



BI Norwegian Business School - campus Oslo

GRA 19703

Master Thesis

Thesis Master of Science

Leading through change: A qualitative study of culture and leadership's impact on the implementation of "Nærpolitireformen"

Navn: Ane Aurora Brynildsen, Duyen Phuong Thi Nguyen

Start: 15.01.2019 09.00

Finish: 01.07.2019 12.00

Master Thesis

BI Norwegian Business School

Leading through change: A qualitative study of culture and leadership's impact on the implementation of “Nærpolitireformen”

Date of submission:

01.07.2019

Examination code and name:

GRA 19703 Master Thesis

Supervisor:

Cathrine Filstad

Program:

Master of Science in Leadership and Organizational Psychology

“This thesis is a part of the MSc program at BI Norwegian Business School. The school takes no responsibility for the methods used, results found and conclusions drawn”

Content

SUMMARY	IV
1. INTRODUCTION	1
2. RESEARCH QUESTION	2
3. CASE DESCRIPTION: THE NORWEGIAN POLICE SERVICE	3
4. ANALYSIS OF THE NORWEGIAN POLICE SERVICE	3
4.1 THE 22 ND OF JULY COMMISSION	4
4.2 THE POLICE ANALYSIS	4
4.3 PROP. 61 LS (2014 - 2015)	5
4.4 THE POLICE REFORM (“NÆRPOLITIREFORMEN”)	6
4.5 EVALUATIONS OF THE WORK WITH IMPLEMENTING THE POLICE REFORM	8
5. LITERATURE REVIEW	10
5.1. ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE AND POLICE CULTURE	10
5.1.1 <i>Defining organizational culture</i>	10
5.1.2 <i>How to change an organizational culture?</i>	12
5.1.3 <i>Police culture</i>	15
5.2 LEADERSHIP AND POLICE LEADERSHIP	16
5.2.1 <i>Defining leadership</i>	16
5.2.2 <i>Approaches to leadership</i>	18
5.2.3 <i>The trait approach to leadership</i>	18
5.2.4 <i>The behavior approach to leadership</i>	18
5.2.5 <i>Other approaches to leadership</i>	19
5.2.6 <i>Towards a more integrative approach to leadership</i>	20
5.2.7 <i>Leadership in the Norwegian Police Service</i>	21
5.3 CHANGE PROCESSES	22
5.3.1 <i>Defining organizational change</i>	23
5.3.2 <i>Different approaches to understanding change</i>	23
5.3.3 <i>Reactions to change</i>	25
6. RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODS	26

6.1 RESEARCH METHOD	26
6.2 DATA COLLECTION	27
6.2.1 Informants	27
6.2.2 Interview guide	28
6.2.3 Conducting the interviews	29
6.3 QUALITY CRITERIA	30
6.4 DATA ANALYSIS.....	31
6.5 ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS	32
7. RESULT AND DISCUSSION	33
7.1 SUMMARY OF MAIN FINDINGS	33
7.1.1 Organizational culture	33
7.1.2 Leadership	37
7.1.3 Reflections about the implementation of the Police Reform	39
7.2 CULTURE AND LEADERSHIP’S IMPACT ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE POLICE REFORM	40
7.2.1 Merging of police districts	41
7.2.2 Closure of “lensmannskontor”	42
7.2.3 Focus on centralization	44
7.2.4 A changed organizational culture?	45
7.2.5 Leading in a changing environment	47
8. PRACTICAL IMPLICATIONS AND FURTHER RESEARCH.....	54
9. CONCLUSION	57
10. BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	59
11. APPENDICES.....	74
APPENDIX 1: LIST OF ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS.....	74
APPENDIX 2: TRANSLATIONS	75
APPENDIX 3: REPORTS, ANALYSIS AND EVALUATIONS.....	76
APPENDIX 4: APPROVED APPLICATION NSD	77
APPENDIX 5: CONSENT DECLARATION (“SAMTYKKEERKLÆRING”)	78
APPENDIX 6: INTERVIEW GUIDE	81

Acknowledgements

This thesis is written by Ane Aurora Brynildsen and Phuong Duyen Thi Nguyen, as a concluding part of achieving a Master of Science in Leadership and Organizational Psychology at BI Business School in Oslo. The topic for investigation is the implementation of the Police Reform (“Nærpolitireformen”), and how this implementation has been affected by the culture and leadership within the Norwegian Police Service. The inspiration behind the chosen subject was originally retrieved from own interests, but also the current relevance of the subject. We hope that this thesis will contribute to the research field, and shed light on the major changes occurring in the Norwegian Police Service right now. This master thesis has been written in collaboration with our supervisor Cathrine Filstad and the Norwegian Police University College (“Politihøgskolen” - PHS).

The process of writing this thesis has been interesting and insightful, which have challenged us both professional, personally, and as a team. It has been an informative process for all parts.

We would like to thank all the interviewees that have taken time in their hectic work life in which they have contributed with their knowledge and reflections about the chosen topic. We would also like to thank the Norwegian Police University College that has contributed with funds in our data collection. Additionally, we would like to thank our supervisor for being a good sparring partner and a good inspiration for our thesis. Finally, we want to thank our friends and family for their support and encouraging words.

Oslo, 01.07.2019

Ane Aurora Brynildsen

Phuong Duyen Thi Nguyen

Summary

Public organizations may change gradually through continuous small evolutionary changes or adjustments, through conscious changes made by political and administrative leaders, as a result of external shocks - or through a combination of all three. The attack at Utøya on the 22nd of July 2011 constituted such a shock and triggered a change process of the Norwegian Police Service. This led to the implementation of the Police Reform (“Nærpolitireformen”) and the implementation process has been characterized by different values, goals, expectations and results.

The purpose of the present study is to explore how organizational culture and leadership has influenced the implementation of the Police Reform. The study investigates the existing culture in several police districts, and reveals how this culture has been affected by the changes. The organizational culture within the Norwegian Police Service is highly complex, and studies, analysis and reports has revealed some very positive sides of the culture, that is important to protect, but also some unfortunate sides, that need to be improved in order to become and effective and well-functioning organization. In particular, leaders in the Norwegian Police Service have a major responsibility when it comes to inform, delegate and commend the changes occurring within the organization. In a changing environment where the organizational culture, the work methods and the dynamics of the organization changes the leaders have a difficult job in fulfilling these demands.

The study illuminates the aspects of the change process, and by reflections and thoughts from important leaders within the Norwegian Police Service, the reader will get a broad insight of the positive and negative sides of the implementation of the Police Reform. Surprisingly, most leaders that were interviewed seem to be positive towards the changes. Their reflections however, reveals that the major structural and qualitative changes that has occurred within the Norwegian Police Service the last years, have had an effect on the organizational culture, which in accordance with the different ways of leading the organization has led to a laborious and exhausting process.

1. Introduction

Today's organized crime shows greater mobility, more complex offenses, a professionalization among the people committing crimes and a greater degree of internationalization and multi-crime. An increased population growth, changes in the distribution of the population, partly prominent changes in the composition, and more information and communication technology lead to the extent of criminal activities increasing at a faster pace than earlier. Although registered crime in both Norway and the rest of Northern Europe is decreasing (Lid & Stene, 2011), it is becoming increasingly complex, cross-bordered and organized. These developments have already put the current police model under considerable pressure when it comes to requirements for specialized expertise, new working methods, systems and responsiveness, and to be able to cope with these changes the Police Service need to adapt to the changes in the society.

Consequently, expectations of the Norwegian Police Service (NPS) has augmented as they have the responsibility of delivering an effective and well-functioning police service, protect life and property, and enforce the law. In order for the NPS to be able to cope with the changes and reach expectations, the NPS need to be strengthened, which in turn highlights the need for an organizational change, or specifically - a police reform. Reforms in the public sector have existed for the last three decades and have become a perpetual motion machine which is seen as a political instrument leading to major changes in the organizational structures within the public sector (Larsson & Sørli, 2018). Reforms are used as a political instrument carried out with the goal of implementing changes, and often arise as a political response of a crisis of trust. Policing institutions, both in a Norwegian context and internationally, are currently under pressure to change as they all face similar problems with issues linked to public opinions, effectiveness, public demands on availability and presence, trust in the police and commitment to the police as an institution (Hough, Jackson, Bradford, Myhill & Quinton, 2010; Haake, Rantatalo & Lindberg, 2017).

One of the crucial events that really put the Norwegian Police Reform into action was the unexpected attack in Oslo/Utøya 22nd of July 2011. The attack caused several damages on Norway's democratic institutions and their

departments, and the Norwegian Police Service received substantial attention regarding their managing of the situation. In the aftermath of this incident, there have been placed an increased focus on leadership as well as organizational changes to face the Norwegian Police Services' perceived problems, and for that reason, leadership is at the forefront of the present reform discourse. Leaders are supposed to undertake the role of "change agents" (Dunphy, Griffiths & Benn, 2007), steering the organization in a new desired direction. However, reforms involve more than simply structural changes, and simultaneously, the organizational culture is important to take into account (Glomseth, 2015a). Organizational culture is both central and important concerning the results and behavior of any organization (Glomseth, 2019) in addition to the execution of leadership, which in turn can have an impact on how change initiatives are implemented successfully.

2. Research question

The relevant issue to be investigated in this master thesis will be the relationship between organizational culture and leadership and how these two concepts have influenced the implementation of the new Police Reform. Several factors can have an impact on how a change process are implemented - however, within the Norwegian Police Service organizational culture and leadership has been highlighted as prominent in the implementation process. Major changes in organizations may cause certain problems and/or challenges in the daily structuring of their work. The change within the NPS is notably interesting in the aftermath of Utøya, other terror events internationally, and in addition to change management in other organizations. The research question this thesis attempts to answer is: *"How does the organizational culture and leadership in the Norwegian Police Service influence the implementation of the Police Reform?"*

This thesis continues with a description of the Norwegian Police Service. Further the thesis present the steps of implementing the Reform, as well as evaluations of the implementation process up until today. Then, a literature review of theory on organizational culture, leadership and change processes follows. The methods employed to conduct data collection is then presented, before evaluating our results in a discussion of relevant theories, principles and experiences to

answer the given research question. Lastly, practical implications, limitations, and a conclusion will be presented.

3. Case description: The Norwegian Police Service

The Norwegian Police Service is a national government agency in Norway and is largely based on the principle of an integrated police service where all functions of the police service is collected and work together in one organization. In its organization and its mission, the Norwegian Police Service highly differs from other public sectors, except the Norwegian Armed Forces (Johannessen, 2015). The NPS has the authorization to execute legitimate violence on behalf of the Norwegian state, and is therefore a subject of strong political, democratic and legally control formally structured by the Ministry of Justice and Public Security. Accordingly, the NPS can be viewed as a professional bureaucracy with professional employees and as a knowledge-intensive institution with demanding tasks (Glomseth, 2015a). In addition, the NPS is a professional organization with major focus on preparedness in a complex organization which are governed by two distinct organization- and leadership practices; a legally-bureaucracy practice and a military-operative practice. On the one hand, the NPS is associated with a legal understanding of how organization and leadership should be executed through bureaucracy type of organization. On the other hand, the NPS has a military understanding on how organization and leadership is executed in an operative organization with the intention to fight crime and maintain the community order (Johannessen, 2015). Moreover, the NPS can be viewed as an organization that are constructed to realize specific goals, trying at all times to be organized, equipped and provided with resources that enables them to solve their tasks in a secure manner of high quality (Glomseth, 2015a).

4. Analysis of the Norwegian Police Service

In the aftermath of the 22nd of July 2011, several analysis and evaluations of the Norwegian Police Service has been carried out in order to contribute to the knowledge and understanding of what went wrong during the shooting at Utøya, but also to assess the Norwegian Police Service's use of resources, expertise, leadership and the organization (Solem, 2016). These include the Report from the 22nd of July Commission, the Police Analysis, the resulting government proposal

and parliamentary discussions. Conclusions from these central public reports and official documents have led to conclusions that there has been, and still are, major challenges in the Norwegian Police Service. This has however, led to more knowledge on how to develop, which areas for improvements, and how to - by several changes - strengthen the Norwegian Police Service with the implementation of the Police Reform.

4.1 The 22nd of July Commission

The 22nd of July Commission (“Gjørøvkommisjonen”) was an independent commission set up by the Norwegian government in the aftermath of 22nd of July. Their mission was to analyze the situation and go through the happenings prior and after 22nd of July 2011, with the intention of analyzing what happened, why did it happen, as well as promote suggestions for improvement necessary to develop future preparedness (NOU 2012:14, 2012). The Commission pointed towards several weaknesses in regards to the effort utilized by the NPS during this day, and promoted suggestions for improvement and initiatives to facilitate better solving of tasks and more effective use of resources in the NPS. The Commission also promoted changes in planning work and procedures, in allocating competence and resources, organizational culture, prioritizes and focus, and even the society's attitude (NOU 2012:14, 2012). Overall, the Commission pointed to improvements in issues in leadership, interaction, culture and attitudes as main areas to focus on within the organization. Some of these changes are and have been easy to change by an authority, with the presence of political willingness. Others, such as attitudes, leadership and culture, has to be developed and changed over time. The Commission never actually defined what was meant by these features. Their suggestions for improvement were meant, in accordance to their beliefs, to prepare both the society and individuals better capable of meeting future challenges.

4.2 The Police Analysis

In November 2012, the Minister of Justice at that time, Grete Faremo, initiated actions and initiatives in the committee called “Politianalyseutvalget”. The main focus of this analysis was to point out that the future Norwegian Police Service need to work towards meeting complicated, serious and transboundary

crime as well as deliver a good police service where the population lives (NOU 2013:9, 2013). The Police Analysis suggested to change the organizational structure of the police, mainly by strengthening the central agency and the merging of regional police districts and local police stations, and addressed the need to strengthen the competence of the police. Accordingly, the Police Analysis emphasized the need to implement two types of reforms: the Structure Reform (“Strukturreformen”), encompassing task-based changes and a new structure, with the aim of freeing up resources for core tasks but also to create the preconditions for a competent and robust police with a resilient professional milieu and specialists at the regional and local level (NOU 2013:9, 2013). Second, the Quality Reform (“Kvalitetsreformen”) has been implemented in order to develop a more knowledge-based and effective Police Service capable of continually improving its leadership processes, competence and performance (NOU 2013:9, 2013). Overall, the Police Analysis focused more on structural issues rather than on competence and quality, and alluded the emphasis on culture and leadership in its emphasis on a quality reform.

4.3 Prop. 61 LS (2014 - 2015)

Based on the Police Analysis, consultations with stakeholders and negotiations with supporting parties in the Norwegian Parliament, the government sent the parliament its final proposal for a reform 6th of March 2015, and the Police Reform (“Nærpolitireformen”) was adopted on the 10th of June 2016. The decisions made were grounded in the proposition Prop. 61 LS (2014-2015) (Justis- og beredskapsdepartementet, 2015) in which the proposition addresses the structure of the Norwegian Police Service, task portfolio and sharing of responsibility, as well as a review of the leadership and culture in the NPS. The proposition suggested improvements and strengthening of the Police Service through higher requirements to the service, fewer but more robust and competent police districts, increased collaboration between the Police Service and the municipalities, and fewer tasks for the Police Service (Justiskomiteen, 2015). The implementation of the Police Reform involves a long term development of the Norwegian Police Service in the years between 2015 and 2020 (<https://www.regjeringen.no>).

4.4 The Police Reform (“Nærpolitireformen”)

Referring to the government’s political platform, one of the main objectives in the Police Reform is to establish a Police Service that is; “Operational, visible and accessible, with a capacity to investigate and prosecute criminal acts, as well as ensure safety for the Norwegian citizens” (Justis- og beredskapsdepartementet, 2015, p. 5; Politidirektoratet, 2019). Further, to develop; “(...) a competent and efficient local Police Service close to the population. At the same time, robust professional environments has to evolve in order to be able to face the challenges of both today's and tomorrow’s delinquencies” (Justis- og beredskapsdepartementet, 2015, p. 5; Politidirektoratet, 2019). The main purpose is therefore to move away from empty “lensmannskontorer”, towards a Police Service that is present in local communities, are visible and accessible to all, as well as ensuring security for the citizens (Justiskomiteen, 2015). Overall, there are some main features of the Police Reform that are important in order to achieve the main objectives. The six objectives promote a more accessible and present police that provide equal service to the whole country, a more purposeful contribution when it comes to prevent crime, criminal investigation and high preparedness. The NPS should also improve its competence and capacity, and share knowledge and learn from experiences. The culture should be characterized by openness and trust, through effective and good leadership, and lastly the police should become a Police Service working more effectively by the use of better methods and new technology (<https://www.politiet.no/>).

In addition to being a competent, efficient and local police, present where the citizens live, as well as develop good academic environments that are equipped to meet today’s and tomorrow’s crime challenges, the Police Reform has six standard functions, which are meant to improve work methods and provide the police with better tools in fighting crime. The implementation of these six standard functions (“etterretning”, “politiråd”, “politikontakt”, “tjenestekontor”, “politipatruljen”, “operasjonsentralen” and “felles straffesaksinntak”) are seen in all police districts with support from the National Police Directorate (POD). The main goal is to provide equal quality, a more effective interaction, and facilitate

knowledge-driven and professional development (<https://www.politiet.no/>). Other important initiatives are the work with organizational culture, attitudes and leadership, prevention as a primary strategy, as well as “etterforskningsløftet” (<https://www.regjeringen.no>). In order to improve the organization, a large number of initiatives will contribute to the improvements of the Norwegian Police Service. The initiative can be organized into four main areas; a new structure of the Police Service, the leadership and governance of the Police Service must be strengthened, the Police Service have to develop better ways of working, and police work should be supported by new and better technological tools (<https://www.politiet.no/>).

A prominent and major change that has occurred through the last couple of years is the organizing of the Norwegian Police Service into fewer police districts. The NPS was previously organized in 27 police districts. However, from the 1st of January 2016 the amount of districts was reduced to 12 (<https://www.politiet.no/>). Restructuring of the police districts was grounded in decreasing the differences between the various police districts in size, volume and the scale of crime (<https://www.regjeringen.no/>). There was pointed out that the importance of reorganizing the NPS was important to achieve a professional and cost-effective service, and to ensure that the resources are used in accordance with the core tasks of the Norwegian Police Service. Administrative tasks are meant to be preserved within the given police district as well as in the geographical operating units (GDE), and not in the service department. The main purpose of the service departments is to ensure that the work directed to the population is carried out in collaboration with mobile units (<https://www.regjeringen.no>).

In the first phase of 2017, the organizational and structural dimensions of the Police Reform were central elements, while the more qualitative parts of the reform have come to the fore in the latter part of 2017, and have been central in 2018 and the time ahead (Rubecksen & Ryssdal, 2018). The Norwegian Government has claimed changes in quality that should be improved towards the end of 2020; better police service for the population, better prevention of crime, and more availability of the NPS, as well as better investigation and a more effective prosecution of serious crimes. Regjeringen.no (2019) present several

examples of such claims where; at least 90 per cent of the inhabitants in each police district should have no more than 45 minutes of driving to the closest service department, there should be an improvement of the response time when answering emergency calls, in other words over 95 per cent of all the calls to 112 need to be answered within 20 seconds, the service department should have flexible opening hours, and there should be police contacts visiting the different municipalities within a police districts several times a week (<https://www.regjeringen.no>). Naturally, when such radical changes are implemented, there are some adjustments both in the workforce and responsibilities which in turn can be confusing and difficult for people that are involved. These changes were however, argued to provide a more effective police service at the service departments, and at the places where the Norwegian citizens live.

