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Abstract

The aim of this study was to explore how dimensions of organisational climate affect climate for quality in ØKOKRIM, and how the organisational climate for quality can be associated with their core task of investigation. Organisational climate measure (OCM) (Patterson et al. 2005) was used to explore organisational climate dimensions of effort, efficiency, production pressure and quality, and SWOT-interviews were used to explore perceptions around investigation. The survey data was analysed using correlation analysis and multiple regression analysis. The interview data was analysed using content analysis. The results showed that the climate dimension of effort had a statistically significant effect on quality. The interviews showed that in addition to the effort dimension, when associated with investigation, efficiency and production pressure were also perceived as potential contributors to quality. Practical and theoretical implications, as well as future research are discussed.
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Introduction

The Norwegian National Authority for Investigation and Prosecution of Economic and Environmental Crime, or ØKOKRIM, is a special investigation unit in the Norwegian Police organisation. Their investigative responsibility includes the largest, most complex and symbolic cases of its kind (ØKOKRIM, 2015a). Norway is a wealthy nation with a high level of welfare where the economic, environmental and tax system is based on trust. It is therefore attractive for such crimes, as well as corruption. Moreover, these crimes are continuously growing in numbers and complexity (ØKOKRIM - Strategi 2014-2016, 2014), and thus pose a threat to societal values and welfare (ØKOKRIM - Trusselvurdering 2015-2016, 2015). This makes the Norwegian society a stakeholder in itself to ØKOKRIMs work, making their investigation performance of societal importance. ØKOKRIM is therefore often subject to the public eye having an interest or opinion of their work.

When the media is looking from the outside in, it is often the quality of ØKOKRIMs work that is of interest. For example, the eleven year-long investigation and trial involving the multinational drilling company, Trancocean, that was retracted; and bribes uncovered by the Panama Papers that was not investigated have been subjected to criticism towards the quality of their work (E24, 2016; Aftenposten, 2016). There are a handful of angles to look from when considering the quality of ØKOKRIMs core investigation task besides the scope of the media. Quality for investigation can be defined as “the degree to which the activities meet the required or implied demands or expectations” (Politidirektoratet, 2013). Furthermore, whether the investigation leads to an indictment or not, if the process leads to a conviction, or time and resources spent on the investigation, can be considered traditional factors to evaluate investigation quality. However, these examples can also be considered looking in from the outside in. Also, the complexity and size of ØKOKRIMs cases can be considered to be at a level where traditional investigation or quality evaluation is not enough. Their task can involve novel constitutional practice and affairs that have not yet been investigated; making factors affecting quality possibly varying across cases. Furthermore, an inside perspective to what investigators themselves perceive as important factors for the quality of their work can be considered a little used source of information.

Taking an organisational psychological perspective, an approach that represents employees’ experiences of important organisational values and processes connected to their work, is organisational climate (Patterson, Warr & West, 2004; Patterson et al., 2005).
Research suggests that dimensions of organisational climate can be associated with quality and performance (Lawler, Hall & Oldham, 1974). This is relevant to ØKOKRIM; a core part of their strategy is to maintain a high level of quality as a result to their investigation (ØKOKRIM - Strategi 2014-2016, 2014).

This study will therefore explore climate for quality in ØKOKRIM and the perceptions the investigators have regarding quality in their work. The research will be conducted using the organisational climate measure (OCM) (Patterson et al., 2005) based on the competing values framework (CVF) (Quinn & Rohrbaugh, 1983). Furthermore, as quality is of such importance for ØKOKRIMs investigation, SWOT-interviews focusing on that subject will be conducted to explore how climate can be associated with investigation from the investigator's perspective.

The following section contains a description of the organisational climate concept, including the OCM (Patterson et al., 2005) and its theoretical grounding in the CVF (Quinn & Rohrbaugh, 1983). Further, a description of the climate dimensions of interest for this study, and their connection to each other and with quality follows before presenting the aim of this study.

Theory

Organisational Climate

The definition of the organisational climate concept have experienced substantial disagreement and a long-standing debate in the literature since the 1960’s (Thumin & Thumin, 2011; Schneider, Ehrhart & Macey, 2013). Discussions have considered whether climate is an individual or organisational construct (Ostroff & Schulte, 2014), what dimensions constitute climate (James et al., 2008), and measurement level (James & Jones, 1974; Schneider et al., 2013) compared to psychological climate (Chan, 1998; James et al., 2008; Kozlowski & Klein, 2000). There is a growing consensus on what organisational climate is and what it constitutes (Ostroff & Schulte, 2014).

First, climate involves the individual employee’s perceptions of its organisation, making it a perceptual (Kuenzi & Schminke, 2009), and hence a psychological phenomenon. These perceptions involve the meaning attached to the policies, practices and procedures which employees try to incorporate into a coherent global representation of the organisational climate (Zohar, 2000). Second, it involves the behaviours employees “observe getting
rewarded and that are supported and expected” (Schneider et al., 2013 p.362). Third, climate is a collective phenomenon, meaning that the individual perceptions of employees must be shared with other individual employees to a certain extent (Kuenzi & Schminke, 2009; James et al., 2008; James & Jones, 1974; Dickson, Resick, & Hanges, 2006; Klein, Conn, Smith, & Sorra, 2001). Fourth, climate is measured at the individual level and aggregated to the organisational level, usually by referent shift consensus model. This means that the construct is aggregated from individual level to organisational level, based on within-group consensus (Chan, 1998; Klein & Kozlowski, 2000; LeBreton & Senter, 2008; Schneider et al., 2013). Moreover, as climate is measured, the respondents are measured in how they believe others in the organisation perceives climate (Chan, 1998). The “sharedness” of individual climate perceptions reflects the organisational climate where consensus exists (the degree of within-unit variance) (Luria, 2008; Schneider, Salvaggio, & Subirats, 2002). This ties up the definition of climate as a sum to what is described above; “the shared perceptions of, and the meaning attached to, the policies, practices, and procedures employees experience and the behaviours they observe getting rewarded and that are supported and expected” (Schneider et al., 2013 p.362); a widely shared definition (Glick, 1985; Kuenzi & Schminke, 2009; Ostroff, Kinicki & Tamkins, 2000; Schneider & Reichers, 1983).

This means that climate can give an inside perspective, as opposed to the outside perspective of the public. The approach can contribute to knowledge of what the investigators themselves perceive as important factors for quality in their work. This can in turn help understand the behaviour of the investigators, as it can be considered connected to quality outcomes. Climate is therefore an important factor to understand when it comes to the quality of ØKOKRIMs work.

The climate concept has gained interest in the literature as a conceptual framework for understanding the social context of organisations, how employees experience and act in their work setting, and how climate is used to guide appropriate behaviour (James & Jones, 1974; Katz & Kahn, 1978; Schneider, Ehrhart, & Macey, 2013; Ployhart, Schneider & Schmitt 2006). However, there is a debate considering how organisational climate can be confused with organisational culture, as the two concepts both address experiences of the organisation and work setting among employees (Katz & Kahn, 1978; Schein, 2010; Schneider & Barbera, 2014; Schneider, 2000; Schneider et al., 2013). Although culture can seem to be a possible approach, climate is more fit for this study as it has a better explanatory value than culture. The difference between these two concepts will therefore now be further explained.
Climate vs Culture. There are many different opinions to whether or not climate and culture are the same (Thumin & Thumin, 2011). Some argue that culture causes climate, and that climate is an artefact along with other artefacts deriving from culture itself (Schein, 2000). Both climate and culture deal with how individuals try to make sense of their environment. Furthermore, both are learned through interaction among group members (Kuenzi & Schminke, 2009). Another argument to their link is that measuring climate actually is a measurement of culture (Payne, 2000). However, to capture the inside perspective from the investigators of ØKOKRIM, the culture concept is arguably less tangible than climate. Several scholars support that even though they are in fact connected, climate and culture are still sufficiently different concepts (Schneider et al., 2011), and there are several reasons to view climate and culture as distinct.

First, organisational climate tend to reflect different academic roots due to a longer history than culture research (Kuenzi & Schminke, 2009). This is part of a core difference between the two concepts, as climate is derived from Lewinian psychology (Schneider, 1990) and culture stems from anthropology, a difference that has affected the study and measurement of the two concepts (Kuenzi & Schminke, 2009). Second, climate refers to surface-level manifestations of employee perception on how things are done. Organisational culture on the other hand, exists on a higher level of abstraction focusing on underlying, unconscious, hidden assumptions in the organisation (Schein, 2010; Kuenzi & Schminke, 2009). This can be compared to the iceberg-analogy of Sackmann (1991), where climate is considered the part of the iceberg that is above the observable surface, and culture is what is under the surface. Culture research emphasizes the manifestation of shared values to artefacts, legends and symbols, whereas climate emphasizes how the shared values are attended to (Moran & Volkwein, 1992; Kuenzi & Schminke, 2009).

