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Abstract
The purpose of this thesis was to (1), examine how organizational climate directly affects employees change readiness before a merger between three Norwegian police districts, using the Competing Values Framework quadrats, human relation and rational goal approach. (2) Investigate how these climate approaches directly affect intrinsic and extrinsic motivation, and (3) how intrinsic and extrinsic motivation indirectly affect the relationship between the two climate approaches and change readiness. The thesis contributes to the psychological research field by providing empirical evidence leading to the advancement of knowledge on organizational climate, and by establishing that work theories have limitations when it comes to more specialized organizations. Data was collected from a long-term collaborative research project between the Department of Research at the Norwegian Police University College and the Department of Psychology at the University of Oslo. The sample consisted of 940 employees from three different police districts. The thesis tested ten hypotheses regarding the relationship between the selected variables through structural equation modeling. The results indicate that the rational goal approach has a direct positive effect on change readiness. The human relation approach did not display such effect. Further, the results showed that intrinsic motivation indirectly affects both the relationship between the two climate approaches and change readiness. The extrinsic motivation showed no significant effects, neither directly nor indirectly. These findings are discussed in terms of their theoretical contribution and methodological implications. In addition to the practical importance these findings have for the Norwegian police force.
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Introduction

Due to an increasingly dynamic environment, organizations are continuously confronted with the need to implement change in strategies, structures, processes and culture in order to survive and stay competitive (Armenakis, Harris, & Mossholder, 1993). This also applies for the Norwegian police force. Parallel to the accelerating changes in society at large, where science and technology pave the way for the world economy through new innovations and means of communication, organized crime is also becoming more advanced. With new forms of crime, more open land borders and more international organized lawbreaking (NOU 2013: 09, 2013), the police as an organization must adapt and try to find new ways to fight and prevent illegal activities. To meet the new requirements, various police reforms and models have been developed and implemented (NOU 2013: 09, 2013) like the latest “Nærpolitireformen” (Prop. 61 LS 2014–2015).

Nevertheless, has organizational change proven to be difficult. Several studies have reported that up to two-thirds of all change initiatives fail when implemented (e.g. Brodbeck, 2002; Burnes & Jackson, 2011; Burnes, 2005). With organizational change being unavoidable and the likelihood of failure high, the research field of organizational development has expanded. With theory and practice, organizational development has been dedicated to increase the knowledge about successful organizational change and performance (e.g., Wolf, 2011). The research has mainly focused on factors and antecedents that can predict higher change probability. One of these factors that have been recognized are the organization’s culture (Armenakis et al., 1993; Jones, Jimmieson & Griffiths., 2005; Weiner, 2009). With concepts related to shared basic assumptions, values, and beliefs, guides organizational culture employee’s perception and work behavior (Schneider, Ehrhart, & Macey, 2013). When planning and determining change initiatives, knowledge about the organization’s cultural focus and values are shown to be crucial for the likelihood of success. Ignoring the effect of organizational culture, has proved to be one of the biggest obstacles when implementing new change initiatives (Cameron & Quinn, 2011).

Additionally, all human behavior is generated by some form of motivation. By determining behaviors intention, strength, and duration, work motivation has been the core focus of organizational psychology for many years (Steers, Mowday, & Shapiro, 2004). In the field of organizational development, work motivation has been recognized as a fundamental component in several work theories and models (Cerasoli, Nicklin & Ford, 2014; Pinder, 2008). Especially, in relation to organizational changes. By creating a working environment
where employees view organizational changes as important and necessary, workers motivation and readiness for change will increase the probability for successful change (Armenakis et al., 1993; Eby, Adams, Russell, & Gaby, 2000). This illustrates that organizational culture, climate and employees’ motivation for change are important constructs for achieving an effective and successful change implementation (e.g., Bouckenooghe, Devos, & Van den Broeck, 2009; Hartnell, Ou, and Kinicki, 2011; Rafferty, Jimmieson, & Armenakis, 2013).

Based on this, the aim of this thesis is to examine how organizational climate affect employees change readiness and motivation, and how intrinsic and extrinsic motivation indirectly affect this relationship in a merger between three Norwegian police district. To properly understand how these different constructs can relate to another, it is essential to understand each construct separately. Therefore, the thesis will first address organizational culture and climate, before looking deeper into change readiness and motivation. This will lead to several hypotheses, which are tested using a structural equation model. Further, the thesis will provide an elaboration of the research method, followed by a presentation and discussion of the results. Finally, the thesis will present a consideration of the thesis’ implications, limitations, as well as suggestions for further research.

**Background**

**Organizational Culture**

Organizational culture barely existed in the organizational literature before the early 1980s. After the publication of the two books, *Search of Excellence* (Peters & Waterman, 1982) and *Corporate Culture: The Rites and Rituals of Organizational Life* (Deal & Kennedy 1982), organizational culture became the favorite topic amongst management consultants worldwide. Both books were written by consultants from the famous McKinsey & Company, and promoted the same simple message: that culture was the success formula for every organizational triumph.

Since then, organizational culture has reserved much attention. Particularly regarding cultures relation to organizational performance and effectiveness (e.g., Hartnell et al., 2011). In research on organizational culture, scholars have had a number of interpretations and implications, but the terms definition and operationalization has been consistent.
Organizational culture is defined as:

“the shared basic assumptions, values, and beliefs that characterize a setting and are taught to newcomers as the proper way to think and feel, communicated by the myths and stories people tell about how the organization came to be the way it is as it solved problems associated with external adaptation and internal integration ” (Schneider et al., 2013, p.362).

As the definition states, organizational culture clarifies what the organization is, how it got that way, and what it should be (Trice & Beyer, 1993). It contains standards for behavior, and dictates what is acceptable and unacceptable actions and attitudes within the organization. Additionally, culture guides workers understanding of what is true and false, how things work and how to interpret what is happening around them (Trice & Beyer, 1993). Further, the definition emphasizes that organizational culture is shared between the members of the organization, and that there may be more different sets of shared norms, values and reality contexts within the same organization (Bang, 2013). The definition makes it clear that organizational culture grows through interaction between members, and is not something that can be adopted without being a member of the unit or workplace.

**Organizational Climate**

The quantitative research on organizational work climate began around 1970. In the start, a broad global conceptualization was of interest. By studying the work climate, researchers wanted to understand the influence of situations, effects of individuals and the impact on organizational effectiveness and outcomes (Kuenzi & Schminke, 2009). An approach that turned out to be too ambitious and resulted in a climate field suffering from construct disagreement and criticism of the theoretical and methodological foundations. As a result, the interest of climate declined. Instead, researchers turned their attention to the organizational culture, as it seemed to capture the richness of the organizational environment in ways that climate research could not (Bang, 2013; Schneider et al., 2013).