4.5 Evaluations of the work with implementing the Police Reform

Throughout the past years and the work with the implementation of the Police Reform the Norwegian Police Service has undergone several evaluations of the implementation process, and four main evaluations are important to mention for further discussion (Bakli, Botheim & Lassen, 2017a, 2017b, 2018, 2019). The Agency for Public Management and eGovernment (“Direktoratet for forvaltning og IKT” - Difi) have by the Ministry of Justice and Public Security been assigned to annually evaluate the implementation of the Reform, and by the use of both quantitative and qualitative methods both in the form of data collection, interviews, media analysis, and reference groups, they have collected information about the progress of the implementation of the Reform and which areas in need of further improvements. Culture, attitudes and leadership has been major focus areas during the restructuring, as well as in discussions in the evaluations.

The first evaluation of the implementation process was presented in 2017, evaluating the implementation process in 2016 (Bakli et al., 2017a). The evaluation states that the work with the reform is demanding due to several objectives, but that the main challenge were the distrust from both employees and municipalities in the expected success of the reform, that the concept of “Nærpoliti” was in disrepute, and that there has been major communication

challenges because of the inherent tensions between the desire for local anchoring and more robust academic environments (Bakli et al., 2017a). The second evaluation, also presented in 2017, was a follow-up evaluation of the challenges presented in the evaluation presented earlier that year, and the main focus of this report was to evaluate the culture, attitudes, and leadership within the Norwegian Police Service, as these terms seem to have been used as a generic term for everything that is not working within the NPS. The evaluations presented in 2018 and 2019, presents most of the same issues addressed in the previous reports, with major elaborations on the importance of establishing a clear understanding of what is a desired organizational culture, and to understand the interaction of leadership in relation to the implementation of the Police Reform (Bakli et al., 2018; Bakli et al., 2019).

The evaluations presented between 2017 and 2019 (Bakli et al., 2017a, 2017b, 2018, 2019), report that the Police Service is doing a good job of implementing the reform as determined. This is due to the fact that employees in the NPS are loyal and concerned with their social responsibility. However, there are some important areas that the NPS need to focus on, for the implementation to function in the best possible way. The evaluations has through the past years pointed towards similar suggestions for improvements in the different evaluations, such as a need to clarify and have realistic goals of the implementation of the Police Reform and elaborate on priorities, an explanation of what is meant by “Nærpoliti” and include the employees in processes, focus on “politikontaktene”, put enough funds aside for the implementation, prioritizing of digitalization and IT, focus on already started projects, leaders and the Chief of Police in the different police districts need to make sure there are similar services in all police districts and promote the culture wished for, but also prioritize cultural differences within the different police districts, prioritize leadership, as well as evaluations of the resource distributions (Bakli et al., 2017a, 2017b, 2018, 2019). Through these evaluations there seem to be an imminent focus on culture, attitudes, and leadership.

This thesis will further focus on culture and leadership as important factors to discuss further, rather than attitudes. Attitudes are often mentioned in research

within studies of the Norwegian Police Service; however, we have not intended to map out or describe the attitudes of the employees directly, as the focus has mostly been on leaders. Even though attitudes influences the organizational culture, and vice versa, the description of an organizational culture will still to some extent reflect on dominated attitudes within the NPS.

5. Literature review

Culture and leadership seems to play an important role in the implementation of the Police Reform and it is therefore important to acquire a broad and general understanding of these concepts. The next chapter will present relevant literature on organizational culture, leadership and change processes. In the discussion this literature will be implemented and elaborated further.

5.1. Organizational culture and police culture

Every organization has its own atmosphere, ideology or climate, and within all organizations both leaders and employees develop specific ways in which they experience themselves, cooperate, interact with each other, interpret, prioritize, and solve tasks. Part of this culture is easily observable and easy to perceive, while other aspects are hidden, invisible, and often taken for granted. The organizational culture within an organization is characteristic for that organization, and in the same way as the organizational culture affect the people working there, the employees of that organization create and affect the organizational culture.

5.1.1 Defining organizational culture

Organizational culture is often referred to as the conscious as well as unconscious foundation in an organization (Kirkhaug & Glomseth, 2018), and one of the most widely accepted and most comprehensive definitions of organizational culture has been provided by Edgar Schein (1990). In his definition he distinguishes between three fundamental levels at which any culture manifests itself: (a) observable artifacts, (b) values, and (c) basic underlying assumptions;

... a pattern of shared basic assumptions learned by a group as it solved its problems of external adaptation and internal integration, which has worked well enough to be considered valid and, therefore, to be taught to new

members as the correct way to perceive, think, and feel in relation to those problems (Schein, 1990, p. 113).

This definition draws attention to a number of key characteristics of organizational culture that has come to be accepted by many, if not most, researchers within the field. These include the notion that organizational culture develops over time, that culture is based on practical experience in adapting to the environment, that it is shared by the members of an organization and that it influence how they think and feel, simultaneously with the fact that it is maintained by a process of socialization (Kummerow & Kirby, 2014). Values are viewed as the main foundation in the organizational culture, and can, according to Kirkhaug and Glomseth (2018), be defined as preferences towards a given attitude or behavior. Values are the expression of what is perceived as right and wrong, moral and immoral, fair and unfair, effective and ineffective. Culture is however, also possible to observe through so-called artifacts – external characteristics such as language, clothing and architecture (Higgins & McAllaster, 2004; Kirkhaug, 2018). The basic functions of a culture may constitute a barrier for development within the organization – both in negative and positive manners (Sørli & Larsson, 2018).

Since the establishment of the organizational culture construct, some organizational researchers have applied ideas directly from Schein (Pedersen & Sørensen, 1989; Pedersen, 1991), whereas others have challenged his approach when trying to define the concept (Hatch, 1993). Some researchers has noted the apparent ambivalence and ambiguity found in culture, and have contested the idea that the function of culture is to maintain social structure (Meyerson & Martin, 1987; Feldman, 1991; Martin, 1992), while researchers studying subcultures have disputed Schein's assumption that organizational cultures are unitary (Barley, 1983; Borum & Pedersen, 1990). Most discussions of organizational culture however (Cameron & Ettington, 1988; O'Reilly & Chatman, 1996; Schein, 2017), agree that culture is a socially constructed attribute of organizations that serve as a social glue binding organizations together and that the pattern of shared values and norms distinguishes an organization from another (Veiga, Lubatkin, Calori &

Very, 2000; Alvesson, 2002; Higgins & McAllaster, 2004; Cameron & Quinn, 2011). These shared values and norms indicate what is believed to be important in the organization, and what is to value to organizational members. The values and norms also indicate how things are done in the organization - 'we do it this way, not that way' (Skogstad & Einarsen, 2014). As well as providing direction and meaning for the organization's members, the values and norms energize organizational members in the pursuit of organizational purpose.

Organizational culture has been confused with the concept of climate (Ashkanasy, Wilderon & Peterson, 2000; Skogstad & Einarsen, 2014; Schneider & Barbera, 2014), and the constructs are often used interchangeably for understanding the ways employees experience their total work setting (Schneider & Barbera, 2014). Although there have been some differences in definitions around the edges, organizational climate research has pursued the shared meaning employees attach to the policies, practices, and procedures and the behaviors that get rewarded, supported, and expected at work (Schneider & Reichers, 1983; Schneider & Barbera, 2014). Climate is embedded in the physical look of the place, the emotionally exhibited by employees, the experience of visitors or new employees upon entry, as well as a myriad other artifacts that are seen, heard and felt (Ashkanasy et al., 2000). Both constructs are however seen as having numerous specific attributes but it is the connotations people derive from those attributes that represent the summary meaning or gestalt of the organization for them (Schneider & Barbera, 2014).

5.1.2 How to change an organizational culture?

Culture seems to be more resistant to change than climate (Schein, 2000). Under normal circumstances, values, norms and perceptions remain constant over time because the conditions that affect cultural background also remain relatively unchanged (De Jong, 2009; Petrakis & Kostis, 2013, 2014). Schein (2017) claims that organizational culture is both a dynamic phenomenon that surrounds us at all times, being constantly enacted and created by our interactions with others and shaped by leadership behavior. However, when implementing new strategies within an organization, the organizational culture can create barriers and the

concept of culture must be handled adequately (Iljins, Skvarciany & Gaile-Sarkane, 2015).

Reviewing the literature on how to, and whether it is possible to change an organizational culture, Max Weber was one of the first to emphasize the dynamic aspects of cultural change (Weber, 1978). By utilizing his dynamics theory, he explained the stable and structured aspects of culture rather than explaining change itself, and argued that all change in culture originated in the introduction of new ideas by a charismatic figure. Hatch (1993) compared and contrasted Weber's model with her own understanding of culture, and argued that her cultural dynamics model locates change in the trenches of everyday life in organizations. She argues that culture never stops changing; rather, it is in continuous dynamic flux (Hatch, 2000).

In later years, Sathe and Davidson (2000) reviewed the cultural change literature and made observations about two key unresolved assumptions of ideologies – where the first pertains to whether a culture's fundamental assumptions or ideologies can be changed, and the statement was argued in terms that some values and beliefs indeed can be changed (Ostroff, Kinicki & Tamkins, 2013). Their conclusions was supported by studies showing that cultural change programs resulted in changes in employee behaviors that were consistent with the desired culture (e.g. Langan-Fox & Tan, 1997), and that cultural change programs resulted in corresponding changes in organizational systems, structure, and strategy (Ogbonna & Harris, 1998). Accordingly, these positive results must be tempered by findings from case studies showing that employees' reactions to cultural change are not always what they seem. In a relevant case study, Ogbonna and Harris' (1998) results revealed that value changes were not uniformly positive and ranged from rejection to reorientation, and that some employees behavioral change actually represented resigned compliance rather than authentic change (Ostroff et al., 2013). Suthe and Davidson's (2000) second unresolved issue is associated with the decision of how best to refreeze (Lewin, 1951) or reinforce cultural change. That is, should management use extrinsic and intrinsic forms of reinforcement, and when should they be used? They concluded that both forms of reinforcement are needed at different points in the change process. Gilmore, Shea

and Useem (1997) identified four key side effects or unintended consequences of culture change initiatives based on their personal observations of culture change across numerous organizations over the course of six years. *Ambivalent authority* describe the ambivalence of who is responsible for leading change and who decides what must change, *polarized images*, meaning the contrasting images of and comfort with the new and old ways of doing things can polarize employees, *disappointment blame*, are the resistance and disappointment when initial success occur, and *behavioral invasion*, are the new values, beliefs and behaviors that are absorbed into old ones, making the old seem new and this preserving that status quo without appearing to do so (Ostroff et al., 2013).

Leaders play an important role when changing a culture, with the power to influence the organization with their definitions of reality (Ostroff et al., 2013), and three recent studies can highlight the influence leaders have on a the organizational culture (Schneider, Ehrhart & Macey, 2013). Ogbonna and Harris (2000) examined the extent to which the effects of three styles of leadership (supportive, participative and instrumental) on organizational performance were mediated by organizational culture. They found partial support for culture as a mediator, with some leader behaviors having direct effects on performance. Tsui, Wang and Xin (2006) revealed in their studies that strength of leadership and strength of culture were related, and that some leaders are able to build strong culture through institution-building behaviors (working in the background to build strong organizational systems) rather than performance-building (showing energy and articulating a vision). Lastly, Berson, Oreg and Dvir (2008) studied the relationship between CEO values, organizational culture, and a firms performance, and concluded that the CEO's value of self-direction was positively associated with an innovative culture, security value was positively related to a bureaucratic culture, and benevolence value was positively associated with a supportive culture. According to Schein (2017), leader's impact on the organizational culture is shaped through six factors: where their attention, goals and control are directed, their reactions on critical events and crisis, how leaders allocate resources, their role modelling, coaching and training approaches, criteria for rewards and status, and with recruitment and selection, promotions, and turn-

off factors. When the organization is well-established, the culture will influence the organization, and make it susceptible for certain types of leadership. However, several researchers claim that culture is something that cannot be controlled, but it is something that grows within an organization as a result of several influential factors and processes (Alvesson, 2002; Weick, 1979).

5.1.3 Police culture

The concept of police culture has been studied for more than fifty years (Westley, 1953; Banton, 1964; Paoline, 2004), and the comprehension of culture in the police literature is primarily drawn from anthropological and sociological research (Chan, 1997). Early studies of police culture tended to treat the concept as monolithic with characteristics such as cynicism, authoritarianism, racism, sexism, suspicion, isolation, and solidarity (Cordner, 2017). This led to the understanding of police culture as an essentially negative concept (Cockcroft, 2015). However, over the last 20 years researchers have challenged some of the more simplistic conceptions of police culture and the research on police culture still continues to interest contemporary scholars (Chan, 1996, 1997; Christensen & Crank, 2001; Cockcroft, 2013; Crank, 2015), and we now see an interest in also studying the positive sides of the police culture.

According to Chan (1996) the concept of police culture originally emerged from ethnographic studies of routine police work, which uncovered a layer of informal occupational norms and values operating under the apparently rigid hierarchical structure of police organizations (Manning, 1977; Holdaway, 1983). The concept of police culture in the criminological literature is loosely defined, but Manning (1989) define police culture as collectively accepted ways in experiencing oneself, as well as ways of understanding the reality and their work. Reiner (1992a) equates it with; “the values, norms, perspectives and craft rules” that inform police conduct (p. 360). Police culture can therefore be perceived as a set of understandings that help to cope with the pressure and tension that the police service is confronted with (Reiner, 1992b). Skolnick (1966) speak of; “the working personality” of a police officer – in response to the danger of police work, the authority of the police constable, and the pressure to be both productive and efficient in their work. Essentially, police culture is a set of ideas, customs,

accepted practices, information and rules of conduct, and core skills that define ‘good police work’, and give meaning to police work (Manning, 1977; Boke & Nalla, 2009). In a Norwegian context however, Stig Johannessen (2013) defines police culture as; “the complex and dynamic processes in an organization which constitutes the everyday practices that takes place specifically in the police organization. The police’s organizational culture is in other words ways of acting, thinking, talking and exercising in the police organization” (p. 29). The concept of police culture is therefore seen as a guide for action, control opinions, provide direction when it comes to understanding process and working methods, as well as being a framework that ties the members within the group together (Glomseth, 2018; Kirkhaug & Glomseth, 2018).

5.2 Leadership and police leadership

The field of leadership has been in a state of ferment and confusion for many years (Yukl, 1998), and there are probably as many definitions of leadership as there are people asked to define it (Bass, 2008). The concept of leadership has long been a subject of speculation, and through history much of the research has been on the determinants of leadership effectiveness (e.g. Fiedler, 1964; Hogan, Curphy & Hogan, 1994). Leadership research is however increasing dramatically, and findings underscore that there is a wide variety of different theoretical approaches to explain the complexities of the leadership process (e.g. Rost, 1991; Bryman, 1992; Mumford, 2006; Bass, 2008; Bryman, Collinson, Grint, Jackson & Uhl-Bien, 2011; Yukl, 2013; Hickman, 2018). Some researchers conceptualize leadership as a trait or as a behavior, whereas others view leadership from an information-processing perspective or relational standpoint. Today researchers usually define leadership according to their individual perspectives and the aspect of a phenomenon that is of most interest to them (Yukl, 1998; Robbins, Judge & Campbell, 2017).

5.2.1 Defining leadership

The term “leadership” can be defined in various ways, in terms of traits, behaviors, influence, interaction patterns, role relationships, processes, occupation of an administrative positions, follower perception, and influence on organizational culture (Bass, 2008; Yukl, 2013). In a time span from the

beginning of the 20th century up until today the concept has been defined various ways, where definitions of leadership that appeared in the first three decades of the 20th century emphasized control and centralization of power with a common theme of domination (e.g. Gibb, 1954; Stogdill, 1974; Bass, 1981). Later, trait become the focus of defining leadership (e.g. Bogardus, 1934, Pigors, 1935; Tead, 1935), and in the 1940s, leadership were defined as the behavior of an individual while involved in group activities (e.g. Reuter, 1941; Coperland, 1942; Redl, 1942; Hemphill, 1949). The focus shifted again, and in the 50s leadership were defined as both the continuance of group theory, leadership as a relationship that develops shared goals, as well as the effectiveness of leaders (e.g Gibb, 1954). In later decades, the prevailing definition of leadership as *behavior* that influences people toward shared goals was underscored by Seeman (1960), who described leadership as; “acts by persons which influence others persons in a shared direction” (p. 53). Later, the group focus gave way to the organizational behavior approach, where leadership was viewed as; “the reciprocal process of mobilizing by persons with certain motives and values, various economic, political, and other resources, in a context of competition and conflict, in order to realize goals independently or mutually help by both leaders and followers” (Burns, 1978, p. 425). Debate continues as to whether leadership and management are separate processes, but emerging research from the 80s until today emphasizes the *process* of leadership, whereby an individual influences a group of individuals to achieve a common goal. Today however, researchers like Yukl (2013) defines leadership as; “the process of influencing others to understand and agree about what needs to be done and how to do it, and the process of facilitating individual and collective efforts to accomplish shared objectives” (p. 23), whereas Robbins and Judge (2015) define leadership as; “the ability to influence a group toward the achievement of a vision or set of goals” (p. 364). Northouse (2019) defines the concept of leadership as a “process whereby an individual influences a group of individuals to achieve a common goal” (p. 5).

Although a numerous empirical investigations of leaders have been conducted, it is yet no universal understanding of what leadership comprises. However, in addition to definitional issues, there exist a number of approaches in

carrying out leadership, and this is essential to address in concerns pertaining the nature of leadership.

5.2.2 Approaches to leadership

Through history the understandings of leadership has moved through different eras and even though most researchers today view leadership in different terms than the beginning, mid, and late 20th century, these approaches to leadership are still important and relevant for how the concept is understood today.

5.2.3 The trait approach to leadership

In the early 20th century, leadership traits were studied to determine what made certain people great leaders, and the theories focused on identifying the innate qualities and characteristics possessed by great, social, political, and military leaders (Moore, 1927; Bass, 2008; Northouse, 2019). During this time, research concentrated on determining the specific traits that clearly differentiated leaders from followers (Jago, 1982; Bass, 2008). In the mid-20th century, the trait approach was challenged by research that questioned the universality of leadership traits, and researchers began to study the interactions between leaders and their context instead of focusing only on leaders' traits. Stogdill (1948) suggested that no consistent set of traits differentiated leaders from non-leaders, and argued that an individual with leadership traits who was a leader in one situation might not be a leader in another situation. Personal factors related to leadership continued to be important, but researchers contended that these factors were to be considered as relative to the requirements of the situation (Northouse, 2019).

5.2.4 The behavior approach to leadership

The behavioral approach to leadership focuses exclusively on what leaders do and how they act. Most research on behavioral approaches distinguishes two general kinds of behavior when executing leadership: *task-oriented behaviors* and *relationship-oriented behaviors* (e.g. Yukl, 2013; Northouse, 2019). According to Northouse (2019), task-oriented behavior includes facilitating goal achievement, while relationship-oriented behaviors helps followers feel comfortable with themselves, with each other, and with the context in which they find themselves.

These two behaviors are often combined in the behavioral approaches to leadership where the intention is to influence followers in their efforts to reach goals (Casimir & Ng, 2010). The behavioral approach reminds leaders that their actions towards others occur on a task level and a relational level. In some situations, leaders need to be more task-oriented, whereas in others they need to be more relationship oriented. Similarly, some followers need leaders who provide a lot of direction, whereas others need leaders who can show them a great deal of nurturance and supports. In other cases, a leader must combine both approaches (Casimir & Ng, 2010).

