swe. föreningsmänniskor) Effective policy making Students as actives

Keywords: Organizational Learning, Learning Organizations, Knowledge Management, Continuity Management, NGOs, Handover, Routines, Youth Organizations, Organizational Development, Organizational Life Cycle
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BACKGROUND AND AIM

Focus of research: NGO's

NGO stands for non-governmental organization. The term comes from the need to specify that an organization is neither for-profit, like business corporations, nor non-profit but politically governed, like public schools and hospitals. NGO’s are typically different from these types of organizations in terms of staffing, and pedagogical challenges connected with this, such as motivation. To learn more about NGO’s ought to be valuable to society in general, as well as to the field of educational studies in particular. Many parts of society could benefit from such research. Not least civic society itself, which in turn plays a great and important role for different kinds of stakeholders. It could also be of interest to for-profit organizations which are not among these stakeholders, but face partly the same organizational and educational problems as the NGO’s.

The study of NGO’s could also be a good opportunity for the science of education to show what it has to offer research and society, and thus strengthen its position and giving better conditions for good quality results in this area. Furthering the pedagogical knowledge about NGO’s would benefit all fields of study that concern themselves with learning in organizations.

As it happens, the NGO may also lend itself better than some other types of organizations, to a study in education. Both concerns themselves with enhanced performance, but unlike the for-profit business firm, not so much with competitive advantage. As soon as this concept is introduced in a discussion, it has moved towards organizational economics (Vera & Crossan in Easterby-Smith & Lyles 2003).

Personal experiences from a number of different NGO’s say that they have a high turnover rate of persons being active within an organization, at the same time as they do not give much attention to the handover between predecessors and successors. There does not seem to be any resources left for this investment once they have been used by predecessors on completing the task at hand. Part of the purpose of this study is to investigate more systematically if the situation described exists and is perceived as problematic in NGO’s. To try and address these questions, a search among the scientific literature has been conducted. This is further presented in the chapter Previous research and theoretical background.

Focus of research: Learning Organizations

Among the concepts used to tackle the problem area are Learning Organizations (LO), Organizational Learning, Knowledge management, Knowledge Continuity Management, Continuity Management, Corporate lifecycle, Transfer of Knowledge and Apropiability. From this selection it seems that Learning Organizations is most likely to lead to a useful pedagogical contribution concerning the questions above. It stands out as both having a more pedagogical approach and being more scientific in general than its closest counterpart Knowledge Management. Knowledge Management is described as more of an economic and practice oriented theory.
One question mentioned above is the question of handover, and transfer of knowledge. It should be possible to study this in connection with the part of LO that is about the storing and reusing of knowledge learned by other people – The organizational memory.

**Aim and research questions**

In US, as a NGO, how is handover managed? Which problems arise with respect to handover? The answers to this, I will pursue by way of the following concrete questions:

- How is the transfer of knowledge perceived in an NGO? A significant problem, a small problem, or no problem at all?
- If perceived as a problem – what are thought to be the causes?

**Additional research objective**

Many are the important and valuable discoveries that have been made by researchers who were actually looking for something completely different. (for example Flemming’s neglect leading to penicillin, or the Hawtorne study). I believe this to be conditions to embrace in academic research. An additional objective of this study is therefore to be open to valuable findings along the way towards the objectives above.

**Limitations of the study**

During the past two decades, the gender perspective has proven to enrich the understanding of studied phenomena and the interpretations made within social research. Therefore, it is quite common today, in studies like this one, to include a gender perspective. So not in this case. To seriously treat the question of what impact gender might have on its findings, twice the resources would have been needed, for example time and knowledge about gender impact. Also, there is no evidence found that gender in this case should have a greater impact than say ethnicity, handicap or sibling role (Schönbeck 2008), and therefore should be paid special attention whereas these aspects are not. Age has been included, and the reasons for this is to be found in chapter 4, Result and analysis.
RESEARCH DESIGN

Consequently, I find it fitting to conduct a study on the handover, or transfer of knowledge, within NGO’s based on a theory of LO and the concept of organizational memory as described by Ekholm (2010) and Huber (1991). Given the framework for this study in terms of time and budget, my aim is limited to one organization, and to semi structured interviews. There is quite a number of fitting organizations, but there might not be a lot of people having the time to be interviewed. I need to interview actives who are involved enough to have things to say about the transfer of knowledge.

Selection of subjects

Originally, my intent was to let the subject of my study be represented by one focus group of three to five individuals. Transfer of knowledge within an organization is especially suitable for focus groups, since the talk itself can benefit the participants and their organization regardless of the research. After one email and one phone call, the organization agreed to an interview with two participants. The empirical material was later extended with single interviews with two more respondents from the same organization. Some respondents have also contributed with written material upon request, and this material have been used as supporting material.

Subject of study: Uppsala Student Union

As this study is not conducted upon a request from any external party, with a specific need of data, I have chosen to regard the material itself as my main authority for the collection of material. This have lead to a rather relaxed design of letting the material decide the outcome, rather than trying to decide the material. The organization studied was Uppsala Student Union (US). US is a trade union for students at Uppsala University, and its purpose is to look after the working conditions of the students. The organization has a Headquarter, where 16 half- to full time actives work, alongside 5-6 staff. The organization will be further presented in the Result and Analysis chapter. See also organizational chart in Appendix A.

Since the selection of data is to small to be representative for many NGO’s, or even for the organization studied, there has not been a special focus on making all the interviews conditions as similar as possible for the sake of comparison. This has resulted in such liberties as somewhat different interview guides for every occasion, interviews lasting from 20 minutes to over 4 hours, different number of participants at the interviews – on one occasion there were two respondents present in accordance with the original design, and another respondent sat for two solo interviews. Interviews were conducted at the organization’s central office as well as in the home of the researcher. Since this study does not employ the competence to value the impact of these different conditions on the material, there will not be an account of the different conditions behind each response in among the results presented. All interviews were conducted in the fall of 2009.

The focus group consisting of two persons, later named SB and CSB, have been the main source of empirical material, and the other two single interviews (later named C
and CC) have been used as supporting material. The naming of the different respondents will be further explained under Results and Analysis.
METHOD

Written material

The source for the first literature search was an invitation to a lecture by William Starbuck. The theme looked interesting for my study, and therefore I searched in DISA for books by Starbuck within Uppsala University. None of the Starbuck titles I found in that search were available when I visited the library. I suppose that others had received and invitation as well. Instead I found Adizes (1988), Bryson (1993), March (1994) and a dozen other titles which have not been cited in this work. Some because they have only been relevant as methodological support. Through my supervisor I have received Carlsson (2009), Ekholm (2010) and a couple of titles on method. In the library at the Department for Education I have found Anell (1996), and other titles which have had an influence on the study but are not cited. I have searched LIBRIS and JSTOR for random words associated with NGO’s, Organizational Learning, Knowledge Management and Continuity. Apart from Easterby-Smith & Lyles (2003), this have not given much result. I had better luck when searching on specific titles and authors that I found in the different works mentioned in this paragraph. Other databases, such as EBSCO, have been visited to retrieve online articles which have been located through either Libris or Jstor.

Much of the more important literature I have only gotten hold of after the interviews. Due to this fact, the interview guide, as well as bits of the literature chapter, have a somewhat different approach than what is the case in the analysis of the material. However, the analysis and the literature chosen to base it on, is influenced by the interview material, rather than the other way around.

Interviews and interview guide

The interview guide used is an updated version of the guide used in a former study on a similar subject (Gustafsson et al. 2005). Changes have been made on basis of the results of that study, and to better suit the slightly different focus of this study. The guide has been so written as to not allow a discussion of knowledge that is better not transferred, but to keep the discourse around the actual actions of handover and transfer and unfortunate lack of such actions. I did not have all the background needed to ask all the relevant questions at the time of the interview. Because of this, further alterations of the guide were made as a result of the first and second interviews, but also due to the fact that the respondents had quite different organizational roles with regard to the aims of the study. The common core of the interview guide is given in Appendix B. Since this study employs somewhat different versions of the guide, these have not been followed strictly, but have been used more as an aid if the respondents did not have a lot to say. The main objective with the interviews has been to bring forth what the respondents associate with handover, as a way of achieving a greater understanding of the conditions surrounding NGO’s, as mentioned in the Background chapter. The results of the interviews are presented in chapter four.
**Ethical considerations**

Ethical considerations concern the wellbeing of the respondents, their organization, and individuals and organizations mentioned during the interviews. It would have been quite difficult to make the informants so anonymous in this study that not their closest co-workers or other peers should be able to detect who they are. And the peers are usually the people who matter the most in cases of integrity. To keep the identity of the organization makes the study more interesting and comprehensive, and it would have been impossible to give proper references without uncovering which website they derive from.

All informants have been informed at the beginning of the interview that it will be recorded, and prior to that they have all agreed to participating, under the pretence that it is about a graduate paper in education, about transfer of knowledge within an NGO or a Youth organization. Since all respondents have had a chance (five days) to read the whole preliminary version of this study before it was defended upon, and no objections to the text have been presented, I can only assume that they all agree with the ways in which they are portrayed.
PREVIOUS RESEARCH AND THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

The following is a summary of the findings from the literature search. Among these authors, which is here mainly presented according to subject, some will be used in the analysis of the empirical material for this study, and others will not. One of the main objectives of this chapter is to give an account of the theories and works later referred to in this study. The other one is to provide a helpful overview for others interested in studying the same subject. Knowing what is likely to be a useful read, as well as what is not, may save valuable time.

**Learning Organizations and Organizational Learning**

According to Ekholm (2010), a learning organization has an organizational structure that allows it to seize the learning that takes place in the daily activities of the organization. This structure helps the organization to 1) interact with its environment (within or outside itself) in order to find reactions on its actions which to learn from, 2) collect these reactions and analyze them to produce new knowledge (conclusions) about its own activities, and 3) store this knowledge in a well functioning archive. This archive is called the organizational memory, and the knowledge stored in it should be actively used by the organization, and at need updated, to correspond with newer knowledge.

Huber (1991, in Carlsson, 2009, pp 19) divides the research field of Organizational Learning in four categories: Attaining knowledge, diffusion, transfer of knowledge, interpretation of knowledge and organizational memory. Huber (1991) says that organizations routinely store a lot of “hard” information, due to operational and policy demands. What is less known is that employees also acquire “soft” knowledge routinely. But to turn this into organizational learning, there has to be a well functioning organizational memory. As a rule organizations have a weak organizational memory. Because they do not know where different knowledge is to be found, they cannot make use of it, or even know they have it. Huber’s solution to this is for the organization to improve in spreading the information horizontally. Huber (1991) makes the point that the simple fact that knowledge is transferred, means that it exists in more places and is therefore easier to find. To share the knowledge between departments, the organization gains not only better access to the knowledge, but also a greater understanding of what it means, since it is being interpreted from different perspectives.

In conclusion, both Ekholm (2010) and Huber (1991) describe the same process of OL, perhaps with a slightly different emphasis on the different steps. The organizational memory is described as the central part of the whole process.Probably because the problem seldom lies with the other parts. It is the functioning of the organizational memory which determines whether an organization can be said to be learning or not, on an organizational level. Even though all learning in organizations take place in individuals, it is not enough to call it organizational learning when one individual changes her behavior thanks to having retrieved new knowledge. My conclusion from reading about learning organizations, is that being a learning
organization is a means for having a well functioning - and well used - organizational memory.

Huber (1991) and Ekholm (2010) also seem to share the perspective that OL is important because it could help organizations not to lose value in the shape of knowledge (alternatively not collect new knowledge at the rate they need to stay competitive). This is where I realize that my interest with this study lies more on the individual arriving new in an organization, and how a well functioning organizational memory can serve her in doing her job.

March (1994) speaks about the perils of exploitation and exploration in organizations. Rather, these are organizational processes going on naturally, but according to March (1994) they are opposing each other, and need to be balanced. Exploration means trying to find new, unknown solutions or ways of doing things. Exploitation means exploiting the things previously learned, to perfect it and become more and more skilled and efficient. An organization focusing too little on exploration risks not being prepared when changes hit and their usual way of doing things suddenly isn’t efficient anymore. On the other hand, an organization that spends too little time exploiting what they have found, never really makes use of their finds, and never really discover what these finds really consists of. They never take the opportunity to get returns on the investment they have placed in exploration. This work by March (1994) also deals with the concepts of Effectiveness and Efficiency, which have importance for Exploration and Exploitation. Efficiency means to things efficiently. This is what comes out of proper exploitation. Effectiveness means to do the right things efficiently, and thus having results which gives more effect. Exploration, March (1994) argues, is a prerequisite for effectiveness, as is efficiency. Efficiency have no point without effectiveness. The concepts of Effectiveness and Efficiency will be exemplified later in this chapter.

Ellström & Hultman (2004) speak of the logic of execution (utförandets logik) and the logic of development (utvecklingens logik), which I perceive as a different attempt at making sense the same observations as would be the base of March (1994)’s exploitation and exploration respectively. Ellström & Hultman (2004) have also helped me in the reading of “three lectures”, in which March appears either as inconsequent, or quite complicated to follow indeed. With the support of Ellström & Hultman (2004) however, I could eventually quite safely guess that it was a rather poor attention to detail while compiling March’s three lectures in a booklet that sometimes made the words exploration and exploitation change places with each other (March 1994). Further Ellström & Hultman (2004) talks about the “code” which is typical of organizations following the logic of execution. It exemplifies the exploitation behavior and the values behind it. The main value behind exploitation behavior is homogeneity, which is honored by rapidly and unquestioningly learning in what way things are generally done in the organization, and then acting accordingly. Ellström & Hultman point out that routinized work is more secure and can free mental resource. By treating a task as a routine, and thereby not having to use so much of the mental resources on it, this resource is free to use in solving more complicated or randomly occurring tasks (ibid. 2004).