However, with recent theoretical and methodological developments, the interest of organizational work climate has flourished. This time separating global climate and focused climate. Global climate is the shared perceptions regarding the policies, practices, and procedures that an organization expects, supports, and rewards (Kuenzi & Schminke, 2009; Schneider et al., 2011; Schneider & Reichers, 1983), while focused climates are related to the facet-specific climates (Kuenzi & Schminke, 2009). The global climate is assumed to be a better predictor of broad outcomes such as work-unit performance (Kuenzi, 2008), and is
considered the foundation for the focused climate (Kuenzi & Schminke, 2009; Schneider et al., 2013). These two approaches have contributed to a higher agreement of the conceptual issues, and improved the organizational climate constructs’ validity (Patterson et al, 2005).

Because of the disagreement of construct and context of interest, researchers have operationalized organizational climate inconsistently (e.g., Kuenzi & Schminke, 2009; Patterson et al., 2005). However, scholars have moved closer to an agreement. Especially in the discussion that concern level of measurement (Patterson et al., 2005). Organizational climate, in close relation to the global climate, are defined as: “the shared perceptions of and the meaning attached to the policies, practices, and procedures employees experience and the behaviors they observe getting rewarded and that are supported and expected” (Schneider et al. 2013, p.362).

The definition states that organizational climate is related to concrete guidelines that members of the organization or unit must consciously relate to and follow. Further, the definition shows that organizational climate is a perceptual phenomenon (Kuenzi & Schminke, 2009). A shared perception that creates a collective phenomenon, that can be seen as a framework for understanding the social context of the organization, thereof, how employees collectively perceive, behave, and create meaning from the organizational procedures (e.g. Schneider, 1975). A fundamental assumption underlying organizational climate is that individuals in a unit or organization experience shared perceptions of meaning (James et al., 2008).

The next section elaborates the distinction between organizational climate and organizational culture more explicit.

**Organizational Culture versus Organizational Climate.**

As the definitions makes clear can organizational culture and climate be viewed as related, but distinct constructs (Kuenzi & Schminke, 2009). Cameron and Quinn (2011) argue that the difference between organizational culture and climate, is that organizational climate is the property of the individual and organizational culture is the property of the organization. More specifically, consists organizational climate of temporary attitudes, feelings, and individual perceptions, while organizational culture is the enduring, slow changeable, core characteristic of the organization (Cameron & Quinn, 2011). This distinction explains how organizational culture includes core values and consensual interpretations about how things are, while organizational climate includes individualistic perspectives that are frequently modified as situations change, and new information is encountered (Cameron & Quinn,
2011). Thereby, can organizational climate be understood as the surface manifestation of culture (Patterson et al. 2005), where observable behavior is the product of the underlying culture (Schein, 2010).

Because of this distinction, organizational climate has been recognized as the measurable and abstract properties of the work environments (Noordin, Omar, Sehan, & Idrus, 2010). Recent studies have done this by conceptualize and measure the global climate through the competing values framework (Kuenzi, 2008; Patterson et al., 2005). Based on this, the thesis will use the global climate approached to investigate the collectively perceived behavior related to individual change readiness. The next section will elaborate the competing values framework as the theoretical framework used to examine the organizational climate.

**Competing Values Framework**

The meta-theoretical model, Competing Values Framework (CVF; Quinn & Rohrbaugh, 1983), provides a framework of values that underlie organizational climate (Patterson et al., 2005). The CVF originated in Quinn and Rohrbaughs’ (1983) study to identify the cognitive dimensions underlying 30 organizational effectiveness criteria that were endorsed by experts. The aim was to encapsulate the dominant approaches of organizational values and effectiveness presented over the years, into one framework. Through a multidimensional scaling the authors created the CVF, a circumplex model of value orientations (Quinn & Rohrbaugh, 1983).

The CVF consists of three value dimensions (Quinn & Rohrbaugh, 1983): organizational focus, organizational structure, and means-ends. Organizational focus and structure are organized along two fundamental dimensions, flexibility versus control and internal versus external orientation. For the organizational focus dimension, the emphasis ranges from an internal focus and integration of employee’s development and well-being, to an external focus and differentiation for the organization. For the second dimension, organizational structure, the axis ranges from an emphasis on stability and control to an emphasis on flexibility and discretion (Quinn & Rohrbaugh, 1983). Together they create a framework of four quadrants, which describe four broad approaches of valued outcomes and associated managerial ideologies about the means-ends through which these outcomes may be achieved (Figure 1). In the next section, a description of each approach will be presented.
The human relation approach (internal focus and flexibility in relation to the environment) is characterized by the specific focus on human resource development, and flexible management approach that involve participative decision making. Further, the approach emphasizes and values employees’ wellbeing, growth and commitment to the community within the organization. Managers encourages employee participation, team work and cohesiveness. The goal is for the employees to develop along the pathways of individual growth and transformation that will benefit the organization (Tong & Arvey, 2015).

The open system approach (external focus and flexible relations with the environment) is characterized by the external competition, such as market growth and evolution together with a flexible organizational structure with flat hierarchies or cross-functional teams. Further, the approach emphasizes adaptation to external disruption, creative ideation, and experimentation. With this adaption, the managers continuously seek innovation and resources to stay competitive in a demanding environment (Shipper & White, 1983).

The internal process approach (internal focus and tight control within the organization) is characterized by internal routines and clear lines for reports, approval, and communication (Tong & Arvey, 2015). In this approach, the organizational climate is guided by rules and
work standards, where managers preserve workflow through a system of troubleshooting, scheduling, and coordinating work effort.

The last approach, rational goal (external focus with tight control within the organization) is characterized by profitability, with clear goal setting and process monitoring (Tong & Arvey, 2015). Further, the approach reflects a rational economic model of organizational functioning in which emphasizes productivity and goal achievement. With this organizational climate, the employee’s behavior is influenced by structural goal accomplishment, and where managers initiate action, models hard work, and pushes for productivity and task completion (Tong & Arvey, 2015).

These approaches appear to be mutually exclusive and competing, but as pointed out by Quinn, all four approaches can exist within the same organization, although some approaches are more dominant than others (see Quinn, 1988; Quinn & Rohrbaugh, 1983). Accordingly, this means that values on one side of the dimensions give less weight to the corresponding value dimension. This also applies to the different approaches, where each quadrant has a polar opposite approach, e.g., human relations contrasts with rational goal (Quinn & Rohrbaugh, 1983). In the following, individual change readiness will be operationalized, and the constructs’ relation to CVF will be explored.

Change Readiness

In the 1940s, Knut Lewin developed an organizational change theory that contained a three-step model (i.e. unfreezing, changing and refreezing). The theory became the core of organizational development, and is today known as the planned approach for organizational change. In the 1980s a somewhat different approach appeared, arguing that organizational change is more complex and dynamic. This new emergent approach viewed organizational change as a more continuous, open-ended and unpredictable process of aligning and realigning an organization to its changing environment (e.g. Pettigrew, 1987). Today the constructs of organizational change is regarded as even more complex (e.g., Burns, 2005; Burns & Jackson, 2011), with an increasing focus on the drivers that can predict change successfully (Rafferty & Simons, 2006).