5.2.5 Other approaches to leadership

A current and highly popular approach to leadership that has been highlighted since the 1980s is the transactional and transformational approaches of leadership. These approaches are what is called situational or contingency theories (Hersey & Blanchard, 1969). Contingency theories describe how aspects of the leadership situation can alter a leader's influence and effectiveness (Yukl, 2013), and in the 70s and 80s several contingency theories were proposed (e.g. situational approach, path-goal theory, leader-member exchange theory). Contingency theories view followers as one of the "situational" factors that leader need to manipulate to be able to gain specific outcomes (Uhl-Bien, Riggio, Lowe & Carsten, 2014). The transactional and transformational approaches to leadership give more attention to the charismatic and affective elements of leadership, and are considered as inspiring others to take some purposeful action (e.g. Peters & Waterman, 1982; Bennis & Nanus, 1985; Kotter, 1988). Accordingly, employees who have a charismatic leader are more likely to experience psychological growth and development of their abilities, which again will create effectivity (van Knippenberg & Sitkin, 2013).

Transactional leadership refers to the bulk of leadership models, which focus on the exchanges that occur between leaders and their followers, and is defined in terms of; "such leadership occurs when one person takes the initiative in making contact with others for the purpose of an exchange of valued things. The exchange could be economic or political or psychological in nature" (Burns, 1978, p. 19). Transformational leadership on the other hand, is a process in which

leaders and followers help each other to advance to a higher level of morale and motivation. Transformational leadership is therefore conceptualized as a set of effective behaviors designed to create and facilitate change in organization (Burns, 1978; Northouse, 2019).

5.2.6 Towards a more integrative approach to leadership

Organizations today have become increasingly horizontal, less reliant on direct or constant supervision, and there is now a growing trend in organizations to organize empowered and self-managing individuals and teams (Yukl, 2013). Not surprisingly, the core question in leadership research has always been what makes leaders effective in influencing and mobilizing followers (Yukl, 2013). The focus on integrating followers in research has therefore expanded in recent years (Burak & Bashshur, 2013). *Follower-centric approaches to leadership* therefore arose in response to the earlier leader-centric views and drew attention to the role of the follower in constructing effective leadership (Pillaj, Bligh & Uhl-Bien, 2006; Yukl, 2013). They view leadership as a social construction, and leader emergence as generated in the cognitive, attributional, and social identity processes of followers (Uhl-Bien et al., 2014).

Despite the research presented, most everyday people when trying to define and reflect on the concept, refers to the skills, ability, characteristics and behaviors of a leader, when describing leadership (Yukl, 2013), and it is clear from the multitude of studies conducted through the years on personal characteristics and the behaviors of leaders, that trait contribute to leadership and that the behavior of a leader is important to study in order to understand the concept (e.g. Mann, 1959; Kirkpatrick & Locke, 1991; Zaccaro, 2002). Even though most people think of leadership in terms of skills, characteristics and behaviors, research today focus more on the process of leadership, where they state that leadership is not a trait or a characteristic that resides in the leader, but rather a transactional event that occurs between the leader and the follower. It emphasizes that leadership is not a linear, one-way event, but rather an interactive event that can be learned and is available to everyone (Northouse, 2019). Today people understand the concept differently (Yukl, 2013), but recent research on

leadership suggest the positive effect of combining several leadership approaches (Günzel-Jensen, Hansen, Jakobsen & Wulff, 2018).

5.2.7 Leadership in the Norwegian Police Service

There is limited research of the police leadership within the Norwegian Police Service, as police leadership is regarded as more specific and more circumstantial in comparison with “regular leadership” theories (‘t Hart & Ten Hooven, 2004; Karp, Glomseth, Filstad, 2018). Police leadership is however, generally categorized according to traits, skills, style, situational, transformational and power-influenced approaches to leadership (Allison & Crego, 2008), and has by Andreescu and Vitu (2010) been defined as; “(police) leaders are expected to generate a sense of purpose that both motivates and directs followers so that they voluntarily make meaningful contribution to the organization” (p. 3). According to Karp, Glomseth and Filstad (2018), police leadership may be regarded as; “a set of practices which is a function of actions and interactions within dyadic and network interlinkages, as well as a flow of organizational practice” (p. 2).

A substantial part of research on police leadership internationally has to a great extent been circulated around how it can be characterized (e.g. how to support more transformational leadership in policing, since the police traditionally has been an organization of top-down transactional leadership) - also what the effects of leadership are or how the specific conditions and culture(s) of the police service enlighten leadership practices (Burke & Mikkelsen 2005; Silvestri 2006, 2007; Archbold & Schultz, 2008; Österlind & Haake 2010; Pearson-Goff & Herrington, 2013; Haake, Rantatalo & Lindberg, 2015). Both transactional and transformational leadership styles have been regarded as effective (Dobby, Anscombe & Tuffin, 2004; Avolio & Bass, 2004). Regardless of what approaches are applied in the Police Service, it is connected to various forms of results or effectiveness. However, effectiveness of leadership is difficult to measure, given the complexity and inconsistency of outcomes in police work (Haake et al., 2015). This trend also follows in the research of Norwegian Police Service. Most of the literature on police leadership within the NPS has focused on leaders’ responsibilities, roles and leadership styles (e.g. Glomseth, 2015b; Johannessen, 2015).

Police leaders in the NPS are supposed to maintain three main roles in the execution of leadership. The first objective is to lead the organization they are responsible of – this can be a whole police district, a geographical operating unit, a section or department (Glomseth, 2015b). This type of leadership will include administration, corporate governance, strategy, budget, HRM and leadership of competence. Besides leading the different organizations within the Police Service, the leaders have academic responsibility (Glomseth, 2015b), and last, but not least, are the police leader supposed to lead people, and here help their employees to solve tasks, cooperate and achieve goals (Glomseth, 2015b). This is where the relational element of leadership is presented (Uhl-Bien, 2006). Relational leadership is where the social dynamics of leadership create meaning and help their employees develop. In this way, it moves leadership beyond a focus on simply getting alignment (and productivity) or a manager's view of what is productive, to a consideration of how leadership arises through the interactions and negotiation of social order among organizational members (Uhl-Bien, 2006). An important task is therefore to conquer these roles separately and at the same time be able to prioritize and balance them appropriately adapted to tasks and context. This can be studied and discussed, but police leaders should first and foremost learn these roles through practice and experience as leaders (Glomseth, 2015b).

5.3 Change processes

An organization is often characterized as something safe, stable and predictable (Jacobsen & Thorsvik, 2013). Nevertheless, researchers and authors tell a different story, where many contemporary organizations, from those most exposed to global competition to publicly owned monopolies are subject to change. This could be due to several of reasons. Firstly, there has been an increased technological development in many areas in which more advanced technology might have a huge impact on the way of working in many industries. Secondly, globalization, which leads to competition in different areas of the organizations, can possibly cause severe pressure. In addition, the changing behavior among consumer as well as employees' priorities and capabilities, indicate that in order to survive as an organization today, organizations and their

members have to engage in and attempt to manage change (Kotter, 1996). The interest in explaining why and how organizational change is performed has increased amongst scholars of management and many other disciplines even though explaining it has been difficult, even more difficult managing it (Van de Ven & Poole, 2005), and contemporary organizations often struggle to create meaningful, sustainable changes (Stouten, Rousseau & De Cremer, 2018). Few organizational change initiatives tend to be complete disasters, but few tend to be exclusively successful either (Kotter & Schlesinger, 2008). However, change takes time, and is not always easily sustained. Most change initiatives come across problems; they often take longer than expected and desired, they sometimes kill morale, and they often cost a great deal in terms of managerial time or emotional turmoil (Kotter & Schlesinger, 2008).

5.3.1 Defining organizational change

In the various definitions of organizational change, Huber and colleagues definition from 1993 (referred in Weick & Quinn, 1999) define organizational change as; “the difference in how an organization functions, who its members and leaders are, what form it takes, or how it allocates its resources” (p. 363). At the most general level, Ford & Ford (1994) describes change as; “a phenomenon of time. It is the way people talk about the event in which something appears to become, or turn into, something else, where the “something else” is seen as a result or outcome” (p. 759). Change can be seen as observable differences in form, quality or condition over time (Van de Ven & Poole, 2005), and is often applied when the current condition is not satisfactory. Change can be different both in scope and pace (Greenwood & Hinings, 1996) and is the process of moving from one state to another (Beer & Nohria, 2000).

5.3.2 Different approaches to understanding change

To understand the complexity involved in organizational change, research has used various models, and one of the models that are regarded by many - as the classic or fundamental approach to managing change - is Kurt Lewin's (1951) three steps model of change. According to this model, the process of change involves creating the perception that change is needed (unfreeze), then moving toward the new, desired level of behavior (change) and lastly, setting that new

behavior as the norm (refreeze) for instance through rules, policies and procedures. This model is often used when addressing planned change (Burke, 2008). Nevertheless, the model has been challenged by some scholars especially in regards to its linearity (Bartunek & Woodman, 2015) – that changes develop in sequence, always progressing – who in turn can be at odds with the context in which change occurs (Palmer & Dunford, 1996). In later years Schein (1996b) explicitly added interpretive characteristics to Lewin's model, and Weick and Quinn (1999) stated that; “episodic change follows the sequence unfreeze-transition-refreeze, whereas continuous change follows the sequence freeze-rebalance-unfreeze” (p. 361).

Another influential and utilized model in the field of change management is Kotter (1996), where he identified 8 steps an organization should go through to succeed in change. The 8 steps include; 1) establish a sense of urgency, 2) create a guiding coalition, 3) develop a shared vision, 4) communicate the vision, 5) empower people to act on the vision, 6) create short term wins, 7) consolidate and build on gains, and 8) institutionalize the change. This model highlight the importance of not rushing past any of the steps in the process even though there is a high level of time pressure as it will not gain the organization in the longer term regarding results (Buchanan & Huczynski, 2010). Both Lewin's and Kotter's models are addressing the importance of convincing employees the need for change, and further how to manage change successfully. These two models can also be applied in the change processes of the Police Reform, as the mentality in the models are implicitly considered throughout the process.

Additionally, in the literature there exist a number of other prescriptions on how to manage change processes. These prescriptions are however, often presented as a general recommendations for increasing the success of any particular change initiative (Meyer & Stensaker, 2006). Meyer & Stensaker (2006) also argues that the literature on organizational change has been preoccupied with implementation of change as isolated events, thereby overlooking the opposing effects on daily operations and subsequent change processes. Another large part of the research on organizational change deals with how change recipients reach and respond to change (e.g. Stensaker & Meyer,

2012). Some studies examine what employees actually do in terms of behavior and focus on resistance to change (e.g. Guth & MacMillan, 1986; Ford & Ford, 2010), while others focus on attitudes towards change, thoughts about change or mapping feelings (Perlman & Takacs, 1990; Armenakis, Harris & Mossholder, 1993).

5.3.3 Reactions to change

Organizational change efforts often run into some form of human resistance, and exist at all levels in an organization (Thomassen & Strand, 2000). It is a natural reaction that all people who are affected by a change experience some emotional turmoil. Even changes that appear to be “positive” or “rational” involve loss and uncertainty (Kotter & Schlesinger, 2008). Schein (2006) argued that motivation for change will only be acknowledged if the change targets feel secure and perceive the change as sensible.

Overall, the literature on reactions to change has predominantly been concerned with identifying and explaining negative reactions to change that act as barriers to implantation of change (Stensaker & Meyer, 2012). In addition, sense making theory has been applied in a number of studies of change which have provided important insights on patterns of interaction and sense making practices (Balogun & Johnson, 2005; Maitlis, 2005). Sense making processes are used in resolving the uncertainty and ambiguity that often follow initiation of planned change (Balogun & Johnson, 2005), and allows organizational members to create rational accounts of what, why and how to change which in turn enables action (Maitlis, 2005). Ford and Ford (2010) address the value of resistance which may be the only thing that keeps a change effort alive, and can become a critical factor in the ultimate success of change. Further, Ford and Ford (2010) challenge traditional perceptions of change resistance, and addresses that the resistance can serve as a useful function by making more people aware of the change by using this as an opportunity to learn new ideas on how to execute the change.

The ability to predict and handle different responses to change among employees are key management challenges (Stensaker & Meyer, 2012). It takes a strong leader to step up and engage when a change effort meets with pushbacks (Ford & Ford, 2009). In line with recent perspectives on strategy and change

(Whittington, 2003; Balogun & Johnson, 2005), Stensaker and Falkberg (2007) addresses the importance of managers in organizations, not as passive recipients of change, but rather as active agents who respond to pressure for change, in part by shaping and modifying the change initiative. Other studies highlight the importance of leadership as leaders play an important role in building the legitimacy of and commitment to the change process (e.g. Conger & Kanungo, 1987; Gill, 2003; Skogan, 2008). In addition, the importance of changing the interpersonal dynamics found within the change processes has also been discussed (White & Robinson, 2014).

6. Research design and methods

In this section, the thesis starts with describing and explaining the theoretical foundation for our decisions regarding method and research design used to acquire the results in this thesis. Moreover, we will present the conduction and feasibility for our research as well as method and design for collection and investigation of data.

6.1 Research method

Our study aims to understand how culture and leadership have an impact on the implementation of the Police Reform in the Norwegian Police Service. To acquire a decent understanding of how this is related, we find it appropriate to apply a qualitative research design through a case study. Case studies have commonly been used to document and analyze implementation processes, and have therefore traditionally been associated with process evaluations (Yin, 2011). As our purpose of the study is to explore the topic of culture, leadership and organizational change, an inductive approach is reasonable. An inductive reasoning is more exploratory and open-ended, and often starts by collecting data with the intention of identifying different patterns which can result in a theory or a concept, in other words, drawing inferences out of observations (Bryman & Bell, 2015). Furthermore, our intention was to collect data to build theory, rather than testing theory. Further, our research is determined to be explorative as it focuses on individuals and their social organizations. Nevertheless, there are new theoretical findings on our chosen topic that have been published both before and after generating our findings. For that reason, we have applied an iterative strategy

going back and forth between theory and data, analyzing our findings and searching for more literature in order to make sense of our findings (Bryman & Bell, 2015).

6.2 Data collection

Based on the chosen research design and method, it is important to recruit relevant informants in order to achieve the goal of the research. In particular, we have used in-depth interviews as it is one of the three most common qualitative methods besides participant observation and focus groups (Mack, 2005). The purpose of doing interviews is to understand themes from the subjects' own perspectives. Further, it can give us compelling descriptions of the human world, and interviewing can provide us with well-founded knowledge about our conversational reality (Brinkmann & Kvale, 2015).

6.2.1 Informants

The samples that are used in this research are thirteen police leaders from six different police districts. The different police districts that are chosen are spread out throughout Norway, including both police districts in large cities and rural districts with different distances between the necessary facilities. Originally, we had planned 12 interviews, but ended up with 13 interviews, since one of the informants recommended us to interview an effort manager (“innsatsleder”) as it would give us an operational perspective on our research question. The effort manager was contacted by one of the enrolled informants. In total we ended up with 13 informants.

Our supervisor has been a good contributor in collecting the sample, where she has used her connection at the Norwegian Police University College, and found the interested informants through email invitation. The informants took the initiatives themselves to participate in the research.

Before choosing the sample, some criteria were destined. We wanted a sample including police leaders with a leadership position and with a responsibility of personnel. In addition, police leaders who have worked in the Norwegian Police Service for a longer period with a well established understanding of the organizational culture and managerial experiences within the NPS were included. This is essential for the understanding of our research

question regarding the comprehension of the culture and leadership's impact on the implementation of the Police Reform.

Most of the informants fulfilled the criteria. The leaders which had responsibility of personnel could have between 1 - 300 employees working in their unit. Most of the informants have their educational leadership background from either the Police University or other educational institutions. Nearly all of our informants had completed further managerial training after their initial police education. The study included two women, and eleven men. Our informants work in various levels of management such as executive leaders and head of sections. Whereas many of our informants previously were leaders on an operational level, and now they have more administrative responsibility. Notably, the majority of the police leaders who participated in our study had what we call office-related jobs, and only one were involved in highly demanding physical tasks and active police operations. It is also important to note that this is a qualitative study with a sample that are limited to the thirteen police leaders, and that the sample is small and not representative to do a demographic, gender or rank analysis. The data must therefore be handled accordingly.

6.2.2 Interview guide

Before conducting the interviews, we prepared and developed an interview guide that was used as a guideline during the interviews (see Appendix 6). The interview guide was made with the intention for us as interviewers to have a good progression under the interview situation, and cover the relevant topics or the specific questions to shed light on the research question.

We conducted some test interviews before the actual interviews with the intention to try out the questions, and further sharpened the questions closer to our research questions. The questioned was at first wide and some were not distinct enough. Accordingly, we changed some of the questions making it even clearer, trying to explain the various concepts we wanted to investigate. The interview guide was made under a process where own experiences and interest were connected with research and theoretical perspectives. We have tried to be critical in balancing the relevant topic or relevance of the questions towards what we want

to find out. The questions have been developed based on the relevant topics in order for the respondents to answer independently.

6.2.3 Conducting the interviews

The conducted interviews have followed the structure of a semi-structured interview that is open and flexible, obtaining descriptions of a subject's life in a relation to current phenomena. The semi-structured interview allows new ideas and questions to be brought up as a result of what the interviewee say (Krumsvik, 2014), however the researcher defines and controls the situation. We introduced the topic of the interviews following an interview guide and critically followed up on the informants answer to his or her question. We clearly informed about how much time that was scheduled for the interview, and roughly about the different topics we were looking at. The interviews lasted approximately between 45 - 60 minutes per interview and were conducted at the informants' workplace, a location that was decided by the informants themselves. It is important to consider the context where the interviews are conducted as it could impact the content of the interview, also what Jacobsen (2005) calls the context-effect. Overall, the interviews felt like a conversation where the informants answered in their own words while we tried to understand what was being said. During the interviews we took notes of what was being said.

Further, the interviews were recorded by a recorder device. By recording the interviews, it made it easier for us as interviewers to observe the interpersonal relation during the context of the interview and follow up with questions where there was more to cover.

After conducting the interviews, the interviews were transcribed. Transcribing is the process of converting playbacks into written texts, trying to do it as precisely as possible (Nilssen, 2012). The process of transcribing has been time-consuming, taking approximately four to six hours to transcribe 1 hour of playback. This is however an important part of the analyzing process. Nevertheless, most of the transcriptions have the fallback of not caption the context, body language, eye contact or a general feeling of what might have been important of what is going on (Nilssen, 2012). Despite this, we - during the interviews - had an unique opportunity to observe body languages and the

behavior of the informants in addition to what were said, as both conducting the interviews and the transcription process was carried out by ourselves. The data from the interviews have been transcribed after methodological processes, and the results will be used in the discussion regarding our research question.

As with most other methods, semi-structured interviews may carry some limitations. In this context, it is easy to answer according to what they believe are appropriate from the organization's perspective as well as what is socially desirable (social desirability bias) (Bryman & Bell, 2015). If conducting the interviews in later stages of the implementation process, the answers might have been answered differently, as their answers could have been a result of their state of mind, frustration of slow and non-working processes, which might be temporary due to difficult and complex changing processes. People working for the Police Service usually have a high commitment and loyalty towards the organization in which they work, and this loyalty towards the organization could also have influenced our informant's answers. In addition, the fact that the interviews were recorded could also influence how the informants responded to our questions.

6.3 Quality criteria

In management research, there are three prominent criteria for the evaluation; reliability, replication and validity (Bryman & Bell, 2015). However, there are some writers that are discussing the relevance of reliability and validity for qualitative research, such as Yin (2011) which considers it as appropriate criteria, while others such as Stake (1995) barely mention it at all. Some writers have suggested that criteria for evaluating qualitative studies should be based on other criteria used in quantitative research as they carry connotations of measurement (Bryman & Bell, 2015).