Perhaps March (1994) gives a useful clue to the concept of LOs, which are defined differently by different researchers. Where March (1994) stipulates that exploration
and exploitation oppose each other, I would like to venture that a LO is an organization exempt from this relationship. Could it be that a LO makes exploration a natural part of exploitation? That executing a task includes either exploring, or spreading exploration-finds to others?
Management of Knowledge and Continuity

Easterby-Smith & Lyles (2003) have proven very useful and a source to get an overview of the current studying of Knowledge in organizations within different disciplines. Unfortunately it took a long time before the handbook was available for this study, and for that reason most of the literary search has been conducted in a more random fashion, based on more available, if perhaps less scientific and comprehensive works.

Carlsson (2009) builds on the Knowledge Management (KM) and Knowledge Continuity Management (KCM) theories. Her study deals with questions arising within an organization in connection to retirement. In several aspects this is a situation different from that of the present study, which concentrates on complete jobs to be transferred once a year. It seems that the literature studied by Carlsson (2009) distinguishes between on the one hand transfer of knowledge from a predecessor leaving the organization to a successor who is completely new to it, and on the other hand spreading of knowledge from one place within the organization to other parts. In the first scenario there seems to be a focus on the valuable unit(s) of knowledge, which needs to be contained in a new vessel, not to be lost when the old vessel is no longer available. In the second scenario the focus is on the ability to better cooperate between units. In neither of the scenarios the focus seems to be on the task which the knowledge should be used for, nor on the person in need of the knowledge to complete this task.

Under the concept of Continuity Management (CM), Beazley, Boenisch & Harden (2002) divide the process of learning a new job into five phases of productivity. Whereas knowledge management typically concentrates on the horizontal transfer of knowledge, i.e. on the diffusion of knowledge among the same employee generation, CM focuses on the vertical transfer of knowledge, i.e. between a predecessor and successor on the same job.

Phase 1, Orientation
This is the phase entered into when a person is starting on a new job. It typically includes formal and informal introduction sessions, which in the present study will be referred to as introduction and handover. In the orientation phase, the new employee is using much of the co-workers competence to acquire job-critical operational knowledge. Among the foundations of CM is the notion that new employees are dependant on the organization to sort out what is important information, and how to get hold of it, from the overwhelming reservoir of knowledge that usually comprise today’s organizations. They agree with the scholars of Organizational Learning that it is the organization, and not the newcomer, that has the means – and therefore the responsibility – to provide the individual with the operational knowledge she needs to become productive.

Phase 2, Assimilation
In the next phase, the new employee is still a net consumer of knowledge, but ceases to be a drain on organizational productivity. Earlier employees can go back to their main tasks and ordinary productivity pace. For a parallel to other theories, this can be said to be the phase where the “code”, which Ellström & Hultman (2004) associate with the logic of execution, is being adapted.
Phase 3, Productivity
This is when the new employees becomes a net producer of knowledge. Her work is autonomous and innovative. Since she is now assimilated, she and other employees in the production stage have also switched from an outsider perspective on the organization to an insider perspective. They may have a strong motivation to add to existing knowledge.

Phase 4, High Performance
This is when one is not only doing one’s job in a professional manner, but also increases the productivity of others. The employees possess the skill and motivation to develop their job as well as the organization at large. There is an extensive exchange with different communities of knowledge.

Phase 5, Departure
The last phase is when employees prepare to leave. This means that production is decreasing. Focus is on the next job, or retirement, and motivation is low to develop the current job. Motivation can also suffer a setback among other employees, because of disagreement with the fact that a co-worker is leaving.

The same employee can be on different stages concerning different aspects of their job. The same person can produce at high performance in one task, and at the same time still be in the orientation phase concerning something else. Although not mentioned by Beazley et al. (2002), I imagine this can be especially common when reorganizing or moving to new premises. In the same way, someone can be performing occasionally on an exceptional level, whilst on the whole being a net consumer of knowledge. According to Beazley et al. (2002), in an ideal scenario, employees progress smoothly through the first three phases into the fourth phase of high performance. But such is not always the case. Employees may get stuck in an earlier phase and never advance beyond it. Or they may leave the organization as soon as - or even before - reaching the high-performance phase. This means an unsuccessful investment in employment for the organization, and undue frustration and sense of failure on behalf of the employee.

Beazley et al. (2002) stress that even though the co-workers in phases 1-2 are not productive, they present a valuable opportunity to improve the performance of the organization at large. “New employee feedback is an important source of creative ideas that lead to increased productivity and refinements in processes, products and services” (Beazley et al. (2002) s 75). Thanks to their outside perspective on the organization and its activities, the new employees will ask questions and think of alternative solutions which lies outside the ordinary framework of thinking within the organization. Once having succeeded to conform enough to move from the assimilation phase to that of production, this source input will be lost. The parallel to OL, and Ekholm’s (2010) and Huber’s (1991) ”collecting reactions”-activity, is quite obvious. So is the link from these two to March’s (1994) “exploration”. Other similarities can be found as well. For example, the unmanageable reservoir of knowledge mentioned by the CM authors, appears to be Ekholm’s (2010) organizational memory (less certain for Huber (1991)), as seen from a management perspective. And finally, of course, what perhaps the study of Continuity and Knowledge Management – as well as of Organizational Learning and Learning
Organizations (LO) – is all about: The responsibility of the organization. Theorists of education and business economics seem to agree that it is up to the organization to provide the employees with the means to perform to their best ability to the benefit of the organization, and therefore the organizations should have the knowledge and the structure to do this.

Anell (1996) is a study of how work roles (have to?) change when an organization becomes a LO. She presents interesting information on structural change needed for the transition from non-learning to learning organizations, which has been of importance in this study. It has not however been a source of any theoretical explanations or illustrative quotations, and is therefore not referred to further in this study. It should seem reasonable that all that has been of importance to a study should be properly accounted for. But sometimes it’s difficult to pinpoint exactly where the inspiration given by a certain source has had the strongest impact, and also exactly what has affected each conclusion made. This study is conducted under the basic assumption that researchers are affected by much in their work which is not conscious to them. The decisions referred to above, regarding Anell (1996), have not directly to do with the results of the study but rather with tactics concerning in which direction to continue with the study.

**Corporate Lifecycle**

In my first run-through of literature, I sought for literature on some sort of natural development for organizations, much in the same way as for organic beings. All research works on development and organizations seemed to focus more on the evolution of organizations in society, rather than on development within individual organizations. After repeated tries, I found one other who had addressed this concept of the organizational life cycle. Adizes (1988, 1999), focuses mainly on for-profit corporations. In his books I could see many similarities to the non-profit, governmental organizations, which were my main interest, but there were not enough stuff to explain the development that I have seen as typical for this type of organizations. The stages in Adizes (1988, 1999) corporate lifecycle are Courtship, Infancy, Go-Go, Adolescence, and Prime. For unfortunate organizations it then continue with The Fall, Aristocracy, Salem City, Burocracy and finally Death (1999). What the Adizes (1988, 1999) model claims to help corporations do, is to quickly reach, and then infinitely stay, in the prime-stage.

The typical, as well as the optimal, leadership styles employed over the life cycle, are expressed in combinations of four letters, P A E and I, where P stands for Performance, A for Administration, E for Entrepreneurship and I for Integration. As well as a typical management, there is a typical strategic focus for the different “ages” in the lifecycle. At the courtship stage, when the company is not yet a reality, the founders-to-be spend due amount of dreaming on all the important bits of the business: Customers, Management, Capital, Organization and Labor. But once the whole thing has started, in Infancy, they have to give all their attention to the customers. This means concentrating completely on sales. When this has been going on for a while, with steadily increasing sales, conditions demand that attention need also be focused to Management. This means that the company moves on to the Go-Go stage. Suddenly, there is a whole organization that needs looking after and shaping up, if the firm is not to lose the customers trust, and with attention to Organization, as well as to Managers and Customers, we have reached Adolescence. The problem
so far has been that through all these changes the reasons for the changes has been to keep up the sales. It is a problem, since focusing only on sales, and not on profits, often means that the business is actually selling at a loss. Once Capital and Labor are added to the areas of attention, the organization has reached its Prime. It is healthily focusing on both sales and profits – or as March (1994) might have put it – on both efficiency and effectiveness.

Although the type of NGO’s treated in this study do not describe their activities in terms of sales and profits, the distinction is equally true for them. Only their efficiency can be spending a whole lot of time e.g. collecting money or names on a list from people on the street – and their effectiveness can be raising a whole lot of more money and awareness e.g. by hosting a gala on TV – with the use of the same or less hours of work. The NGO’s equivalent to giving too much attention to profits at the expense of the customers could perhaps be in being extremely effective in fundraising but forgetting who they collect the money for – and thus loosing trust with the public and so with the donors.

Once a business firm starts focusing only on profits and lose interest in sales, Adizes (1988, 1999) says, is where it plunges from Prime into The Fall. Once in Aristocracy it no longer pays any attention to the customers. In normal circumstances, this is when corporations die. But although Adizes (1988, 1999) does not address NGO’s, he mentions non-profit organizations who do not need a customer focus to stay in competition. Or rather, there is no competition, for these are the government public organizations with monopolies. These will live on, if maybe not very happily, until the government decides to shut them down.

Adizes (1988, 1999) is strictly management literature, and as such closer to business economics than to education studies, although highly regarded among practitioners in business economics (Marie Hallander Larsson, former manager of personnel, Posten AB, informal interview, Uppsala, 091029). It has been very helpful to me since it has provided much of the central and peripheral concepts and words to use in further database searches for more academic sources. Although being the only work found in due time on the subject of development stages in organizations, Adizes (1988, 1999) does not give enough information for the reader to be able to predict an organization’s ability and attitudes concerning knowledge transfer and learning based on its development stage (Adizes, 1988, 1999). There are some hints as to in which stages of the development of the organization the focus may be more towards exploration or exploitation, Knowledge Management or Organizational Learning. Reading Adizes (1988, 1999), it seems likely that there is a correlation between the development stage of an organization, and its use of routines for handover. My conclusion is that, depending of the art of the business, this is something that will accompany the attention to Management (i.e. the Go-Go stage) or to Organization (i.e. the Adolescence stage). However, he does not go into enough detail about this to place his theory in the centre of my study.

Non-governmental organizations, NGO’s
Unfortunately, as mentioned earlier, the literature search done for this study has not resulted in any useful literature on NGO’s and organizational learning. Even a search on only NGO’s gave quite meager returns. Only one of the titles in the literature search-table above had NGO in the title. Bryson (1993) writes about strategic and
long term planning for public and non-profit organizations. The difference between the two types is that

“strategic planning typically focuses on strategic issues and their political context while long range planning emphasizes goals and objectives without clearly acknowledging the politics of planning. Strategic planning thus is better suited when competing interests are involved, while long range planning may work well in an atmosphere of consensus and clear authority”(1993 p. 2).

I have not been able to deduct from his book if Bryson (1993) would regard handover or CM (in general or concerning knowledge in particular) as strategic or long range planning. Further he states that for public as well as for non-profit organizations there is often the problem (more so than in for-profit firms one must assume) of not having effective policy making boards. This is in line with my own experience of such organizations, but I cannot say to what extent this makes them different from for-profit organizations. But since the policy making boards of NGO’s (at least all voluntary NGO’s) often have to give attention to, and often themselves execute, a big portion of the operational tasks of the organization, they have little possibilities to concern themselves with serious policy making.

The only other work that has been available on NGO’s is Gustafsson et al. (2005). This is a previous study on the same subject, namely handover in youth organizations. It is based on Markus’ theory of Knowledge Reuse (Markus, 2001). It shows a process of capturing, packaging for reuse, distributing and finally reusing the knowledge. In the study it is seen as a drawback that the theory concentrates on documentation, and does not include overlapping between predecessor and successor, and on the knowledge which does not lend itself to being transferred in writing. The handover of contacts and relationships is given as the most important example on this. Further, it shows that all three organizations involved have problems with handover. This is thought to be mostly because it’s up to the employees themselves to give and receive information, and that they usually prioritize other things. Another cause mentioned is the high turnover which makes it difficult to develop routines for documenting knowledge.

In the one organization in Gustafsson et al. (2005), where everyone is involved strictly on a voluntary basis, the representative thought that remuneration could change the situation for the better. The other two representatives were remunerated or hired full time, and did not think that this was a factor. One of them thought that in for-profit organizations with a high turnover the handover probably works better. In two out of three organizations it was thought to be a good thing leading to creativity that not everything was handed over successfully. There were significant differences between the organizations as to how they regarded handover and continuity. Unfortunately this cannot be compared with Adizes’ life cycle (Adizes 1988, 1999), since there is not enough lifecycle data on the participating organizations in Gustafsson et al. (2005). However, judging from these three examples, youth organizations seem to be more concerned with exploration than exploitation. Gustafsson et al. (2005) could probably have been used more extensively had it only been attained at an earlier stage of this study, as could some of its references.
**Actives – a definition**

All the authors mentioned in this chapter talk about employees or co-workers (in Swedish medarbetare) as the people whom the handover and continuity concern. When it comes to NGO’s these terms are not suitable for all the different commitments that can be the case – neither from the individual perspective nor from the organization’s. Both terms suggest a paycheck of some sort, and a set work description. There is of course the term volunteer for people who commit themselves and their time to an organization without reimbursement or a given mission of any kind. Although volunteer in any given organization can stand for anything from this to a full time job and –income the common association with this word is someone who on their spare time, with no particular economical benefits, helps out in an organization according to the wishes of that organization (telephone conversation with Marita Klasson, Voluntärbyrå Uppsala, 10-02-18). For this study a term is needed which includes all of the above at the same time. The word active has previously been used as a noun in research concerning levels of participation among members of trade unions (Tagliacozzo 1959). In this study, written by Tannenbaum & Kahn and reviewed by Tagliacozzo, as well as in the present study, an active is defined as someone who takes up a specific role in an organization and thus contributes to the running of the organization to a higher degree than someone who is only involved as a member.
RESULT AND ANALYSIS

US is like any organization a gathering of people working toward a common goal or cause (for example Minkler, 2005; March, 1965). What does the empirical material (i.e. interviews and working documents from the organization) tell about what people, what kind of working and which goals and objectives are specific to US? This presentation of the results will start with a presentation of the people of US, and then move on to seeing what kind of objectives and other circumstances lie behind this setup of roles. Finally take a closer look of some of these roles, and how the tasks they represent are performed. Since someone’s whole work situation can be difficult to account for in this format, this presentation, like the gathering of the information, is structured around handover and organizational memory.
Who are the persons representing US in this study?