One of these drivers has been identified as employees change readiness. A construct that involves employees initial support for change initiatives (e.g., Holt, Armenakis, Feild, & Harris, 2007; Vakola, 2014). At an individual level, the individual employee is essential for organizational change. All organizational changes are done by altering employees concrete work tasks and organizational behavior. Armenakis et al. (1993) goes even further, and claims
that individual change readiness is the most important precursor in order to successfully change an organization. To achieve this kind of readiness, employees must have the right "beliefs, attitudes, and intentions regarding the extent to which change is needed and the organizations capacity to successfully make these changes" (Armenakis et al., 1993, p.681). This emphasizes that workers must understand and see the need for organizational change (i.e., change acceptance), as well as believe that a change is likely to have positive implications for themselves and the broader organization (Jones et al., 2005). In addition, has other individual-level variables such as change self-efficacy (e.g. Kwahk & Lee, 2008; Rafferty & Simons, 2006), organizational commitment (e.g. Kwahk & Kim, 2008; Kwahk & Lee, 2008) perceived personal competence (e.g Kwahk & Kim, 2008), and job satisfaction (e.g. McNabb & Sepic, 1995) shown to be important for individual change readiness.

On an organizational level, the creation of readiness for change involves changing individual cognitions across a set of employees. As the social-information phenomenon suggest (e.g., Salancik & Pfeffer, 1978), any individual readiness may also be shaped by the readiness of others. Through the dynamics of social information processing, an organization's collective readiness is continuously being influenced by the readiness of the members in the organization (Armenakis et al., 1993). Specifically, studies have shown that employees believe in organizational ability to accommodate changing situations (Eby et al., 2000; Jones et al., 2005), and the policies to support change (Eby et al., 2000; Rafferty & Simons, 2006) could increase individual readiness for organizational change.

**Organizational Climate and Change Readiness**

In times of change, interpersonal interactions are highly valued, making nature of such relationship an important feature of shaping the employees' readiness for change (Bouckenooghe, 2009). By focusing on building supportive, cooperative, trusting relationships, and creating commitment, organizational effectiveness can be achieved (Bouckenooghe, 2009; Quinn & Rohrbaugh, 1983). Research has found that the human relations approach mobilizes the forces and energies necessary to create such employee confidence and capability to undertake new workplace challenges and changes (Zammuto & O'Connor, 1992). As several studies has emphasized, an organizational climate with flexible and supportive structures will be better suited to establish a positive attitude toward organizational change (Eby et al., 2000; Jones et al., 2005). Based on this, the empirical human relation approach will be applied. Thus, the following hypothesis are put forward:

**H1a**: There is a positive direct effect of human relation climate on change readiness.
Lone et al. (2017) conducted a qualitative study on Norwegian police force, which explored the relation between organizational climate and investigation performance. They conducted 38 semistructured-interviews of employees in different investigation units. Six salient context-specific climate dimensions were identified and organized in the CVF. The results showed that rational goal, together with human relation, had highest effect on work performance (Lone et al., 2017). Where the rational goal approach was associated to increased performance by encourage planning, goal setting, and task focus, and the human relations approach by values linked to human capital and cooperation. Because the sample in this thesis is similar to the sample in the study performed by Lone et al. (2017), it would be interesting to examine how the rational goal approach affects employees change readiness before a merger of several police districts. Therefore, together with the recommendations of choosing among the CFV`s quadrats when studying the subjects of interest (Patterson et al., 2005), this thesis will utilize the empirical rational goal approach. Thus, the following hypothesis are put forward:

**H1b**: There is a positive direct effect of rational goal climate on change readiness.

In the following sections, employee’s work motivation will be theorized, organizational climates relation to motivation will be hypothesized. In addition, will motivations’ indirect effect be explored.

**Motivation**

Work motivation has been recognized as the core of organizational psychology (e.g. Steers et al., 2004), and an essential component in many theoretical models on organizational development (Cerasoli et al., 2014; Pinder, 2008). Work motivation has been defined as "a set of energetic forces that originates both within as well as beyond an individual`s being, to initiate work-related behavior, and to determine its form, direction, intensity and duration" (Pinder, 2008, p.11).

The Self-Determination Theory (SDT; Deci & Ryan, 1985) illustrates how individual motivation can vary in both types and regulation, all depending on the source of action (Ryan & Deci, 2000). The theory argues that individual motivation not only differ in amount, but also in features. What kind of motivation the individual feels is determined by the individual`s basal psychological needs for autonomy, competence, and relatedness.

Autonomy is the psychological need to be self-directed and to experience the freedom of regulating one`s actions (Deci & Ryan, 1985). Employees that can independently administrate their work task, will feel freer and more committed to the action because it is
self-regulated (Deci & Ryan, 1985). Competence is the psychological need to “be effective in interaction with the environment, and it reflects the desire to exercise and extend one’s capacities and skills, and in doing so, to seek out and master optimal and developmental appropriate challenges” (Deci & Ryan, 1985; Reeve, 2009, p. 167). For an employee to feel competent, the employer must select work tasks that the employee can master. The work tasks should neither be too easy nor not too difficult, but customized to challenge the employees' level of knowledge. Relatedness is the psychological need to create emotional bonds with other people (Reeve, 2009). All human beings seek warm interpersonal relationships, if not at work then at home. Relatedness gives the human being the social tool needed to interact with other people and relate to the society (Reeve, 2009).

The SDT consists of three distinct types of motivation: amotivation, extrinsic motivation and intrinsic motivation (Deci & Ryan, 1985; Ryan & Deci, 2000). The three types of motivation are organized along a continuum of perceived self-determination. Ranging from total amotivation to intrinsic motivation, with extrinsic motivation in the middle. Intrinsically motivated behaviors are themselves enjoyable, purposive and provide sufficient reason to persist (Cerasoli et al., 2014), and the activity is done for its inherent satisfaction (Ryan & Deci, 2000). Although intrinsic motivation exists within individuals, people are not intrinsically motivated for all tasks and assignments. In everyday life, most of the activities individuals do are not intrinsically motivated. In the workplace, employees are obligated to adjust to job tasks, co-workers, managers and the organization’s overall norms and rules. This type of behavior is extrinsically motivated. Extrinsically motivated behavior emerges when an activity is done in order to attain a specific outcome (Ryan & Deci, 2000). In contrast to intrinsic motivation, extrinsic motivation relates to the instrumental value of the task or goal (Ryan & Deci, 2000). Amotivation, which means without motivation, is excluded from this thesis because of its lack of motivational force.