Reliability concerns the question of whether the results of a study are repeatable (Bryman & Bell, 2015), and refers to the preciseness of research including data, which data are being used, how the data are collected and how they are being analyzed (Johannesen, Tufte & Christoffersen, 2016). This criterion is mostly an issue in connection with quantitative research (Bryman & Bell, 2015). Similar to our research, such techniques for systematic data collection are

not usual as the interviews with our informants somehow control the data collection. With regards to reliability, we assume that our research do not have a high extent of reliability as it is difficult for the study to be repeatable as the perception of their reality can change over a period of time and are context dependent. Further, validity as the most important criterion of research concerns with the integrity of the conclusions that are generated from a piece of research (Bryman & Bell, 2015). As our study has conducted in-depth interviews with real people in a real organization with informants representing different parts of the organization, our sample are sufficient in giving good perception of the reality. However, holding a qualitative approach can entails problems regarding external validity, in which the investigation of one specific organization can limit the possibility for generalization across social setting. At the same time, the outcome of our study may not be as valid as we are relying only on the informants' subjective perceptions and meanings. However, findings can be true since our interpretations and conclusions are drawn from research findings (Fisher, Buglear, Lowry, Mutch & Tansley, 2010). Although qualitative researchers have sought to improve what they believe to be proper criteria, the impact on evaluation of research is not as great as might be expected (Bryman & Bell, 2015).

6.4 Data analysis

Analysis is all about making sense of the data which have been collected, and the strategy of analysis are dependent on what it is that we are interesting in and want to find out (Hayes, 2000). The data analysis was grounded from approximately 119 000 words of transcribed interviews, in addition to notes from observations during the interviews. We have chosen a phenomenological analysis, along the lines of what Lemon and Taylor (1997) has described. In the first phase, our material was read thoroughly and we were looking for central topics, making an overall impression of data as well as beginning to develop a sense of understanding. This could contribute a better understanding of how informants experience a phenomenon (Hayes, 2000), in this case organizational change, and what leadership means to them, and how they perceive the organizational culture. All irrelevant information was removed in order for us to concentrate only on information that is central for the overall research question. Further, we identified

the meaningful statements or phrases of the material and labelled it, i.e. coding process. The next step of the analysis concerns in analyzing the statements in terms of their subjective meaning.

Through the analysis of our interviews, we analyzed our transcribed interviews into ten categories of what our informants spoke about, with several sub-categories accordingly; “general information”, “leadership”, “organizational culture”, “mindset”, “structure and organizing”, “the change process - Nærpolitireformen”, “change potential”, “communication and interaction” and “social responsibility”. Some of our categories were more interesting than others, and we further decided on focusing on three major categories, namely; “organizational culture”, “leadership” and “the change process - Nærpolitireformen”. Overall, our main objective of this thesis is to discuss how the organizational culture and leadership has an effect on the implementation of the Police Reform, and these categories were highly relevant. We have in our discussion used quotes and inspiration from the other categories.

At the end of this process, the themes were structured and organized in order for us to present them in an orderly manner. We have collected the most important information within these categories we believe is important to discuss regarding our research question. In the results and discussion part we will present our collection of data highlighting findings that are relevant for our research question.

6.5 Ethical considerations

Interview studies - like all research methods - raise ethical issues. Such issues include respect for human decency and respect for integrity, freedom and participation (Nilssen, 2012). As a researcher, it is our responsibility to follow the ethical guidelines that are appointed. However, interviews are a useful way of collecting data about human beings, and one of their great advantages is the way that they offer scope for in-depth exploration of people’s experiences (Hayes, 2000).

To ensure that the ethical guideline of managing data is done correctly, we have applied for an approval from Norwegian Centre for Research Data (NSD) before the data collection started. Our project has been approved by NSD (see

Appendix 4). The informants have been informed about the objectives of this research project, and that all data would be kept confidential, only accessible to the research group and be only used for research purposes. We have also collected consent declarations (see Appendix 5) securing that all informants are informed and are participating voluntarily, and the informants has signed and confirmed to the information given to them. They have also been informed about the possibility of withdrawal of their consent. Accordingly, the ethical consideration of anonymity and confidentiality has been fulfilled.

7. Result and discussion

The last part of the thesis will discuss our main findings in relation to relevant theory from our literature review, as well as previous analysis and evaluations presented. Our main goal of this master thesis is to examine; *“How does the organizational culture and leadership in the Norwegian Police Service influence the implementation of the Police Reform?”*

First, we briefly present an overall summary of our main findings in regards to the organizational culture and leadership, and hence how the concepts are understood amongst our informants. In order to discuss our research question, there is also important to consider the informants’ subjective reflections about the change process, as this might have an impact on the implementation process. We further discuss the change initiatives within the NPS, and how the concepts of organizational culture and leadership affect the implementation process. Further, practical implications and our contribution to research will be elaborated, and lastly, further research will be suggested subsequent by our concluding remarks.

7.1 Summary of main findings

7.1.1 Organizational culture

Organizational culture is fundamental for everything that happens within an organization, both the conscious as well as the unconscious foundations (Kirkhaug & Glomseth, 2018). Within the literature, the definition of Edgar Schein (1990), where culture is referred to the observable artifacts, values and basic underlying assumptions manifested within an organization, is well established. Largely, the findings show that amongst the informants the definition and the understanding of what culture comprehend is diverse. In the Norwegian

Police Service, and literature surrounding them, the definition of culture are often defined in terms of “the way we do things around here” (e.g. Bang, 2011; Skogstad & Einarsen, 2014; Bakli et al., 2017b, 2018), and this is constant in the findings as well.

Every organization has its own atmosphere, ideology or climate (Glomseth, 2015a). When describing culture, most people define the concept in terms of the context they work in; “(...) *we do things a bit differently here (...)*” (e.g. Interviewee 6, Interviewee 12 & Interviewee 13). As for understanding the culture and reflecting about the concept, some of the informants describe the culture within the police district as a whole; “(...) *we are a close-knitted group. And that is something I feel about the whole district (...)*” (Interviewee 10), others describe the culture within the city in which they live and work; “(...) *when you think of it here in this town, it has one type of culture (...)*” (Interviewee 12). Some described the culture at their section; “(...) *within this section our culture is informal (...)*” (Interviewee 10), while some described the culture among their closest colleagues; “*Between me and my colleagues working in my section, we help each other, we are open, we have meetings in the morning where we for instance talk about conflicts at the workplace – if we have some*” (Interviewee 5). In addition, some of the informants with a leadership position at higher level describes the culture in relation to the strategic leadership group they are member of, and several describes the leadership culture as good with statements such as; “(...) *we are lucky here, because we have a very good leadership group (...)*” (e.g. Interviewee 2 & Interviewee 5). The findings show a leadership culture characterized by a culture where they feel welcome, included and have sparring partners in discussions;

“(...) we have indeed different academic standpoints. But we have these weekly leadership meetings, where we try to build a common leadership culture. This can be challenging. Both because we all have different backgrounds, but also because we have different ages and viewpoints, and then different professional approaches” (Interviewee 11).

The NPS consists of different units and professions dealing with different tasks and challenges, and it naturally arises a numerous of subcultures which makes it complex to describe only one culture (Finstad, 2000). This is noted in the findings; “(...) *all cultures are different. You cannot talk about only one police culture (...)*” (Interviewee 7); “(...) *this probably vary from person to person and how they experience the culture (...)*” (Interviewee 11), and; “(...) *honestly I think it’s very difficult to summarize the police culture because the culture is so different from one police district to another (...)*” (Interviewee 1). Although there is room for several subcultures within the Norwegian Police Service, it is arguably important with some common values and goals. This requires that the various subcultures cooperate, share knowledge and have mutual respect for each other’s needs and challenges. This might be demanding for all organizations, and the NPS is no exception.

Within all organizations, both leaders and employees develop specific ways in which they experience themselves, how they cooperate and interact with each other, their interpretation and prioritizing when solving tasks. A sense of identity, provided unwritten and often unspoken guidelines for how to get along in the organization helps stabilizing the social system they experience as well as reflecting prevailing ideology that people carry inside their heads (Cameron & Quinn, 2011). However, the NPS has some common features representing their culture such as action-oriented behavior, a pride towards what they do, focus on their social responsibility, in addition to a sense of duty, internal support, loyalty and humor (Kirkhaug & Glomseh, 2018). Some of these positive characteristics are also highlighted in the findings, where several describe the culture in terms of how they interact with each other as well as characteristics they think their culture occupies.; “(...) *the culture is open and including (...)*” (Interviewee 10); “(...) *it is us (...)* *the feeling of being us (...)*” (Interviewee 13); “(...) *we have humor and we get things done when we have decided to do it (...)*” (Interviewee 3 & Interviewee 9); “(...) *we try to establish a culture that are characterized by performance (...)*” (Interviewee 6 & Interviewee 7), and; “(...) *it is recognized by a pride for what you are doing (...)*” (Interviewee 8).

However, negative characteristics of the police culture are typically described in terms of; the police as little receptive to criticism, too little focus on cooperation and learning from others, high degrees of pharisaical attitudes and high degree of verbal communication (NOU 2009:12, 2009; Cordner, 2017). Some of these characteristics are also recognized in the findings; “(...) *we are aware that we are not receptive to criticism and we should probably be better at it when it is necessary (...)*” (Interviewee 7), and; “(...) *our culture does not encourage interaction between the sections, even if we want to. But it is difficult to do it (...)*” (Interviewee 5). In addition, an undesirable culture is described amongst our informants; “(...) *it has previously been a bad culture in many areas (...)* *some of the undesirable culture have made it difficult to solve our tasks within the frameworks we have been allocated (...)*” (Interviewee 10). Furthermore, one informant states;

“(...) I don't think we ever will get an optimal culture because there are so many people involved. I am not quite sure if we ever can or should have a similar culture from one town to another (...) what is culture? The culture is where you are and the way we do it here. As long as it is within the framework of our social mission and the priorities, I think it is difficult to say that we should have an equal culture everywhere (...)” (Interviewee 12).

Johannessen (2013) addresses that the Norwegian police culture on the one hand is characterized by being democratic, involving, tolerant and including, which is recognized by several of our informants; “(...) *the culture is characterized by openness, honesty and direct speech (...)*” (Interviewee 12). On the other hand, Johannessen (2013), describe a culture that is undemocratic, authoritarian, oppressive and exclusive. These characteristics have not been recognized in the findings. However, the findings show a high degree of loyalty, both to the organization and the Police Reform, which in turn might influence their statements about the culture; “*As a leader, I am obliged to be loyal (...)*”

(e.g. Interviewee 1, Interviewee 4, Interviewee 12, Interviewee 3 & Interviewee 8).

Further, Johannessen (2013) addresses that the different police districts are characterized by environments with great companionships, strong social conscience, and justice for each other and the society, but also an environment with misguided loyalty ties, strong social sanctions, conformity, and people fighting for power. This aligns with one of the following statements;

“(...) it becomes such an internal struggle in the strategic leadership group because everyone want to provide for their own, they will also sell in and advance themselves, and this leads to an internal cannibalism in the geographical operating unit, which in turn influences the leadership culture (...)” (Interviewee 12).

The presented findings show that there are different perspectives of culture, and in accordance to research, the concept of organizational culture is difficult to understand and define (Meyerson & Martin, 1987; Feldman, 1991; Martin; 1992). However, it is essential to acquire a sensible understanding of culture as it might be important in the understanding of connections between culture and other key elements in organizations - leadership, structure, goals, strategies and other important processes such as communication, decision-making, interactions and practices. Culture is usually seen as the social glue binding the organization together (Cameron & Ettington, O’Reilly & Chatman, 1996; Schein, 1996a), and when there are major changes like the ones occurring within the NPS, the organization and the dynamics of the organization might lose its distinctness.

7.1.2 Leadership

Similar to the concept of culture, the leadership is also a diffuse concept. Leadership means different things to different people (Northouse, 2019), and what is deliberated as decent leadership and how it is executed is diverse. There are probably as many definitions of leadership as there are people asked to define it (Bass, 2008). This is also transparent in the findings where one of the informants states; *“(...) I think it is as many opinions about it as there are people. One must*

recognize that every leader is different from one another, and I believe that this must be challenged (...)” (Interviewee 3).

Leadership within the Norwegian Police Service is highly important, and as clarified and noted by informants of the study - to be a good leader within the organization - it is a necessity to have; “*(...) the capabilities to reflect over own choices and your own mindset (...)*” (Interviewee 6). The findings show a consensus in which having an “open-door” policy where open dialogues are welcomed (e.g. Interviewee 5), creating involvement (e.g. Interviewee 12), prioritizing (e.g. Interviewee 10), and to make sense to the achievement of goals are important when addressing what is important leadership characteristics, and hence what employees could expect from their leaders;

“(...) they should expect me to be a clear leader that involves in processes where involvement is required. Additionally, I think they should expect that I can make sense to the goals, that I’m not only presenting a goal, but also formulate an opinion behind these goals (...)” (Interviewee 7).

In the execution of leadership, the findings show a similarity in which the informants are applying approaches where motivating and inspiring employees to the achievement of the common goal, are especially central (e.g. Interviewee 10, Interviewee 12 & Interviewee 7). One of the approaches often mentioned is process leadership; “*(...) it is influencing the way I try to execute leadership, through giving room for involvement, making opinions, and sometimes things have to be investigated before making a decision. And it works efficiently (...)*” (Interviewee 2). A leadership approach that focus on processes aligns with what Northouse (2019) describes in his definition of leadership, in which leadership is a process where it is about showing direction for a group of individuals to achieve a common goal.

In addition, findings show that several of the informants apply to an approach in which relational processes within leadership are essential, where the leaders focus on the well-being of the employee, and having a good relation to their colleagues;

“(…) I'm probably a relationship manager in many ways. I usually say it, but I might be too concerned about being comfortable with my surroundings. But for me, it means well-being for me, but also for my employees. And, it has been an important part for me as a leader (…)” (Interviewee 13).

Further, one of the informants states; *“(…) within our section, there is a focus on the interpersonal relations, and we make it work as long as we are interested in trying to acquire it”* (Interviewee 10). The informant also thinks it is important to; *“(…) care about human beings, to be empathic. And in general it is about being a good human being (…)”* (Interviewee 10) when executing leadership.

Regardless the approach leaders apply when executing leadership, it is essential to see leadership's function and its phenomenon in regards to tasks, employees and context (Glomseth, 2015b). What characteristics and skills that are considered as important for being a “good” leader seems to be indefinite in our findings, however, several of the informants agree upon that it is about being clear and show direction to the goals that are decided and prioritized, in addition to being available for their employees (e.g. Interviewee 3 & Interviewee 12).

7.1.3 Reflections about the implementation of the Police Reform

A major part of the findings in this study addresses in particular our respondent's reactions towards the changes with the implementation of the Police Reform. Their views provide us with valuable information of how to understand in what way the culture has changed, and how difficult it can be to lead in a changing environment - not only their understandings of the different concepts.

Filstad and Karp (2018), in their report; “Ledelse, implementering, effekter og resultater av Nærpolitireformen”, present results from research between 2016 and 2018, where they executed an assessment amongst employees in the NPS, and studied the effect of the Reform. According to Filstad and Karp (2018), they argue that nearly 80 % states that the police work has become worse than it used to be, 90 % would say that the police is less available to the public,

almost all of the 4495 interviewees do not believe that the Reform will provide better results, and only 20 % of the employees think that the reform gives meaning (Filstad & Karp, 2018). However, amongst the informants in this study, there seem to be an overarching positivity towards a reform within the organization; “(...) *honestly I think this reorganizing was great, and it’s exciting to see the final results (...)*” (Interviewee 11); “*I don’t see an alternative to the reform (...)*” (Interviewee 2); “*This Reform is something that the NPS really needed. No doubt about that*” (Interviewee 13); “*I choose to talk about the positive outcomes of the reform*” (Interviewee 2); “*I really believe in this reform. I have believed in it since the beginning and I think the main goal of the reform is great (...)*” (Interviewee 5); “*We needed it. We needed something new (...)* *I would never turn back time*” (Interviewee 6); “*I am very positive towards the Reform (...)*” (Interviewee 7), and; “*My colleagues and I, we believe in this reform (...)*” (Interviewee 10). However, one of the informants thinks that there was a need for change, but not necessarily a new Police Reform;

“(...) there was no need for a new reform to do the necessary changes. We implement new reforms because it will improve the efficiency. But if we had implemented rather small change efforts in pipeline while considering the developmental processes, there would have been no need for a new Police Reform (...)” (Interviewee 3).

7.2 Culture and leadership’s impact on the implementation of the Police Reform

The Police Reform represents fundamental changes when it comes to the structure and the quality of the Norwegian Police Service, with a content that is comprehensive. Changes takes time, and is not always easily sustained. Nonetheless, there is a significant agreement in the NPS about the need for changes due to changes in the society. The main objective for leaders in the NPS are to work towards securing preventable work, safety, high preparedness, and criminal investigations simultaneously with implementing a comprehensive reform (Justis- og beredskapsdepartementet, 2018). In order to be able to manage

these objectives, the need for change has been essential. The need for change is recognized in the findings; “(...) *we are navigated by the events, and as long as the society changes, we must change accordingly. And we should be in the forefront of these changes (...)*” (Interviewee 5).

Within the Norwegian Police Service, there have been major changes in both the structural and the quality of the organization. The Police Reform is divided into two important parts – the Structure Reform and the Quality Reform. The Structure Reform includes proposals for changes, and a new structure and organizing of the NPS. The main tasks are to facilitate a competent and stable local Police Service (NOU 2013:9, 2013). The main purpose of the Quality Reform is to develop a more knowledge-based and effective Police Service capable of continually improving its leadership processes, competence and performance (NOU 2013:9, 2013). Our study, substantiated by research, analysis and evaluations of the implementation process (NOU 2012:14, 2012; NOU 2013:9, 2013; Bakli et al., 2017a, 2017b, 2018, 2019), show that the major structural changes within the Norwegian Police Service has led to an altering culture, and that leading within a changing culture and an ongoing reorganizing of the organization, is difficult. This has an impact on the ongoing implementation process. Research (e.g. Bakli et al., 2017b) supported by the views of our informants, argue that the major structural changes where the merging of police districts, the closure of “lensmannskontor”, and the focus on centralization, has contributed to change the culture through the implementation process; “(...) *I am critical towards the structural part of the Reform, not the quality part (...)*” (Interviewee 1).

7.2.1 Merging of police districts

The Police Analysis (NOU 2013:9, 2013), argued in 2013 that the organizing of the 27 police districts were not sustainable and that there were major differences in the police districts both when it came to size, volume and the severity of crime. The NPS was therefore organized into 12 police district, and the findings show that the process has affected the people working within the Police Service; “(...) *yes, we felt the changes when the structural changes came. We felt the changes on our body (...)* in the phase when we merged the police districts,

people disagreed and we had fights and discussions” (Interviewee 6). Several of the police districts that were visited throughout the study were merged together with the police districts nearby. Consequently, some difficulties and conflicts arose;

“(…) this police district was merged together with another district - they became a geographical operating unit within this district. We have doubled our geographical units (…) when they joined us we had to start from scratch. That was a difficult process. When we spoke together we did not speak the same language (…) in the phase when we were merging the districts, we had several fights and discussions” (Interviewee 6),

and; *“(…) there has been a cultural change (…) it was difficult when we merged this police district with that police district”* (Interviewee 13). Notably, these findings addresses the difficulties in joining together two distinct police districts, or said differently, merging two distinct cultures with different values, norms and perception of reality. The merging of several distinctive cultures within the NPS may lead to incompatible cultures and resulting in a failing change process. It is therefore highly essential to consider organizational culture when implementing change.