Thus, climate is not only a more tangible construct than culture, which better fits this study; it is also more fit than culture for survey measurement, as it focuses on the observable manifestations of culture (Denison, Nieminen, & Kotrba, 2014) and not underlying, unconscious and hidden assumptions that are more problematic to measure from the investigator's point of view. For more discussion see Schneider and Barbera (2014) or Denison (1996).

To measure climate, this study will use the organisational climate measure (OCM), a global multidimensional tool developed by Patterson et al. (2005). The OCM is theoretically grounded in the competing values framework (CVF) developed by Quinn & Rohrbaugh (1983). The CVF explains how different cultures can coexist in one organisation. Within this
framework is the rational goal model, which involves quality. As quality is the focus of this study, the rational goal model in the framework is the one of interest. The OCM is designed to measure the dimensions of the quadrants that constitute the CVF, including the dimensions in the rational goal model. Before explaining the OCM, the CVF will therefore be further explained.

The competing values framework

The competing values framework (Quinn & Rohrbaugh, 1983) is widely used to understand organisational phenomena (Cameron & Quinn, 2006; 2011). The contemporary version is based on tensions in organisations, sorted by two value dimensions or axes (Quinn & Rohrbaugh, 1983). The dimensions, representing organisational dilemmas, are linked to traditional managerial approaches in organisational psychology, recognized individually before Quinn and Rohrbaugh (1983) integrated them in a single conceptual framework.

The first dimension ranges from internal focus, e.g. on employee well-being and harmony, to external focus, e.g. on effectiveness and competitiveness among co-workers. The second dimension is focused on organisational structure and ranges from flexibility, e.g. organisations flexible toward the environment, to stability, e.g. organisations keeping their structure regardless of environmental change.

Combining the two dimensions constitutes the framework of the model (see figure 1). Brought together, they form four quadrants along two axes, representing underlying collective values and beliefs that guide management and focus. Each quadrant contains characteristics that are assumed to positively correlate to each other (Cameron & Quinn, 2011). With different evaluation criteria for performance, the quadrants are linked to particular behaviours. As with organisational climate, they represent the social normative expectations that allow members know how things are done in their organisation.

The combination of flexibility and internal focus constitutes the upper left quadrant in the framework, the human relations model. Here, organisations have an emphasis on employees and their well-being, growth, development and commitment.

The combination of control or stability towards the environment and internal focus constitutes the lower left quadrant, the internal process model. Here, formal rules and procedures are seen as important to hold the organisation together (Cameron & Quinn, 2011). The focus is on employees, communication, routine tasks, centralization and stability and continuity (Kalliath et al., 1999; Quinn & Rohrbaugh, 1983).
The combination of control or stability towards the environment and external focus constitute the lower right quadrant, the rational goal model. This is the model that is relevant to this study. Here, production organisations focusing on task quality are found, with planning and goal attainment in focus to reach productivity, efficiency and performance in their production (Quinn & Rohrbaugh, 1983; Kalliath et al., 1999).

A meta-analytic study of the CVFs theoretical suppositions found that the characteristics from the four quadrants coexist and collaborate in organisations, suggesting they are complementary rather than competing (Hartnell, Ou, & Kinicki, 2011). Therefore it is likely that aspects from all of the four quadrants can help understand factors important for quality in ØKOKRIMs climate, with more emphasis on some quadrants than others (Kalliath et al., 1999). However, as ØKOKRIM are oriented towards their task of investigation, which is considered a production task (Dean, Fahsing, Glomseth & Gottschalk, 2008; Quinn & Rohrbaugh, 1983; Kalliath et al., 1999) this study will focus on the rational goal model to understand climate for quality.

There are two measurement tools grounded in the CVF. The Organisational Culture Assessment Instrument (OCAI) was developed to identify a reference for change, connected to core values, shared assumptions and approaches to organisational tasks (Cameron & Quinn, 1999; Heritage, Pollock & Roberts, 2014). However, the OCAI is not a climate measure. It is not widely tested and has only been used to a small extent in the Norwegian context. Furthermore, it uses an ipsative measurement scale, which can be considered...
controversial (Eijnatten, Ark & Holloway, 2014). The alternative, the organisational climate measure (Patterson et al., 2005) is more fit than the OCAI for this study. It is widely used, more relevant to this study as it measure climate, and it is validated in the Norwegian context (Bernstrøm, Lone, Bjørkli, Ulleberg & Hoff, 2013).

**Organisational Climate Measure (OCM)**

The OCM is developed by Patterson et al. (2005) and consists of 82 items assessing 17 dimensions mapped on to the four quadrants of the CVF. The dimensions and measurement will be further defined in the methods section.

The OCM was validated through a study of 6869 employees from 55 UK manufacturing organisations (Patterson et al., 2005). To assess generalizability and structure for the tool, confirmatory factor analysis was used. The tool showed discriminant validity, meaning that it was able to discriminate between organisations, and employees working in the same organisations tended to respond in a similar fashion, supporting the consensual validity of the tool. Moreover, examining whether innovation & flexibility and reflexivity correlated with the response given by employees a year after the initial test, predictive validity of the measure was assessed. Studies have also validated the tool in a Norwegian context, finding interrater agreement for the factor structure and internal reliability of the questionnaire (Bernstrøm et al., 2013). The tool has also been used to study the climate for the police districts in Norway and the Norwegian Police Academy (Bø, 2014; Fjeld, 2013; Lone & Garnås, in review). This makes the OCM highly relevant for this study on ØKOKRIM as a special unit in the Norwegian Police Organisation. The instrument is well tested and gives researchers a robust tool to assess the dimensions of employee perception regarding work environment, and hence investigators perceptions of factors of importance for quality.

Among the 17 climate dimensions that constitute the OCM, there are six dimensions that represent the rational goal quadrant in the CVF. These are performance feedback, clarity of organisational goals, production pressure, effort, efficiency and quality. This study will focus on effort, efficiency, production pressure and quality. Research suggests that effort, efficiency and production pressure have a relationship with each other and with quality. Thus, they are more relevant to this study, as it explores climate for quality.

**Quality.** Patterson et al. (2005) defines the quality dimension as the emphasis given to quality procedures. The quality dimension has been found to be of highest importance
compared to other climate dimensions by previous studies on ØKOKRIM (Bø, 2014), and is treated as the dependent variable in this study. Research suggests that dimensions of effort, efficiency and production pressure can be positively or negatively correlated to quality. Thus, these dimensions are treated as independent variables in this study to explore how they affect the quality dimension in ØKOKRIM.

**Effort.** Patterson et al. (2005) defines effort dimension as the perception of how hard people work towards achieving goals. It can also be translated at a basic level to time and energy (Brown & Leigh, 1996). This dimension has been associated with quality and performance in several studies (Gardner, Dunham, Cummings & Pierce, 1989; Blau, 1993). The relationship between effort and performance can increase with task practice (Yeo & Neal, 2004), and according to Milam (2015), a lack of effort can cause negative outcomes where climate for effort is high. Furthermore, relevant to ØKOKRIMs investigation, which is considered complex, effort can be associated with task complexity (Yeo & Neal, 2004), where an increase of complexity is positively correlated with effort. Patterson et al., 2005 have also found a significantly positive correlation between effort and quality. Dimensions of effort have also been related to performance and productivity by Brown & Leigh (1996) and Wright & Staw (1999).

**Efficiency.** The efficiency dimension can be defined as the degree of importance placed on employee efficiency and productivity at work (Patterson et al., 2005). It can also be described in terms of an input-output ratio or comparison. Research suggests that quality and efficiency can have a positive or negative correlation with each other (Ostroff & Schmitt, 1993). Previous research on KRIPOS, a similar special investigation unit in the Norwegian Police Organisation, found that investigators can perceive time as flexible when working on complex cases, and criminal investigators have to spend time to organise and carry out the investigation (Glomseth & Gottschalk, 2009).

There are also indications to how quality can have a relationship with detail orientation (Miron, Erez & Naveh, 2004). Efficiency and detail orientation can be associated with terms of a trade-off between speed and accuracy, and research suggests that accuracy is positively correlated with time. If the task must be completed faster, a decrease in accuracy can be expected (Camp, Paas, Rikers & Merrinboer, 2001). For complex tasks such as the investigation in ØKOKRIM, the attention to detail can be time consuming, while efficiency is oriented towards fast processing of production. However, research also indicates that for tasks where attention to detail is important, efficiency and quality can be both positively and negatively correlated (Miron et al., 2004).
**Efficiency and effort.** There is also an ambiguous association between efficiency and effort. Research suggests that investing time and energy in task details can have a negative effect on efficiency, and can be negatively related to meeting deadlines (Miron et al., 2004). This indicates that effort used when paying attention to detail is related to quality outcome, with a consequence of paying the price of low speed and efficiency. However, Patterson et al (2005) have found a positive relationship between these two dimensions. Therefore, it can be interesting to explore how these two dimensions affect quality for ØKOKRIMs complex work.