One picture of who makes up US is the organizational chart on the US webpage (see Appendix A). Another, which is more interesting to this study grows forth from the interviews and working materials collected. This other picture is shown in table 1 below. UU stands for Uppsala University.

Table 1 – Structure of the actives in US

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Full time.</td>
<td>Registry /staff (Swe Kansliet) Editor (of US press organ).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Full time.</td>
<td>C (Swe Centralt)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Part time.</td>
<td>SB (Swe Studiebevakare)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Part time / Occasional.</td>
<td>Student representative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The titles C and SB above will be further explained on the next page. But first, to give a more comprehensive picture of the organization, there is a table of the actives and members of US who are exempt to the structure in table 1, or concerning which this study does not reveal enough information to place them correctly.

Table 2 – Exceptions from the structure in table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 – 4?</td>
<td>Environmental Officer</td>
<td>One year appointment? Like C, but not remunerated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Council (Fullmäktige) and Board, except for presidium (C)</td>
<td>Politically elected. 1 year. Occasional.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5?</td>
<td>Representatives of the Studieråd: Actives in student organizations department boards</td>
<td>Elected. Terms may vary according to the statutes of each organization. Representatives on the department board like 4 above, but not remunerated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-4</td>
<td>US Members</td>
<td>With the exception of kansliet and possibly of project employees, membership is mandatory for doing any kind of job within the US structure, as well as for studying at Uppsala University, UU.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The persons interviewed represent the full time remunerated, or the part time remunerated, i.e. levels 2 or 3. Some hold this position at the time of the study, some have held one or more of these positions recently. Subsequently these are the categories in focus for the study of handover and organizational memory in US.
SB in the table, as well as in the quotations below, is someone who has experience as Studiebevakare. The term does not have an English translation, but it can be defined as an Ombudsman for students (i.e., student union members) at a certain faculty at a university. I have chosen the abbreviation C for the informant who has experience from the C-level. The C stands for Central, or in Swedish centralt, as in the active is working with full time remuneration at the Central office, or Headquarters.

Subsequently, CSB is what I call the informant who has experience both as an SB and at Central level. CC in the quotations below is to indicate that the informant has not only one, but two terms at Central level from which to draw experiences about handover and the organization. I have found it of interest to specify how much experience each informant have of the organization, to be able to compare their statements. This would have been harder to do if they would just have been called A B C and D. My basic assumption is that someone working full time at the central office (C) have in general a better understanding of how the organization and its roles work, then someone working part time in a somewhat more peripheral setting (SB).

All are between 22 and 29 years old, and have become involved with US after 3-8 semesters of studies at UU. They are further introduced below in their own words:

SB: Already in primary school I was very engaged all the time - I was on the student council and things like that, and have always wanted to influence and ask questions. And then I expressed interest for representative in a council of students, from my seminar group, and was omitted through a friend to the local [different council].

I: But did you see a notice or anything where people were sought for to take these roles?

SB: No that was not the case but rather the person then responsible for the local organization, who held this post at the time, who told me. (Appendix C, quote 1)

CSB: [in my case] it was also thanks to a friend who dragged me along, but just like [SB] I have always been engaged ... on the board of the student council in upper secondary school, and I react when I feel that something is not right...

(Appendix C, quote 2)

C: It was sort of by accident...They had advertised this post and not had any responses, and then [ ] who then was the president gone around to everyone in the office and said "listen, doesn't anybody know anybody?" So my friend [ ] sent me an email saying "isn't this something for you, you could at least send in an application". So I did, and here we are. So that was really like slipping on a banana peel... I have never been interested in student union activities, and I guess I'm still not politically engaged in union issues, but I see it as a job and I see it as a merit. Then of course one becomes interested in what is ones work. Even if [the policy work] isn't exactly what my work role is about, I suppose I have become engaged and interested in general. (Appendix C, quote 3)

CC: I was approaching the end and started to feel that I wasn't ready to be finished yet, I didn't want to write my thesis right now - I want to do something else. So I became [C-position 1], and worked as such for a year...I think it started with someone convincing me to run in the [US] elections, so it started with me signing up, and by way of that I wound up on the board and then in connection to that somehow before that I guess I found out more about
[position 2:1] particularly that this was a typical [CC's field of study] job, here I can actually be a [field of study] for real - I guess I viewed it as a year's worth of practice... [and then] I worked as [C-position 2](Appendix C, quote 4)
...I both read about it in Ergo [official press organ of US], and probably also on the webpage but I did already know about it in a way. I had started to get more familiar with [US] and to see how it worked, and I knew there were all these positions, I just didn't really know how you got elected to them. I had a teacher who [...] used to be active in [US] and he handed out flyers like “this is US, this can be good to know” (Appendix C, quote 5)

As is shown above, SB and CSB were interviewed together. This focus group has been the main source of empirical material, and the other two single interviews have been used as supporting material.

**Purpose and conditions**

Uppsala Student Union (US) is somewhat of a mix of different types of NGO’s. They resemble many other youth organizations in that they have their own version of a “mother organization”- which will henceforth be titled “partner organization”. But whereas, for example, the youth varieties of political parties, in most cases have a role of doing the same thing, but in a more youthful way - US can be regarded as one of the work unions for Uppsala University (UU), only concerning those which are not technically employees of UU. Furthermore, their “adult” counterpart is not an NGO but a governmental body. This is what causes one of the respondents in this study to call the US a “quasi government body”. US is also a political organization, in that its actives are elected among the political student parties. This political orientation combined with being in many ways an extension of a government body, gives a very policy-intense framework to act within. In its daily work US is quite the typical youth organization. Their actives are young, as has been shown above, and the roles are seen more as training positions rather than something one is appointed to out of a proven record of merits. In the interviews, it has also been mentioned, as an implicit objective of the organization, to let people grow in confidence and develop their skills. However, the explicit objective of US is to act for the best conditions for the students of UU. They can be said to have a better opportunity to do this compared to other student unions, being the oldest in its kind in Sweden, and having perhaps developed furthest organizationally. As an example it can be mentioned that US has a central office with about 8 full time staff, which is besides the same number of full time remunerated actives. This is to be compared to younger student unions, where all activity is completely based on actives working in their free time with no economic compensation. Since US is non-profit, it is not rich compared to organizations at large, but it has some special opportunities to keep costs down, such as remuneration of their staff instead of regular salaries. Also, the material presented here shows that engagement is something that comes with the active, rather than something that has to be kindled by the organization, as popular and scientific literature alike give the impression is the case for business corporations, and other regular employers. US has one of the largest membership bodies, since UU is one of the largest universities, and union membership is mandatory. The one largest challenge for US right now – in Spring 2010 - is the fact that this will change later this year, and membership in student unions will become voluntary for all students. So how does one run an organization like this?
**Working at US**

In this chapter the work- and handover situations of the actives are described, somewhat, but not completely divided into their respective level of engagement.

**Level 2 - Central office**

There is a work contract for all positions at this level, which states work conditions and benefits, named the Remuneration Agreement (Arvoderadeavtalet). Everyone on C and SB level also receives a work description and a handover document. The work description for the three fold presidium is a bullet list of areas of responsibility and who they belong to. It has none of the typical political organization/bureaucracy characteristics such as authors, date, version, number of pages, why it has been written, or organizational logotype (since it is for internal use only). It has been presented to this study as a word-document, and not as a PDF-file. Some answers to why this document isn’t more official-looking, can be found in this quote:

*there is no work description for the presidials. This is usually said to be because the council must not be tied down by this, and the presidium should be of a flexible nature… /CC (Appendix C, quote 6)*

An additional reason can be that there is another actual work description, namely the operational plan (Verksamhetsplanen)

*what is written there is what my tasks are […] I have a printout hanging on my notice board for checking /CSB (Appendix C, quote 7)*

The impression given in all interviews on C-level, is that it is a heavy workload, and sometimes a hectic job.

*you have to restrain yourself. I usually try not to work more than 50 hours a week, but…sometimes you do anyway. Especially if there are things happening during weekends /CSB (Appendix C, quote 8)*

*when at its most hectic, you can be forced to drop that thing you're already stressed out over to deal with something even more urgent /C (Appendix C, quote 9)*

*it would be fun to redo it, but there's seldom any time for it /C (Appendix C, quote 10)*

However, it seems as if the organization has addressed part of this problem:

*A system for keeping track of working hours was introduced some years ago, so now you fill out how much you work…. So you can keep track… so we need to try and keep our total around 40 hours for a fulltime and 20 for a halftime and so on /CSB (Appendix C, quote 11)*

The remuneration agreement, as mentioned above, pinpoints a two week overlap period for handover, and in the work descriptions it is part of everyone’s explicit duty
to handover in writing and in person to ones successor. However, it does not give more details about what the handover should entail. In some cases the most important handover documents consists of the work material itself.

*but of course, many flyers exist already, so all you have to do is update them and change the contact info.* /C (Appendix C, quote 12)

Although the informant mentions a timeline for the all year perspective as the most useful in the received handover, the informant also talks about the flyers and how the informant would have liked to update them if there had only been enough time. The person who contributed the most firm and contemplated opinions about handover was the one with the most experience of running the organization.

*people don't give attention to written instructions if they are not somehow forced to. You have to test them on it, or go through it verbally, and then give the document to keep as support for the memory* /CC (Appendix C, quote 13)

*I think the best hand-over is when you have both a selective measure and one of long duration. What might be a problem when remaining in the office is that you forget the selective measure and respectively, if you don’t remain in the office you forget about the long-term, that you need to meet up sometimes [for a coffee and a chat]* /CC (Appendix C, quote 14)

The two week period stipulated in the Remuneration Agreement is in this context to be seen as part of the selective measure. The long term contact is more like a mentorship. The concrete example given was telephone contact about a still unsolved case which had been inherited from predecessor to successor for three years. Two of the participants in this study have had their predecessor remaining in the building on a different job, during most or all of their own term. This has indeed led to the selective measure part of the handover being less serious because of this.

*I started out very autonomously and did most things on my own simply because that's how you learn. And, she was close enough that I could always pop over and ask something, which was great.* (Appendix C, quote 15)

and the flip side of that same situation looked something like this:

*I think I could've done a better job on my own part...instead, what happened was that I skimmed through the [hand-over] and the work description...I should've read it more thoroughly so that I really knew what I was signing up for. But I still think I got a good hand-over.* /C (Appendix C, quote 16)

...that you should really start with cleaning out the office and see what you find...rifling through all folders and such...I did that at some point last spring when I found the time, and found some great inspiration and such /C (Appendix C, quote 17)

Especially the tidying and clearing seems to be important. All the other three informants agree that it is important to keep the handover on the slim side, in order for it to be useful:
one of the most important thing to in handover these days – maybe not before, but now – is of course to restrict the quantity of material, i.e. what you should not read /CC (Appendix C, quote 18)

[pred.] created loads of different binders and printed stuff out and [organized] them in filing systems...quite a lot of material. But [pred] is a person who doesn’t like things digitally [pred] wants it like on paper and that, while the person taking over after [pred] is someone who ...works like on the computer ... so if [succ] ever needed that binder, it was standing right there in the office and [succ] had not read it... /CC (Appendix C, quote 19)

...and not writing too much either, since it gets more difficult to sift out the important information; you have to keep it terse. [one SB] received a 60 page hand-over document, which is way more than you need, mildly speaking /CSB (Appendix C, quote 20)

But about how much is appropriate...5-10 pages...? /CSB
I'd say 10 pages, but 5-10 pages might do it... /SB

The same discussion also show how tricky it can be to keep things to a minimum:

Well, that ought to cover the essentials, and then maybe add some attachments to that /CSB
the question is if whether you include contact list and such in that... /SB
That's true, a lot is of a purely practical nature: [circle of] contacts, lists of handy people to talk to, email passwords and such /CSB (Appendix C, quote 21)

but there’s a risk that you forget that which worked well [in your own handover] /CSB

...so maybe take that which was in your own handover and add the things you had to figure out for yourself /SB (Appendix C, quote 22)

In the interviews the opinion was presented that the lack of personal or functional work descriptions makes it difficult to collaborate effectively in the presidium, and that a clearer division of work could make an improvement. Another thing slowing down the performance of the presidium, and perhaps of all the C-level actives, was that everyone starts new at the same time of the academic year. One respondent explained the difficulties of changing this system, but also felt that it could be worth it:

the [political] parties would be against it... arguing that that the parties, that is the elections, should decide for the whole year and that there should be a possibility for new majorities... on the other hand, with a overlap system you make things a bit more stable – you create some form of continuity and that you don’t have to end things so abruptly /CC (Appendix C, quote 23)

you could still have a constituting assembly in the beginning where you elect one half of the posts, and then have another assembly further on, perhaps
November, it can be earlier as well so that you know – there is no harm in electing people before they start. [of course] the one assembly will elect for half a term over the other [assembly’s] but it would be the same for everybody /CC (Appendix C, quote 24)