7.2.2 Closure of “lensmannskontor”

Previously, the Norwegian Police Service was categorized by a strong culture where the “lensmann” was an important leader within the rural areas of Norway. Through the restructuring of the NPS, over 126 “lensmannskontor” has been closed (<https://www.politiet.no/>), and this seems to have a major effect on the organizational culture. The findings related to the closure of “lensmannskontor” are twofold. On the one hand, closing these divisions was a necessary initiative to implement as it provided a more sustainable use of the resources; *“(…) it is not sustainable when less than five people worked there (…)”* (Interviewee 8); *“(…) the old structure with a very prominent “lensmann” was in danger of extinction anyways (…) there had to be some changes (…)”* (Interviewee 7), and;

“(…) the ”lensmannskontor” where there were not even light in the light bulb has been closed. In those police districts, there is lack of crime, and when you work in this business, you would need some crime to have something to do, right?” (Interviewee 6).

On the other hand, other informants prefer the old structure; *“(…) as a previous ”lensmann”, of course I do not like these structural changes (…)” (Interviewee 5), and; “(…) when you are a ”lensmann”, you are a ”lensmann” at the private as well as at the workplace (…)” (Interviewee 1). Further, some of our informants describe cumbersome processes because of closing the “lensmannskontor”;*

“(…) when you call the police station and no one picks up the phone, and when they do they put you on hold, and then transfer you to another person, and then another, and when someone picks up you have no idea who you are talking to. Not a lot of people prefer doing that more than once. People think; forget it, it’s not that big of a deal. And that information they were calling about, that information could’ve been ground-breaking (…)” (Interviewee 4).

A great deal of our findings in relation to this addresses that losing the “lensmann” is something that cannot be replaced and that leading in a process where prominent and important leaders has disappeared is demanding; *“(…) back in the days we had a structure around the so called ”lensmannsmodellen”, and we therefore have a culture characterized from the role of a ”lensmann”(…)” (Interviewee 3), and; “ (…) I don’t think we will be able to find a model that will compensate for ”lensmannskulturen” (…)” (Interviewee 4). Nevertheless, nearly all of the informants agreed that; “(…) what we did back in the days is not necessarily the correct way to do it today (…)” (e.g. Interviewee 2).*

7.2.3 Focus on centralization

Another major and prominent part of the restructuring of the Norwegian Police Service is the increased focus on centralization. The Police Analysis (NOU 2013:9, 2013) argued in its report that one see a population in growth, and that there has been a centralization of the Norwegian population. More and more people live and work in major cities, rather than densely populated areas. These stable tendencies are expected to continue in the future. The centralization focus has throughout the findings shown dissatisfaction amongst the informants;

“(...) we lose a lot of the local knowledge in the districts when everything are to be centralized into larger units. We are not enough people to be everywhere at the same time, and when we had offices there and people who worked these places we had more knowledge about the area”

(Interviewee 4);

“(...) the service provision will be worse for the people living in rural areas (...)” (Interviewee 9); *“I mean that the difference between the public and the police will be huge in 5 to 10 years because there will be no police services in the rural areas (...) one need to be where the population are (...)”* (Interviewee 1), and;

“(...) losing the local knowledge is a challenge and it is not certain that we solve our problems by restructuring, but we try to figure that out by the use of police contacts and the municipality per se. If we are using the wrong strategies, there need to be changes. We are dependent on the trust out in the municipalities, if not: there will be no well-organized and functioning reform. That I know for sure!” (Interviewee 2).

The Norwegian Police Service has solved many of their operational tasks through gathered information from the public and losing the local knowledge might have an impact on their task performance. Some researches highlight local knowledge as highly important in order for the police to solve their main tasks

(e.g. Lassen, 2019). There is significant evidence in the findings that addresses the challenges and consequences of the increased centralization focus, for instance; *“We are now less visible (...)”* (Interviewee 4). Consequently, this has interfered with their social responsibility as a police service, hence might make it difficult for them to deliver the service they desire.

7.2.4 A changed organizational culture?

Organizational culture is broadly defined as; the pattern of shared values and norms that distinguishes one organization from another (Bang, 2011). These shared values and norms indicate what is believed to be important in the organization - what is of value to organizational members. They also indicate how things are done in the organization - ‘We do it this way, not that way’ (Skogstad & Einarsen, 2014). These shared values and norms provide direction and meaning for the organization’s members. They also energize organizational members in the pursuit of organizational purpose (Skogstad & Einarsen, 2014). The implementation process of the Police Reform has however challenged the shared values and norms in the NPS.

For centuries the role of the “lensmann” has been a prominent part of the culture within the Norwegian Police Service and this is addressed in the findings. Today this role is fading alongside the implementation of the Police Reform, and is currently replaced by other functions. Simultaneously, the merging of the police districts and the increased focus on centralization has, grounded in the findings, affected the culture;

“I have been on leave of absence during the most hectic period of the restructuring, and when I came back I noticed that the culture had changed through the process of implementing the Police Reform (...) I noticed that the attitudes of culture in the house was completely different” (Interviewee 5), and; *“(...) it has been a huge development of the culture(...)”* (Interviewee 6).

The implementation of the structural change efforts of the Police Reform has been executed with limited resources, new roles has occurred, new areas of

responsibility have been generated and consequently, the process has not been painless. Values, norms and perceptions usually remain constant over time (De Jong, 2009), however, through the major structural changes that have occurred the last couple of years, the organizational culture has changed – there are now new ways of working, new ways of communication and the roles has changed. This has contributed to change the Norwegian Police Service`s way of doing things, hence it might have an effect on their culture. Organizational culture is a dynamic phenomenon surrounding us at all times, and is being constantly enacted and created by interactions (Schein, 2017). Today, the organization is still changing and the currently changed culture within the NPS is however not optimal and settled yet.

The process of changing culture is difficult (Ogbonna & Harris, 1998), and it usually takes several years (Schein, 2000), thus leading such processes are not an easy task. The leaders therefore play an important role as they have the power to influence the organization with their definitions of reality (Ostroff et al., 2013). It is an attempt of changing minds and habits in a culture where the NPS has a common understanding of “how things are done around here”, and this culture is difficult to change as it is rooted long time ago. This is to a great extent addressed in the findings, that building culture takes time, and the following quotation describes this; “(...) *we need to build the culture together. And it takes a 10 - 15 year to change a culture (...)*” (Interviewee 11). Moreover, how the NPS “do things around here” influences the exercise of leadership; “(...) *even though we are transparent (...) it becomes so visible for others of what we leaders do (...)*” (Interviewee 12). Nevertheless, the lack of clarity of what is included in the terms culture is often used as an explanation of why everything does not work well in the Norwegian Police Service (e.g. NOU 2012:14, 2012), and it can be difficult to get hold of what is specifically wrong and what kind of culture is desired. The findings show that there is a majority of the informants who believe there is nothing wrong with the culture, nor leadership; “(...) *I can't quite understand what about the leadership culture that is problematic (...)*” (Interviewee 2), and; “(...) *the criticism of the police culture and police leadership is diffuse. What is it about the leadership that is unsatisfying? And what is it about the culture that is*

inadequate? These concepts have not been defined (...)" (Interviewee 7). To summarize, the culture has changed, but there seem to be little clarity within the NPS of what is the desired culture within the organization, making the implementation process difficult.

7.2.5 Leading in a changing environment

The importance leaders have for the organizational culture has been pointed out in several researchers (Ford & Ford, 2009; Stensaker & Falkenberg, 2007). Schein (2006) argues that culture is developed by leaders, that culture and leadership can be viewed as two sides of the same coin, and that none of the two concepts should be viewed separately. Hennestad (2010) argues that leaders have an important role in the interaction that builds the organizational culture, namely that leaders both affect and are affected by the culture within an organization. Police leaders should therefore have knowledge and concepts about culture and how culture is created and changed as well as how culture affects everyone in the agency - in the police district and in the operating units (Glomseth & Aasterud, 2012). Simultaneously they need knowledge about how the given culture works, and last but not least how they – as leaders – can influence the culture through direct and indirect mechanisms for having an impact (Schein, 2017). This will enable the police leaders to lead the cultural dimension of their organization as cultural architects (Bakli et al., 2017b) as they are responsible for creating a decent organizational culture.

Despite the stressful surroundings of a changed culture, change is inevitable, even for policing, and leadership is the crucial element that determines the success or otherwise in the change implementation process (White & Robinson, 2014). The Police Reform is radical, and it includes losses that might not be replaced in its entirety. It is both natural and rational that such uncertainty during change processes creates counter-forces, criticism and conflicts (Kotter & Schlesinger, 2008). When individuals are exposed to conditions and behaviors that differ from the behaviors that are normal to them, they follow a process of cultural eclecticism (Peterson, 1992; Peterson & Kern, 1996), whereby they accept and adopt certain behaviors, reject others, and partially adopt some of them. Reorganization is usually feared, because it means disturbance of the status

quo, a treat to people's vested interest in their jobs, and upset to established ways of doing things (Kotter & Schlesinger, 2008). However, resistance in change is both necessary and evolving, and important for challenging well-established working methods and routines (Ford & Ford, 2010). What works well in one place, in isolation, may not be the best for the whole and the opposite. The ability in predicting and managing different reactions to change are considered as key management challenges (Stensaker & Meyer, 2012), and the leaders as active agents who respond to pressure for change, by shaping and modifying the change initiatives are especially important in this matter. Leaders are important resources within the NPS as they are role models for effective problem solving, operation and development. They need to be at the forefront of the changes, and it is important that police leaders proactively manage and lead the changes (White & Robinson, 2014). This often requires a clear vision, strategy and the development of a culture of sustainable shared values which in turn will empower and motivate those involved or affected.

Relating this to the literature on change management processes, it is naturally to consider Lewin and Kotter's models of change. In their models, they both address the importance of convincing employees the need for change and how to manage change successfully. Lewin (1951) has in his model of change addressed three steps that are important; creating the perception of change, moving toward the new, desired level of behavior and setting the new behavior as the norm, for instance through rules, policies and procedures. In later years, Kotter's (1996) eight step model of change identified the importance of establishing a sense of urgency, creating a guiding coalition and developing a shared vision. Further, the following steps in his model highlight the importance of communicating the vision, empower people to act on the vision, create short term wins, consolidate and build on gains, and hence institutionalize the change (Kotter, 1996). These two models has some critiques directed towards them, however, these two models will be used and discussed interchangeably. Although these models establish some steps to follow, the use of the models in explaining this particular change process has been adjusted.

A major part of the findings addresses somehow changes of the Police Reform in some of the steps of Lewin and Kotter's models, even though they are not following them imitative. The importance of applying these two models are related to the part where involvement of the employees are an important part in convincing them about the need for change and develop a shared perception of the change even though the culture is changed. Accordingly, it might be difficult to empower people to act on the vision if the vision is not communicated clearly. In this matter, the findings show a diverse perception of "Nærpolitireformen" in its name and the content of the Police Reform are interpreted contradictory; "(...) *do not call it a "Nærpolitireform", because it is not a "Nærpolitireform"*" (Interviewee 1); "*I think it is political coin*" (Interviewee 2); "*To call it a "Nærpolitireform" is to lie to people (...)*"; "*I would have changed the name (...)*" (Interviewee 7); "*It's a joke*" (Interviewee 13) and; "*The name is very unfortunate. I call it "Nærpolitireformen" myself, because I am loyal. But let's be honest: it is a reform focusing on centralization. It's a reform to save money"*" (Interviewee 11). However, only two out of thirteen informants agreed with the name; "*I think the name gives meaning because it commits to something (...)*" (e.g. Interviewee 2, Interviewee 5). The name "Nærpolitireformen" can be seen as a cultural artifact - an artifact which helps define the culture (Higgins & McCallister, 2004). This artifact has to be reinforced and believed in to help characterize the Norwegian Police Service, or as a result, it will leave a barrier to their success (Higgins & McCallister, 2004). As this cultural artifact influence the success of both strategy formulation and strategy execution (Higgins & McCallister, 2004), the artifacts, i.e. the name of the Police Reform should be aligned with the purpose of the strategy. When it is a discrepancy in what leaders want the employees to act on, it creates difficulties in communicating the vision clearly enough to persuade the employees in believing in this; "(...) *it's difficult to inform the employees about things that you don't know anything about (...)*" (Interviewee 5).

There is evidence in the findings that there are lack of information, and the guidelines and instructions might be too ambiguous and not described clearly enough. This creates the room for different interpretations, hence different ways

of implementing the initiatives. This creates uncertainty, hence frustration amongst the employees. The attempts of combining standardization and dynamic scope of action for local adaptation is a challenge thus will have an impact on how the culture and leadership are executed. However, local adjustments are necessary as the police districts are different from one and another, both in population and geography. This aligns with the findings, in particular one of the informant states; *“(...) when the organizational chart doesn’t match the terrain, it will have an impact on culture and kind of how leadership is executed (...)”* (Interviewee 12).

Moreover, the findings show a distinct agreement that the equivocal reactions to change have been due to a poorly communication and interaction between all levels of the NPS, and the findings points at this with the following statements; *“(...) more information about the processes would’ve led to less frustration amongst the employees (...)”* (Interviewee 5); *“What’s most difficult by being in such a reform is the insecure amongst the employees (...)”* (Interviewee 2); *“There has been too little focus and time for interpersonal relationships”* (Interviewee 6). However, several of the informants think that communicating the goals and making sense to the goals are one of the important leadership characteristics that they want to apply (e.g. Interviewee 7) and;

“(...) what is happening next comes from the management (...) and if it is a huge gap between what is actually happening here working operatively and the leadership, it is difficult to get people with them. It is important that the leaders are close to it (...)” (Interviewee 4).

Even though leadership has an impact on how the change initiatives are implemented, the executed leadership should not be underestimated as it might be a demanding responsibility;

“(...) it is demanding to be a leader, because you have to speed up the changes that are happening, and at the same time still have an understanding of what is painful and difficult. In addition, to convey that this is how it is going to be. This is determined. It is not useful to

counteract things that are carved in stone. We have to make the best of it (...)” (Interviewee 11).

Another addressed challenge of implementing the Police Reform has been related to the high pace; *“(...) it is too little time and too little information to be able to make decisions on serious happenings. That’s a critical factor”* (Interviewee 3); *“(...) too much has been going on at the same time (...)”* (Interviewee 2), and; *“Slow down! We don’t have the time to start new processes and then test it and then evaluate the result. Now there are too many processes going on at the same time (...)”* (Interviewee 4). This is contradictory to what Kotter (1996) highlights in his model, in which rushing past any of the steps in the change process will not gain the organization in the longer term regarding results (referred in Buchanan & Huczynski, 2010). In addition, not only has the Police Reform been implemented too quickly, it has also been limited financial resources allocated; *“We do not have the resources. We will not make it, like the situation is now, we will not make it”* (Interviewee 10);

“We need to acknowledge the fact that we are in a reform because we want to meet new challenges. In this case we should have received a lot more resources. But when they don’t give you the resources you need, you need to find the resources somewhere else which leads to cut other places” (Interviewee 8), and; *“(...) what I see as the biggest drawback is the financial part. The reform is not financed (...) it’s about doing more for less (...)”* (Interviewee 7).

Implementing the Police Reform with this high pace and limited resources have created challenges both for the leaders and the employees. Such complex processes such as the Police Reform need some time to settle down, whereas there is opportunities to find a balance between utilizing already existing practice, further develop and improve this practice (Filstad, 2017). Even though it has been challenging implementing the Police Reform, it is a common determination in the findings that they try to make the best out of the resources that are allocated.

Change processes are not always about changing the organizational structure, as it seems as many leaders often take this approach when going into change processes (Thomassen & Strand, 2000). Further, Filstad (2017) addresses that leaders slightly change culture, rather they find ways of utilizing leadership within an organizational culture in which could include several different cultures rather than only one culture. In this matter, according to Kotter's model, it is an essential leadership task to create short term wins and consolidate and build on the gains. This has throughout the findings shown that despite the challenges, the NPS is relatively good at making the best out of it, and see the opportunities rather than the downside of implementing the Police Reform. This is where some of the investigated police districts have shown to be more effective than others as they have a leader that focus on the role as a culture builder;

"(...) The Chief of Police is an important ambassador, and the Chief of Police has been very clear about it from the start; that we have to build culture, we need to meet each other, we have get to know each other, we have to be confident of each other, and we have to wish each other well (...)" (Interviewee 12).

This quotation addresses the impact the Chief of Police might have had on their process of developing a culture that is welded together in a context such as the Police Reform. Schein (2006) argues that culture is developed by leaders, and that they impose their own values and assumptions on a group. The results of the group's performance form the basis of which leadership style that is accepted. Most leadership literature have focused on what makes leaders effective in influencing and mobilizing followers (e.g. Yukl, 2013), and it has shown that a follower-centric approach might be appropriate to increase effectiveness. Connecting this to the findings, it is evidence that the police leaders have strongly expressed their desire to be good change agents and try to be good role models setting good standards while considering the relational aspect of it, however, it is difficult to execute as in this setting, as it might be challenging changing a culture with robust attitudes.

According to Johannessen and Glomseth (2015), the role of the leader can in many ways be regarded as a catalyst for the unfolding and utilization of human competence and motivation. Leaders have the power of influence through the way they behave, in their priorities and actions (Glomseth & Aasterud, 2012). Schein (2006) further argues that leaders, who have the ability to step outside the culture, are more fit to manage change process effectively, and lead their group to be more adaptive to the process. In order to fulfill the challenges of a change process, they need to understand the dynamics of culture (Schein, 2006).

There is indeed much controversy of whether organizational culture can and should be consciously changed by management (e.g. Smircich, 1983; Martin, 1985; Harris & Ogbonna, 1999; Sathe & Davidson, 2000). The opinions range from management can and should change culture (Sathe & Davidson, 2000), to arguments that culture only occur naturally and is not the consequence of management's direct interventions (Ogbonna, 1993). However, the findings have overall shown that implementing the Police Reform has had a major impact on the organizational culture of the NPS, and vice versa, in addition to how leadership are executed while leading in such demanding change processes. There is significance in the findings that organizational culture and leadership are important to the reform, and has an impact on how the implementation of the Police Reform has been; *"(...) that culture and leadership are important to the reform - it is quite obvious. And it is the leaders who are cultural builders together with the employees (...)"* (Interviewee 11) and; *"(...) the implementation process is not done yet, and I know that it will settle in the future (...)"* (Interviewee 5).

Leadership is incredibly important to ensure an effective implementation of the Reform. The work with building a good organizational culture is a task for the leader, and should be put in focus to a higher degree for the leaders within the NPS. The strategic leadership group in collaboration with the Chief of the Police is highly central in this manner, but there is a responsibility to be found amongst the first-line managers as well. Middle managers and first-line managers who meet the employees on a daily basis must motivate and justify the changes. They have a difficult task in motivating, explain and provide answers to everyone

affected in the Norwegian Police Service. These leaders also need to properly manage and lead through the changes, and not only conduct administrative work. This is however a difficult job to do in a changing culture, and in a complex implementation process that affects thousands of employees. The organizational culture within the Norwegian Police Service is highly complex, and studies, analysis and reports has revealed some very positive sides of the culture, that is important to protect, but also some unfortunate sides, that need to be improved in order to become an effective and well-functioning organization. There should be clear guidelines for what is the desired culture within the given plans, initiatives and guidelines already promotes, but one needs to clarify these initiatives, in order for the initiatives to become clear for the individuals within the organization. This will lead to a broader understanding of what needs to be done. Change is and has always been driven by people, especially leaders. The developing internal role models and change agents are important. The leaders are those who can further develop the culture and inspire others to take new approaches to challenges, while seek the opportunities of tomorrow.