**Organizational Climate and Motivation**

In several meta-analytic studies, researchers have questioned whether extrinsic motivation has a decreasing effect on intrinsic motivation (e.g., Cameron, Banko, & Pierce, 2001; Deci, Koester & Ryan, 1999, 2001; Eisenberger & Cameron, 1996; Eisenberger, Pierce, & Cameron, 1999; Pierce, 1994; Rummel & Feinberg, 1988; Tang & Hall, 1995; Wiersma, 1992). However, newer studies have debate that this assertion fails to recognize that organizational success comes as a result of both intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. One way this has been studied is through performance and the quality and quantity approach (e.g.,
Adams, 1965; Campbell, McCloy, Oppler & Sager, 1993). Cerasoli et al. (2014) found in their meta-analysis that quality tasks have a stronger link to intrinsic motivation. The reason was assumed to be that quality-tasks require a higher degree of complexity and engagement, resulting in higher personal investment. To reach this level of motivation, the workers’ psychological needs must be met (SDT; Deci & Ryan, 2000). In the CVF, the human relation approach is the organizational climate that fulfills these requirements the best. This approach focuses on the human resources and the employees’ needs as the way to achieve organizational goals. Thus, the thesis hypothesizes the following:

**H2a**: There is a positive direct effect of human relation climate on intrinsic motivation.

On the contrary, other researchers have argued that quantity-tasks are more related to extrinsic motivational behavior (e.g., Cerasoli et al., 2014; Kruglanski, Friedman, & Zeevi, 1971; Lawler, 1969; Wimperis & Farr, 1979). These findings complement the existing meta-analytic work on extrinsic incentives by showing that extrinsic motivation has a better effect on quantity performance (Jenkins, Mitra, Gupta & Shaw, 1998). In particular, quantity-tasks do not require a substantial degree of judgment and autonomy for their satisfactory production. Instead, they are produced primarily by focused, remaining, and structured behavior. Linking quantity-tasks to extrinsic motivation (e.g., Deci & Ryan, 1985; Frey, 1994). This kind of tasks require a high degree of external control, and are conducted in exchange of a particular outcome. In relation to the CVF, the rational goal approach nurtures an organizational climate that strives to reach the organizational goal through task monitoring and goal achievement. For that reason, the following hypothesis is presented:

**H3a**: There is a positive direct effect of rational goal climate on extrinsic motivation.

Further, the meta-analyses found that intrinsic motivation has a substantial effect on performance regardless of whether external incentives were presented (Cerasoli et al., 2014). Illustrating that intrinsic and extrinsic motivation cannot be seen as opposites and that external incentives coexist with intrinsic motivation, and reverse. Based on this assumption, there is a reason to believe that the organizational climate, regardless of approach, will affect the workers motivational regulation both intrinsically and extrinsically. Consequently, workers in a human relation climate will be extrinsically motivated for tasks that are not intrinsically regulated, and employees in a rational goal climate will contain a considerable amount of intrinsic motivation for their work tasks. Based on this, the following hypotheses are proposed:
**H2b:** There is a positive direct effect of human relation climate on extrinsic motivation.

**H3b:** There is a positive direct effect of rational goal climate on intrinsic motivation.

**Organizational Climate, Change Readiness and Motivations Indirect Effect**

Organizational climate is shown to have a significant impact on organizational development (Bouckenooghe et al., 2009; Hartnell et al., 2011). With the organizational climates effect on employees’ perception, motivation and behavior, organizational climate has been identified as a crucial component for organizational performance and change (Cerasoli et al., 2014; Mark van Vuuren, Menno, Jong & Seydel, 2007; Pinder, 2008; Jenkins et al., 1998; Lone et al., 2017).

A study found that employees who perceive their organization to have more flexible policies and procedures, are more likely to evaluate their organization and colleagues as more responsive to change incentives, and more motivated for organizational change (Eby et al., 2000). In the CVF’s human relations climate, high levels of cohesion and morale among employees are promoted through training, development, open communication, and participative decision-making. These values will increase employee’s intrinsic motivation and lead to higher self-determination by satisfying the employees basal psychological needs (SDT; Deci & Ryan, 2000). Thereby, will employees level of individual change readiness increase through intrinsic motivation. Based on this, the following hypothesis is presented:

**H4a:** There is a positive indirect effect of intrinsic motivation between human relation climate and change readiness.

In organizations that have a climate close to the rational goal approach, efficiency and productivity are attained through goal-setting, planning, and centralized decision-making. Plans and goals are known to generate motivation by focusing employees’ attention on the discrepancy between the present situation and the end goal (e.g., Locke & Latham, 2002). For more extensive organizational changes, such as the three merging police districts, employee's motivation for change may be guided by future visions and expectations related to their new workplaces. Thereby, knowing that quantity-tasks are closer related to a rational goal climate and extrinsic motivation (Cerasoli et al., 2014; Jenkins et al., 1998), and that discrepancy and future vision can create individual change readiness, the following hypothesis is proposed:

**H5a:** There is a positive indirect effect of extrinsic motivation between rational goal climate and change readiness.
Based on findings that intrinsic and extrinsic motivation cannot be seen as mutually exclusive, it would be interesting to see how extrinsic motivation indirectly affects the relationship between human relations approach and change readiness. Equally interesting will be to investigate how intrinsic motivation indirectly affects the relationship between rational goal and change readiness. Thus, the following hypotheses are put forward:

**H4b**: There is a positive indirect effect of extrinsic motivation between human relation climate and change readiness.

**H5b**: There is a positive indirect effect of intrinsic motivation between rational goal climate and change readiness.

In sum, this thesis proposes ten hypotheses, which are displayed in figure 2.

*Figure 2*: Graphical representation of the hypothesized relations among the variables. Hypotheses 4 and 5 are not displayed in the figure. H4a paths go through HR → IM → CHA, and H4b through HR → EXT → CHA. H5a paths go from RG → EXT → CHA, and H5b from RG → IM → CHA.
Method

The project
The thesis is a part of a long-term collaborative research project between the Department of Research at the Norwegian Police University College, and the Department of Psychology at University of Oslo. The aim of the thesis was to (1) examined how organizational climate, with the CVF’s the human relations and rational goal approach, directly affects employees change readiness before a Norwegian police district merge. (2) Investigate how these climate approaches directly affect intrinsic and extrinsic motivation, and (3) how intrinsic and extrinsic motivation indirectly affect the relationship between the climate approaches and change readiness.

Ethics
The thesis, and the ongoing study collaboration, follows the Norwegian center for research data’s guidelines on national ethical standard for research on human beings. The invitation to participate in the study was communicated through presentations, conversations, and mail (For invitation letter see Appendix 1). The information contained: the purpose of the study, voluntary participation, respondent’s anonymity, and the reporting of the results. By completing the questionnaire, the respondent confirmed their understanding of the study information, their anonymity, and consented to participation in the study.

Data collection
The data was collected in collaboration with the local police force in three independent police districts, prior to the merger. The data collection took place in December 2015 and January 2016. After receiving the informative mail, the respondents were asked to fill out the questionnaire by pen and paper and return the form in a sealed envelope. 1730 questionnaire were distributed. 1007 questionnaire were returned, of these 940 were filled out, and 67 were blank. The accurate response rate for all three police districts was 58%.

Sample
The whole sample consisted of 940 respondents from three different police districts. After excerpting variables and removing cases with missing values, 861 respondents remained. The excerpt consisted of 53% men (n=454), and 47% women (n=407). 272 respondents were between 23-31 years old, 367 respondents between 32-47, and 222 respondents between 48-51 years old. 27% were civilian employed (n=232), 26% worked in investigation (n=224), and 21% in operative duty (n=180). The remaining 26% worked in justice, prevention, or had other combinations of work tasks (n=225). 29% had 1-5 years seniority (n=250), 21% had 6-
10 years (n=184), 23% had 11-20 years (n=196), and 18% had 21-31 or more years of seniority (n=153).