This information is backed up by another informant with contrary information, namely that there is an overlapping of offices in the central office, and that this is a good thing:

so it’s both in the spring and in the fall that posts are exchanged? /I yes, some are exchanged, information officer and international officer [are appointed] in January /C (Appendix C, quote 25)

and besides, I start when people have already been here for one semester, so it was easy to just come along in their routines /C (Appendix C, quote 26)

Level 3 - part time SB

Moving focus to the third level, all the actives are studying alongside their US mission. CC and CSB both feel that full time SBs would be better than part time, since the conflict between studies and SB work causes problems.

if it would fit in the budget I would love to have fulltime SBs. I think that would be good for the student advocacy work. It is way more difficult to get hold of the SBs during exam periods for natural reasons. So fulltime SBs would be to prefer /CSB (Appendix C, quote 27)

the tasks for these people are actually quite comprehensive, at least if they should work as well as one might wish. And in that case they should probably be at a higher remuneration, like... maybe you could put them together and make them into a single one instead. One overall problem when you divide it on more people is that you think that you get 50 + 50, but you don’t since there has to be coordination between them as well /CC (Appendix C, quote 28)

As implied, sometimes one part time role is split between several students. The reasons for splitting a part time on two or sometimes more SBs are: that this is sometimes what the appointed students themselves prefer; conflicting scheduled meetings (not studies), where not one person can fulfill the duty, as that would occasionally mean being at two different meetings at the same time; conflict with studies (especially on the medical faculty students do not have time for more than 25%); and finally, it offers flexibility, since a smaller role can be moved around to different faculties depending on where the need is strongest at the moment. As described above, this does not always work out to the satisfaction of the organization. One way in which the us, according to CC and CSB, have thought of coming to terms with this is to have overlapping terms for these part time SBs. This have not been put to the test, mainly because of the turnover rate at the SB-level, which is higher than for the level above:

it depends on the position - the most common thing for a central position is that you start your post, serve your term, and quit when your terms over. But for [SBs] there is much greater turn-over during the year, since they're formally
elected for [year of activity]. But then there are those who quit around new years because they are going on an exchange, and someone new replaces them, and then someone quits at the end of the semester someone new comes along there, and then you can't find anyone new, which means some one else steps up from 25% to 50... /CSB (Appendix C, quote 29)

...difficult to do anything about these things, other than making sure that the person who gets the job does some soul-searching to try and to figure out if they can handle 25 or 50% along with their studies. I'm not sure that's one of the main factors in people quitting. I think there's a lot to what you're saying, some simply want to go abroad /SB (Appendix C, quote 30)

...some have already announced that they are applying for exchange studies in the spring ... so that can be a possibility [...] and since the SBs study simultaneously there’s a study situation to take into account as well (exactly /SB) /CSB (Appendix C, quote 31)

And this is how this may look to someone who is not involved directly in this process:

...and then there are these SBs who can start kind of whenever - when it is needed, or when that person can start and so on /C (Appendix C, quote 32)

Also, even if the SB stays for her whole appointed period, attendance is usually lower than for the C-actives at common activities:

...and there has been a couple of other training days... /SB that's right, like the one yesterday, where you attended... /CSB yes I participated for a couple of hours /SB (Appendix C, quote 33)

...guess it was rather good attendance [...] even if some disappeared, and there were not particularly many who stayed over I suppose... /CSB (Appendix C, quote 34)

As for the actives at Central level, the SB role also comes with a work description and with handover. However, one of the things where the SB-role seems to function less well than the C-level roles concerns the knowledge of what their job entails:

haven’t thought of that, whether handover is one of my tasks /SB it is part of the job to hand over /CSB ... well yeah, but that I think I would to either way, but if you say it’s a [explicit] task then of course it is... /SB (Appendix C, quote 35)

Is there a work description for the SB? /I There [was] one sent out to you, I think... /CSB Was this in that SB-binder? /SB It should be in there /CSB (Appendix C, quote 36)

...everyone have a portion of the remuneration for handover, if I remember correctly, so the SBs also have... (so you mean one gets some money, oh, alright.../SB) /CSB (Appendix C, quote 37)
I began my assignment in the middle of August, right? (August 15th I believe it was /CSB) mine is for one year, a little less than one year... suppose it ends... I think it is June 1st (I think it is June 15th /CSB) okay (I’m not completely sure, but your appointment is for 10 months anyway /CSB) okay /SB (Appendix C, quote 38)

One of the main tasks of the SB, is to appoint representatives for the different decisive fora within the university where the student body should be represented, and to create and uphold councils for these representatives to meet. These are the actives at level 4 in table 1. This at least is the description given by CSB and CC. The SB interviewed, however, defines the task as representing, in these fora, rather than appointing others. Later in the interview (which is held together with CSB) SB changes the definition to the meaning held by CSB. What the work description for SB-s say on this matter, I have unfortunately not been able to find out. The written source of information used is the text in the announcement for this post, shown in Appendix D.

CC goes on to say that it is a big risk that SBs chooses to represent themselves rather than creating a council of representatives. Either because they want to do the job themselves, or because they fail to find others who are interested. At the same time, SB claims that the representing on different boards as something which comes in the way of what SB finds most important with the SB-role, which is helping individual students:

there’s a lot of continuous work for the SBs /CSB
oh yes there certainly is! Especially the representation on committees... but I feel that I get to do fun stuff, and the things I like to do – to make my voice heard and help the students. But I think there has been a lot less individual cases than I had thought /SB (Appendix C, quote 39)

there are examples of things in the orientation stage resulting in ineffectiveness and frustration rather than motivation as pointed out by Beazley at al. (2002):

we had problems for a long while for example with access keys, to get them.
because we were waiting about 2 weeks for the wrong person to come back, someone who had then probably quit /SB (Appendix C, quote 41)

but yeah, this kind of stuff which now afterwards just seem like such an incredibly unnecessary waste of time ... Really [laughter]! Have spent a whole lot of time on totally trivial things like that /SB (Appendix C, quote 42)

passwords, and user login, and sending letters – where are the envelopes, and if you have to top up the printer, where is the paper, if you want reimbursement for expenses, like if you have bought meeting snacks – who has to sign, and who to go to...? /CSB (Appendix C, quote 43)

Then where does the motivation come from?
Working at US in general
Well, the most important motivational factor seems to be something which may not easily lend itself to handover:

so I think it’s difficult to fulfill all the goals, but I do notice when I have helped someone, and the appreciation is often enormous /SB (Appendix C, quote 44)

even if it’s just a thank you in an email, It does mean a lot for your energy and enthusiasm and commitment – to feel that it makes a difference /CSB (Appendix C, quote 45)

As have been described earlier, the workload is substantial for both the C- and SB-levels. This may be connected with the high expectations actives on these levels have, and the fact that one expects it to be tough work

I suppose it’s usually about that amount [ of time for which SB is remunerated] sometimes it has even been less, but sometimes I feel that it’s more… if I include all the time put down [on] email, and reading documentation, different issues and discussions… /SB (Appendix C, quote 46)

…but I think it’s only natural to feeling kind of overwhelmed by the work there is to do… and how long it takes to drive things home /SB (Appendix C, quote 47)

the problem is that there is such a lot of continuous work that has to be taken care of, and there is very little time again for the things that you really want to do /CSB (Appendix C, quote 48)

In this they were thought to differ from the level above, the Registry:

some of them have been working there for quite a number of years, and for them its not like when you come in for one year and change the world and solve all the worlds problems in that year… /CSB (Appendix C, quote 49)

Under the previous headline, some of the conditions for handover between SBs came up. The conditions for handover at the Central level may also not be perfect:

so then you should both do a handover and write the annual report at the end, which means that the report becomes rather important… /CC (Appendix C, quote 50)

you are meant to do the handover together, but because one person is elected sometime in May perhaps, and is supposed to start in August, they might not have planned to suddenly be at the office at the end of June or July because then they will be somewhere else /CC (Appendix C, quote 51)

some start working, and then maybe in the place where their from, which may not be Uppsala […] and some might need a bit of vacation… and go away maybe, and then they get ready to start studying again, and it becomes a hustle to organize everything, and some starts a post graduate program in Lund or
someplace […] there is quite a lot to fit into that period of time [between June and September 1st]
Then you can probably do it in August, but it's better if you can fit it in June, and then take your successor with you and introduce them at different meetings, that's what I did /CC
so not just for [the SB’s] sake, but for that group as well? /I
Exactly. Because they have sort of a hard time also with people being exchanged all the time, so it can be difficult to learn all the names, and be easier just to "okay, so you are the new student representative" and not bother about the name /CC (Appendix C, quote 52)

Still, handover is seen as important by US, judging by the fact that it is part of the work description. This norm is shared by the actives interviewed:

*even if you are worn out you still want the next person to be able to pick it up with as much speed possible... /CSB (Appendix C, quote 53)*

The general work situation for actives on the C and SB levels leads to the following thoughts on handover, which are presented in the interviews. Some thoughts appear to be well established with the respondent. Others seems to be formed as the interview progresses, or even while they are expressed.

*... totally trivial things like that... or now they're trivial, and I wish that I could make them trivial for my successor now... /SB (Appendix C, quote 54)*

*I suppose I would just think about what have been best for me, and then talk to my colleague and ask what's been best for her, and the most useful advice and documents and... contacts. There is of course a whole lot of social aspects too which have taken time to arrange [...] and all this practical stuff to that we have been talking about, you could go with them and introduce, and make them get keys for the offices and all that already from the beginning /SB (Appendix C, quote 55)*

*I think that the registry is not very good at handing over to the C-actives. If It was up to me, I would like them to be a bit more active and say that «now we will have this day, or week even, when we run through how things work here at the [central office] /CC (Appendix C, quote 56)*

*I can imagine that the registry sometimes have gotten into trouble when the presidium [effectively the boss of the registry] don't understand how to handle personnel and such, so they probably have a strategy to lay low sometimes as well... /CC (Appendix C, quote 57)*
like the code to get in, what happens if the alarm goes off, can the alarm be shut off if you want to have a meeting late, and super practical stuff like that... printouts, if color is more expensive than non-color, to make it nice and cheap... /CC (Appendix C, quote 58)

and then explain... or decide together rather, how to handle the kitchen and the dishwasher, is it ok to have meetings in the kitchen or not. Norreda – how to book it. And talk about the different functions in the registry /CC ( Appendix C, quote 59)

and then of course the reception and how to enroll people [...] that you have to learn in June a little bit, in order to take care of it in July when the registry go on vacation, and then someone among the remunerated take care of it once a week when the registry have personnel conferences /CC ( Appendix C, quote 60)

I think that the registry, mainly the head of office, should hold a briefing about this [...] together with the presidium. And the presidium needs to be convinced that it is a good idea to go through these things. Its not on their agenda, they haven’t even thought about it /CC ( Appendix C, quote 61)

Conclusions regarding the main research questions

The original research questions (described under Aim and research questions in the Background chapter), can with regard to the subject of study be summed up as:

1) How is transfer of knowledge perceived in US – as a significant problem, a small problem or no problem at all?

2) If transfer of knowledge is perceived as a problem, what are thought to be the causes?

3) In US, as a NGO, how is handover managed? Which problems arise with respect to handover?

4) What else of interest can be found?

The fourth question will be answered under its own heading - Bonus results. The answer to the third question will be presented in the form of a concluding text. Thus it will also sum up what I have chosen to present as results and discussion integrated.

How is transfer of knowledge perceived in US?

As a significant problem, a small problem, or no problem at all? There are no doubt at least four different answers to this question, depending on who is asked. Based on the accounts in this study, the answer is As a small problem. All of the respondents had encountered problems concerning the transfer of knowledge. In one case the problem could not be judged to be more than insignificant. Some had encountered more significant problems with their handover, but all respondents had bigger challenges to report for the organization: Reaching out with their information to all students, the active’s considerable workload, and the elimination of the mandatory union
membership for students (expected to come into effect July 2010). However, handover is something that the organization thinks about. There are routines and rules concerning handover (in Swedish överlämning), and the term is frequently used in the interviews. The terms Learning Organization, Transfer of Knowledge and Continuity Management are not used by the informants, which they probably would have been if they were concepts familiar to them. However, they do talk a lot about continuity (kontinuitet), in the same sense as it is being used by the literature used in this study, and as something which they wish that US would be better at.

If perceived as a problem – what are thought to be the causes?
The effects of poor handover mentioned were mainly waste of time and that the work was not being effective. Projects were halted in their progress, or even completely cancelled. And there are the costs that Beazley et al. (2002) mention: setbacks because the orientation phase causes frustration rather than motivation.
Examples mentioned of poor handover were loads of material too extensive to read through, inaccurate or outdated information, insufficient introduction, and actives forgetting about the long term handover.
Among the causes and effects linked to these were: predecessors wanting to handover too much of their own way of doing things, or not giving enough consideration to the needs of their successor; short terms of office and premature termination of term of office. These in turn were seen as caused by difficulty finding interested and competent students; difficulty finding students who want to take the office for longer periods; Exchange studies - when the semester abroad starts in spring, after half the SB-term of 10 months; That SBs are unprepared for the considerable workload and cannot find time for both it and their studies; and the need to prioritize other things when the handover is supposed to be written.
Possible solutions/improvements mentioned were

- To make the handover routine into two explicit parts: one selective measure and one prolonged
- To keep in contact throughout the assignment - preferably a task for the predecessor.
- To employ a template for handover throughout the organization, concerning routines
- Overlapping terms in the Presidium.
- An explicit work description and division of responsibilities also for the Presidium, set by the Board.
- That the Registry holds an introduction for all new C-actives.
- Handover/training about how to effectively make an impact as a representative
- To have two SBs on the same faculty, with overlapping terms
- Dividing the SB hours into full time roles, rather than part time roles.