**Production pressure.** Patterson et al. (2005) defines the dimension of pressure to produce as the extent of pressure employees have to meet targets. Research suggests that production pressure is a factor that can be associated with quality, and that it can contribute to, or inhibit performance depending on what is considered important task elements (Kelly & Loving, 2004). Production pressure can also lead to a less concern of quality, and the outcome can be less creative, less adequate, and of lower quality than when it is abundant (Karau & Kelly, 1992). For intellectual tasks such as ØKOKRIMs investigation, performance has been found to improve without time pressure (Kelly, Jackson & Hutson-Comeaux, 1997).

Furthermore, research indicates that lack of time pressure or no production pressure at all is positively correlated with outcomes. Time limits or production pressure has also been found to have a negative relationship with quality when quality is central to performance (Kelly & Loving, 2004). However, when there is a balance between time pressure and information, research suggests the outcome might improve (Kelly & Loving, 2004).

Considering investigation, as it gets more complex, the more time is expected to be spent (Dean, Fahsing & Gottschalk, 2006). As quality is of such high importance to ØKOKRIMs investigation, which is considered highly complex, the literature indicates that time abundance or absence of production pressure can be positively correlated with quality.

**Production pressure and efficiency.** Production pressure can also be associated with efficiency. Production pressure can cause an increase in efficiency to complete a task, as research suggests that this can lead to a focus on central aspects of importance for completion. Consequently, production pressure can cause aspects perceived as less relevant for completion to be left out (Kelly & Loving, 2004).

The dimensions of effort, efficiency and production pressure are the ones that represent the independent variables in this study to explore how they affect the dependent variable, quality, in ØKOKRIM organisational climate. When focusing on these dimensions,
it is not to imply that they represent the only or primary associations with climate for quality. It is rather to explore how they are associated with quality in ØKOKRIM, considering their representativeness for production and research indicating ambiguous relationships between them and quality. Henceforth, the following section explains the aim of this study.

**Aim of study**

The aim of this study is to explore how dimensions of organisational climate affect climate for quality in ØKOKRIM. The organisation has a core focus on quality in their performance, which their strategy also revolves around. Dimensions of effort, efficiency, production pressure and quality represent production (Patterson et al., 2005), and research suggests that they have a relationship with each other and with quality in different ways. Thus, this study more specifically explores the relationship between organisational climate dimensions of effort, efficiency and production pressure, and quality. Furthermore, as quality is of such high importance for their investigation, this study will explore how the organisational climate for quality can be associated with this core task.

**Research question:**

*How do climate dimensions affect the climate for quality in ØKOKRIM?*

The climate dimensions explored in this study are grounded in the rational goal model of the CVF (Quinn & Rohrbaugh, 1983). Based on the CVF, the OCM (Patterson al. 2005) will be used to measure general climate. Furthermore, to explore investigators perceptions around investigation quality in particular, semi-structured SWOT-interviews will be used.

Research suggests that there can be both positive and negative effects between the dimensions and quality. The effort dimension has been associated with quality and performance in several studies (Gardner, Dunham, Cummings & Pierce, 1989; Blau, 1993; Brown & Leigh, 1996; Wright & Staw, 1999; Yeo & Neal, 2004; Patterson et al., 2005; Milam, 2015).

Research has also found associations between quality and efficiency. Some studies indicate that efficiency can be a contributor to quality (Ostroff & Schmitt, 1993); while others indicate that the relationship can depend on task complexity (Camp et al., 2001), and that efficiency can be both positively and negatively correlated with quality in detail oriented tasks (Miron et al., 2004). Investigation in ØKOKRIM is regarded highly complex, and complexity have been found to have a positive correlation with time used to investigate (Dean et al., 2006).
Production pressure is a factor that research suggests is positively associated with quality (Kelly et al., 1997; Kelly & Loving, 2004). However, there are also evidence indicating a negative relationship between production pressure and quality (Kelly & Loving, 2004; Karau & Kelly, 1992, Dean et al, 2006). The society is considered a stakeholder for ØKOKRIM and is represented by the public press having interests in the performance and quality of investigation. From this point of view, the investigators in ØKOKRIM can experience production pressure.

According to the OCM and the CVF, the characteristics within the same quadrant are assumed be positively correlate with each other (Cameron & Quinn, 2011). Although this is in line with some of the studies presented, the studies come from different theoretical approaches and are not related to climate in particular. The measures in this study are based on the CVF and OCM, and the dimensions are therefore expected to have a positive association with quality.

\[ H1: \text{The effort dimension will have a positive effect on climate for quality.} \]

\[ H2: \text{The efficiency dimension will have a positive effect on climate for quality.} \]

\[ H3: \text{The production pressure dimension will have a positive effect on climate for quality.} \]

**Method**

**The research project**

This study is part of long-term collaborating research project between the Department of Work and Organisational Psychology at the University of Oslo, and the research apartment at the Norwegian Police University College. The project started in 2008 with the aim of researching the quality in investigation work in the police. Prior to this study, qualitative interviews and OCM-questionnaires with respondents from ØKOKRIM have been conducted.

**Sample**

The sample of this study consists of 28 respondents (N=28) from ØKOKRIM. The sample procedure was strategically carried out to ensure representation from different teams and roles, making the sample evenly distributed between jurors (N=9), economists (N=9),
police (N=9) and one respondent in a management position. The sample consisted of 12 women (43%) and 16 men (57%).

There are several characteristics in ØKOKRIM, which makes the organisation interesting for exploring how dimensions of organisational affect climate for quality. ØKORKIM is a special agency in the Norwegian Police organisation. The Norwegian Police organisation is subject to the Ministry of Justice and Public Security (Justis- og beredskapsdepartementet), and consists of The National Police Directorate, twenty-seven police districts, and six special agencies. In addition to the operative task of the Police Organisation, investigatory work is a central part of police work, and an important part of this study, as it also aims to explore how climate for quality can be associated with ØKOKRIMs core task of investigation.

Organisation. Created in 1989, ØKOKRIM is one of the special agencies of the Police Organisation. It is organised in seven sections and eleven teams. Each section has a leader, and a lawyer leads each team (ØKOKRIM, 2015b). The teams consist of investigators with economical, law, police, technical or other relevant professional backgrounds. The eleven teams are the bankruptcy team, the taxes team, the tax and competition team, the corruption team, the fraud and corruption team, the investment team, the dividend team, the money laundering team, the assistance team, the environment team and the unit of financial intelligence (ØKOKRIM, 2015b). The environmental team and the unit of financial intelligence have a clearly defined field of investigation. Apart from this, the other nine teams are supposed to be able to investigate any case within the organisation's area of responsibility, even if all teams have their area of special responsibility (ØKOKRIM, 2015b).

Task. ØKOKRIM separates from the rest of the Norwegian police organisation with regards to their mission and task to expose, investigate and prosecute economic and environmental crime (ØKOKRIM, 2015c). They also aim to increase knowledge in the police and the prosecution authority. Furthermore, they assist national and international police and prosecution authority, and consult and advise the central government (ØKOKRIM, 2015c).

The majority of economic and environmental crime is investigated in the local police districts. What recognizes ØKOKRIMs investigation is their special expertise within their field. Their resources are allocated towards economic and environmental crime of societal impact, i.e. the largest and most complex cases which have a symbolic value (ØKOKRIM, 2014). Moreover, ØKOKRIM are known to take on only a few cases. The investigators have the autonomy to choose which case to investigate on their own initiative, or among the reported ones on behalf of the prosecution authority (Riksadvokaten, 2015; ØKOKRIM,
CLIMATE FOR QUALITY IN ØKOKRIM

2014). ØKOKRIMs investigation is also recognized by strong counterparts, which are often corporations or actors in the business world that have a large amount of resources to defend their case.

**Ethics**

The respondents received a letter with information on the project and its objectives; that the interviews would be recorded, that participation was voluntary, and that they were free to withdraw participation at any time (see appendix A). Participants gave their informed consent. The interview questions were included in the information giving the respondents the opportunity to prepare. The data was stored safely at a database in accordance with established safety routines for sensitive data at the University of Oslo, Department of Psychology.