Measures
The thesis applied three established scales to measure the construct of interest, thereof, organizational climate, motivation, and change readiness. A table of the chosen scale measurements is displayed in Appendix 2. The measurement scale on organizational climate has been used in earlier studies conducted in the Norwegian Police. All negatively worded items have been reversed before the analysis. The measures’ degree of internal consistency was investigated by calculating their respective Cronbach's alpha, where a value of $\alpha \geq .70$ represents acceptable reliability (Mulhern & Greer, 2011).

Organizational Climate. Organizational climate was operationalized as a set of shared perceptions regarding the policies, practices, and procedures that an organization rewards, supports, and expects (Schneider & Reichers, 1983). The measure of organizational climate is based on Kuenzi’s (2008) global work climate, and on the Competing Values Framework (Quinn & Rohrbaugh, 1983). The global organizational climate was measured with 29 items, capturing global evaluations of the organizational climate in different police districts. The scale was measured with a 5-point Likert scale response format, ranging from definitely false (1) to definitely true (5). Example of an item is: “Employees develop supportive, positive working relationships among department members.” (Norwegian: “Vi utvikler støttende, positive arbeidsforhold her på enheten”). Cronbach’s alpha was estimated to be $\alpha=.94$ on the entire scale. For the selected six items on the human relations approach the Cronbach’s alpha was estimated to be $\alpha=.88$, and $\alpha=.80$ for the selected five items on the rational goal approach.

Change Readiness. Given the importance of individual perceptions and readiness to change for a successful change implementation (e.g., Bouckenooghe et al., 2009; Vakola, 2014), an outcome variable measuring readiness at the individual level was included. Individual readiness to change was operationalized as "… willingness to support change and confidence in succeeding in change" (Vakola, 2014, p. 196). This highlights the individual's perceived beliefs that change will be better than the expected negative effects. Individual readiness to organizational change was measured with six items adopted from Vakola (2014) “Scale for Individual Readiness to Organizational Change.” The scale was measured with a 5-point Likert scale response format, ranging from definitely false (1) to definitely true (5). Example of an item is: “When changes occur in my company, I believe that I am ready to
cope with them.” (Norwegian: “Når endringer skjer på min enhet, tror jeg at jeg er klar for å takle dem”). Cronbach’s alpha was estimated to be $\alpha = .75$ on the entire scale, and $\alpha = .77$ on the five chosen items, which display satisfactory reliability.

**Motivation.** Motivation is manifested by individual's attention, effort, and persistence, and operationalized as: "… a set of energetic forces that originates both within as well as beyond an individual's being to initiate work-related behavior, and to determine its form, direction, intensity and duration" (Pinder, 2008, p. 11). The scale used to measure intrinsic and extrinsic motivation were adopted from Tremblay, Blanchard, Taylor, Pelletier, and Villeneuve (2009) 18 item scale "Work Extrinsic and Intrinsic Motivation Scale." The scale was measured with a 5-point Likert scale response format, ranging from definitely false (1) to definitely true (5). Example of items was: "For the income it provides me," and “Because I derive much pleasure from learning new things." (Norwegian: “På grunn av inntekten jobben gir meg”, og “Fordi jeg får mye glede av å lære meg nye ting”). Cronbach's alpha was estimated to be $\alpha = .75$ on the entire scale. For the three items on intrinsic motivation the Cronbach's alpha was $\alpha = .77$, and $\alpha = .75$ for the three items on extrinsic motivation, which display satisfactory reliability.

**Analysis**

**Inter-Rater Reliability.** Before any analysis was conducted, an inter-rater reliability test was carried out to measure the accuracy of the questionnaires entering job. Krippendorff's Alpha was chosen as the measure because it can be generalized across different scales of measurement, with or without missing data, and be used with any number of observers (Hayes & Krippendorff, 2007). By using the dfeelon ReCal online reliability calculator (Freelon, 2010), we were able to report Krippendorff's Alpha and average percentage agreement.

**Sample size.** There are different recommendations regarding suitable sample size for conducting factor analysis. Tabachnick and Fidell (2013) suggest that "it is comforting to have at least 300 cases for factor analysis" (p.613). Others suggest that it is not the overall size that is of concern, but the ratio of participants to items. The sample size is also debated within structural equation modeling (SEM) analysis. Just as for factor analysis, different thresholds (most often $N>200$) and ratios have been suggested. However, simulation studies have shown that required sample size is sensitive to the degree of normality, missing data, estimation method, model complexity (i.e., number of indicators, factors and parameters estimated), the magnitude of factor loadings, and path coefficients (Wolf, Harrington, Clark, & Miller, 2013). Based on the screening of the data there is no indication of non-normality,
no missing data, and the excerpt sample size satisfies the recommendation both for factor analysis and SEM analysis (Hair, Black, Babin & Anderson, 2010).

**Preliminary analysis.** Data screening, preliminary and descriptive analysis was conducted using the IBM SPSS 25.0 software. Data screening and preliminary analysis are further elaborated below, while the descriptive analysis is presented in the results part.

There were no missing data for any of the indicators to be included in the hypotheses testing. By Kline’s (2005) recommendations, the chosen constructs were evaluated for normality. None of the indicators displayed skewness or kurtosis values larger than the guiding values of severe skewness (>3,0) and problematic kurtosis (>10,0) (Kline, 2005). The most considerable skewness value was -0,90, and for kurtosis 1,40. Linearity was investigated by inspecting the scatter plots between the mean scores of each construct. While multicollinearity was examined by controlling for high correlations between variables (r = .9 or above). Both were found to be satisfactory, and the data were suitable for further analysis.

When designing the questionnaire, additional items were added to the already established scale measurements. Because of this, exploratory factor analysis (EFA) and confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) of each measurement scale were conducted before testing the theorized model through an SEM analysis.

**Structural Equation Modeling.** The hypotheses were investigated using SEM. Statistically, are SEM analysis used to study multiple relationships among latent variables simultaneously. It is an extension of general linear modeling procedures, such as ANOVA and multiple regression analysis (Li & Wu, 2007). The causal pattern of relations within the theorized model is specified a priori. This way it is possible to determine whether the theorized model is consistent with the collected data. Moreover, the method can achieve better estimates of the effect sizes between constructs, because one controls for the unique variance of indicators that are attributable to their common latent factor (Kline, 2005). The SEM-analysis was conducted with the AMOS 24.0 software, with maximum likelihood estimation, and bootstrapping for obtaining the 95% confidence interval for the specified .05 level of the effects.