Except for the fact that there are other things of higher priority to be done at the same time as the handover (see quotes under Working at US in general), and the need for a long term handover or mentoring, there was no mentioning of people not being motivated to hand over or not giving it due attention. On the contrary, this was denied:

even if you are worn out you still want the next person to be able to pick it up with as much speed possible... /CSB (Appendix C, quote 62)
This is contrary to the results in Gustafsson et al. (2005), where all three NGO’s studied expressed that active’s unwillingness to hand over, or to read their predecessor’s handover, as the main problem with continuity. There are however examples in the present study as well of lessons in the handover having not been learned.

Attention to handover and US-specific circumstances.

As has already been shown above, there is much thought given to handover in US. This is exemplified by explicit demands on handover as part of ordinary work roles, and it has been given a lot of thought by some of the informants.

Although the attention to handover is anything but poor in this organization, the circumstances which govern the possibilities for handover, and for continuity at large, differentiate US from a for-profit organization in a number of ways. These I find to be typical not of NGO’s in general, but of the kind of youth organization which has been the focus of interest in his study

- The actives are young. This will be further discussed under “Students as actives”
- The actives generally see the job as a mission, rather than a way to earn a living. See further under “On Actives-mentality”
- US have a more democratic and political environment for making decisions
- Additional possibilities for reimbursing actives (i.e. remuneration and strictly voluntary work)
- Their turnover for most posts are at a yearly basis.

Is US a Learning Organization?

The results of this study show that the US is indeed a learning organization (LO) according to the definition of Ekholm (2010) as described earlier. US has a structure which allows it to take in new impressions from their environment to learn from, and they actively and passively collect these impressions and process them. They have an organizational memory (OM) where the learning is stored and from where it is distributed. However, this and all the other steps could work better under the current conditions for the organization. The chapter below will give examples of this.

One way to describe the organizational structure which supports learning is by highlighting the following phenomena:

- The Norreda Kick-off – a recurring 3-day introduction convention for the new appointees early in the academic year.
- The work roles of the organization, as described in the table in chapter 4.1.
- The explicit work descriptions for the work roles
- Routines for handover
- Routines for recruitment
- The integrated use of partner organization, UU, in the daily work.

These phenomena play different roles in collecting, analyzing, storing and making available.
The Norreda Kick-off
This annually recurring teambuilding and orientation activity has become an institution in the operations of the organization. Nothing has come up in the interviews which suggests any need for improvement, but rather it seems to be a very appreciated activity which meets its purposes very well. It is much referred to in the interviews, which suggests that it has made a significant impression. However, not all the new appointees stay the whole time that is intended for their group, which will be further discussed under "Bonus results”.

Work roles
The traditional work roles of US are, have been shown in tables 1 and 2. It has been found that the roles differ in how efficient they are, and how well the continuity works. Basically, the closer to a full time job, the better the performance of the appointees. This too will be further elaborated under "Bonus results”. The registry could be more involved in introduction of C-actives. The material suggests that the employees of US are the best source of certain level of comprehension, and perhaps the only one. They have the long term experience to best provide basic information for the introduction phase as described by Beazley et al. (2002) in the previous chapter, but are currently not especially involved in the introduction. Also, they could be better at handing over their own tasks at need – namely during vacations when the office is run by C-actives.

Explicit work descriptions
As mentioned in chapter 4.1, there are written work descriptions for the roles on C and SB levels. The Registry level has not been explored in this study, and for the lower levels there seems to be no work description. If there is, it is not in all cases known to the active doing the job. There is no evidence that the SB is unaware that he or she has a work description, but there is evidence that they do not always know what it says:

* haven’t thought of that, whether handover is one of my tasks /SB
  (Appendix C, quote 63 (35))

Also the work description could be retrieved for all the C level jobs when asked for (4 different versions) but not for the SBs (also on four different occasions, involving 6 different SBs, some current ones and some former).

The C level is an exception, and this has political reasons. The three actives in the presidium have a list of areas of collective responsibilities for the presidium, but not with duties assigned to any specific person or role (president, vice president or treasurer):

* There is no work description for the presidials. This is usually said to be because the council must not be tied down by this, and the presidium should be of a flexible nature... /CC (Appendix C, quote 64 (6))

In the interviews the opinion was presented that the lack of personal or functional work descriptions makes it difficult to collaborate effectively in the presidium, and that a clearer division of work could make an improvement. Another thing slowing down the performance of the presidium, and perhaps of all the C-level actives, was
that everyone starts new at the same time of the academic year. One respondent explained the difficulties of changing this system, but also felt that it could be worth it. This information is backed up by another informant with contrary information, namely that there is an overlapping of offices in the central office, and that this is a good thing.

**Routines for handover**

US has elaborated routines for handover besides that of the introductory Kick-off at Norreda Torp mentioned above. And this routine is part of the work description for everyone at the C- and SB levels. It consists of a 2 week short term handover period (shorter for part time actives), and a written handover document. There are no instructions for what the handover should look like. This study has shown examples when poor knowledge of what is a useful handover and have not resulted in a waste of time and inadequate introduction. On the other hand, Gustafsson et al. (2005) in a study concerning three cases pretty much exactly like this one, suggest that had there been a written instruction for handover, it probably would not have been consulted. Also in this study there have been evidence of actives not having studied the handover given by their predecessors, and that this have in one case lead to not knowing things that they now feel would have been useful to them earlier, and in the other case resulting in not knowing what one’s duties are. How well the task of handing over is executed will be returned to under "Bonus results" Perhaps the lack of a long term handover is of a greater significance. This has been expressed as a shortcoming by the informants.

I think the best hand-over is when you have both a selective measure and one of long duration. What might be a problem when remaining in the office is that you forget the selective measure and respectively, if you don’t remain in the office you forget about the long-term, that you need to meet up sometimes [for a coffee and a chat] /CC (Appendix C, quote 65 (14))

There are activities which do not seem to have been created explicitly for continuity reasons, but for coordination in the present and exchanging of information. This can be seen as part of the organizational structure for learning

...the students committee where the SBs get together every two weeks /CSB
(Appendix C, quote 66)

we have had presidial lunches, which is handover via presidium /CC
(Appendix C, quote 67)

There are also training occasions, besides the Norreda kick off, which seem to be for learning new skills on what Beazley et al. (2002) might have called the operational or high performance level:

sfs [national organization of student unions] have been here and talked about being a good leader, and how to run campaigns. And a little course on master suppression techniques /C (Appendix C, quote 68)

...and there has been a couple of other training days... /SB
(Appendix C, quote 69 (33))
Routines for recruitment

Being a political organization with general elections every year, US has a set of well-established and elaborate routines connected to recruitment. At least 7 different information channels came up in the interviews, for informing about available positions. But it seemed as if this is still not enough:

- It’s difficult to reach out to 35 000 students / CSB (Appendix C, quote 70)
- If you have any suggestions on this we would like to hear it /CSB (Appendix C, quote 71)
- It is hard to find people who want to commit themselves for that long /CSB (Appendix C, quote 72)
- They had advertised this post and not had any responses /C (Appendix C, quote 73 (3))

There are indications in these quotes about recruiting being a problematic area. It is also a fact that information about vacancies is often accessible only to those already active. This study can only account for level 4, below SB. On SB and over it gives no reliable information. However, all the US actives interviewed had started their appointments mainly due to personal contacts. Another conclusion is that Ergo (the official press organ of US) and the home page could be better used to inform about vacancies, at least when it comes to tasks on the fourth level. The same could be said about at least one resource within the UU which is at the time of this study not part of the strategy. A survey has been conducted on how students (members) find information about US. But since the data was only collected, and never analyzed, nothing new was added to the organizational memory.

The interviews also show that the knowledge of which are the best methods to recruit are at least occasionally present within the organization. There are two examples of implicit recruitment strategies, which may be explicit even if not proven so in this study:

- and then [] who then was the president gone around to everyone in the office and said "listen, doesn’t anybody know anybody?" So my friend [] sent me an email saying "isn't this something for you /C (Appendix C, quote 74 (3))

- When there is SFS-fum for example [representative assembly of all Swedish student unions], you need about 50 people, and that's more then in the people working here and the assembly [local] combined [...] and it's a typical occasion for making sure to recruit some extra people from around [...] If you do it well they get their own little area of responsibility and the task to try and
lobby this little point into the discussions and into the policies which we should agree on, and work on that together with other unions. And this gives them their own bit of responsibility, and it gives them some, not a lot but still some – knowledge of the US. And we have introductions before, and it’s a rather good way in – you sort of get interested […] so it works really well as a base for recruitment. And you fill a busload and head of to another place and stay there for 4-5 days and have way to little sleep and have some festivities in the evenings […] and there is a lot of social stuff going on. You get to see that there are others, that there is a wider context. So the whole ambiance is good for recruiting… /CC (Appendix C, quote 75)

By not writing this knowledge down nor distributing it in an effective way, or otherwise making sure it is circulated among the actives, these experiences and this knowledge risk being lost altogether.

Some information is not being used because it has not been actively collected. The four persons interviewed had all been students at the UU for quite some time before taking an interest in volunteering for US. But the strategy used for recruiting is aimed at the first year students. Could one reason be that this is done deliberately, because the organization also know that it takes a few years for the idea to mature in the students? Another reason could be that one has not reflected on who is most likely to be interested in working for US, and why. Of course there could also be a different main reason for the activity in question, which makes it more suitable for the A-level courses, than for students more familiarized with the basic student-situation.

**Use of partner organization**

UU is the other part of the long term memory of US, besides the registry. To employ this UU-part of the OM is well integrated in the daily work of both C- and SB actives of US, and it is often the first place to look for the information needed.

*But no, if I have questions I usually contact the legal department at the university /CSB (Appendix C, quote 76)*

*you know who to turn to if you have a question concerning education, and you know who to talk to if its about quality [assessment] and so on /SCB (Appendix C, quote 77)*

Also, individuals working in the UU (where the continuity and experience are present to a high degree) actively seek out the US actives, offering their support.

*Yeah, or sometimes during a coffee break they come up and start talking to you, and then they show that there are people you can ask, and who you turn to /SB (yes, who make time for you /CSB) (Appendix C, quote 78)*

*And some of these people start by sending a whole lot of emails /CSB (Appendix C, quote 79)*

*there has been a lot… passive introduction… When you ask questions you usually get more answers. Both from people at the faculty and from US. And it has been easy to ask questions and get answers /SB (Appendix C, quote 80)*
There seems to be an understanding of the more difficult conditions under which the US deals with continuity and information. This suggests that concerning the individuals referred to in the quotes above, the UU operates on a "high performance" level according to Beazley's et al. taxonomy. This level of performance is much appreciated by the actives in US, both moral support and professional expertise:

*But he or she still takes the time to answer our questions and discuss current issues. He or she gladly shares info from the upper echelons and is really a very kind person. /SB (Appendix C, quote 81)*

*But also those who work at the University and are extremely proficient /CSB (Appendix C, quote 82)*

US is quite dependant on the continuity of UU functioning:

*we had problems for a long while for example with access keys, to get them. because we were waiting about 2 weeks for the wrong person to come back, someone who had then probably quit /SB (Appendix C, quote 83)*

From these interviews the use of UU seems to be limited to expertise and political support of individuals, not as a means for communicating US’s own information externally.

**Bonus results**

**Representation on boards - an area for improvement**

All information gathered about US (spoken, written and e-mailed) put together, shows an SB who does more work than they are appointed to. Although this is even more true of the offices higher up in the US hierarchy, here it is also because of doing work which is not necessarily a task that comes with the job. The most evident example is the task of representing the student body on different decisional/executive/policy making boards within the university. Typically, the SB man these positions themselves, even though an explicit job description states that the task is to appoint and stay in contact with the student representatives in these organs (Appendix D). Though it also came up that the representation is what keeps SBs away from what they mostly want to do with their term of office, which is helping individual students. From documents we learn that the representation on boards which is otherwise reimbursed (i.e. from UU), should not be calculated in the time report for remuneration as SB (Uppsala studentkår 2008: Arvoderadeavtalet). The present study however does not follow up on the exact effects this has for US when choosing who to put on a committee. It is unclear whether there are student representatives other than SBs who currently receive remuneration from US (TT 2009) (Appendix E).
Possible reasons for this discrepancy between work description and execution of office can be:

- The job description may be incorrectly interpreted in this study. A current job description, as described in the interviews, has unfortunately not been available to this study. The work description used is from an advertisement meant for recruiting to this post (Appendix D).
- The SB not knowing what the job description says – as one of the interviews show: not all SBs know for certain if they have one or not.
- The difficulty of finding someone else to appoint. This being a major challenge for the organization became evident in the interviews.
- The wish of the SB to do the task themselves. Of the interviewed both persons who had a background as SB stated that it’s an interesting and fun job working with student issues, and therefore it easily happens that one takes on more work than one should, out of sheer interest.
- The wish of US for the SBs to do these tasks themselves for organizational reasons. It is known that every added person in a system means an added cost for coordination and sharing of information. It is unclear whether US as a whole thinks like this. From the interviews we have examples that points in two different directions: on the one hand the notion that two SBs sharing a role can get more done than if only one person does it. On the other hand, the statement that two 50%-SBs equals less than one full time ditto. Possible organizational reasons could be that US does not have the necessary organizational structure to keep track of all the actives if there should be a different active for each task.
- The wish of US for the SBs to do these tasks themselves for budget reasons. Given the information above, it is not apparent whether there is any economical effect for US to choose an already remunerated person instead of choosing someone else.