Overall, in order for the remaining implementation process to move forward successfully, there is important with a culture that supports change and development, and help to achieve the goals of the Police Reform. Leadership is of great importance to culture, and the value of leader`s influence must be considered as well. Culture is influenced by the organization, structures for management and follow-up, allocation of resources and selection, development opportunities and equal treatment as well as rewards in various forms (Bakli et al., 2017). The structural changes of the Police Reform have affected the culture which creates challenges in leading in such changing environments, where employees and leaders are disunited with the changes being made. There is a broad consensus that management and leaders are important for the success of the Police Reform. Leaders are culture bearers and their attitude to the reform will affect employees.

8. Practical implications and further research

The limitations to a qualitative study must be evaluated differently from quantitative studies, as the goal of the research is not deduction and generalization, rather induction of meaning and depth. This study investigates

several factors that are often broad and complex, and naturally it encompasses several limitations. When taking the wide scope of our study and the thesis' scope in consideration, the specific concepts may not have been investigated in a sufficient manner, and this is something to be aware of. Our concluding remarks of this thesis have been retrieved from a specific context, i.e. the Norwegian Police Service, and the Police Reform which in turn makes it complex to describe or explain how culture and leadership might have impact on all change processes. Additionally, when investigating organizational culture and leadership, naturally it conceives different perspectives and attitudes which in turn are a difficult subject to measure in a complex study with this limited scope as basis. Nevertheless, we have investigated in particular the structural changes, as it was most addressed in the findings, rather than the quality changes of the Police Reform. This limits our concluding remarks to only some parts of the implementation of the Police Reform.

Considering our small amount of informants, we find a limitation related to their representativeness for the organization as a whole. However, it suits the purpose of this study and can be assumed to be a valid theoretical sample as we have interviewed leaders representing 6 out of 12 police districts. Nevertheless, a sufficient investigation of organizational culture and leadership is difficult, considering our short period of time investigating the relevant concepts.

Generalization is also a limitation, as our use of method often limits the possibility to apply our findings more broadly. Still, our study is done in a Norwegian context, and the findings can be generalized internally in the Norwegian Police Service; however not externally as it is context dependent. Nevertheless, the findings can be used in the understanding the importance of culture and leadership in change processes, in other organizations, in other police services, as well as internationally police services.

As the interviews were conducted at a particular moment there might be some limitations regarding the informant's abilities to reflect on the past, e.g. if we are performing the interviews another day, we might get completely different answers. Thus, our study is a "here and now" picture of the investigated factors. In addition, the interviews were conducted in Norwegian, and our thesis is written in

English, and some of the essence in our findings might be lost in translation, however, the awareness of this limitation has been present. Overall, the restriction is due to the scope of this paper, and a larger study of this should include multiple perspectives.

It exist a limited research on both police culture and police leadership which makes it difficult for us to provide a short and definite answer on our research question. As we have not succeeded in finding distinctive support in previous research, this has resulted in making us rely mostly on our own findings. Future research between the investigated factors is needed to increase the possibility to draw any conclusions on these findings. In addition, further research should investigate more in depth of the quality changes of the Police Reform, as it is still a developmental process. However, we believe that our contribution give basis for further research to the understanding of the how culture and leadership are essential in implementing change processes. Moreover, our findings can be used in the interpretation of how the Police Reform has been implemented, and contribute to the development of improvements. Nevertheless, more comprehensive analysis is beyond the scope of this thesis; hence the analysis may lack complete understanding of the discourse of organizational culture, leadership and change management research.

In order to elaborate and broaden our understanding of the investigated factors, future research is needed. Although there is already conducted quantitative research on this topic, however, it could be interesting to conduct a quantitative research and examine the factors that we have investigated in this thesis, as mediating factors. This could enhance our understanding of each of the factor's impact on implementing change initiatives, and whether they are dependent on each other. As our research is studied from a leader's perspective on the matter, it would be interesting to see the employers perspective in comparison to the leaders, as we believe the opinions of the investigated factors will be different. It would also be interesting to identify similarities or differences in a broader scope across departments, organizations, industries and countries as well.

9. Conclusion

In this thesis, we have examined the implementation processes of the Police Reform (“Nærpolitireformen”) in the Norwegian Police Service, and examined how organizational culture and leadership has influenced this process. The change process within the NPS is developed grounded in reports and analysis presented in the aftermath of the 22nd of July 2011, and in these reports organizational culture and leadership have been pointed out as important focus areas in the future.

In our study, we have elaborated on organizational culture and leadership as factors influencing the implementation of the Police Reform. The purpose of our research question was to identify how these factors have influenced the implementation of the Police Reform. In order to study this, we have taken a qualitative approach and conducted in-depth interviews to get a broader understanding of the topics.

It was apparent from our study that organizational culture and leadership have influenced the implementation of the Police Reform. First, we found that the concepts of organizational culture and leadership are difficult to define and understand, and without a distinct understanding of the concept, naturally it is difficult to apply it to their practice optimally. The culture permeates the organization, and is an important topic for practical organizational understanding and the execution of leadership. Further, the findings have shown that the organizational culture within the Norwegian Police Service has changed due to the structural changes of the Police Reform, as it has challenged some existing values, norms and their perception of reality.

The findings have also shown that this has challenged the leadership, as leading in such uncertain processes is not an easy task. It has been changes whereas prominent structures and roles have changed, and consequently, some has reacted in disunited ways, which in turn has influenced how leadership has been executed. It is essential with good leadership that creates understanding and motivation for the changes, and involves the employees in further development of the process, if the leaders want employees to gain greater confidence in implementing the Police Reform. Overall, the findings show that both

organizational culture and leadership has influenced the implementation of the Police Reform, but also that the Police Reform has influenced how the culture has changed, thus how leadership has been executed. In conclusion, in order for the Norwegian Police Service to meet the future demands, they must collaborate and interact across departments, thus develop and improve their existing practices, and simultaneously focus on the factors that might influence the results and behavior of the organization. The police leaders must be at the forefront of the changes, as they are influential as leaders, both also an important factor for the organizational culture.

10. Bibliography

- Allison, L., & Crego, J. (2008). *Policing Critical Incidents - Leadership and Critical Incident Management*. London: Willan.
- Alvesson, M. (2002). *Organisasjonskultur og ledelse*. Oslo: Abstrakt forlag.
- Andreescu, V., & Vito, G. F. (2010). An exploratory study on ideal leadership behaviour: the opinions of American police managers. *International Journal of Police Science and Management*, 12(4), 567-583.
- Archbold, C. A., & Schulz, D. M. (2008). Making Rank: The Lingering Effects of Tokenism on Female Police Officers' Promotion Aspirations. *Police Quarterly*, 11(1), 50-73.
- Armenakis, A. A., & Bedeian, A. G. (1999). Organizational change: A review of theory and research in the 1990s. *Journal of management*, 25(3), 293-315.
- Armenakis, A. A., Harris, S. G., & Mossholder, K. W. (1993). Creating Readiness for Organizational Change. *Human Relations*, 46(6), 681-704.
- Ashkanasy, N. M., Wilderon, C. P. M., & Peterson, M. F. (2000). *Handbook of Organizational Culture & Climate*. London: Sage Publications Inc.
- Avolio, B. J., & Bass, B. M. (2004). *Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire. Manual and Sampler Set (3rd ed.)*. California: Mindgarden.
- Bakli, O., Botheim, I., & Lassen, V. (2017a). *Evaluering av nærpolitireformen. Statusrapport 2016* (ISSN 1890-6583). Oslo: Direktoratet for forvaltning og IKT.
- Bakli, O., Botheim, I., & Lassen, V. (2017b). *Evaluering av nærpolitireformen. Underveisrapportering om kultur, holdninger og ledelse* (ISSN 1890-6583). Oslo: Direktoratet for forvaltning og IKT.
- Bakli, O., Botheim, I., & Lassen, V. (2018). *Evaluering av nærpolitireformen. Statusrapport 2017* (ISSN 1890-6583). Oslo: Direktoratet for forvaltning og IKT.
- Bakli, O., Botheim, I., & Lassen, V. (2019). *Evaluering av nærpolitireformen. Statusrapport 2018* (ISSN 1890-6583). Oslo: Direktoratet for forvaltning og IKT.
- Balogun, J., & Johnson, G. (2005). From intended strategies to unintended

-
- outcomes: The impact of change recipient sensemaking. *Organization Studies*, 26(11), 1573-1601.
- Bang, H. (2011). *Organisasjonskultur (4th ed.)*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- Banton, M. (1964). *The Policeman in the Community*. New York: Basic Books.
- Barley, S. R. (1983). Semiotics and the study of occupational and organizational cultures. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 28, 393-413.
- Bartunek, J. M., & Woodman, R. W. (2015). Beyond Lewin: Toward a Temporal Approximation of Organization Development and Change. *ARPOB*, 2(1), 157-182.
- Bass, B. M. (1981). *Handbook of leadership: Revised and expanded edition*. New York: Free Press.
- Bass, B. M. (2008). *The Bass Handbook of Leadership, Theory, Research and Managerial Applications, (4th edition)*. New York: Free Press.
- Beer, M., & Nohria, N. (2000). Cracking the code of change. *Harvard business review*, 14-23.
- Bennis, W., & Nanus, B. (1985). *Leaders: The strategies for taking charge*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Berson, Y., Oreg, S., & Dvir, T. (2008). CEO values, organizational culture and firm outcomes. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 29, 615-633.
- Boke, K., & Nalla, M. K. (2009). Police Organizational Culture and Job Satisfaction: A Comparison of Law Enforcement Officers' Perceptions in Two Midwestern States in the U.S. *Journal of Criminal Justice and Security*, 11(1), 55-73.
- Bogardus, E. S. (1934). *Leaders and leadership*. Oxford: Appleton-Century.
- Borum, F., & Pedersen, J. S. (1990). Understanding the IT people, the subcultures, and the implications for management of technology. In Borum, F., Friedman, A. L., Monsted, M., Pedersen, J. S., & Risberg, M. (Eds.), *Social dynamics of the IT Held: The case of Denmark* (p. 105-120). Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Brinkmann, S., & Kvale, S. (2015). *InterViews – Learning the Craft of Qualitative Research Interviewing*. California: SAGE Publications Inc.
- Bryman, A. (1992). *Charisma and leadership in organizations*. London: Sage
-

Publications Inc.

- Bryman, A., & Bell, E. (2015). *Business Research Methods*. (4th ed.). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Bryman, A., Collinson, D. L., Grint, K., Jackson, B., & Uhl-Bien, M. (2011). *The Sage Handbook of Leadership*. Los Angeles: Sage Publications Inc.
- Buchanan, D. A., & Huczynski, A. A. (2010). *Organizational Behavior* (7th ed.). United Kingdom: Pearson.
- Burak, O. C., & Bashshur, M. R. (2013). Followership, Leadership and Social Influence. *Leadership Quarterly*, 24(6), 919-934.
- Burke, W. W. (2008). *Foundations for organizational science. Organization change: Theory and practice* (2nd ed.). California: Sage Publications Inc.
- Burke, R. J., & Mikkelsen, A. (2005). Gender differences in policing: signs of progress? *Employee Relations*, 27(4), 425-436.
- Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York. Harper & Row.
- Cameron, K. S., & Ettington, D. R. (1988). The Conceptual Foundations of Organizational Culture. In Smart, J. C (Ed.) *Higher Education: Handbook of Theory and Research*, (Vol. 4). Norwell: Kluwer.
- Cameron, K. S., & Quinn, R. E. (2011). *Diagnosing and Changing Organizational Culture - Based on the Competing Values Framework*, (3rd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass A Wiley Imprint.
- Casimir, G., & Ng, Y. N. K. (2010). Combinative aspects of leadership style and the interaction between leadership behaviors. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 31(6), 501-517.
- Chan, J. (1996). Changing Police Culture. *The British Journal of Criminology*, 26(1), 109-134.
- Chan, J. (1997). *Changing Police Culture: Policing in a Multi-Cultural Society*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Christensen, W., & Crank, J. P. (2001). Police work and culture in a nonurban setting: An ethnographical analysis. *Police Quarterly*, 4(1), 69-98.
- Cockcroft, T. (2013). *Police Culture: Themes and Concepts*. London: Routledge.
- Cockcroft, T. (2015). Golden Ages, Red Herrings and Post Keynesian Policing:

-
- Understanding the Role of Police Culture in the Police Professionalism Debate. *Nordisk Politiforskning*, 2(2), 183-196.
- Coperland, N. (1942). *Psychology and the Soldier: the Art of Leadership*. Washington D. C: Military Service Publishing Company.
- Cordner, G. (2017). Police culture: individual and organizational differences in police officer perspectives. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management*, 40(1), 11-25.
- Crank, J. P. (2015). *Understanding Police Culture (2nd ed)*. London: Routledge.
- Conger, J. A., & Kanungo, R. N. (1987). Towards a behavioral theory of charismatic leadership in organizational settings, *Academy of Management Review*, 12, 637-647.
- De Jong, E. (2009). *Culture and economics: on value, economics and international business*. London: Routledge.
- Dobby, J., Anscombe, J., & Tuffin, R. (2004). *Police leadership: expectations and impact*. London: Home Office.
- Dunphy, D. C., Griffiths, A., & Benn, S. (2007). *Organizational Change for Corporate Sustainability: A Guide for Leaders and Change Agents of the Future*. London: Routledge.
- Feldman, M. (1991). The meanings of ambiguity: Learning from stories and metaphors. In P. Frost, P., Moore, L., Louis, M., Lundberg, C., & Martin, J (Eds.) *Reframing organizational culture* (p. 145-156). California: Sage Publications Inc.
- Fiedler, F. F. (1964). A Contingency Model of Leadership Effectiveness. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 1, 149-190.
- Filstad, C. (2017). Forskningsprosjektet: "Politiledelse i praksis". *Rapport til Difi v/Direktør Vivi Lassen*, 1-28.
- Filstad, C., & Karp, T. (2018). *Forskningsprosjektet: Ledelse, implementering, effekter og resultater av nærpolitireformen*. Oslo: Politihøgskolen.
- Finstad, L. (2000). *Politiblikket*. Oslo: Pax Forlag.
- Fisher, C., Buglear J., Lowry, D., Mutch, A., & Tansley, C. (2010). *Researching and writing a dissertation for business students. (3rd ed.)*. England: Pearson Education.
-

-
- Ford, J. D., & Ford, L. W. (1994). Logics of Identity, Contradiction, and Attraction in Change. *The Academy of Management Review*, 19(4), 756-785.
- Ford, J. D., & Ford, L. W. (2009). Decoding resistance to change. *Harvard Business Review*, 87(4), 99-103.
- Ford, J. D., & Ford, L. W. (2010). Stop blaming resistance to change and start using it. *Organizational Dynamics*, 39(1), 24-36.
- Gibb, C. A. (1954). Leadership. In Lindzey, G. (Ed.) *Handbook of Social Psychology*, (p. 877-917). Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley.
- Gill, R. (2003). Change management - or change leadership? *Journal of Change Management*, 3(4), 307-318.
- Gilmore, T. N., Shea, G. P., & Useem, M. (1997). Side Effects of Corporate Cultural Transformations. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 33(2), 174-189.
- Glomseth, R. (2015a). Politiet som organisasjon. In Johannessen & Glomseth (Eds.) *Politiledelse* (p. 42-72). Oslo: Gyldendal Norsk Forlag.
- Glomseth, R. (2015b). På sporet av politiledelse - styring og ledelse i og av politiet. In Johannessen & Glomseth (Eds.) *Politiledelse* (p. 140-172). Oslo: Gyldendal Norsk Forlag.
- Glomseth, R. (2018). Endringer, reformer og adaptivt lederskap. *Magma – Tidsskrift for økonomi og ledelse*,(7), 10-11.
- Glomseth, R. (2019). Hva er organisasjonskultur, og hvorfor bry seg med den? *Magma - Tidsskrift for økonomi og ledelse*, 11-14.
- Glomseth, R., & Aasterud, T. (2012). Politiet – når endring møter kultur, en krevende lederutfordring. *Magma - Tidsskrift for økonomi og ledelse*, 77-82.
- Greenwood, R., & Hinings, C. R. (1996). Understanding Radical Organizational Change: Bringing together the Old and the New Institutionalism. *The Academy of Management Review*, 21(4), 1022-1054.
- Günzel-Jensen, F., Hansen, J. R., Jakobsen, M. L. F., & Wulff, J. (2018). A Two-

-
- Pronged Approach? Combined Leadership Styles and Innovative Behavior. *International Journal of Public Administration*, 41(12), 957-970.
- Guth, W. D., & MacMillan, I. C. (1986). Strategy implementation versus middle management self-interest. *Strategic Management Journal*, 7(4), 313-327.
- Haake, U., Rantatalo, O., & Lindeberg, O. (2017). Police managers make poor change agents: managerial practice in the face of a major organisational reform. *Policing and Society*, 27(7), 764-778.
- Harris, L. C., & Ogbonna, E. (1999). Developing a market orientation culture: A critical evaluation. *Journal of Management Studies*, 36(2), 177-196.
- Hatch, M. J. (1993). The Dynamics of Organizational Culture. *Academy of Management Review*, 18(4), 657-693.
- Hatch, M. J. (2000). The Cultural Dynamics of Organizing and Change. In Ashkanasy, N. M., Wilderom, C. P. M., & Peterson, M. F (Eds.) *Handbook of Organizational Culture & Climate* (p. 245-260). California: Sage Publications Inc.
- Hayes, N. (2000). *Doing Psychological Research - Gathering and analysing data*. U.K.: Open University Press.
- Hemphill, J. K. (1949). Situational factors in leadership. *Ohio State University. Bureau of Educational Research Monograph*, 32(xii), 136.
- Hennestad, B. W. (2010). Kulturbevisst ledelse: fra ord til handling som virker. *Magma*, 8, 61-69.
- Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K. (1969). Life cycle theory of leadership. *Training and Development Journal*, 23, 26-35.
- Hickman, L. (2018). Effective leadership development in information technology: building transformational and emergent leaders. *Industrial and Commercial Training*, 50(1), 1-9.
- Higgins, J. M., & McAllaster, C. (2004). If you want strategic change, don't forget to change your cultural artifacts. *Journal of Change Management*, 4(1), 63-73.
- Hogan, R., Curphy, G. J., & Hogan, J. (1994). What we know about leadership: Effectiveness and personality. *American Psychologist*, 49(6), 493-504.
-