When specifying and testing a theorized model, the SEM consists of two main parts, a measurement model, and a structural model. Where the measurement model represents a set of observable variables as multiple indicators of a smaller set of latent variables and the structural model describes relations of dependency between the latent variables (McDonald & Ho, 2002). First, the measurement model is evaluated through CFA. Here the relationship
between the theorized model’s indicators and latent variables are tested (i.e., which indicators load on which factors). Secondly, if the measurement model fits the observed data well, the structural model can be specified by determining the relation between the latent factors (i.e., one’s hypotheses).

To evaluate how well the theorized model (i.e., the measurement and structural model) represent the observed data, the SEM analysis produces different estimates. The global fit of the overall model is examined by a range of goodness-of-fit indices, as well as the local fit through residuals, modification indices, and the size and significance of parameter estimates (e.g., factor loadings and regression coefficients) (Hair et al., 2010; Kline, 2005). Based on the overall evaluation of global and local fit, the theorized model can be retained, improved or rejected.

Goodness-of-fit (GOF) indices are estimates of global fit, which indicate how well the specified model can reproduce the observed covariance matrix among the items (Hair et al., 2010). In this thesis, Chi-square, Comparative Fit Index (CFI), Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA) and Standardized Root Mean Residual (SRMR) will be reported as recommended by Kline (2005).

Chi-square ($\chi^2$) is an absolute fit index which estimates whether the specified model is significantly different from the observed covariance matrix (Mulhern & Greer, 2011; Lei & Wu, 2007). A non-significant chi-square ($p>.05$) indicates good fit because it shows that the theorized model and the observed data is not equal by chance. However, chi-square also has its limitations. It is sensitive to larger sample sizes and larger numbers of indicators. There one or both will inflate the chi-square and make it more difficult to achieve good model fit (i.e., non-significant result) (Lei & Wu, 2007). Hair et al. (2010) state that for models containing more than 30 indicators and $N<250$ a significant $p$-value for $\chi^2$ is expected, which is the case in this thesis. So, CFI, RMSEA, and SRMR are included as a supplement for the chi-square statistics (Lei & Wu, 2007).

CFI is a fit indicator that measures the increase in how well the specified model fits the observed variables, compared with a zero model where all indicators are uncorrelated (Lei & Wu, 2007). The fit index has a positive value between zero and one, where values closer to 1 indicate better fit. Following Hair et al. (2010) model-specific guidelines (i.e., $N<250$, number of indicators $>30$), a CFI greater than .92 suggests good fit.

Both the RMSEA and SRMR are absolute fit indices that measure the extent to which the specified model reproduces the observed covariance matrix (Lei & Wu, 2007). RMSEA is
reported with 90% confidence interval (Brown, 2015), and should be less than .08 together with a CFI above .92 to indicate good fit (Hair et al., 2010). The SRMR uses the residuals (i.e., the difference between the estimated and observed covariance) to compute the average standardized residual as a measure of how well the overall model fits the data. SRMR should be below .09 (together with CFI>.92) to indicate proper fit (Hair et al., 2010). Several other researchers apply firmer values for the CFI (≥.95), RMSEA (≤.06) and likely SRMR (≤.08) to indicate good fit (e.g., Lei & Wu, 2007).

When evaluating the theorized model, the standardized covariance residuals are used to discover local fit. The local fit is important because the global fit alone do not reveal which part of the model that makes a good or a poor fit. In larger samples, the standardized covariance residual is more likely to be more equal a standardized normal distribution; where less than 5 % of the residuals should fall outside the range of -2 to +2 (Kline, 2005). Residuals with values above 4 need to be further examined (Hair et al., 2010). By inspecting the standardized residuals covariance, it is possible to detect if specific indicators are problematic.

Finally, the estimated parameters of the theorized model should be inspected. The factor loadings should be statistically significant and with considerable size, in the predicted direction. With satisfying loading above .50, and ideally .70 or higher (Hair et al., 2010).

Reliability and Validity. In SEM-analysis, internal consistency is estimated by calculating each scales composite reliability (CR). CR is a measure of a scale's convergent validity. There CR is the ratio of explained variance over total variance (Kline, 2005). A value of .70 or higher is considered as acceptable reliability (Hair et al., 2010). Further, to ensure that a construct measures what it claims to measure, the scales items should share a substantial amount of variance (i.e., convergent validity), and be distinct from the other constructs (i.e., discriminant validity). Ideally, items should load highly on one factor, and simultaneous correlate low or not at all with other constructs (e.g., >.85) (Kline, 2005).
Results

Results of the Preliminary and Descriptive analysis

Inter-Rater Reliability. 100 randomly selected cases were punched twice by five students, where each student punched 40 cases. In total, the 100 cases were punched three times and had a total Krippendorff’s Alpha at 0.991 and average percentage agreement of 99.33%. The Competing Values framework had a Krippendorff’s Alpha at 0.992 and average percentage agreement of 99.43%. The measurement for motivation had a Krippendorff’s Alpha at 0.989 and average percentage agreement of 99.19%, and the Scale for Individual Readiness to Organizational Change had a Krippendorff’s Alpha at 0.983 and average percentage agreement of 98.56%. Overall, the Krippendorff’s Alpha scores lie closely to 1.000, and near 100% for the average percentage agreement, which displays pleasing reliability.

Descriptive analysis. Table 1 displays the mean, standard deviations, Cronbach’s alpha and inter-correlation between the total scores of the theoretical model's constructs. The average was above the response scale midpoint (3) for four out of five constructs, indicating a positive degree of the two climate approaches, intrinsic motivation and change readiness in the sample. The relationship between the same four constructs displayed significant correlations, with medium strength (Cohen, 1988). The extrinsic motivation construct displayed lower mean and low nonsignificant negative correlations with all constructs, except with intrinsic motivation.

Table 1
Mean, standard deviation (SD), Cronbach’s alpha (A) and zero-order correlations for all constructs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. CVF, Human Relation</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. CVF, Rational Goal</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Intrinsic Motivation</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.345*</td>
<td>0.338*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Extrinsic Motivation</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>-0.32</td>
<td>-0.40</td>
<td>-0.143*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Change Readiness</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.233*</td>
<td>0.319*</td>
<td>0.306*</td>
<td>-0.054</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2tailed)
To test the significant difference between the constructs, a t-test was conducted. The results showed a significant difference between the five constructs, indicating a measurement of five separate variables. The largest significant difference were between the human relation variable ($M=4.2$, $SD=0.6$) and the extrinsic motivation variable ($M=3.0$, $SD=0.9$) displaying $t(860)=32.78$, $p=.000$. The difference between the rational goal variable ($M=3.8$, $SD=0.6$) and the change readiness variable ($M=3.9$, $SD=0.6$) had the lowest significant difference at the specified .05 level, $t(860)=-3.77$, $p=.000$.