**Measurements**

**Quantitative measure (Close-ended questionnaires).** The Norwegian translation of the Organisational Climate Measure (Patterson et al., 2005) was used in this study to collect survey data. The questionnaire consists of 82 statements of items. Using a four point likert scale ranging from definitely false, mostly false, mostly true and definitely true (In Norwegian: helt feil, ganske feil, ganske riktig, helt riktig), the respondent marks the degree of agreement with each statement (see Appendix B). A score of 1 or 2 is considered negative and a score of 3 or 4 is considered positive. Some of the 82 items had to be reversed in the data analysis due to the wording. The questionnaire was somewhat modified to better fit the Norwegian Police Organisation. For example, words like “market”, “company”, “boss”, and “client” were considered to be of little relevance in a police setting. The changes were done by the Institute of Psychology at the University of Oslo.

The 82 items of the OCM questionnaire is distributed differently on the 17 dimensions of the OCM (Patterson et al., 2005, pp. 385-386). The scales are: 1. Autonomy (5 items): Designing jobs in ways that give employees wide scope to enact work. 2. Integration (5 items): The extent of interdepartmental trust and cooperation. 3. Involvement (6 items): Employees have considerable influence over decision-making. 4. Supervisory Support (5 items): The extent to which employees experience support and understanding from their immediate supervisor. 5. Training (4 items): A concern with developing employee skills.
6. Welfare (4 items): The extent to which the organisation values and cares for employees. 7. Formalization (5 items): A concern with formal rules and procedures. 8. Tradition (4 items): The extent to which established ways of doing things are valued. 9. Innovation & Flexibility (6 items): Flexibility - an orientation towards change. Innovation - the extent of encouragement and support for new ideas and innovative approaches. 10. Outward Focus (5 items): The extent to which the organisation is responsive to the needs of the customer and the marketplace in general. 11. Reflexivity (5 items): A concern with reviewing and reflecting upon objectives, strategies, and work processes, in order to adapt to the wider environment. 12. Clarity of Organisational Goals (5 items): A concern with clearly defining the goals of the organisation. 13. Efficiency (4 items): The degree of importance placed on employee efficiency and productivity at work. 14. Effort (5 items): How hard people in organisations work towards achieving goals. 15. Performance Feedback (5 items): The measurement and feedback of job performance. 16. Pressure to Produce (5 items): The extent of pressure for employees to meet targets. 17. Quality (4 items): The emphasis given to quality procedures. See appendix B for specific items.

Qualitative measure (Open-ended interviews). The semi-structured interviews were utilized with regards the PEACE model developed for police officers on investigative interviews (Clarke & Milne, 2001). This model is based on cognitive interview procedures and considers the different stages of the interview process: planning and preparation (P), engage and explain (E), account clarification and challenge (A), closure (C) and evaluation (E). The framework provides structure of the interview from beginning to end, and was designed to promote open and detailed explanations from interview objects in different situations (Clarke & Milne, 2001; Köhnken, Milne, Memon & Bull, 1999). The SWOT-approach was used to conduct the interviews. This is a semi-structured, open-ended interview technique that divides the questions into categories of strengths (S), weaknesses (W), opportunities (O) and threats (T) regarding the subject matter. This approach is often used as a tool for strategic analysis and planning in organisations (Helms & Nixon, 2010). The questions are open and impartial, as the framework was utilized to encourage reflection from the interview objects (Lone et. al., 2014). Moreover, the SWOT model also operates along dimensions of positive and negative, past and future, and within and without (Lone et. al., 2014). This format offers structure to the reflections of the respondents without encouraging certain responses, as the questions does not limit the interview on behalf of assumptions made by the interviewer (Lone et. al., 2014; Hoff, Straumsheim, Bjørkli & Bjørklund, 2009).
Thus, the approach allowed the respondents to be asked to state their own reflections regarding the quality investigation work, giving a rich description of the subject matter.

The interview technique encourages free association space set by the dimensions positive-negative and present-future. Each interview consisted of these four open questions:

*What do you think works well regarding the investigative work in ØKOKRIM? We call this the strengths of the investigating work.*

*What do you think does not work well regarding the investigative work in ØKOKRIM? We call this the weaknesses of the investigating work.*

*What do you consider to be opportunities for improving the quality of the investigation in ØKOKRIM? We call this the opportunity of the investigating work.*

*What do you consider to be the threats against improving the quality of the investigation in ØKOKRIM? We call this the threats of the investigating work.*

Each informant was given possible follow-up questions based on the answers to explore themes introduced by the respondent during the interview. Before the end of each interview, the informants were also given the opportunity to provide extra information.

For this study, quotes and statements from the interviews that associate dimensions of effort, efficiency and production pressure with investigation and quality will be used selectively to explore how they can be associated with the climate for quality in ØKOKRIM.

**Procedure**

OCM questionnaires were handed out to the respondents in conjunction with the qualitative interviews and thus making the survey respondents the same as the interview objects (N=28). The interviews were conducted during the fall of 2013 and spring 2014, with each interview consisting of two interviewers present, both with extensive training in the PEACE-model and the SWOT-framework. This training secures the standardizing of interviews and strengthens reliability. After being carried out in Norwegian and recorded, the interviews were transcribed and unitized; which means that the transcriptions were divided into statements of the least meaningful unit. Previous master students and research assistants on the project conducted the process.

**Transcription.** The tape-recorded interviews were transferred to a computer for transcription. By transforming oral conversations into written text, interview material was
prepared for analysis (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009). All interviews were transcribed verbatim, including words like “ehm” and “mhm”.

**Data treatment and statistical analysis.**

All survey data was plotted manually into an SPSS file. Missing values were replaced by a mean value using the SPSS procedure “Replace Missing Value” (RMV). The 32 reversed items were transferred into new variables. The 82 items were then categorised into the 17 OCM dimensions, according to Patterson et al., (2005). Henceforth, correlation analysis was conducted for the four production dimensions of interest, which were effort, efficiency, pressure to produce and quality. The analysis was conducted to check for relationships between them. Henceforth, a multiple regression analysis, consisting of production pressure, efficiency and effort as independent variables and quality as the dependent variable, was carried out to analyse to what extent each of the dimensions could significantly explain the variation in quality.

**Interview analysis.**

The purpose for using the interview data was to further refine, extend or enrich the findings from the quantitative analysis (Hsieh & Shannon, 2005). Based on the quantitative statistical analysis and the aim of the study, each interview was scrutinized to extract representative quotes and statements. The interview quotes and statements were extracted using content analysis, after subjective interpretation of their relevance to the climate dimensions and the quantitative results (Hsieh & Shannon, 2005).

**Content analysis.** The purpose of content analysis is to reduce the transcribed interviews to categories of a model or instruments, which in turn makes it possible to compare and to test hypotheses (Krippendorff, 2004). The analysis is considered a stepwise process (Neuendorf, 2002). In this study, it was carried out on the transcribed data to find quotes and statements that that could contribute to the explanation on the relationship between the dimensions. This was done to explore if and how the dimensions were associated with investigation.
Results

Quantitative results

Descriptive statistics. The results summarise the OCM questionnaires from the 28 respondents. Table 1 presents descriptive statistics for the four climate dimensions. The means ranged from 2.25 (Efficiency) and 3.54 (Quality), giving a variation of 1.29. The standard deviation ranged from .40 (Quality) and .46 (Efficiency), giving a variation of .06.

Table 1. Descriptive statistics of the OCM (N=28)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OCM Dimension</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Efficiency</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Effort</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Press to produce</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Quality</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Inferential statistics. A correlation analysis was conducted for the dimensions to explore the relationship between the variables. Table 2 presents the results from the correlation analysis.

Table 2. Correlation between dimensions of Quality, Efficiency, Effort and Pressure to produce (N=28)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Quality</th>
<th>Efficiency</th>
<th>Effort</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td>.468*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effort</td>
<td>.544**</td>
<td>.310</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pressure to produce</td>
<td>.150</td>
<td>-.022</td>
<td>.043</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:
* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
Multiple regression analysis was conducted to determine if there was a significant linear relationship with between the dimensions and the Quality dimension as outcome variable. Table 3 presents the results from the multiple regression analysis.

Table. 3 *Summary of Standard Multiple Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Quality* 
\((N = 28)\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>(\beta)</th>
<th>(t)</th>
<th>95% CI lower/upper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality (Constant)</td>
<td>1.180</td>
<td>0.619</td>
<td>1.907</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.097 / 2.457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effort</td>
<td>.430</td>
<td>.163</td>
<td>.434*</td>
<td>2.638</td>
<td>.094 / .767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td>.293</td>
<td>.143</td>
<td>.336</td>
<td>2.043</td>
<td>-.003 / .589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pressure to Produce</td>
<td>.124</td>
<td>.140</td>
<td>.139</td>
<td>.889</td>
<td>-.164 / .413</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(R^2\)          .414**
\(R^2adj\)        .341**
\(F\)             5.659**

\(*p < .05. **p < .01.\)

The multiple regression analysis shows how the variance in effort, pressure to produce and efficiency predict variance in quality. A statistically significant relationship was found (\(F(3,24) = 5.659, p = 0.004\)), \(R^2 = .414/R^{2adj} = .341\). Effort had a statistically significant effect on the variance in quality (\(B = .43, p<.05\)). Efficiency (\(B = .293, p = 0.052\)) and pressure to produce (\(B = .124, p = .383\)) did not have a statistically significant effect on the variance in quality.