-
- Holdaway, S. (1983). *Inside the British Police: A Force at Work*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell. *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, 20(2-3), 93-100.
- Hough, M., Jackson, J., Bradford, B., Myhill, A., & Quinton, P. (2010). Procedural Justice, Trust, and Institutional Legitimacy. *Policing: A Journal of Policy and Practice*, 4(3), 203-210.
- Iljins, J., Skvarciany, V., & Gaile-Sarkane, E. (2015). Impact of Organizational Culture on Organizational Climate During the Process of Change. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 213, 944-950.
- Jacobsen, D. I. (2005). *Hvordan gjennomføre undersøkelser? Innføring i samfunnsvitenskapelig metode (Vol. 2)*. Kristiansand: Høyskoleforlaget.
- Jacobsen, D. I., & Thorsvik, J. (2013). *Hvordan organisasjoner fungerer. (4. utg.)*. Bergen: Fagbokforlaget.
- Jago, A. G. (1982). Leadership: Perspectives in theory and research. *Journal of management science*, 28(3) 315-332.
- Johannessen, S. O. (2013). *Politikultur: Identitet, makt og forandring i politiet*. Trondheim: Akademika Forlag.
- Johannessen, S. O. (2015). *Politi i krise: Spillet om norsk politi etter 22.juli 2011*. Bergen: Fagbokforlaget.
- Johannessen, S. O., & Glomseth, R. (2015). *Politiledelse*. Oslo: Gyldendal Norsk Forlag AS.
- Johannessen, A., Tufte, P. A., & Christoffersen, L. (2016). *Introduksjon til samfunnsvitenskapelig metode (5. utg.)*. Oslo: Abstrakt forlag.
- Justiskomiteen. (2015). *Endringer i politiloven mv. (trygghet i hverdagen – Nærpolitireformen)*. (Innst. 306 S (2014-2015)). Retrieved from: <https://www.stortinget.no/no/Saker-og-publikasjoner/Publikasjoner/Innstillinger/Stortinget/2014-2015/inns-201415-306/?lvl=0>
- Justis- og beredskapsdepartementet. (2015). *Endringer i politiloven mv. (trygghet i hverdagen – nærpolitireformen)*. (Prop. 61 LS (2014 - 2015)). Retrieved from: <https://www.regjeringen.no/contentassets/0f5847ca5bae4b2996b6441423e5ea09/no/pdfs/prp201420150061000dddpdfs.pdf>
-

-
- Justis- og beredskapsdepartementet. (2018). *Politiets oppgaver og organisering*. Retrieved from: <https://www.regjeringen.no/no/tema/lov-og-rett/kriminalitet-og-politi/innsikt/politiet/id713373/>
- Karp, T., Glomseth, R. & Filstad, C. (2018). 27 Days of Managerial Work in the Police Service: “Being foremost among equals”. *Police Practice and Research*, 1-17.
- Kirkhaug, R. (2018). *Verdibasert ledelse. Betingelser for utøvelse av moderne lederskap*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- Kirkhaug, R., & Glomseth, R. (2018). Å takle endring: Hva fremmer og hemmer reformer i organisasjoner generelt og i politiet spesielt? In Sørli, V. L., & Larsson, P (Eds.) *Politireformer. Idealer, realiteter, retorikk og praksis* (p. 281-297). Oslo: Cappelen Damm AS.
- Kirkpatrick, S. A., & Locke, E. A. (1991). Leadership: Do Traits Matter? *Academy of Management Executive*, 5, 48-60.
- Kotter, J. P. (1996). *Leading change*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Kotter, J. P. (1988). *The Leadership Factor*. New York: Free Press.
- Kotter, J. P., & Schlesinger, L. A. (2008). Choosing strategies for change. *Harvard Business Review*, 86(7/8), 130-139.
- Krumsvik, R. J. (2014). *Forskningsdesign og kvalitativ metode – ei innføring*. Bergen: Fagbokforlaget.
- Kummerow, E., & Kirby, N. (2014). *Organisational Culture. Concept, Context, and Measurement. Volume 1*. Singapore: World Scientific Publishing Co. Pte. Ltd.
- Langan-Fox, J., & Tan, P. (1997). Images of a culture in transition: Personal constructs of organizational stability and change. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 70(3), 273-293.
- Larsson, P., & Sørli, V. L. (2018). Reformen i politiet. In Sørli, V. L., & Larsson, P. (Eds.), *Politireformer: Idealer, realiteter, retorikk og praksis* (p. 15-34). Oslo: Cappelen Damm AS.
- Lassen, Vivi. (2019). Nærpolitireformen - for mye på én gang? *Stat & Styring*, Article 14 out of 16, 29, 52-55.
-

-
- Lemon, N., & Taylor, H. (1997). Caring in casualty: The phenomenology of nursing care. *Doing qualitative analysis in psychology*, 227-243.
- Lewin, K. (1951). *Field theory in social science*. New York: Harper.
- Lid, S., & Stene, R. J. (2011). Kriminalitetsbilder i endring. *Samfunnsspeilet*, 5-6.
Retrieved from: <https://www.ssb.no/sosiale-forhold-og-kriminalitet/artikler-og-publikasjoner/kriminalitetsbilder-i-endring>
- Mack, N., Woodsong, C., MacQueen, K. M., Guest, G., & Namey, E. (2005). *Qualitative research methods: A data collector's field guide*. U.S.: Family Health International.
- Maitlis, S. (2005). The social processes of organizational sensemaking. *Academy of Management Journal*, 48, 21-49.
- Mann, R. (1959). A review of the relationships between personality and performance in small groups. *Psychological Bulletin*, 56(4), 241-269.
- Manning, P. K. (1977). *Police Work: The Social Organization of Policing*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Manning, P. K. (1989). The police occupational culture in Anglo-American societies. In Hoover, L., & Dowling, J. (Eds.) *The Encyclopedia of Police Science* (p. 472-475). New York: Garland.
- Martin, J. (1985). Can organizational culture be managed? In Frost, P. J., Moore, L. F., Louis, M. R., Lundberg, C.C. & Martin, J. (Eds.) *Organizational culture* (p. 95-8). California: SAGE Publications Inc.
- Martin, J. (1992). *Cultures in organizations: Three perspectives*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Meyer, C. B., & Stensaker, I. G. (2006). Developing capacity for change. *Journal of Change Management*, 6(2), 217-231.
- Meyerson, D., & Martin, J. (1987). Cultural change: An integration of three different views. *Journal of Management Studies*, 24, 623-647.
- Moore, B. V. (1927). The May conference on leadership. *Personnel Journal*, 6, 124-128.
- Mumford, M. D. (2006). *Pathways to outstanding leadership: A comparative analysis of charismatic, ideological, and pragmatic leaders*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
-

-
- Nilssen, V. (2012). *Analyse i kvalitative studier: Den skrivende forskeren*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- Northouse, P. (2019). *Leadership: Theory and practice (8th ed. International Student ed.)*. California: Sage Publications Inc.
- NOU 2009:12. (2009). *Et ansvarlig politi - Åpenhet, kontroll og læring*. Retrieved from: <https://www.regjeringen.no/contentassets/b23f9c491cea42f1b99f46a6ae899377e/nou/pdfs/nou200920090012000dddpdfs.pdf>
- NOU 2012:14. (2012). *Rapport fra 22. juli-kommisjonen*. Retrieved from: <https://www.regjeringen.no/contentassets/bb3dc76229c64735b4f6eb4dbfcdbfe8/nou/pdfs/nou201220120014000dddpdfs.pdf>
- NOU 2013:9. (2013). *Ett politi - rustet til å møte fremtidens utfordringer*. Retrieved from: <https://www.regjeringen.no/no/dokumenter/nou-2013-9/id730815/sec1>
- O'Reilly, C. A., & Chatman, J. A. (1996). Culture as Social Control: Corporations, Cults, and Commitment. In Staw, B. M., & Cummings, L. L. (Eds.) *Research in Organizational Behavior*. Greenwich: JAI Press.
- Ogbonna, E. (1993). Managing Organisational Culture: Fantasy or Reality? *Human Resource Management Journal*, 3(2), 42-54.
- Ogbonna, E., & Harris, L. C. (1998). A three-perspective approach to understanding culture in retail organizations. *Personnel Review*, 27(2), 104-123.
- Ogbonna, E., & Harris, L. C. (2000). Leadership style, organizational culture and performance: Empirical evidence from UK companies. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 11(4), 766-788.
- Ostroff, C., Kinicki, A. J., & Tamkins, M. M. (2013). Organizational Culture and Climate. In Weider, (Ed.). *Handbook of Psychology* (p. 643-676). New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Palmer, I., & Dunford, R. (1996). Conflicting uses of metaphors: Reconceptualizing their use in the field of organizational change. *Academy of Management Review*, 21(3), 691-717.
- Paoline, E. A. (2004). Shedding light on police culture: An examination of officers' occupational attitudes. *Police Quarterly*, 7(2), 205-236.

-
- Pearson-Goff, M., & Herrington, V. (2014). *Police Leadership: A Systematic Review of the Literature*. *Policing: A Journal of Policy and Practice*, 8(1), 14-26.
- Pedersen, J. S. (1991). *Continuity and change: Central perspectives on organizational change and transformation in information technology firms*. (Ph.D. Series 2.91 Samfundslitteratur). Denmark: Copenhagen Business School. Institute of Organization and Industrial Sociology.
- Pedersen, J. S., & Sørensen, J. S. (1989). *Organizational culture in theory and practice*. England: Avebury & Gower.
- Perlman, D., & Takacs, G. J. (1990). The 10 stages of change. *Journal of Nursing Management*, 21(4), 33-38.
- Peters, T. J., & Waterman, R. H. (1982). *In Search of Excellence*. New York: HarperCollins.
- Peterson, R. A. (1992). Understanding audience segmentation: From elite and mass to omnivore and univore. *Poetics*, 21(4), 243-258.
- Peterson, R. A., & Kern, M. R. (1996). Changing highbrow taste: From snob to omnivore. *American Sociological Review*, 61(5), 900-907.
- Petrakis, P., & Kostis, P. (2013). Economic growth and cultural change. *The Journal of Socio-Economics*, 47, 147-157.
- Petrakis, P., & Kostis, E. (2014). Medium term effects of culture, transactions and institutions on opportunity entrepreneurship. *Journal of Innovation and Entrepreneurship*, 3(1), 11.
- Pigors, P. J. W. (1935). *Leadership Or Domination*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Pillaj, R., Bligh, M., & Uhl-Bien, M. (2006). *Follower-Centered Perspectives on Leadership: A Tribute to the Memory of James R. Meindl*. Charlotte: Information Age Publishing.
- Politidirektoratet. (2019). Disponeringskriv 2019. *Politi- og lensmannsetaten. Politidirektoratets (POD) styringsdokument til politidistrikt, særorgan og andre enheter for driftsåret 2019*.
- Redl, F. (1942). Group emotion and leadership. *Psychiatry: Journal for the Study of Interpersonal Processes*, 5, 573-596.
-

-
- Regjeringen. (2019). *Modernisering av Politiet*. Retrieved from:
<https://www.regjeringen.no/no/tema/lov-og-rett/kriminalitet-og-politi/innsikt/narpolitireformen/modernisering-av-politiet/id2398894/>
- Reuter, E. B. (1941). *Handbook of social psychology*. New York: Dryden.
- Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. A. (2015). *Organizational Behavior (16th ed)*. Harlow: Pearson Education Limited.
- Robbins, S. P., Judge, T. A., & Campbell, T. T. (2017). *Organizational Behavior, second edition*. Harlow: Pearson Educational Limited.
- Rost, J. C. (1991). *Leadership for the Twenty-First Century*. Connecticut: Greenwood Publishing Group.
- Rubecksen, K., & Ryssdal, A. (2018). *Nærpolitireformen: gjennomføring, endringsutfordringer og konsekvenser* (ISSN 2387-5615). Bergen: Uni Research Rokkansenteret.
- Sathe, V., & Davidson, E. J. (2000). Toward a new conceptualization of culture change. In Ashkanasy, N. M., Wildersom, C. P. E., & Peterson, M. F (Eds.) *Handbook of Organizational Culture and Climate* (p. 117-129). London: Sage Publications Inc.
- Schneider, B., Ehrhart, M. G., & Macey, W. H. (2013). Organizational Climate and Culture. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 64, 361-388.
- Schneider, B., & Barbera, K. M. (2014). *The Oxford Handbook of Organizational Climate and Culture*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Schneider, B., & Reichers, A. E. (1983). On the etiology of climates. *Personnel Psychology*, 36(1), 19-39.
- Schein, E. H. (1990). Organizational culture. *American Psychologist*, 45(2), 109-119.
- Schein, E. H. (1996a). Culture: The missing concept in organization studies. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 41(2), 229-240.
- Schein, E. H. (1996b). Kurt Lewin's Change Theory in the Field and in the Classroom: Notes Toward a Model of Managed Learning. *Systems Practice*, 9(1), 27-47.
- Schein, E. H. (2000). Sense and nonsense about culture and climate. In

-
- Ashkanasy, N. M., Wilderom, C. P. M., & Peterson, M. F. (Eds.) *Handbook of organizational culture & climate* (xxiii–xxx). California: Sage Publications Inc.
- Schein, E. H. (2006). From brainwashing to organizational therapy: a conceptual and empirical journey in search of 'systemic' health and a general model of change dynamics. A drama in five acts. *Organization Studies*, 27(2), 287-301.
- Schein, E. H. (2017). *Organizational Culture and Leadership*(5th ed.). New Jersey: Wiley.
- Seeman, M. (1969). *Social status and leadership*. Columbus: Ohio State University, Bureau of Educational Research.
- Silvestri, M. (2006). Doing Time: Becoming a Police Leader. *International Journal of Police Science & Management*, 8(4), 266-281.
- Silvestri, M. (2007). “Doing” Police Leadership: Enter the “New Smart Macho”. *Policing and Society*, 17(1), 38-58.
- Skogan, W. G. (2008). Why reforms fail. *Policing and Society*, 18(1), 23-34.
- Skogstad, A., & Einarsen, L. A. (2014). Organisasjonskultur - et system av konkurrerende verdier? In Einarsen, S., & Skogstad, A. (Eds.) *Det gode arbeidsmiljø. Krav og utfordringer* (2nd ed.) (p. 120-137). Bergen: Fagbokforlaget.
- Skolnick, J. H. (1966). *Justice without Trial: Law Enforcement in a Democratic Society*. New York: Wiley.
- Smircich, L. (1983). Concepts of Culture and Organizational Analysis. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 28(3), 339-358.
- Solem, G. (2016). *Mellomledere i politireformen – translatører mellom idé og praksis? Masteroppgave*. Høgskolen i Østfold.
- Stake, R. E. (1995). *The art of case study research*. California: Sage Publications Inc.
- Stensaker, I., & Falkenberg, J. (2007). Making sense of different responses to corporate change. *Human relations*, 60(1), 137-177.
- Stensaker, I. G., & Meyer, C. B. (2012). Change experience and employee

-
- reactions: developing capabilities for change. *Personnel Review*, 41(1), 106-124.
- Stogdill, R. M. (1948). Personal Factors Associated with Leadership: A Survey of the Literature. *The Journal of Psychology*, 25(1), 35-71.
- Stogdill, R. M. (1974). *Handbook of leadership: A survey of theory and research*. New York: The Free Press.
- Stouten, J., Rousseau, D. M., & De Cremer, D. (2018). Successful Organizational Change: Integrating the Management Practice and Scholarly Literatures, *Academy of Management Annals*, 12(2), 752-788.
- Sørli, V. L., & Larsson, P. (2018). *Politireformer: Idealer, realiteter, retorikk og praksis*. Oslo: Cappelen Damm AS.
- Tead, O. (1935). *The art of leadership*. Oxford: Whittlesey House (Mcgraw-Hill).
- 't Hart, P., & Ten Hooven, M. (2004). *Op zock naar leiderschap. Regeren na de revolte*. Amsterdam: De Balie.
- Thomassen, Å., & Strand, P. O. (2000). *Ledelse i politiet*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- Tsui, A. S., Wang, H., & Xin, K. R. (2006). Organizational Culture in China: An Analysis of Culture Dimensions and Culture Types. *Management and Organization Review*, 2(3), 345-376.
- Uhl-Bien, M. (2006). Relational Leadership Theory: Exploring the social processes of leadership and organizing. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 17(6), 654-676.
- Uhl-Bien, M., Riggio, R. E., Lowe, K. B., & Carsten, M. K. (2014). Followership theory: A review and research agenda. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 25(1), 83-104.
- Van de Ven, A. H., & Poole, M. S. (2005). Alternative Approaches for Studying Organizational Change. *Organization Studies*, 26(9), 1377-1404.
- Van Knippenberg, D., & Sitkin, S. B. (2013). A Critical Assessment of Charismatic - Transformational Leadership Research: Back to the Drawing Board? *The Academy of Management Annals*, 7(1), 1-60.
- Veiga, J., Lubatkin, M., Calori, R., & Very, P. (2000). Measuring organizational

-
- culture clashes: a two-nation post-hoc analysis of a cultural compatibility index. *Human Relations*, 53(4), 539-557.
- Weber, M. (1978). *Economy and Society: An Outline of Interpretive Sociology*. California: University of California Press.
- Weick, K. E. (1979). *The Social Psychology of Organizing*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Weick, K. E., & Quinn, R. E. (1999). Organizational change and development. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 50(1), 361-386.
- Westley, W. (1953). Violence and the police. *American Journal of Sociology*, 49(1), 34-41.
- White, V., & Robinson, S. (2014). Leading change in policing: police culture and the psychological contract. *The Police Journal*, 87(4), 258-269.
- Whittington, R. (2003). The work of strategizing and organizing: For a practice perspective, *Strategic Organization*, 1, 117-25.
- Yin, R. K. (2011). *Applications of case study research*. California: Sage Publications Inc.
- Yukl, G. (1998). Managerial Leadership: A Review of Theory and Research. *Journal of Management*, 15(2), 251-289.
- Yukl, G. (2013). *Leadership in Organizations (8th ed)*. U.K.: Pearson Education.
- Zaccaro, S. J. (2002). Organizational leadership and social intelligence. In Riggio, R. E., Murphy, S. E & Pirozzolo, F. J. (Eds.) *LEA's organization and management series. Multiple intelligences and leadership* (p. 29-54). New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
- Österlind, M., & Haake, U. (2010). The leadership discourse amongst female police leaders in Sweden. *Advanced Women Leadership Journal*, 30(16), 1-24.

11. Appendices

Appendix 1: List of acronyms and abbreviations

Difi	Direktoratet for forvaltning og IKT
GDE	Geografiske driftsenheter
NOU	Norwegian Official Report
NPS	Norwegian Police Service
NSD	Norwegian Centre for Research Data
PHS	Politihøgskolen
PNP	Prosjekt Nye Politidistrikt
POD	Politidirektoratet

Appendix 2: Translations

Avdeling	Department
Direktoratet for forvaltning og IKT	The Agency for Public Management and eGovernment (Difi)
Driftsenhet	Operating unit
Geografisk driftsenhet	Geographical operating unit
Justis- og beredskapsdepartementet	Ministry of Justice and Public Security
Lensmann	The title “lensmann” is a title describing the leader of a
	“lensmannskontor”. “Lensmannskontor” are often located in a rural areas
Lensmannskontor	“Lensmannskontor”
Lensmannskultur	“Lensmannskultur”
Lensmannsmodell	“Lensmannsmodell”
Norges Offentlige Utredninger	Norwegian Official Report (NOU)
Nærpoliti	A police close to the population
Nærpolitireformen	Police Reform
Politianalysen	Police Analysis
Politidirektoratet	the National Police Directorate (POD)
Politiøghøgskolen	Norwegian Police University College
Politikontakt	Police contact
Politiledere	Police leaders
Politimester	Chief of Police
Politioperasjon	Police operation
Samfunnsoppdrag	Social responsibility
Stortinget	The Norwegian Parliament
Tjenestesteder	Service department

Appendix 3: Reports, analysis and evaluations

Difi 2017:2	Evaluering av nærpolitireformen. Statusrapport 2016
Difi 2017:9	Evaluering av nærpolitireformen. Underveisrapportering om kultur, holdninger og ledelse
Difi 2018:2	Evaluering av nærpolitireformen. Statusrapport 2017
Difi 2019:1	Evaluering av nærpolitireformen. Statusrapport 2018
Innst. 306 S (2014 - 2015)	Innstilling fra justiskomiteen om endringer i politiloven mv. (trygghet i hverdagen – nærpolitireformen)
NOU 2009:12	Et ansvarlig politi - Åpenhet, kontroll og læring
NOU 2012:14	Rapport fra 22. juli-kommisjonen
NOU 2013:9	Ett politi - rustet til å møte fremtidens utfordringer. Politianalysen
Prop. 61 LS (2014 - 2015)	Endringer i politiloven mv. (trygghet i hverdagen - nærpolitireformen)

Appendix 4: Approved Application NSD

19.6.2019

Meldeskjema for behandling av personopplysninger

Prosjektet vil behandle alminnelige kategorier av personopplysninger frem til 31.12.2019.