**Exploratory factor analysis.**

EFA with maximum likelihood as extraction was first conducted separately for all five constructs, then together. Three steps were used (1) assessment of the suitability of the data, (2) extracts of factors and (3) rotation of the factors. In the first step, the suitability of data for factor analysis was assessed. Inspection of the correlation matrix revealed the presence of satisfying coefficients of .3 and above. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin value was .89, exceeding the recommended value of .6 (Kaiser, 1970, 1974) and Bartlett`s Test of Sphericity (Bartlett, 1954) reached significance, supporting the factorability of the correlation matrix. In the second step, the principal component analysis revealed the presence of six components with eigenvalue exceeding 1, explaining 27.5%, 9.7%, 7.7%, 6.4%, 5.4%, and 3.9% of the variance. An inspection of the scree plot revealed a clear break after six components. This was further supported by the result of the Parallel Analysis (Horn, 1965). A six components solution were retained, explaining a total of 60.5%. In step three, an oblimin rotation was performed. The rotated solution revealed a simple structure (Thurstone, 1947), with strong loading and most items loading on one component. Table 2 shows the result of the EFA, with a pattern matrix containing six-factors. The results confirm that the measurement scales used measure what they were supposed to measure. With the exception of a few items, loading on the sixth component. The sixth component consists of five items from CVF`s Human Relation (HR) and Rational Goal (RG) approach, indicating that these items do not measure what they were intended to measure. An overview of all the questions with related item names is displayed in Appendix 2.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Factors</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HR 2.02</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR 2.03</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR 2.06</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR 2.05</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR 2.04</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR 2.01</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHA 9.05</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHA 9.06</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHA 9.01</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHA 9.02</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHA 9.03R</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHA 9.04</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXT 8.16</td>
<td></td>
<td>.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXT 8.09</td>
<td></td>
<td>.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXT 8.02</td>
<td></td>
<td>.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RG 2.23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RG 2.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RG 2.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RG 2.24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RG 2.28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.37</td>
<td>-.36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IM 8.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IM 8.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IM 8.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR 2.29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR 2.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RG 2.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.39</td>
<td>-.45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RG 2.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hypothesis Testing – Structural Equation Model

Measurement model. The CFA of the first measurement model (model 1) contains all items and latent factors, with correlation arrows between the latent variables. A path diagram of the initial measurement model can be found in Appendix 3. As expected, model 1 did not meet the criteria for good model fit, as displayed in Table 3. Based on the EFA and the CFA conducted on the theorized model’s different constructs, several adjustments were made. Items were excluded stepwise, by identifying questions that were theoretically and methodologically difficult to include in the theorized model. This was done by examining the standardized residuals covariances, review the questionnaire, and by monitoring the goodness of fit statistics, and beta values.

Compared with the EFA, the outcome of the first measurement model is almost equivalent. The difference was with item CHA 9.04 and item RG 2.28. Despite that CHA 9.04 had a decent component loading on the change readiness component in the EFA, the item showed high standardized residuals covariances and led to a poor model fit in the CFA. Because of this, the item was excluded. For the item RG 2.28, the EFA showed a low negative double loading on both the rational goal component and the sixth component, but in the CFA, there was no statistical reason to exclude the item. For this reason, item RG 2.28 was retained for content validity concern. The remaining items that loaded high on the sixth component in the EFA (HR 2.29, RG 2.07, RG 2.26, and RG 2.27), did also display high standardized residuals covariances and contributed to lower goodness of fit. These items were therefore excluded. Additionally, two items in the human relation variable (HR 2.02 and HR 2.03) and two items in the rational goal (RG 2.22 and RG 2.23) variable had similar wording in the question. By inserting a correlation arrow between the items error variance, the items standardized residuals covariances went down and the measurement model’s goodness of fit and beta values went up. The four items were therefore retained with correlation arrows.

The second measurement model (model 2) displays the model fit without the excluded items. The values of CFI, RMSEA, and SRMR indicate good fit. It was possible to further modify the model and achieve a better overall fit, but this could result in a weaker fit between the theorized model and the observed data (MacCallum, Roznowski, & Necowitz, 1992). A path diagram of the second measurement model, is displayed in Appendix 4.
Table 3  
**Measurement model Goodness of Fit statistics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>X²</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>X²/df</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>RMSEA [CI¹]</th>
<th>SRMR</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1648.75**</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>5.251</td>
<td>.855</td>
<td>.070</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td>All items included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>608.03**</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>3.055</td>
<td>.942</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>Items: HR 2.07, HR 2.29, RG 2.26, RG 2.27, and CHA 9.04 are excluded</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Chi-square significant at level 0.01  
¹ 90 % confidence interval of the RMSEA

Reliability and Validity. Composite reliability was above .70 for all constructs: CVF human relation $CR= .89$, CVF rational goal $CR=.83$, change readiness $CR=.83$, intrinsic motivation $CR=.83$, and extrinsic motivation $CR=.86$. Reliability and convergent validity were satisfactory for all measurement scales. To investigate the content validity further, all constructs were pairwise compared and tested for significant differences (i.e., discriminant validity). A chi-square test was conducted, and showed a significant difference between all measurement scales (Mulhern & Greer, 2011), except between the two climate approaches and extrinsic motivation.

Structural model. The second step in SEM is to specify the structural model. To test the specified hypothesis, arrows were drawn from the predictor variables to the outcome variables. The complete theorized model, with measurement and structural elements, are displayed in Figure 3. The direct paths between the latent variables are interpreted as standardized regression coefficients ($\beta$). Paths from the latent variable to each item are factor loading, and the two-headed arrows are correlations.
Figure 3: Structural model path diagram.

Estimation method: Maximum Likelihood. Displaying Standardized coefficients. Circles represent latent variables (factors), while rectangles represent observed variables (indications). Circles that are labeled the letter "e" denotes error variance and circles that contain "d" denotes disturbance items. The disturbance is other variables which affect the latent variable but are not accounted for in the model.

The theorized model’s goodness of fit is displayed in Table 5. With the adjustments made from the factor analysis and the measurement models, the theorized model fits well to the observed data. No further adjustment was therefore made.

Table 5
Structural model Goodness of Fit statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>X²</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>X²/df</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>RMSEA [CI¹]</th>
<th>SRMR</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Structural model</td>
<td>449,429**</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>2.270</td>
<td>.964</td>
<td>.038 [.034-.043]</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>Items: HR 2.07, HR 2.29, RG 2.26, RG 2.27, and CHA 9.04 are excluded</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Chi-square significant at level 0.01
¹ 90% confidence interval of the RMSEA
Table 6 displays the direct, indirect, total effects and difference between the latent variables. Not all effects were found statistically significant \((p < .05)\), and several hypotheses were not supported. For the direct effect hypotheses, only H1b, H2a, and H3b were supported. Where the rational goal had a significant positive direct effect on both change readiness (H1b: \(\beta = .27, 95\% \, CI \, [.17, .38]\)), and intrinsic motivation (H3b: \(\beta = .27, 95\% \, CI \, [.18, .37]\)). The human relation showed only a significant positive direct effect on intrinsic motivation (H2a: \(\beta = .25, 95\% \, CI \, [.16, .34]\)). For the hypotheses on indirect effect, only H4a and H5b were supported. Intrinsic motivation indirectly effected the relation between human relation and change readiness (H4a: \(\beta = .065, 95\% \, CI \, [.04, .11]\)), as well as the relationship between rational goal and change readiness (H5b: \(\beta = .072, 95\% \, CI \, [.04, .11]\)).