Qualitative results

**Descriptive statistics.** Mean interview length: 48:28 min. Minimum length: 20:13 min. Maximum length: 1h 30:01min. SD: 17:19 min.

**Content Analysis.** The content analysis found that effort, pressure to produce and efficiency were perceived as contributing and inhibiting quality in different ways. There were also several interconnections, where more than one dimension was involved in perceptions of their relationship with quality. A summary explaining these perceptions will now be presented.

**Effort.** Effort was described in terms of time and resources, going in depth and thoroughly investigating as contributing to quality. This dimension was also associated with
the high complexity of cases as well as the strong and resourceful counterparts in the prosecution, making effort necessary to achieve quality.

On the other hand there were examples of how too much effort could be a threat to quality. A phenomenon called “over-investigation” described how investigators put effort into investigating every criminal affair that was possible to find, either because of a fear to leave important things out or to reach the highest possible level of quality. In such cases, drawing the line at a certain level of quality was perceived as important.

Examples of statements that represent these perceptions are:

“we are privileged(...) there is definitely possibilities to work thoroughly with a case. And you can get(...) quality over the work”.

“(...) it has its price with high quality(...) it will cost resources(...) things take longer(...) investigation takes time, eh, and we also use resources to investigate each case”.

“(...) some have trouble finishing a task(...) it leads to a lot of over-investigation(...) wasted resources”

**Pressure to produce.** Production pressure was also described in terms of how having time for each case, only focusing on a few cases at once. Low production pressure was seen as contributing to quality as it was associated with allowing investigators to focus on finishing one case at a time. Thus, low production pressure was associated positively with quality. However, investigators also perceived production pressure and taking in more cases as something that could contribute to quality. This was described in terms of how it could increase investigation experience.

Some statements that exemplify some of these perceptions are:

“(...) choosing cases, it is an obvious strength in the investigation(...) You can choose to do a very good job with that one case”.

“Time pressure will always be a threat to quality”.

“(...) I think there is a side of quality to having pressure”.

“(...) if you do not work a lot you do not get experience either(...) you dig your own grave if you do not take in enough cases”.

**Efficiency.** Efficiency was mainly perceived as a possible contributor to quality, and low efficiency was perceived as an inhibitor. In over-investigation cases, efficiency was
perceived as a possible contributor to quality in terms of cutting to the core characteristics of an indictment. A higher focus on efficiency was also perceived as a way of avoiding the negatives parts of a phenomenon called “spin-off cases”, which is when investigation opens up more to investigation of one case. This was associated with over-investigation and could make cases so large and complex to an unmanageable point. Efficiency was also associated with resource allocation, where teams experiencing downtime for different reasons could help other teams with a higher workload as a contribution to quality.

Examples of statements that give example to some of these reflections are:

“(...) the downtime in large cases(...) if we take in more cases(...) we could have a better dynamic(...) have something to do all the time and using the investigation tools(...) i think that would improve quality”.

“(...) lots of conditions in one case(...) sometimes a case is so large and take so long and we could perhaps cut more to it. And get to the objective faster. And still get a good decision. Sometimes people get so invested in the person or business they investigate(...) finding new conditions(...) and it turns to a monster(...) you can get lost(...) feel that you will never finish(...).

**Interconnections.** Some of the reflections included above can also be considered relevant to more than one of the dimensions. There were also many other reflections that involved interconnections between two or more dimensions in their association with quality. Efficiency could be associated with effort when perceived as a contributor to quality. When these two dimensions were associated, too much effort could be perceived an inhibitor to efficiency and in turn inhibit quality.

Production pressure could be perceived as a threat against having the time and resources, i.e. effort to ensure quality. Furthermore, production pressure was also perceived as a contributor to efficiency, but in such a case, also a possible inhibitor to quality.

There were also perceptions of how effort could inhibit production pressure and efficiency in cases where the latter two dimensions could contribute to quality. Lastly, there were perceptions representing how a balance between the dimensions could contribute to quality.

Examples of statements representing some of these perceptions are:

“(...) choosing our own cases(...) is has a backside(...) you do not get as effective as you could have been(...) when not having the constant pressure that ordinary police has(...) Still it is positive because the quality gets better.”
“(…) choosing cases(...) it can be a strength, but it can also be a weakness(...) To keep up the pressure, it is a limit maybe, to how many cases you can have. But there is also a limit to how few cases to can have. So it becomes a balance, actually”.

“(…) having a lot to do, I work more effectively when I have a little pressure, than when I do not have pressure”.

“(…) when we have time, we can take everything from the smallest accounting infringement(...) and the cases get vast and take a long time to get through(...) and if (referring to the defendant) gets convicted for 40 or 20 violations, right, maybe one must draw the line somewhere”.

There are several ways to understand and explain these results. A further explanation of the results as well as different ways of understanding what they suggest will now be presented in the following discussion.

**Discussion**

The aim of this study was to explore how organisational climate dimensions of effort, efficiency affect climate for quality for ØKOKRIM. The study also aimed to explore how the organisational climate for quality could be associated with their core task of investigation. The OCM (Patterson al. 2005) was used to measure climate dimensions, and semi-structured SWOT-interviews focusing on investigators perceptions around investigation quality were used to explore further. A correlation analysis on the dimensions motivated a multiple regression analysis.

**Summary of quantitative results**

A correlation analysis was conducted on the OCM results, and showed a statistically significant positive correlation between quality and effort, and between quality and efficiency. There was a positive correlation between effort and efficiency, but it was not statistically significant. Moreover, a multiple regression analysis was conducted, and showed a statistically significant relationship between the dimensions and quality as outcome variable.

Hypothesis one stated that the effort dimension would have a positive effect on climate for quality. The results from the multiple regression analysis showed that effort had a
statistically significant effect of between 34.1% ($R^2_{adj}$) and 41.4% ($R^2$) on the variance in quality ($B = .43, p<.05$). Based on the results from the correlation analysis and the multiple regression analysis, this hypothesis is supported.

Hypothesis two stated that the efficiency dimension would have a positive effect on climate for quality. The multiple regression analysis showed that efficiency had an effect on quality ($B = .293$), although not statistically significant ($p = 0.052$). Furthermore, the correlation analysis found a statistical significant relationship between efficiency and quality. There was also a relationship between efficiency and effort. Although this relationship was not significant, it should be noticed. The results show a tendency towards efficiency having an effect on quality. However, the results from the multiple regression analysis were not statistically significant. Thus, hypothesis two is rejected.

Hypothesis three stated that the production pressure dimension would have a positive effect on climate for quality. The correlation analysis did not find a statistical significant relationship between production pressure and quality. The multiple regression analysis found an effect ($B = .124$). But this effect was not statistically significant ($p = .383$). Based on the correlation analysis and the multiple regression analysis, this hypothesis is rejected.

**Summary of qualitative results**

A content analysis was conducted on the SWOT-interviews to explore how the climate dimensions of effort, production pressure and efficiency was perceived when associated with investigation quality. The results showed that when considering investigation, all three dimensions were perceived as having an impact on quality. Thus, the interviews give a supplement to the general climate evaluation with associations considering the specific task of investigation.

**Effort.** Effort was described in terms of time and resources, which was perceived as necessary to ensure quality. However, effort was also perceived as potentially inhibiting to quality when the investigation reached a point where more effort no longer would contribute to quality. This can be exemplified with over-investigation, which also needs to be considered for the two other dimensions of efficiency and production pressure.

**Efficiency.** Efficiency was as effort, described in terms of time spent on cases, and in terms of organising, strategy and priorities. This dimension was perceived as a contributor to quality, and low efficiency was perceived as an inhibitor to quality. This dimension also needs to be understood in relation to the other two dimensions of effort and production pressure, which will be elaborated below.
**Production pressure.** Production pressure was described in terms of time used for each case investigated. This dimension was perceived as both potentially contributing and inhibiting to quality. However, the same could also be perceived for low production pressure. Also, the right balance was perceived as a possible contribution to quality. To further understand this dimensions perceived effect on investigation, effort and production pressure also need be considered.

**Interconnections.** The dimensions perceived effect on investigation is better understood when taken together, and discussed in terms of the cases investigated. The results suggest that they are interconnected in their potential contributing or inhibiting effect on investigation quality.