LOVLIG GRUNNLAG

Prosjektet vil innhente samtykke fra de registrerte til behandlingen av personopplysninger. Vår vurdering er at prosjektet legger opp til et samtykke i samsvar med kravene i art. 4 og 7, ved at det er en frivillig, spesifikk, informert og utvetydig bekreftelse som kan dokumenteres, og som den registrerte kan trekke tilbake. Lovlig grunnlag for behandlingen vil dermed være den registrertes samtykke, jf. personvernforordningen art. 6 nr. 1 bokstav a.

PERSONVERNPRINSIPPER

NSD vurderer at den planlagte behandlingen av personopplysninger vil følge prinsippene i personvernforordningen om:

- lovlighet, rettferdighet og åpenhet (art. 5.1 a), ved at de registrerte får tilfredsstillende informasjon om og samtykker til behandlingen
- formålsbegrensning (art. 5.1 b), ved at personopplysninger samles inn for spesifikke, uttrykkelig angitte og berettigede formål, og ikke behandles til nye, uforenlige formål
- dataminimering (art. 5.1 c), ved at det kun behandles opplysninger som er adekvate, relevante og nødvendige for formålet med prosjektet
- lagringsbegrensning (art. 5.1 e), ved at personopplysningene ikke lagres lengre enn nødvendig for å oppfylle formålet

DE REGISTRERTES RETTIGHETER

Så lenge de registrerte kan identifiseres i datamaterialet vil de ha følgende rettigheter: åpenhet (art. 12), informasjon (art. 13), innsyn (art. 15), retting (art. 16), sletting (art. 17), begrensning (art. 18), underretning (art. 19), dataportabilitet (art. 20).

NSD vurderer at informasjonen om behandlingen som de registrerte vil motta oppfyller lovens krav til form og innhold, jf. art. 12.1 og art. 13.

Vi minner om at hvis en registrert tar kontakt om sine rettigheter, har behandlingsansvarlig institusjon plikt til å svare innen en måned.

FØLG DIN INSTITUSJONS RETNINGSLINJER

NSD legger til grunn at behandlingen oppfyller kravene i personvernforordningen om riktighet (art. 5.1 d), integritet og konfidensialitet (art. 5.1 f) og sikkerhet (art. 32).

For å forsikre dere om at kravene oppfylles, må dere følge interne retningslinjer og/eller rådføre dere med behandlingsansvarlig institusjon.

OPPFØLGING AV PROSJEKTET

NSD vil følge opp ved planlagt avslutning for å avklare om behandlingen av personopplysningene er avsluttet.

Lykke til med prosjektet!

Tlf. Personverntjenester: 55 58 21 17 (tast 1)

Appendix 5: Consent Declaration (“Samtykkeerklæring”)

Vil du delta i forskningsprosjektet

«Kultur og ledelse i Politiet»

Dette er et spørsmål til deg om å delta i et forskningsprosjekt hvor formålet er å studere hvordan ulike faktorer har påvirket implementeringen av Politireformen i Norge 2015 (Nærpolitireformen). Nærpolitireformen har skapt mye skepsis og en del kritikk fra flere hold. Vi ønsker ikke å se effektene av reformen, men hovedsakelig å se nærmere på hvordan organisasjonskultur og ledelse har påvirket implementeringen av reformen. I dette skrivet gir vi deg informasjon om formålene for prosjektet og hva deltakelse vil innebære for deg.

Formål

Formålet med prosjektet er å finne ut av hvilken påvirkning Nærpolitireformen har hatt for dagens Politi, og i hvilken grad kultur og ledelse har påvirket implementeringen av reformen.

Vår problemstilling er som følger: *“How does the organizational culture and leadership in the Norwegian Police Service influence the implementation of the Police reform?”*

Prosjektet er en masteroppgave skrevet i samarbeid med Handelshøyskolen BI Oslo, institutt for Ledelse og Organisasjon og Politihøgskolen v/Cathrine Filstad. Dette prosjektet vil også være i samarbeid med Politiet som stiller med informanter til intervju.

Hvem er ansvarlig for forskningsprosjektet?

Handelshøyskolen BI Oslo er ansvarlig for prosjektet.

Vi er studenter fra Handelshøyskolen BI Oslo, Master of Science in Leadership and Organizational Psychology, 2. år:

Phuong Duyen Thi Nguyen
Ane Aurora Brynildsen

Denne studien er et bidrag i et pågående forskningsprosjekt om ledelse i og av politiet. Cathrine Filstad - som er professor ved Handelshøyskolen BI, samt Politihøgskolen og øvrige kolleger fra Politihøgskolen, leder hele prosjektet.

Hvorfor får du spørsmål om å delta?

Utvalget til forskningen er politiledere rundt omkring i Norge, i forskjellige politidistrikter. Utvalget er ansatte i Politiet, med forskjellige lederstillinger og arbeidsoppgaver. Henvendelsen har gått ut til 10-15 personer som vil delta som intervjuobjekter i prosjektet. Deltakelse i intervju er avgjørende for datainnsamlingen.

Vår veileder Cathrine Filstad har et nettverk innad i Politiet, som vi har benyttet oss av. Hun sitter på personens kontaktopplysninger som har blitt videreformidlet til oss.

Hva innebærer det for deg å delta?

Hvis du velger å delta i prosjektet, innebærer det at du deltar på et personlig intervju som er semi-strukturert. Dette innebærer at temaet for intervjuet er fastlagt, spørsmålene er delvis satt, med

muligheter for oppfølgingsspørsmål ved behov. Spørsmålene vil være åpne, med mulighet for å prate fritt. Hovedtemaene for spørsmålene er blant annet kultur, ledelse, endringsprosesser, med fokus på implementeringen av Nærpolitireformen.

Intervjuet vil ta ca. 60 minutter. Dine svar på spørsmål i intervjuet vil bli registrert gjennom lydopptak. Vi ønsker å ta lydopptak av intervjuet for å kunne høre dette på nytt og transkribere data til så å bruke i tolkningen i hovedoppgaven. I tillegg vil det bli tatt notater fra intervjuet.

Det er frivillig å delta

Det er frivillig å delta i prosjektet. Hvis du velger å delta kan du når som helst trekke samtykke tilbake uten å oppgi noen grunn. Alle opplysninger om deg vil bli anonymisert. Det vil ikke ha noen negative konsekvenser for deg hvis du ikke vil delta eller senere velger å trekke deg. Det vil heller ikke ha noe påvirkning til din arbeidsplass eller arbeidsgiver.

Ditt personvern – hvordan vi oppbevarer og bruker dine opplysninger

Vi vil bare bruke opplysningene om deg til formålene vi har fortalt om i dette skrevet. Vi behandler opplysningene konfidensielt og i samsvar med personvernregelverket.

- Det er de oppnevnte prosjektansvarlige i dette skrevet som vil ha tilgang til prosjektet, samt vår veileder. Vi vil behandle all innsamlet data selv.
- Dine navn og kontaktopplysninger vil vi erstatte med en kode som lagres på egen navneliste adskilt fra øvrige data, og datamaterialet vil bli lagret på en sikker server som vil være låst med kode. Du vil ikke kunne gjenkjenne deg selv i publikasjoner.

Hva skjer med opplysningene dine når vi avslutter forskningsprosjektet?

Prosjektet skal etter planen avsluttes 1. juli 2019. Personopplysninger vil da ligge lagret 6 måneder frem i tid for evaluering av oppgaven. Personopplysningene og opptak vil automatisk bli slettet etter endt evaluering, senest i utgangen av 2019. Det vil kun være vi studenter oppnevnt i skrevet og veileder som vil ha tilgang til disse opplysningene.

Datamaterialet vil bli anonymisert før innlevering av hovedoppgaven.

Dine rettigheter

Så lenge du kan identifiseres i datamaterialet, har du rett til:

- innsyn i hvilke personopplysninger som er registrert om deg,
- å få rettet personopplysninger om deg,
- få slettet personopplysninger om deg,
- få utlevert en kopi av dine personopplysninger (dataportabilitet), og
- å sende klage til personvernombudet eller Datatilsynet om behandlingen av dine personopplysninger.

Hva gir oss rett til å behandle personopplysninger om deg?

Vi behandler opplysninger om deg basert på ditt samtykke.

På oppdrag fra Handelshøyskolen BI Oslo har NSD – Norsk senter for forskningsdata AS - vurdert at behandlingen av personopplysninger i dette prosjektet er i samsvar med personvernregelverket.

Hvor kan jeg finne ut mer?

Hvis du har spørsmål til studien, eller ønsker å benytte deg av dine rettigheter, ta kontakt med:

Prosjektansvarlige:

Ane Aurora Brynildsen - aurora.brynildsen@hotmail.com, +47 40 61 06 99

Phuong Duyen Thi Nguyen - duyennnguyen@live.no, +47 95 09 42 43

Cathrine Filstad - cathrine.filstad@bi.no, +47 46 41 07 15

v/Handelshøyskolen BI Oslo

- Vårt personvernombud:
NSD – Norsk senter for forskningsdata AS, på e-post (personverntjenester@nsd.no) eller telefon: 55 58 21 17.

Med vennlig hilsen

Prosjektansvarlig
Ane Aurora Brynildsen
Phuong Duyen Thi Nguyen
Cathrine Filstad

Samtykkeerklæring

Jeg har mottatt og forstått informasjon om prosjektet Masteroppgave om kultur og ledelse i Politiet og har fått anledning til å stille spørsmål. Jeg samtykker til:

- Å delta i intervjuet
- At mine personopplysninger lagres etter prosjektslutt, til etter endt evaluering av oppgaven, slettes innen utgangen av desember 2019.

Jeg samtykker til at mine opplysninger behandles frem til prosjektet er avsluttet, ca. desember 2019.

(Dato, sted, signert av prosjektdeltaker)

Appendix 6: Interview Guide

INNLEDNING

Hei, og tusen takk for at du har mulighet til å stille opp på intervju. Vi kommer som du allerede vet, fra Handelshøyskolen BI i Oslo, og fullfører til sommeren en mastergrad i Ledelse and Organisasjonspsykologi. Vi jobber med en masteroppgave som omhandler hvordan/i hvilken grad organisasjonskultur og ledelse i det norske politiet påvirker implementeringen av Nærpolitireformen, og særlig endringsprosessene rundt dette. Vi skriver masteroppgaven vår i samarbeid med Politihøgskolen og reiser rundt i landet i ulike politidistrikt for å samle inn data til forskningen vår. Vår veileder er Cathrine Filstad, som både er foreleser ved Handelshøyskolen BI i Oslo, men også foreleser på Politihøgskolen. Vi har satt av om lag 1 time til dette intervjuet og vil benytte oss av lydopptak under intervjuet. All data som samlet her vil bli behandlet konfidensielt, og vil bli slettet 6 måneder etter sensur av avhandlingen. Du vil også bli anonymisert i oppgaven vår. Dette er allerede informert om på forhånd, ved mottatt informasjonsskriv og underskrevet samtykkeerklæring. Dersom du har noen spørsmål underveis eller om noe er uklart, så si ifra om det.

INNLEDENDE SPØRSMÅL

- Navn:**
- Politidistrikt, samt lensmannskontor/politistasjon:**
- Først, kan du gjerne fortelle oss litt om hva slags utdanningsbakgrunn du har, og hvor lenge har du jobbet for politiet?**

LEDERE OG DERES ROLLE

- Hva er din nåværende stilling? Har stillingen din endret seg i løpet av de siste årene og etter at Nærpolitireformen trådte i kraft?**
 - Du er leder for en avdeling ikke sant? *Hva er avdelingen du leder ansvarlig for?*
 - Hva er dine ansvarsområder?*
 - Hvilke arbeidsoppgaver har du?*
 - Har du personalansvar? Hvor mange har du ansvar for?*
 - Hvor mange års ledererfaring har du?*
 - Hvor lenge har du hatt den rollen du har i dag?*
- Hva er de interne og eksterne forventningene til en politileder?**
 - Hva mener du forventes av deg som leder, og hvordan forholder du deg til disse forventningene?*
 - Hva mener du at dine medarbeidere kan forvente av deg som leder?*
 - Har du opplevd bekymring rundt det å ikke levere godt nok i din rolle som leder?*
- Hvordan utøver du ledelse, og hva ser du på som viktige lederegenskaper?**

LEDERKULTUR

- Hva mener du kjennetegner kulturen i politiet?**
- Hvordan oppfatter du nåværende lederkultur på din arbeidsplass?**
 - Mener du at lederkulturen bør endres? (i så fall hvordan?)*
 - Som leder har du et visst ansvar, føler du at det i ditt politidistrikt blir gitt anledning til å utøve det lederansvaret din stilling representerer?*

o *Du opplever kanskje utfordringer på egen ledelse, i form av mye du gjerne skulle ha gjort, men som du kanskje ikke får gjort. Er dette situasjoner du opplever? Eller har opplevd? Har du noen tanker rundt dette og hvordan det alternativt kunne blitt forbedret?*

- Litteratur skrevet om politiet hevder at politikulturen i Politiet har fått en diagnose og det er flere ganger blitt gitt hardtslående kritikk av ledelsen. Hva er dine synspunkter relatert til dette?**
 - o *Synes du kritikken dere mottar er berettiget?*
 - o *Kan du komme med noen eksempler?*
- Den kulturen som allerede er etablert i organisasjonen, tror du den påvirker hvordan ledelse utøves?**
 - o *Kan du gi et eksempel på hvordan du opplever at ledelse kan bli påvirket av organisasjonskulturen?*

IMPLEMENTERING AV NÆRPOLITIREFORMEN

Nærpolitireformen ble vedtatt i 2015 og det har naturligvis kommet flere endringer som et resultat av dette.

- Hvordan er din involvering av implementeringen av reformen?**
 - o *Føler du at din kompetanse blir verdsatt og at din stemme blir hørt ved implementeringen?*
 - o *I hvilken grad har du vært involvert i prosesser og beslutninger som har blitt tatt? Har du noen eksempler?*
 - o *Opplever du at det er lett å være proaktiv og å ta initiativ for å bli involvert?*
- Ledelse er et satsingsområde i reformen. Hva tenker du om dette? Hvordan opplever du dette?**
 - o *Det har blitt vist til at høyere ledernivåer er mer opptatt av behovet for å jobbe mer kunnskapsbasert, utnytte ressurser bedre og er i vesentlig større grad enige i prioriteringene i reformen. Kan du utdype dine tanker rundt dette?*
- Hva blir det viktigste for deg som leder i reformen?**
- Tilbake til det du snakket om dine ansvarsområder, vil vi gjerne trekke det opp mot implementeringen av Nærpolitireformen. Hva har vært dine ansvarsområder ift. Implementeringen av reformen?**
 - o *Opplever du at du får gjennomslag på det du ønsker å gjennomføre (på høyere ledernivåer)?*
 - o *Hvis stillingen har endret seg: Har du opplevd å miste din lederposisjon, blitt degradert, omplassert og flyttet på, eller har du blitt oppgradert, fått større ansvar som leder og opplever nye og utfordrende arbeidsoppgaver?*
 - o *Opplever du at det stilles høye forventninger og krav til deg som leder?*
 - o *Blir det gitt nødvendig tid, ansvar og myndighet til ledernivåene for å skape forståelse for endringer og blir dette videreført til dine medarbeidere?*
- Har noen av dine medarbeidere ytret frustrasjon i forhold til implementeringen av reformen?**
 - o *Opplever du at medarbeidere - som følge av reformen - enten har sluttet i eller søkt seg til andre oppgaver i politiet fordi de har vært misfornøyde med de nye ordningene?*
- Hvis det var tre ting du fikk lov til å forandre i endringsprosessen av**

implementeringen av Nærpolitireformen, hva ville det vært? Og hvorfor ville du ha endret disse forholdene?

- **Mange i politiet er jo enig i at det er behov for endringer fordi samfunnet og former for kriminalitet endrer seg. Hva tenker du om endringsbehovet i politiet?**
 - *Hvorvidt opplever du at reformen ivaretar endringsbehovet?*
 - *Har du merket noen merkbare endringer etter at Nærpolitireformen trådte i kraft? I så fall hvilke? Har du noen konkrete eksempler?*
- **Et av delmålene i reformen er at det skal bli et politi som skaper bedre resultater i en kultur preget av åpenhet og tillit. Hvordan føler du at det målet blir satt i fokus?**
 - *Kan du komme med noen eksempler på hvordan dette gjøres.*
 - *Hva mener du er viktig å ha fokus på for å skape mening og felles mestringstro gjennom denne endringsprosessen?*
 - *Hvordan er tilliten mellom deg og dine medarbeidere?*
- **Det finnes ulike måter å «løse» politireformen på. Hvordan opplever du at ditt politidistrikt har «løst» Nærpolitireformen? (I Finnmark har Politidirektoratet blant annet foreslått at Finnmark politidistrikt skal inneholde fire lensmanns- og politistasjonsdistrikt, med 17 tjenestesteder fordelt på disse).**
 - *Opplever du at de prioriteringene som reformen innebærer de riktige for deg og din avdeling?*
 - *Føler du at ditt politidistrikt har blitt rettferdig ivaretatt i denne endringsprosessen?*
- **Hva tenker du om hvordan piloter eller PNP (prosjekt nytt politidistrikt) har blitt gjennomført? Har du vært involvert i noe av dette?** (Prosjekt nye politidistrikter er ett av flere prosjekter i politireformen og innebærer implementeringen av de nye politidistriktene i Norge. Det innebærer blant annet arbeidet med å endre organisering og sjøsette de nye operasjonssentralene).

HVORDAN ORGANISASJONSKULTUR OG LEDELSE PÅVIRKER IMPLEMENTERINGEN AV NÆRPOLITIREFORMEN

- **Hva syns du kjennetegner kulturen i politiet? Kan du gi oss noen eksempler?**
 - *Med begrepet "kultur" refererer vi til de felles verdier, normer og virkelighetsoppfatninger som utvikler seg blant medlemmer i en organisasjon og som igjen skaper en felles virkelighetsoppfattelse. Hva tror du dette kan det være i politiet - denne felles virkelighetsoppfatningen?*
- **I hvilken grad tror du lederkulturen har blitt påvirket av og vært med å påvirke implementeringen av Nærpolitireformen?**
- **I hvilken grad tror du organisasjonskulturen på din arbeidsplass har blitt påvirket (negativt/positivt) av implementeringen av Nærpolitireformen?**
 - *Hvorvidt opplever du en positiv organisasjonskultur i ditt politidistrikt?*
- **Helt til slutt: Det som kjennetegner både norsk og internasjonal politi er at man går gradene internt som leder og dermed har ledere i politiet stort sett samme bakgrunn. Hva tenker du om det? Tenker du at andre personer med annen bakgrunn også kan eller har de samme evnene til å være politiledere (dvs. som ikke er politi eller jurister)?**

AVSLUTTENDE SPØRSMÅL

- Dette var alle spørsmålene vi hadde, er det noe helt på slutten du kunne tenke deg å legge til?

Andre oppfølgingsspørsmål som kan stilles generelt:

- Kan du gi noen eksempler på dette?
- Hva legger du i det?
- Hvorfor er det vanskelig/en utfordring?