Which of these, if any, are the main causes for the SBs doing additional tasks to what is in their job description, does not fall into the objectives of this study. However, the explanation that the problem with finding other people to do the job is the most likely cause mentioned for the SBs having too little time for their main tasks (one of the big problems, compared with handover which is less of a problem), is that which received most attention in the interviews to carry on with. The question subsequently, is why it is so hard to find volunteers.

Judging from this study, the best, and perhaps only way to get new actives is through personal contacts. Everybody “knows” this, and it seems like finding the time going around encouraging people to apply is the reason why this knowledge is not more efficiently employed. However, it is also likely to be a signal of an insufficient OM. One thing that would testify a stronger OM, could for example be a written routine for doing this "contacting", perhaps in a work description for the roles concerned with recruiting. There seems to be a routine for the SBs to give a personal presentation in all A-level courses, but no sign of an explicit routine for a more directed encouraging of individual students or personal friends.

There seems to be the case in US that not only transfer of knowledge to do a certain task is crucial, but also the transfer of information about tasks to be done is important.
But spreading the information about the tasks is just one of two ways of attacking the recruitment problem as seen by the informants. A conclusion in this study is that this way is especially relevant for the roles below SB-level.

Another way would be to change the role itself to make it more attractive to the members of US. This concerns mainly the SB-level. The information which has come up in this study points to the SBs never having been a full time role. At the same time, there is evidence that this part time role does not work as well as the full time roles, and both CC and CSB feels that this would be preferred to the current situation.

**Changing the roles**

The organizational memory does not seem to provide any historical reasons for not having full time SBs. The reasons for this can be that this knowledge does not exist, that is not kept accessible enough in the OM, or that this study has not been asking the right questions. However, the organizational memory is employed for reasoning about an alternative solution (having overlapping SBs on the same faculty). No political reasons are mentioned for not having full time SBs. Nor are there arguments why full time should make it more difficult to recruit SBs. Though it is being argued that a two year part time role would be more difficult to find interest for among the students, than a one year ditto. The one obstacle mentioned for not having full time is finances. This statement is probably based on the assumption that all the current SB-roles should be extended to full time positions. This study suggests that even if it is not possible to finance such a change, it is still an improvement to divide all of today’s part time positions into a fewer number of full time positions. This would probably also be a less costly solution than the one used at the moment, since there are less individuals for activities such as Norreda, and to be handled by the administrative staff.

In conclusion, making the division of student rights advocacy into full time - rather than in part time -missions, will make them more efficient for a larger portion of the 10 months (or the year). By working full time the SB would not have to simultaneously focus on her education, and can therefore both be more accessible to her co-workers, and clients, and will also probably make the SB-role a higher priority in life than is the case when she is studying parallely. One will also have to spend less of the SB-time on coordination compared to if the position is divided in two or more part times. Also, with use of a full time week the organization can provide the SB a better opportunity of climbing Beazley’s et al. productivity-ladder. Even more so, if one’s predecessor has had a chance to reach the fifth level. Then she will have a much more useful handover to grant a smooth introduction period.

By in this way making the SB role more effective, one could for example make progress when recruiting to the active-level just below SB, being one of the responsibilities of the role. At faculties where the hours can not be evenly divided in 100%, one solution can be the added position of assistant SB, where such tasks could be performed which do not risk interfering with the coursework.

If one feels like stretching these results to the limit, one might also argue that this alteration of the SB role could help with another of the major problem for US – how to keep the number of members up when membership becomes voluntary later this year (2010). Many students today feel that their education lacks the opportunity to
trainee experience. We have learned that actives in US view their full time role as just such a Near-work-experience. The opportunity for practical training, as well as a better functioning student rights advocacy, could be the incentive needed for many students to stay or become members. Those university programs which have the finances for this, also reimburse the receiving organization for work placed education. Making C- and SB-positions official traineeships, would perhaps increase the status of the role. But it could also make the focus more career oriented and less interest oriented.

**On "Actives-mentality"**

The idea, that there is such a thing as natural born actives (Swe. föreningsmänniskor) is common among actives in NGO’s. It is held both by people who view themselves as such, and by those who don’t. A natural born active is someone especially prone to take up voluntary work, and has a certain actives-mentality. This study supports the idea of actives-mentality. Two of the respondents (one spontaneously and one strongly affirming when asked) gave descriptions of what actives-mentality meant to them. One counted the own person among the engagement people, and the other among the non-engagement group.

*don’t know about norm exactly, but its rather common that those who are active [in US] have been so before… my guess is that it has to with personality… I mean, if you are an engaged person then you are drawn to engagement - either here, or at a Nation or in an association /CSB (Appendix C, quote 84)*

*Do you think that it is possible to divide people in engagement people (Yes /C) and non-engagement people? /I*

*It certainly is, and that is valid here too... there are lots who are very prone to engagement and they have a hundred projects going on in different [...]. But I am not one of them. /C (Appendix C, quote 85)*

A third person, interviewed at the same time as the spontaneous respondent, agreed with the idea, but also put forth an alternative explanation to the same phenomena:

*yes, partly that, but also, I think another personality trait is that you are the first so speak out when something is not right /SB (Appendix C, quote 86)*

This could have more to do with interview and interaction dynamics than with there really being a difference in whether respondents believe stronger in one explanation or another. The fourth respondent had yet another association when asked about the existence of engagement- and non engagement people. The respondent used the terms together-people and medal-people, to explain the two main types of motivation behind volunteering. Both types (everyone has a little bit of both) are present and needed in NGO’s, although having different personal reasons for joining. For some, it’s the status the role brings, or possibilities for increasing ones status in some other way. For others it’s the sense of belonging and the joy of doing things together and working towards a common goal that makes them join and stay in NGO’s. This classification does not disagree with the idea of actives-mentality. However it puts forth a different focus as more important when it comes to studying who might be persuaded to volunteer for one cause or another.
Effective policy making

The interviews give an image of a relatively effective US policy making board. Though this is identified as a common problem area for NGO’s (Bryson 1993), I see a possible connection between the effectiveness in policy making and how much of the organizations work that relies respectively on paid staff/professionals, semi-volunteers, and complete volunteers. One of the informants also made comparisons between US, which is a large and developed student union, with some newer and almost completely voluntary student unions. Bryson (1993) also argues that a typical challenge for NGO’s, as opposed to business firms, is lacking clear authority for its policy making. With policy making being a chief instrument for obtaining US objectives, there is in a way a clear authority in terms of rules and policies previously decided by US and the organizations on which they depend. And also, they have a lot of experience and competence when it comes to policy making, than perhaps does the typical NGO that Bryson (1993) sees before him.

Students as actives

One of the special conditions found in this study, which may set the conditions for handover and continuity, was that the actives in US are young adults who are also students:

- time often seem to pass slower when you are younger, and as a student it is also overthrowing /SB (Appendix C, quote 87)
- There is a lot happening in a students life… suddenly you find yourself somewhere different, and you resign from your mission /CC (Appendix C, quote 88)

As a student, there are an incomprehensible amount of chances and possibilities to act on. The problem is that one cannot decide and plan for one self, but most of these possibilities are decided by somebody else. There is always the element of being chosen or accepted among many applicants. Without enough luck, the student may end up with nothing, in spite of an industrious compiling of applications. Therefore the SB cannot afford to apply only for SB one year, and only for exchange studies the next. Given my conclusions, if the SB role was full time it would be chosen over the exchange studies more often. And I also think that having the chance at Central level, knowing what you are going to be doing for two years, rather than one, might be more attractive to many students, than to again have to apply for a bunch of new possibilities already after one year. Especially as the position at US also comes with an income on a somewhat uncertain job market.

Students as a group are also exposed to a lot of chances which are not as uncertain as the ones above. The problem is rather which ones to choose, and not to choose to many. This is predominantly a dilemma for the students with an actives-mentality as described earlier. But it is also a dilemma for the US- who depend on this category of students – be they medal- or together oriented. Although Uppsala University may be filled with people interested in student issues, and in being active in US, the environment is one of fierce competition for this NGO.
The present study supports the notion that youth organizations with a high turnover rate of actives have a tendency towards exploration and not doing enough exploitation to be effective. Thanks to this work I now have the concepts to word this part of my interest to single out youth organizations from other organizations.
DISCUSSION

Due to the impossibility of giving a complete account of the interviews and ways to understand the meaning of them, what has been presented in the Results and Analysis chapter is only a part of what has been found, and an simplification of the picture drawn of the informants, and of the situation of handover in US. For example, the interview material as a whole give a strong indication that the people on C-level have a much better grasp of their own work role than does the SB. However, in retrospect the material selected gives a somewhat different picture. The three C-actives do not agree on who starts when. On the other hand, they know when their own term laps and what their duties are, in contrast to SB. In the same way, I have found it impracticable to go into all aspects of method and analysis that could be in its place regarding this study. Below is a selection of examples.

Reflections on method

Under the headline "Working at US – thoughts on Handover" I state that:
Some thoughts appear to be well established with the respondent. Others seems to be formed as the interview progresses, or even while they are expressed.
This is a very typical example of the so called interview effect, which has been present in this study to a high degree. I would like to use this paragraph to argue my opinion on the up-and downsides of the interview effect.

Kvale (1997) points out the risks of the interviewer unintentionally affecting the outcome of the interview by reactions in body language, or by the way in which questions are asked. In this study I have deliberately used this dynamic and the interview guide is meant to steer the discussion in a certain way. At times the questions have been vague in order to capture what the respondent associate with continuity and handover in their work situation, and what they perceive as problems. In other situations the questions have been very direct, in order to get specific examples of general problems mentioned.

The good interview effect, is when the discussion leads to the respondents (predominantly in the group interview) hearing one another’s views and taking an influence from this. It may not be of a special value to the study, but perhaps to the organization and individuals involved. To me this is a desirable side effect in this particular type of research. It can lead to better understanding of the issue, and to better relations between individuals.

what have been discussed before is if they ought to be overlapping... /CSB Interesting! /SB (Appendix C, quote 89)

my guess is that it has to with personality... I mean, if you are an engaged person then you are drawn to engagement ... /CSB yes, partly that, but also, I think another personality trait is that you are the first so speak out when something is not right /SB Yeah, that is probably an important point as well... /CSB (Appendix C, quote 90 (84, 86))
Sometimes the group interview can have a positive effect for the study as well, as participants help each other to remember things that would otherwise have been left out even though important to the forgetful informant:

*and those [mentioned by SB] could be seen as examples of that – I had totally forgotten about them /CSB (Appendix C, quote 91)*

*...and then we have done presentations during lectures for freshmen /SB that’s true - there’s a thing we do as well... to make the SBs known, to go visit the A-courses /CSB (Appendix C, quote 92)*

**Reflections on results**

As the observant reader may have noticed, in the previous chapter I suggest both that there ought to be less and more actives in US. I argue for fewer SBs at the same time as I argue for a better way to divide tasks now performed by SBs on fourth level actives who are currently not involved. Therefore an elaboration on this is motivated.

Firstly, I do not argue for fewer SBs per se. The suggestion is to divide the budget at hand in fewer, but larger pieces, to make it more productive. Regarding the level below SB, there are three main reasons why they are different from the SB-level:

1. **Representation on boards is among the most important activities of US.** Sometimes this task is not performed, because the SBs do not have the time. SBs need more time for getting familiar with their role, and for appointing student representatives besides one self, in accordance with the job description. The representatives (fourth level actives) have only their own committee as their responsibility, and it's a much smaller area of responsibility than the SB-role.

2. **Getting more people involved.** To hand someone a smaller task, like the responsibility of student representation on a single board, is described as a good way to get new people involved. The student representatives can do this alongside their studies. They become a good base for recruitment who already have some knowledge of the organization when they start as for example SB or at C-level, as well as being themselves somewhat "tested" by the US.

3. **The SB role is a stress on the already overworked C-actives and the registry.** Fewer full time SB-s would give actives on the 1st and 2nd levels more time for other tasks, in that there would be fewer contacts to handle and to administrate, and in that a full time SB would be better equipped to solve their own problems to support the central level actives with the information they need. A fourth level representative is not a stress on the central actives but rather on the SBs.
Reflections regarding future research

For US in particular
The main suggestion here is to conduct a more comprehensive survey among actives within the organization to see to what extent they agree with the results in this study, - i.e. its definitions of problems and solutions - and what they might find more significant or better ways for a constructive development of US. Based on the results of the current study, focus group interviews ought to be one suitable method. It allows participants to draw from each others thoughts in building their own viewpoint, as well as provide a forum for voicing ideas and opinions.

For academic research in general
This study has not been able to prove that there exists an up to date and comprehensive overview of the scientific field of organizational development in non-profit organizations. Nor has it been able to prove the opposite. A good investment would be to set out to prove one of these. In the case that it is proven that there is no such overview, or work of orientation, readily available to researchers within concerned disciplines, another suggestions is to get started on one, place it well reachable within the organizational memory of the research community, and then to make use of it!
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För mer information om de olika delarna i organisationskartan, klicka på önskad organisationsdel.
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**Studenten:** Ungefär 35 000 studenter på grund- och forskarutbildningsnivå är medlemmar i Uppsala studentkår, vilket gör oss till Sveriges största studentkår.