Effort was perceived as necessary to ensure quality. For example: “*We have time to dive down in the cases and to things thoroughly*”. This can be linked with the novelty, size and importance of the cases investigated. For example: “*It is supposed to be large or principal cases(...) and if there are new laws or matters there are a focus on in society. So we get time and resources to go completely in depth. And that is good*”.

When a certain level of quality had been reached as a result of high effort, there could be a risk of over-investigation. In such cases, the results indicate that a focus on efficiency could help “cutting to the chase”. For example: “*(...) when we have time, we can take everything from the smallest accounting infringement(...) and the cases get vast and take a long time to get through(...) and if (the defendant) gets convicted for 40 or 20 violations, right, maybe one must draw the line somewhere*”.

For efficiency, this dimension could also be perceived as contributing to quality together with production pressure. Consequently, low efficiency and low production pressure could be perceived as a threat to investigation. This can also be associated with the high focus on effort and a risk of over-investigation, making investigators experience trouble with finishing their task. For example: “*(...) some have trouble finishing a task(...) it leads to a lot of over-investigation(...)*, and another example: “*(...) a lot of resources are used to double check that you will not do a mistake(...) eats your time*”.

Production pressure was also perceived as a threat to investigation quality. Pressure to produce was perceived as a potential inhibitor to quality as it could lead to tunnel vision. For example: “*(...) feeling stressed and low on time(...) can give unwanted effects(...) getting the tunnel vision we are not supposed to have*”. In such cases, the results suggest that a combination of low production pressure and high effort was a contributor to quality.
The contribution of low production pressure and a high focus on effort as contributing to quality was associated with investigators having the autonomy to choose cases themselves, and having only a few at once. For example: “(...) We can hold a high quality to the cases we actually investigate(...) we do not have to look at new cases all the time”.

Furthermore, low production pressure could also be perceived as a threat, associated with how time spent on cases could inhibit quality. For example: “(...) witnesses will remember less the more time has passed(...) the evidence are weakened”. Low production pressure combined with the high focus on effort was therefore perceived as a threat to investigation quality.

The results can also be discussed and understood with regards to previous research, as it can give suggestions to possible explanations for the dimensions association with investigation.

**Previous research.** The results indicate that the high focus on effort could inhibit quality, where too much effort was exemplified with investigators having trouble with finishing their task. In such cases, a higher focus on efficiency or more production pressure can contribute to quality. Research suggests that effort increases with task complexity (Yeo & Neal, 2004). This can be a part of the explanation to how the dimensions effect investigation has ØKOKRIMs investigation is considered highly complex.

Complex investigation has also been found to increase time spent on investigation (Dean et al., 2006). Research on KRIPOS, which is also a special investigation agency in the Norwegian Police Organisation, suggests that investigators perceive time as flexible in complex cases (Glomseth & Gottschalk, 2009).

Considering production pressure, performance can actually improve without this type of pressure for intellectual tasks such as ØKOKRIMs investigation (Kelly et al., 1997). Research also suggests that such pressure can lead to a less concern of quality, and the outcome can be of lower quality than when time is abundant (Karau & Kelly, 1992). This can also be connected to efficiency, which is oriented towards fast processing of production.

Furthermore, quality can be affected by detail orientation (Miron et al., 2004), and when more accuracy is required, the time necessary to complete a task can increase (Camp et al., 2001). For complex tasks such as the investigation in ØKOKRIM, attention to detail can be time consuming. Investing time and energy in task details has also been found as a
possible inhibitor to efficiency. This can also be connected to production pressure, as it can be negatively related to meeting deadlines (Miron et al, 2004).

However, research also indicates that for tasks where attention to detail is important, efficiency and quality can be both positively and negatively correlated (Miron et al., 2004). This can help explain why the effect of efficiency on climate for quality was somewhat inconclusive, and why some investigators saw an importance of cutting to the chase as a contributor to quality.

**General discussion**

The results from this study show that the climate dimension of effort has a strong significant effect on the climate for quality in ØKOKRIM. The efficiency dimension also showed an effect on quality, although not as strong as the effort dimension, and not statistically significant. Production pressure showed a non-significant correlation with effort. The multiple regression analysis showed that this dimension did not have an effect on the climate for quality. The results thus indicate that the climate for quality has an impact on investigation, and the strong impact effort has on climate is also perceived as necessary for investigation quality. Furthermore, efficiency and production pressure is not as strong in their effect on the climate for quality as the effort dimension. The results thus suggest that a strong effect of effort can inhibit the potential contributing effects from the other two dimensions.

However, what can be considered particularly interesting is that when these dimensions are associated with the specific investigation task, all three dimensions are perceived as having an interconnected effect on quality. This is shown by the interviews, and not by the OCM, and the interviews thus give a more nuanced picture of how the dimensions affect the core investigation task than the survey-instrument.

The interviews show how the dimensions were perceived to have an effect on the investigation, which can be discussed in terms of process quality or result quality. High focus on effort and a low focus on efficiency and production pressure can lead to over-investigation. This can be considered an example for how the dimensions affect the process of investigation.

An example of how this can have a negative effect on the results of the investigation is that witnesses can have trouble remembering important events when the investigation has taken long to finish. Over-investigation and spin-off cases can also exemplify how the dimensions could affect both the process and the result. These phenomena were perceived as
potentially making a case so large and complex to a point where a focus on efficiency in terms of cutting to the core characteristics of a case could contribute to better process quality and in turn result quality. The strong effect effort showed on the climate for quality, and the potential contributing effect from the other dimensions can also be discussed in terms of the size and complexity of cases. Time and resources are put in to ensure quality in the investigation. The longer a case takes to finish, the longer it takes before a new case is investigated. Consequently, there is a long period of time in between when the investigators work at a certain stage of the investigation. The results showed that variety in cases in terms of size and complexity was perceived as a potential contributor to investigators experience in the different stages of the investigation. More experience can be regarded as a potential contributor a more efficient process, which in turn can contribute to the quality in the investigation of larger and more complex cases.

When considering the traditional evaluation methods mentioned in the intro, where quality can be evaluated with regards to time and resources, or if the results of the investigation is an indictment or not, the results in this study indicate that the investigation process is also an important evaluation criteria besides the evaluation of investigation results. This represents a difference between the survey measurement and the SWOT-interviews. When the interviews are considered, the results show how the climate dimensions from the OCM does not only have a potential effect on the results of the investigation, but that when associated with a specific task, also the process leading up to its results.

Implications

Practical implications. This study is seems to be the first to explore how climate dimensions affect climate for quality in ØKOKRIM, and further how this can be associated with their core task of investigation. Studies on special investigation units such as ØKOKRIM are rare, and therefore a contribution to research of such groups. Furthermore, as ØKOKRIM is also a part of the Norwegian Police Organisation, it makes this study a potential contribution to the research on the police force in general.

The results of this study indicate that organisational climate dimensions have an effect on climate for quality, and the quality of a specific task. More particularly, they indicate that there is complex relationship between climate dimensions of effort, efficiency and production pressure when associated with the specific task of investigation.
Moreover, this complex relationship suggests that the effect organisational climate has on climate for quality in ØKOKRIM lies in balancing these climate dimensions. Characteristics such as case size and complexity, over-investigation, spin-off cases or cutting to the main case are examples of aspects that need to be considered in this balance.

**Theoretical implications.** The four quadrants in the CVF, which the OCM is built on (Quinn & Rohrbaugh, 1988; Patterson et al., 2005), have known tensions between them. Research suggests that there are tensions between the quadrants in the CVF, but also that characteristics from different quadrants can coexist within organisations (Hartnell et al., 2011). This study indicates that the dimensions within the quadrants also coexist, and that there are tensions between them as well. Quinn (1988) argued that the key to perform was in the balance between contradictory demands.

This study is a contribution to the discussion on how climate dimensions can affect climate for quality in ØKOKRIM, and how it can be associated with investigation. However, there are important limitations that have to be addressed.

**Limitations**

**Sample.** This study gathered data from a relatively small sample. The results might therefore not represent the organisation as a whole, and can be difficult to generalise. Conducting this study with a larger sample was not possible, but could however, lead to different results. The results from the multiple regression analysis showed that effort had a statistically significant effect of between 34, 1% ($R^{2adj}$) and 41, 4% ($R^2$) on the variance in quality. For small sample sizes such as in this study, the $R^2$ can overestimate the relationship between variables (Pallant, 2007). However, this study also presented the $R^{2adj}$ to give a more complete representation of the results. Also, to lower the effect of a small sample size in terms of representativeness, the sample procedure was strategically carried out to ensure representation from different teams and roles, making the sample evenly distributed to represent the organisation as a whole.