**Föreningar och studieråd:** Finns eller bör finnas på varje institution. Föreningarna och råden är basen till studentinflytandet vid universitetet och fyller en oerhört viktig funktion då den lokala studiebevakningen sköts av dessa. Motsvarigheten för doktorander är doktorandföreningar och doktorandråd.

**Kårpartier:** Som medlem i ett parti jobbar man med studentfrågor och kan kandidera för valet till fullmäktige. Alla medlemmar i Uppsala studentkår kan starta ett parti.

**Kårfullmäktige (FUM):** Studentkårens högsta beslutande organ. Består av 41 ledamöter från olika kårpartier. Fullmäktiges uppgift är att ange riktlinjer för och övervaka kårens verksamhet. Fullmäktige sammanträder ungefär en gång i månaden och mötena, som annonseras i bl a Ergo och på hemsidan, är öppna för alla kårens medlemmar.
Studiebevakare: (Tidigare kallade fakultetssamordnare). Avvorderade studenter som är utsedda av fullmäktige för att ha speciellt ansvar för utbildningsfrågorna på de olika fakulteterna. Varje fakultet har alltså minst en student som arbetar med att samordna och stimulera studentinflytandet på just den fakultets institutioner.


Appendix B - Interview guide

INTERVJUGUIDE

praktiska frågor kring intervjun och studien

informera om uppsatsens syfte

Att ta reda på behovet & förekomsten av överlämning inom Kåren, som ett exempel på en idédriven organisation med hög personalomsättning. Inom pedagogik=lärande inom Personalvetarprogrammet. Som tack ta del av studien.

upplägg för intervjun


Bakgrundsfakta om informanterna:

Namn, ålder, utb & nuvarande roll i organisationen
(pluggar samtidigt, arvoderad?)

Tidigare roll i US: Vilka roller har du haft inom kåren?

Hur ser din engagemangsskarriär ut?

Frågor om arbetsuppgifter och överlämning:

Hur länge har du ansvarat för dessa uppgifter (nuvarande roll)?

Hur länge har du varit verksam i organisationen totalt?

Samma [person 2]

Hur kommer det sig att du har det här uppdraget idag? Hur gick det till när du fick det?

Samma [person 2]

När slutar du vara ansvarig för denna uppgift?

Samma [person 2]

Liten ÖVNING om [person 2]'s roll: [person 1 & 2] var sitt papper (pennor).

Vad är dina arbetsuppgifter?

Vad fick du för överlämning då du tog över (stolpar, så ska vi prata om dem sen)?

Billet: skriftligt material, modelling, coaching, scaffolding/fading, introduktion.

(Om bredvidgående, var det du eller företrädaren som gick bredvid?)

Prata om övningen: Först [person 1], sedan [person 2]: Vad har du skrivit?

Diskussion (se checklista nedan). inkl [person 1]'s roll.
Har jag fått med?
*arbetsuppgifter? (Ingår överlämning?)
* Har ni egna tankar om överlämning? Vad vore bra? Vad vore dåligt? Hur kommer din egen överlämning att se ut?
* Vilka problem upplever du att ni ställs inför då en nyckelperson byts ut och dennes kunskap ska lämnas vidare till efterträdaren?
* Tror du att lärande och kunskapsförvaltning inom organisationen generellt sett är stora/intressanta frågor för studentkårer och andra studentorganisationer?
* organisationskarta, manualer, arbetsbeskrivningar. Uppdateras? Kan hittas?
* återkomma med följdfrågor på mejl? (ny teoretisk information, spec. vad ni menar i intervjun). Ev hjälp med att hitta dokument
* Vad vill du tillägga?

Vid utviklingar:
- Du sa tidigare att… - är det rätt uppfattat? Håller du (andra personen) med om det?
Appendix C - Original quotes in Swedish.

quote 1
SB: "...i grundskolan redan var jag väldigt engagerad hela tiden - var med i elevråd och dylikt [och] har alltid velat vara med och påverka och ställa frågor. Och sen … anmälde [jag] mig som kursrådsrepresentant … för min seminariegrupp, och då kom jag in genom en vän, in i det lokala studieutskottet"
I: "men det var inte så att du såg ett papper eller nåt där det stod att vi söker folk som vill göra det här…"
A: "nej så var det inte utan det var … en av de som då var ordförande för den lokala organisationen, som satt på den posten [som] berättade om det"

quote 2
CSB: "…det var ju också på grund av en kompis som drog med mig, men precis som [SB] så har jag ju alltid varit engagerad … i elevrådsstyrelsen på högstadiet, och reagerar när jag tycker att det är nåt som inte stämmar"

quote 3
C: "eh, jag…halkade in […] de [hade] utlyst den här posten och inte fått in några ansökningar, så hade […] som var ordförande då gått ut till alla i huset och sagt men hörrni är det nån som känner nån? Så min kompis […] mejlade mig och sa är inte det här nåt som inte stämmer? Så då gjorde jag det och [sen] vart det så. Så det var ett riktigt bananskal…jag har aldrig varit intresserad av när jag tycker att det är nåt som inte stämmer"

quote 4
CC: "började komma mot slutet och började känna att jag vill […] inte bli färdig än, jag vill inte skriva min uppsats just nu - jag vill göra nånting annat. Och då vart jag med i nåt som [position 1], och så jobbade jag som det ett år…jag tror att jag började med [att] det var nån som övertygade mig om att jag borde ställa upp till kårvalet, så det började med att jag ställde mig på listan, sen så i och med det så hamnade jag i styrelsen och sen i och med det så förstod jag väl det där med [position 2:1] framför allt jag tänkte nog mycket på att det här är ju en typisk [CC's field of study] tjänst, här kan jag vara [field of study] på riktigt på nåt vis - jag såg det som ett år av praktik…” 

quote 5
"jag såg det dels i Ergo [Official press organ for US], jag såg det säkert på hemsidan också men jag visste ju litegrann att jag började ju lära känna kåren och se hur det fungerade och jag visste ju om att det fanns alla de här posterna, jag visste bara inte riktigt hur man blev vald till dom hur det funkade och sådär"
"jag hade haft en lärare som […] hade varit aktiv på kåren, [och] han delade ut nån liten såhär det här är kåren det är bra att känna till"

quote 6
"Det finns ingen arbetsbeskrivning för presidialer. Det brukar kallas att man inte vill binda fullmäktige och presidiet ska kunna vara föränderligt till sin natur /CC"
quote 7
... det som står där är ju det jag ska göra […] jag har den utskriven som hänger på min anslagstavla att kika i /CSB

quote 8
det gäller att försöka begränsa sig. Jag brukar väl försöka att inte jobba mer än 50 timmar i veckan, men…ibland gör man det ändå. Speciellt om det är saker och ting som händer på helgerna /CSB

quote 9
när det är som mest kan man behöva gå ifrån det man egentligen är stressad med för att göra nånting som är ännu mer akut /C

quote 10
det skulle vara kul att göra om dem men man hinner oftast inte /C

quote 11
det infördes för några år sen ett tidsrapporteringssystem så nu fyller man i , hur mycket man jobbar , så kan man se , och det gäller ju att försöka hålla sig runt 40 timmar för en heltidsarvodering och 20 för en halvtid och så vidare /CSB

quote 12
sen så är det ju många av flyersen som redan finns, som egentligen är klara som man bara går in och ändrar lite datum och kontaktuppgifter på /C

quote 13
skriftlig information tar inte människor till sig om man inte på nåt vis tvingar dem […] man måste ha nåt förhör på det, eller man måste liksom gå igenom frågorna och sen få den här skriftliga vid sidan av som en påminnelse /CC

quote 14
jag tror den bästa överlämningen sker när man har både en punktinsats och en långvarig insats … det som kanske är ett problem om man är kvar på ett kontor är att man glömmer bort punkinsatsen , och tvärtom , är man inte kvar på kontoret så glömer man bort det långvariga, att man beöver ses nån gång [ibland och kanske ta en fika] /CC

quote 15
jag började väldigt självständigt och gjorde mycket själv just för att det är så som man lär sig också. Och så fanns hon i andra korridoren så jag kunde springa dit när som helst och fråga, så det var jätteskönt

quote 16
tror jag att jag hade kunnat gjort det bättre själv… för nu var det mer att jag skummade igenom [överlämningen] och skummade igenom arbetsuppgiften, alltså … jag skulle ha läst det lite mer noggrant så att jag verkligens visste vad det var jag gav mig in på. Men jag tycker att jag fick en bra överlämning /C
quote 17
att man egentligen ska börja med att städa kontoret och rensa och se vad som finns...att kolla igenom [...] alla mappar och [så] ... det gjorde jag nån gång när jag fick tid i vårån, och hittade liksom ganska mycket rolig inspiration och sådär /C

quote 18
bland det viktigaste man kan göra i sin överlämning är ju i dagens samhälle, kanske inte förrut men nu, det är ju att begränsa sig - dvs vad man inte ska läsa /CC

quote 19
[pred.] gjorde massor med olika pärmar och skrev ut saker och [ordnade] dem i register...ganska rejält [ ] med material. Men [pred.] är en person som inte vill ha saker digitalt, [pred.] vill ha dem på papper och sådär, medans den personen som tar över efter [pred] är en person som ... jobbar med sin dator liksom ... så om [succ.] behövde den pärmen nån gång så stod den på kontoret och [succ.] hade inte läst den /CC

quote 20
och inte skriva för mycket heller, för då blir det ... svårt att sålla ut den viktiga informationen, utan fatta sig kort. [en SB] fick ett överlämningsdokument på 60 sidor, och det var ju... mer än vad som behövdes om man säger så /CSB

quote 21
men vad kan man säga [är lagom]... 5-10 sidor...? /CSB
ja jag skulle säga 10 sidor, [men det] kanske kan räcka med 5-10... /SB
jaa det borde man kunna få med det viktigaste [på], och sen kanske lägga in nån form av bilagor /CSB
det är frågan om man räknar in kontaktnät och sådär [då]... /SB
ja mycket är ju sånt också rent praktiskt [också] som du säger: kontaktnät, lista på bra personer att prata med, lite lösenord till mejlen och liknande saker /CSB

quote 22
...sen finns det ju risk att man glömmer det som funkade bra ... /CSB
...så kanske ta med det som fanns med I ens egen överlämning, plus det som man fick klura ut själv /SB

quote 23
partierna skulle lägga fram emot det hela ...att man tycker att partierna ska besluta alltså att kårvalet beslutar över året liksom och sen ska det kunna komma nya majoriteter... å andra sidan, tar man ett omlott-system så gör man ju att saker och ting blir lite mer stabila - man skapar ändå nån sorts kontinuitet, och att det inte behöver sluta saker såhär [tvärt] lika lätt ... /CC

quote 24
man kan ju fortfarande ha ett konstituerande fullmäktige i början där man väljer halva posterna och så har man ett fullmäktige längre fram, i november kanske, man kan ju ha det tidigare också så att man vet - det är ju inget farligt att välja personer innan de ska börja. [visserligen] så väljer ju det andra fullmäktiget för ett halvår över den andra men så blir det ju för alla /CC
så det är både inför vårtermin och hösttermin som man byter ut? /I
ja några byts ut, informationsansvarig och internationellt ansvarig, [tillsätts] i januari. /C

...och dessutom så, kommer jag in när folk redan hade suttit ett halvår, så då var det ju
ganska enkelt att följa med i deras mönster. /C

Fanns budgetutrymmet så skulle jag gärna ha heltidsstuciebevakare – jag tror att det
skulle gynna studiebevakningen … det är betydligt svårare att få tag i studiebevakarna
under tentaperioder av naturliga skäl. Så heltidsstuciebevakare vore att önska /CSB

arbetsuppgifterna för den här personen blir egentligen ganska stora, åtminstone om de
skulle fungera såpass bra som man skulle vilja. Och då borde den ju kanske vara på en
högre arvodenning, typ man kanske ... skulle lägga ihop dem och göra till en istället.
Problemet över huvud taget är ju när man delar på flera att man tror […] att man får
50 +50 men det får man ju inte för man måste ju ha samordning […] dem emellan
också /CC

det beror på vilken post det är - när man sitter här centralt så är det vanligast att man
går på, och så sitter man, och så går man av när mandatperioden är slut. Men för
studiebevakarna är det betydligt större omsättning under året, för de väljs ju formellt
på verksamhet, men då är det de som avgår vid nära för att de ska på utbyte till våren
och sen så kommer det in någon ny, och sen är det någon som avgår i slutet på terminen
och så kommer det in någon ny där, sen hittar man ingen ny så sen är det någon annan som
går upp från kvartstid till halvtid …/CSB

[...]svårt att göra nånting åt det där [] annat än att se till [] när personen får tjänsten
att man verkligern får personen att ransaka sig själv om de känner att de klarar av 25
eller 50% tillsammans med sina studier […] ja jag vet inte om det är en av de
huvudsakliga orsakerna till avhopp…Jag tror att det är mycket som du säger, att det är
någon som vill…dra utomlands helt enkelt

vissa har ju sagt det nu så jag vet [att de ska] söka utbyte till våren och… […]det kan
ju vara allt möjligt […]i och med att studiebevakarna studerar samtidigt så har man ju
e studie situation att ta hand om där också (precis /SB) /CSB

sen finns det ju de här studiebevakarna som kan hoppa på lite när som helst - lite när
det behövs, när den personen kan börja, o s v…. /C
...och sen så har det ju varit ett par andra utbildningsdagar... /SB
Ja, som den [vi] hade igår var du ju med... /CSB
Ja, jag var med ett par timmar /SB

det var väl ganska bra närvaro [...] även om en del försvann, och det var inte så många som sov över, men… /SCB