**Data Collection.** The data used in this study has been gathered as a part of a larger project, and several participants have been involved in the different stages of collecting data. Different participants have conducted the transcription, unitizing and coding of interviews. This can limit the reliability as one cannot control completely for individual interpretations of preference for the length of units or other factors concerning reliability. However, as the
content analysis in this study was conducted on the transcribed data, it limits the risk for affecting reliability. To be able to use both the quantitative and qualitative data, this study has trusted that a correct procedure for the questionnaires and the transcription has been conducted correctly.

**Instrument.** This study used the OCM, which is a self-report survey developed by Patterson et al. (2005), to collect quantitative data. The survey methodology has several well-known limitations (Kuenzi & Schminke, 2009). Method biases are likely to be present in such a study, as the data for all the variables were obtained from the same respondents in the same measurement context using the same item context and similar item characteristics (Podsakoff, Mackenzie, Lee & Podsakoff, 2003). This same-source bias can inflate relationships artificially (Kuenzi & Schminke, 2009). Furthermore, a limitation to the data used in this study is social desirability bias and consistency motif (Podsakoff et al., 2003). However, ensuring anonymity and reassuring participants that there were no right or wrong answers were non-statistical measures to reduce these biases (Podsakoff et al., 2003).

**Interviews.** The interviews focused on the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats regarding the quality of investigation. Semi structured, open-ended interviews is a valuable tool for collecting data as it can provide a lot of useful information. However, considering the research question, interviewers did not ask the participants how dimensions of effort, production pressure and efficiency were related to investigation quality. This guided the choice of statements and quotes to represent the different perceptions of the dimensions relationships to quality. Furthermore, the content analysis was conducted on the transcribed data only, and the coding schemes were not used. There is interview data that has not been used, and several quotes and statements that could have been a contribution to the findings in this study might have been missed. However, the interviews were used together with the multiple regression analysis conducted on the OCM. The interviews therefore gave enough information to enrich, understand and discuss how the dimensions could be associated with investigation, and hence served their purpose for this study.

**Generalizability.** ØKOKRIM is considered a unique organisation, and a possible generalisation of the findings in this study may be limited to ØKOKRIM only. However, it is also a part of the Norwegian Police Organisation, which makes it a public organisation. The results might be generalizable to similar public organisations or investigative units. The OCM that was used to measure the organisational climate in ØKOKRIM was used in this study to extract a measurement for the quality dimension as well as the dimensions of effort, production pressure and efficiency. There are several other ways to measure climate that
could have been relevant to this study (e.g. see Cameron & Quinn, 2011; Chhokar, Brodbeck, & House, 2007; House, Javidan, Hanges, & Dorfman, 2002). However, the OCM was found to be the tool most fit for this study. Also, it is well used in the Norwegian context and in other studies of organisational Climate in the Norwegian Police Organisation.

Furthermore, this study is limited to studying how dimensions of effort, production pressure and efficiency affect climate for quality in ØKOKRIM. These are theoretically grounded in the same quadrant of the CVF, which justify exploring their effect on climate for quality. However, there are several other possible factors that can have an impact on quality and investigation. This motivates future studies should to explore how other possible relevant factors for investigation or production can affect quality.

**Future studies**

From a theoretical point of view, the findings in this study indicate that dimensions of the OCM coexist within the quadrants of the CVF (Quinn & Rohrbaugh, 1983), and that there can be tensions between them when associated with a specific task. It could be interesting to investigate other dimensions from the OCM and the CVF to explore how they can be associated with quality and investigation or production.

Future research can also expand this research to a larger sample of the organisation to strengthen the findings and their generalizability. Furthermore, conducting a similar study on other organisations in other countries can give interesting results for comparison of either investigative organisations such as ØKOKRIM or other organisations with an important or complex production task.

Considering that ØKOKRIM is a part of the Norwegian Police Organisation, an expansion of the sample to cover other parts of the organisation to compare with the findings in this study can be done. This can be executed with the same or with different dimensions associated with quality, and can contribute to a discussion that also includes other parts of the police organisation. Examples of interesting units to study are the National Criminal Investigation Service (KRIPOS), traditional investigation units, or operative police forces. This would contribute to comparative knowledge among several units in the police organisation and a discussion to what is associated with quality in different environments.
Conclusion

The aim of this study was to explore how dimensions of effort, production pressure and efficiency affect quality of investigation in ØKOKRIM. The study used the OCM (Patterson et al., 2005) to measure and analyse organisational climate using multiple regression analysis, and SWOT-interviews to explore how this could be associated with investigation. The main findings were that the effort dimension had a statistically significant effect on climate for quality. Furthermore, when associated with the specific task of investigation, the findings indicate that there is an interconnected relationship between effort, efficiency and production pressure, and investigation quality, and that their potential contributing or inhibiting effect on investigation quality involves different factors. This is a contribution to studies on special investigation agencies such as ØKOKRIM and research that explore how climate for quality is associated with investigation from the investigator's point of view.
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Appendix A: Letter of information / consent

Økokrim COLLEGE
Postboks 8193 Dep.
0034 OSLO

Deres referanse: Vår referanse: Sted, Dato
201100956 Oslo, 17.september 2013

PROSJEKT ETTERFORSKNING
Jeg viser til møte hos ØKOKRIM 6.9.13 og samtale med ØKOKRIM-sjef Trond Eirik Schea 11.9.13 der Schea har bifalt at ØKOKRIM deltar i forskningsprosjektet.

Som jeg presenterte har Politidirektoratet gitt Politihøgskolen midler til å gjennomføre et prosjekt med sikte på å undersøke organiseringen av politiets etterforskningsarbeid i Norge.

Fra Politihøgskolen består prosjektgruppen av:
  • Professor Tor-Geir Myhrer.
  • Professor Johannes Knutsson.
  • Politiinspektør Trond Myklebust.

I tillegg har vi et formelt samarbeid med faggruppen for arbeids- og organisasjonspsykologi ved Psykologisk institutt, Universitetet i Oslo (UIO).

Som Cato A. Bjørkli (UIO) og undertegnede presenterte for dere i vår gjennomgang av prosjektet, har vi intervjuet representanter fra samtlige politidistrikter samt faglærere ved Politihøgskolen. Som en videreføring av prosjektet ønsker vi å intervjue et utvalg fagpersoner fra de ulike fagteamene ved ØKOKRIM.

Vi takker for at ØKOKRIM har sagt seg villig til å delta i prosjektet. Som avtalt vil vi forholde oss til Terje Ingstad for det praktiske- og administrative arbeidet rundt intervjuene, herunder utvelgelse av respondenter.

Det er frivillig å være med og hver deltaker har mulighet til å trekke seg når som helst underveis, uten å måtte begrunne dette nærmere. Dersom en deltaker trekker seg vil alle innsamlede data fra personen bli slettet så langt det er mulig.

Alle opplysninger vil bli behandlet konfidensielt, og intervjuene vil bli avidentifisert slik at ingen enkeltpersoner vil kunne gjenkjennes i prosjektets skrevne sluttprodukt (rapporter/artikler). Opplysningene anonymiseres og opptakene slettes når forskningsprosjektet er ferdig, ikke senere enn 1.1.2020.

Intervjuene vil være struktureret etter en såkalt SWOT-tilnærmning og består av følgende fire
tema/spørsmål:

I. Fortell om det som i dag fungerer godt ved etterforskningsarbeidet her i ØKOKRIM – vi kaller dette styrken i etterforskningsarbeidet.

II. Fortell om det som i dag ikke fungerer godt ved etterforskningsarbeidet her i ØKOKRIM – vi kaller dette svakheten i etterforskningsarbeidet.

III. Fortell om det du i dag ser som muligheter for å forbedre kvaliteten i etterforskningen her i ØKOKRIM – vi kaller dette for mulighetene i etterforskningsarbeidet.

IV. Fortell om det du i dag ser som truslene mot å forbedre kvaliteten i etterforskningen her i ØKOKRIM – vi kaller dette for truslene i etterforskningsarbeidet.

Intervjuene vil bli tatt opp på lyd. Lengden på intervjuene vil variere ut i fra informantens mengde med informasjon. Fra tidligere prosjekt vil erfaringsmessig hvert intervju ta omlag 90 minutter.

Etter intervjuet vil den intervjuede få utlevert et (multiple-choice) spørreskjema. Dette spørreskjemaet bruker respondentene omlag 15 minutter på å besvare. Spørreskjemaet måler organisasjonsklima og har undergått kontroll av validitet og reliabilitet i forskningsprosjekter ved Psykologisk Institutt, UiO. Spørreskjemaene er aidentifiserte ved at daglig forskningsansvarlig påfører skjemaene et tilfeldig respondentnummer.