Jag har inte tänkt på det om jag har som uppgift att överlämna /SB
Det ingår ju i arbets[uppgiften] att överlämna, till sin efterträdare /CSB
... a precis, men det skulle jag nog göra oavsett men ja, om du säger det så är det klart att det ingår /SB

Finns det en arbetsbeskrivning för SB? /I
Det [...] skickat ut till er faktiskt
Var det i den där SB-pärmen?
Det borde finnas där /CSB

alla har ju viss del av arvoderingen för överlämning om jag inte minns fel, så även studiebevakarna har...(jaha du menar [man f]år lite pengar, aha, okej… /SB) /CSB

jag tillträdde väl mitt uppdrag i mitten av augusti va (15 augusti tror jag att det var /CSB) mitt är på ett år, lite mindre än ett år… det tar väl slut [...] jag tror det är första juni (jag tror att det är 15 juni /CSB) ok (jag är inte säker på det[15 juni], men du sitter på 10 månader /CSB) ok /SB

det är väldigt mycket kontinuerligt arbete för studiebevakarna /CSB

jaa det är det ju verkligen! Just själva studentrepresentationen - sitta med i olika nämnder[...]men jag tycker att jag får göra kul grejer [och det jag] ville göra - försöka göra min röst hörd och hjälpa studenterna. men jag tycker att det har varit väldigt mycket färre fall än vad jag trodde - fall där man får hjälpa en viss [student] /SB

vi krånglade jättelänge tex med paserkort, att försöka få dem. För ... vi väntade på fel person i ungefär 2 veckor, som då antagligen hade slutat. /SB

men ja, såna saker som bara så här i efterhand känns som otroligt onödigt tidsödande …verkligen [skratt]! Har spenderat mycket tid med såna där otroligt triviala saker… /SB
lösenord, och användarnamn och skicka brev - var finns kuvert, och om man behöver fylla på papper till skrivarn var finns det, om man vill ha ersättning för såna här utlägg , om man har köpt mötesfika , vem skriver på och vart går man … /CSB

så jag tycker det är svårt att uppnå _alla_ mål, men jag känner ju av när man verkligen hjälper någon och uppskattningen är ju ofta enorm /SB

even om det bara är ett tack i ett mejl, så betyder det ganska mycket för ens energi och ens entusiasm och engagemang - att man känner att det gör en skillnad /CSB

det brukar väl va ungefär den tiden[som SB är arvoderad för] ibland har det till och med varit mindre. men ibland så känner jag att det är mer […]om jag räknar _all_ tid jag lägger ner [på] email och läsningar av handlingar, olika frågor o diskussioner... /SB

men jag tror att […]det är en naturlig sak att uppleva ett slags överväldigande över hur mycket det är att göra... [och hur]lång tid det tar att driva igenom det /SB

det som problemet är är att det är så otroligt mycket kontinuerligt arbete som måste göras , och det blir väldigt lite tid över till det man egentligen vill göra /CSB

vissa har jobbat där i ganska många år och dom har ju inte det här att man ska komma in ett år och så ska man förändra världen , och lösa alla världens problem på det här året /CSB

… i det ska man dels överlämna sen ska man skriva verksamhetsberättelse i slutet vilket gör att versksamhetsberättelsen blir ganska viktig /CC

tanken är att man ska kunna ha överlämningsa samtidigt men i och med att den ena personen blir vald någon gång i maj kanske och ska börja i augusti så har dom kanske inte planerat att plötsligt vara på kåren i slutet av juni eller juli helt plötsligt för då är du någon annanstans /CC
en del börjar ju jobba, och jobbar kanske då någonstans där dom kommer ifrån, som inte alls är i Uppsala […] en del vill ju kanske ha lite ledigt …och åker bort kanske, och sedan ska dom börja plugga snart och då blir det svårt att fixa allting, den del får doktorandtjänst i Lund eller vad det nu kan vara […] man vill klämma in ganska mycket på den tiden [mellan juni och första september]
Sen kanske man kan ha det i augusti om det går, men oftast är det bättre om man kan lyckas få till det i juni redan, och då kanske drar mer sig sin [eftetradare] på lite olika möten, det var det jag såg till att göra […]
(Så inte bara för hans skull utan även för den styrelsen eller gruppen också? /I)
Ja, exakt. För dom har ju lite svårt att hängra med i att studenter byts hela tiden, så det kan vara jobbigt att [lära sig] namn, det kan vara bättre att "jaja, du är den nya studentrepresentanten", och strunta i namnet /CC

även om man är sliten så vill man ju ändå att den andra ska ta över med så bra fart som möjligt… /CSB

såna där otroligt triviala saker, eller -- nu är de triviala ... och jag önskar [att jag] kunde göra dom lite triviala för min efterträdare nu... /SB

man skulle helt enkelt tänka vad som varit bäst för mig och sen skulle jag prata med min kollega vad som varit bäst för henne , och de mest användbara råden och dokument och… kontakter. Det är ju en hel del sociala aspekter också som har tagit tid att få samman […] och även de här praktiska sakerna som vi pratat om , man skulle kunna gå med dem och introducera och få dem att få nycklar till kontoren och sånt där på en gång /SB

[jag tycker nog att] kansliet är ganska dålig på överlämning till förtroendevalda. Om jag fick välja så skulle jag vilja att de alla var lite aktiva och sa att nu ska vi ha den här långa dagen, eller veckan kanske till och med, när vi har överlämningar om hur det funkar här på kåren /CC

[jag tror säkert att] personalen ibland har råkat ganska illa ut när presidialerna inte […] förstår hur man ska hantera personalen och sådär, så dom har nog en ide om att de ska ligga lite lågt ibland också... /CC

dels liksom koden för att komma in, vad händer när ett larm går, kan man stänga av larmet om man har nåt möte sent på kvällen och såna här jättepraktiska saker, utskrifter ... om färgutskrifter kostar mer än inte färg - för att göra det billigt och bra... /CC
sen kan man väl lära... komma överrens kanske snarare om hur man ska hantera köket och diskmaskinen, och får man ha möten i köket till exempel eller inte. Norreda ... hur man bokar. Och också prata om de olika [kansli-]funktionerna... /CC

Receptionen och skriva in folk och sånt förstås också [...]det måste lära sig den nån gång i juni litegrann. för att kunna ta hand om den under juli [när personalen har semester]. och sen [tar] nån av de förtroendevalda tar hand om den en gång i veckan pga att personalen har personalmöte.

Jag tycker att kansliet, kanslichefen framförallt, bör ha med det lite grand. [...] tillsammans med presidiet. Och presidiet måste ju vara övertygade om att det är en bra idé att gå igenom sådana saker. Presidiet har inte det på sin agenda, dom har inte ens tänkt på det /CC

even om man är sliten så vill man ju ändå att den andra ska ta över med så bra fart som möjligt… /CSB

Jag har inte tänkt på det om jag har som uppgift att överlämna /SB

Det finns ingen arbetsbeskrivning för presidialer. Det brukar kallas att man inte vill binda fullmäktige och presidiet ska kunna vara föränderligt till sin natur... /CC

Det som kanske är ett problem om man är kvar på ett kontor är att man glömmer bort punktinsatsen, och tvärtom - är man inte kvar på kontoret så glömmer man bort det långvariga , att man behöver ses nån gång. /CC

... studieutskottet som SB-na samlas [i] varannan vecka /CSB

vi har haft presidieluncher, alltså överlämningar via presidium /CC

... sfs har kommit hit och pratat om [att] vara en bra ledare t ex, och hur man ska bedriva kampanj. Och en liten kurs om härskartekniker. /C

...och sen så har det ju varit ett par andra utbildningsdagar... /SB

Det är svårt att nå ut till 35 000 studenter... /CSB
quote 71
Har du nåt bra tips på det här så tar vi gärna emot det /CSB

quote 72
...det är ju svårt att hitta folk som vill sitta o binda upp sig... /CSB.

quote 73
...och så hade de utlyst den här posten och inte fått in några ansökningar /C

quote 74
Så hade […] som var ordförande då gått ut till alla i huset och sagt men hörni är det nån som känner nån? Så min kompis […] mejlade mig och sa är inte inte det här nånting för dig? /C

quote 75
när man åker till sfs-fum till exempel […] så behöver man en 50 personer nätning och det är ju fler än vad som jobbar på kåren eller som sitter i fullmäktige […] och det är ett typiskt tillfälle när man ser till att rekrytera in lite extra människor som kommer från nånstans ifrån […] och gör man det bra så får de ett ansvarsområde och får liksom uppgiften att den här lilla åsikten bör du försöka framföra och försöka föra in i de här dokumenten som vi ska anta och så får de gå ut och försöka loa in den tillsammans med andra kårer och det ger dem ett eget ansvar det ger dem en liten, men ändå en kunskap, om kåren. Och man har kurser innan och är en ganska bra väg in - man blir liksom intresserad […] så den har funkat väldigt bra som rekryteringsbas och man tar ju och plockar en buss full med människor och åker iväg till en annan stad och är där i 4-5 dagar och sover alldeles för lite, har lite festligheter på kvällen […] och det är mycket socialt. Man ser att det finns fler, att det finns ett sammanhang. Alltså hela miljön gynnar liksom rekrytering... /CC

quote 76
Men nå , har jag frågor så brukar jag kontakta juridiska avdelningen på universitetet… /CSB

quote 77
[man] vet vem man ska vända sig till om man har en fråga som rör pedagogik , och man vet vem man ska prata med om det gäller kvalitetsfrågor osv /CSB

quote 78
Ja, eller att nån gång under kaffepausen så kommer dom och börjar prata med [en] och då visar de att det finns folk man kan fråga och [som] man kunde vända sig till /SB ( ja, som tar sig tid /CSB)

quote 79
och vissa av de där personerna börjar ju med att [skicka] väldigt mycket mejl /CSB

quote 80
Det har varit mycket … passiv introduktion … När man ställer frågor brukar man ofta få fler svar. Både från personal på fakulteten och från kåren. Och det har varit lätt att ställa frågor och få svar. /SB
Men han eller hon tar ändå ofta tid för oss å svara på våra frågor och diskutera aktuella frågor. Han eller hon delar gärna med sig av saker uppifrån och är en väldigt vänlig människa.

…men också de personer som sitter som tillsvidareanställda på universitetet, som har, enormt bra koll.

vi krånglade jättelänge tex med paserkort, att försöka få dem. För ... vi väntade på fel person i ungefär 2 veckor, som då antagligen hade slutat.

norm vet jag inte, men det är ganska vanligt att de som är engagerade [i US] har varit det tidigare … min gissning är att det handlar om personlighet (Jaa) … jag menar är man en engagerad person så drar man sig till engagemang - antingen här eller på nation eller i nån förening.

tycker du att det finns en sån uppdelning som engagemangspersoner (Jaa) och icke engagemangspersoner /I

Jaa, det gör det ju, och det gäller ju här också … det är ju många som är väldigt sådär engagerar sig och det är 100 projekt på gång inom olika [saker]. Men jag är inte en av dem. /C

ja dels det… Jag tror också att [...] ett annat personlighetsdrag är att man är [...] den första att säga till när något är fel…

Tiden känns ofta längre när man är yngre, och som student är det ofta likaså omvälvande.

[det] händer mycket i livet för en student … plötsligt befinner man sig någon annan stans och så fränsäger man sig sitt uppdrag …

det som har pratats om tidigare är om […] de satt omlott … Intressant! /SB

min gissning är att det handlar om personlighet - jag menar är man en engagerad person så drar man sig till engagemang…

ja dels det, men jag tror också att ett annat personlighetsdrag är att man är [...] den första att säga till när något är fel…

joo det är nog också en viktig poäng
där kan nog de där [mentioned by SB] komma in också - dom hade jag helt glömt bort /CSB

...och så har vi gått ut på föreläsningar för förstaårsstudenter /SB justja, det görs ju också... för att göra det känt att SB finns, att gå ut i a-kurserna /CSB
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Utlysta poster

1. Utlysta poster

**Studiebevakare, samhällsvetenskapliga fakulteten**

Vill du bli studiebevakare på den samhällsvetenskapliga fakulteten?


Vi söker en studiebevakare som arvoderas på halvtid. Om du har frågor är du välkommen att kontakta studentombudet Märta.

Du kan också höra av dig till ordförande Kristina Ekholm ordf@us.uu.se, eller 018-480 31 01, som även tar emot ansökan senast 7 december.

- Utlysta poster

**Studiebevakare, språkvetenskapliga fakulteten**

Vill du bli studiebevakare på den språkvetenskapliga fakulteten?


Vi söker två stycken studiebevakare som arvoderas på kvartstid. Om du har frågor är du välkommen att kontakta studentombudet Märta.

Du kan också höra av dig till ordförande Kristina Ekholm, ordf@us.uu.se, eller 018-480 31 01, som även tar emot ansökan senast 7 december.
För att säkra studenternas inflytande vid lärosätena införs ett särskilt statsbidrag till kårerna.
Bidraget är på 105 kronor per helårsstudent.
"Kårobligatoriet är lika fel som en gång kollektivanslutningen till socialdemokraterna och statskyrkan var", säger högskole- och forskningsminister Lars Leijonborg i ett pressmeddelande.
Sveriges omkring 340.000 högskolestudenter har laglig rätt att vara representerade i högskolans alla beslutande organ. Å andra sidan måste en student i dag vara medlem i en studentkår, som utser representanter.
Årsavgiften ligger på i snitt 500 kronor, pengar som främst går till arvoden för representanter i högskolans olika beslutande organ. Avgiften går också till bostadsförmedling och annan social service.
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