Bare den daglig forskningsansvarlige har tilgang til koblingsnøkkelen mellom spørreskjemanummer og respondentens navn. Koblingsnøkkelen holdes innelåst på forskningsleder kontor i låsbart skap ved Politihøgskolen. Koblingsnøkkelen makuleres etter at intervjuer er transkribert og koblet opp mot svar på spørreskjema. Disse opplysningene vil lagres som aidentifiserte datafiler. Det vil deretter ikke være mulig å re-identifisere respondentene. Forskere som senere skal analysere data vil bare ha tilgang til disse i aidentifisert form.

Lydopptak av samtalen lagres på eget dataområde etter de sikkerhetsrutiner som er etablert for personsensitive opplysninger ved Psykologisk Institutt, Universitetet i Oslo. Lydopptakene slettes fra dette dataområdet etter at det er foretatt inter-rater reliabilitets-tester av transkripsjonene. I samarbeid med Ingstad utarbeides den en tidsplan for når de ulike intervjuene blir gjennomført.

På forhånd takk for at ØKOKRIM deltar i intervju og utfylling av spørreskjema. Eventuelle spørsmål eller kommentarer til prosjektet bes rettet direkte til undertegnede (e-mail: trond.myklebust@phs.no, tlf direkte 23 19 98 55, tlf centralbord 23 19 99 00).

Trond Myklebust  
Politiinspektør/PhD  
Forskningsavdelingen

Jeg er villig til å delta i denne studien (signatur, dato)
Appendix B: The OCM Questionnaire

Instruksjon


Kryss av for det svaralternativet som er mest korrekt i forhold til påstanden/Spørsmålet, slik du oppfatter det. Kryss kun av et alternativ for hver påstand.


Se informasjon i følgebrev for prosedyre etter gjennomgang av spørreskjema.

Forklaring av uttrykk og begreper:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Folk</th>
<th>Publikum</th>
<th>Ledelse</th>
<th>Denne organisasjonen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Forklaring av svaralternativen:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Helt feil</th>
<th>Ganske feil</th>
<th>Ganske riktig</th>
<th>Helt riktig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
# Undersøkelse av organisasjonsklimaet i Politiet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spørsmål</th>
<th>Helt feil</th>
<th>Ganske feil</th>
<th>Ganske riktig</th>
<th>Helt riktig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Ledelsen lar stort sett ansatte ta sine egne beslutninger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Ledelsen har tillit til at folk kan ta arbeidsrelaterte beslutninger uten å innhente tillatelse først</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Ledelsen holder streng kontroll med arbeidet til de ansatte</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Ledelsen har for strengt regime over måten ting blir gjort på</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Det er viktig å dobbeltsjekte med nærmeste leder før man tar en beslutning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Folk er mistenksomme overfor andre avdelinger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Det er svært lite konflikt mellom avdelingene her</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Folk er innstilt på å dele informasjon på tvers av avdelinger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Det er svært effektivt samarbeid mellom avdelingene</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Det er lite respekt mellom noen av avdelingene her</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Ledelsen lar de ansatte medvirke i beslutninger som angår dem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Endringer blir gjort uten å snakke med de involverte</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Folk har ingen innvirkning i avgjørelser som påvirker arbeidet deres</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Folk føler at beslutninger ofte tas uten at de blir hørt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Informasjon delas i stor grad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Det er ofte kommunikasjonssvikt her</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Overordnede er svært dyktige til å forstå folks problemer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Overordnede viser at de har tiltro til sine ansatte</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Overordnede hos oss er vennlige og lette å henvende seg til</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Folk kan stole på at overordnede gir god veiledding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spørsmål</td>
<td>Helt feil</td>
<td>Ganske feil</td>
<td>Ganske riktig</td>
<td>Helt riktig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Overordnede viser forståelse for sine ansatte</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Folk får ikke tilstrekkelig opplæring i nye systemer eller nytt utstyr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Folk får tilstrekkelig opplæring i bruk av nye systemer og utstyr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Organisasjonen gir kun et minimum av den opplæringen folk trenger for å gjøre jobben sin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Folk blir sterkt oppmunrtet til å utvikle sine ferdigheter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Denne organisasjonen vier lita oppmerksomhet til ansattes interesser</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Denne organisasjonen forsøker å ta vare på sine ansett</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Denne organisasjonen bryr seg om sine ansett</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Denne organisasjonen prøver å handle rettferdig overfor sine ansett</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Hos oss blir det oppfattet som svært viktig å følge reglene</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Folk kan ignorere formelle prosedyrer og regler hvis det bidrar til å få jobben gjort</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Hos oss må alt gjøres etter reglene</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Hos oss er det ikke nødvendig å følge alle prosedyrer til punkt og prikke</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Hos oss blir ingen særlig opprørt hvis reglene brytes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Toppledelsen foretrekker å holde seg til de etablerte, tradisjonelle måtene å gjøre ting på</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Måten denne organisasjonen gjør ting på har aldri forandret seg sårlig mye</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Ledelsen er ikke interessert i å prøve ut nye ideer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Hos oss skjer endringer i måten ting gjøres på svært langsamt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Hos oss blir nye ideer gjerne akseptert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Organisasjonen reagerer raskt når endringer er nødvendig</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Behov for å gjøre ting annerledes fanges raskt opp av ledelsen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Denne organisasjonen er svært fleksibel; den kan raskt endre prosedyrer for å møte nye vilkår, og problemer løses når de oppstår</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spørsmål</td>
<td>Helt feil</td>
<td>Ganske feil</td>
<td>Ganske riktig</td>
<td>Helt riktig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. Støtte til utvikling av nye ideer er lett tilgjengelig</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. Folk i denne organisasjonen er alltid ute etter å se problemer fra nye vinkler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. Denne organisasjonen er ganske innadrettet; man bryr seg ikke om hva som skjer i samfunnet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. Det legges ikke mye vekt på måter å bedre service til publikum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. Publikum sitt behov er ikke ansett som topp prioritet hos oss</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. Denne organisasjonen er treg til å reagere på publikums behov</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. Denne organisasjonen ser stadig etter nye muligheter i samfunnet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. Måten de ansette jobber sammen på i denne organisasjonen endres gjerne hvis det bedrer prestasjonen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. Arbeidsmetodene brukt i denne organisasjonen blir ofte diskutert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. Hvorvidt de ansette jobber effektivt sammen, blir regelmessig diskutert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53. Denne organisasjonens målsetninger endres i takt med forandringer i miljøet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54. I denne organisasjonen tar man seg tid til å evaluere organisasjonens målsetninger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55. Ansatte har en god forståelse av organisasjonens formål</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56. Organisasjonen sin fremtidige retnings blir klart og tydelig kommunisert til alle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57. Ansatte har ikke en klar forståelse av hva som er organisasjonens mål</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58. Alle som jobber her er bevisst på organisasjonens fremtidsplaner og retnings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59. Det finnes en klar oppfatning av hvor organisasjonen går</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60. Tid og penger kunne blitt spart dersom arbeidet var bedre organisert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61. Ting kunne blitt gjort mye mer effektivt hvis folk tok seg tid til å tenke seg om</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62. Dårlig planlegging resulterer ofte i at man ikke når sine målsetninger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63. Produktiviteten kunne blitt forbedret om arbeidet ble bedre organisert og planlagt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64. Hos oss ønsker folk alltid å prestere så godt de kan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65. Folk er entusiastiske i forhold til jobben sin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66. Her slipper folk unna med å gjøre så lite som mulig</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spørsmål</td>
<td>Helt feil</td>
<td>Ganske feil</td>
<td>Ganske riktig</td>
<td>Helt riktig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67. Folk er innstilt på å gjøre en ekstra innsats for å utføre en god jobb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68. Her legger ikke folk mer innsats i arbeidet sitt enn det de må</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69. Folk får som regel tilbakemelding i forhold til kvaliteten på det arbeidet de gjør</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70. Folk har ingen anelse om hvorvidt de gjør en god jobb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71. Det er generelt vanskelig for ansatte å vurdere kvaliteten på det de presterer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72. Folks prestasjoner måles regelmessig</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73. Måten folk gjør jobben sin på blir sjelden evaluert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74. Det forventes for mye av folk i løpet av en dag</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75. Vanligvis er ikke folks arbeidsbelastning spesielt krevede</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76. Ledelsen krever at folk jobber ekstremt hardt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77. Folk er under sterkt press for å nå målsetninger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78. Arbeidstempoet her er ganske avslappet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79. Denne organisasjonen forsøker alltid å oppnå de høyeste kvalitetsstandardene</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80. Hos oss blir kvalitet tatt svært seriøst</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81. Folks oppfatning er at organisasjonens suksess avhenger av høy kvalitet på arbeidet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82. Denne organisasjonen har ikke noe særlig rykte for å levere tjenester av topp kvalitet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>