Table 6
Theorized models cause and effects on change readiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Causal variables</th>
<th>CVF Human Relation</th>
<th>CVF Rational Goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unst.</td>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal motivation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>.241**</td>
<td>.059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>.241**</td>
<td>.059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extrinsic motivation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change readiness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect – Internal motivation</td>
<td>.058**</td>
<td>.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect – Extrinsic motivation</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total indirect</td>
<td>.058**</td>
<td>.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>.194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>.058**</td>
<td>.020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Unst. unstandardized; St. standardized; SE standard error
*p < .05; **p < .01

Furthermore, the human relation displays a significant positive total indirect effect \((\beta = .065, 95\% \, CI \, [.03, .11])\), but not a significant total effect. Also, the difference between the two indirect variables between the human relation and change readiness were significant \((\beta = .065, 95\% \, CI \, [.03, .11])\). For the rational goal, the total indirect effect \((\beta = .072, 95\% \, CI \, [.04, .11])\).
(0.04, 0.12), the total effect ($\beta = 0.344, 95\% CI [0.25, 0.45]$), and the difference between the indirect variables were all statistically positive significant ($\beta = 0.072, 95\% CI [0.04, 0.12]$). Additionally, each independent variable explained a significant amount of the variance in the change readiness variable. Hence, the two climate approaches explained 21% of the variance, the intrinsic motivation variable explained 22%, and only 0.6% of the variance was explained by extrinsic motivation variable.

**Discussion**

The aim of this thesis was to explore the relationship between organizational climate and change readiness, and how this relationship is indirectly affected by motivation. More specifically, (1) how the CVF’s human relation and rational goal approach directly affects employees change readiness. (2) How these climate approaches directly affect intrinsic and extrinsic motivation, and (3) how these two types of motivation indirectly affect the relationship between the two climate approaches and change readiness. Ten concrete hypotheses were formed and presented in a structural equation model.

The first hypotheses concerned the relationship between the two organizational climate approaches and change readiness. Hypotheses 1a and 1b stated that the human relation climate and rational goal climate would both positively and directly influence individual's readiness to change. The results showed no support for hypothesis 1a, and was therefore rejected. For hypothesis 1b the results produced positive and significant regression coefficients and were retained. These results indicate that only a rational goal climate could directly affect employees change readiness before a merger in the Norwegian police force.

The second and third hypotheses proposed a relationship between the two approaches of organizational climate and employees’ motivation. Hypothesis 2a stated that human relation climate would positively and directly affects intrinsic motivation, while hypothesis 2b suggested the same for extrinsic motivation. The same was projected for the rational goal climate, where hypothesis 3a proposed a positive and direct effect on extrinsic motivation, and hypothesis 3b a positive and direct effect on intrinsic motivation. The results were splayed. For hypothesis 2a and 3b, the analysis produced positive and significant regression coefficients and was retained. Hypotheses 2b and 3a got low, negative and nonsignificant coefficients were therefore rejected. These results indicate that neither human relation nor rational goal climate, have a direct effect on extrinsic motivation.

The fourth hypotheses suggested that human relation climate affects employees change readiness through both intrinsic motivation (H4a) and extrinsic motivation (H4b). The
confidence intervals of the indirect effects displayed a very small variation in the estimates produced by the bootstrap procedure. The lower bound estimate of the indirect effect of extrinsic motivation tended to zero and had a nonsignificant effect. Hypothesis 4b was therefore rejected. Nevertheless, hypothesis 4a was retained, due to significant effects in the predicted direction. This indicates that human relation climate has effect on employees change readiness, but only through intrinsic motivation. Supporting the assumption that a human relation climate does foster values that contributes to psychological need fulfillment (SDT; Deci & Ryan, 2000), leaving employees more motivated for organizational change.

The fifth hypotheses proposed the same as hypothesis four, but with the rational goal climate as the predictor. Whereas, hypothesis 5a suggested that the rational goal climate effects employees change readiness through extrinsic motivation. And hypothesis 5b suggested that rational goal climate effect employees change readiness through intrinsic motivation. As with hypotheses four, the confidence intervals of the indirect effects displayed a very small variation in the estimates produced by the bootstrap procedure, which resulted in a nonsignificant effect of extrinsic motivation, and rejection of hypothesis 5a. Hypothesis 5b was retained, due to significant effects in the predicted direction. These results indicate that intrinsic motivation indirectly effects the relationship between rational goal climate and employees change readiness.

In sum, only hypotheses 1b, 2a, 3b, 4a, and 5b were supported. The most surprising findings were the nonsignificant relationship between the human relation climate and individuals change readiness, despite the convincing empirical and theoretical implications of this existing relationship (Cunha & Cooper, 2002; Haffar, Al-Karaghouli & Ghoneim, 2014; Jones et al., 2005; Knight, 2014). In addition, both climate approaches affect on employees change readiness were indirectly affected by intrinsic motivation. For the human relation climate, intrinsic motivation fully mediated this relationship. Further, the results of the analysis showed no significant direct nor indirect effect on the extrinsic motivation variable, despite meta-analytic evidence that such a relationship would exist (Cerasoli et al., 2014). These findings have interesting theoretical and practical implications that will be discussed in the following.

**Implications for Theory and Practice**

Overall, this thesis contributes to psychological research by increasing the knowledge of how the two organizational climate approaches, human relation and rational goal, affects employees’ change readiness prior to a more extensive organizational merger. Additionally,
the thesis gives useful evidence that established work theories have limitations when it comes to more specialized organizations, such as the Norwegian police force. The findings furthermore broaden the theoretical, conceptual, and operational understanding of the Norwegian police’s organizational climate, motivational regulation, and change readiness in conjunction with larger organizational changes.

**Organizational Climate.** In the development of the hypotheses for this thesis, it was expected that both human relation and rational goal climate would positively affect employees change readiness. The result displayed a somewhat different picture, where rational goal climate had a significant effect, but the human relation climate did not. However, when intrinsic motivation was implemented as a mediating variable, the human relation climates effect on change readiness become significant. The same significant indirect effect was seen between the rational goal climate and change readiness. Additionally, the two climate approaches explained a significant amount of the variance in change readiness, but less than the intrinsic motivation variable alone. Such results indicate that employees’ beliefs, attitudes, and intentions regarding change incentives are closely related to employees’ intrinsic motivation.

Although there are no studies that could be directly compared to this thesis, the findings support and extend the qualitative study conducted by Lone et al. (2017) on organizational climate and investigation performance in the Norwegian police. They identified human relation and rational goal as the two organizational climates that would increase investigation performance the most. The result of this thesis indicates that these two climate approaches are prominent at an even higher organizational level, and that both human relation and rational goal climate have an effect on employees’ motivation and change readiness before larger organizational changes.

Specifically, the results indicate that rational goal climate are positively related to employees’ intrinsic motivation and change readiness. Although Lone et al. (2017) findings support that rational goal climate predict productivity (Quinn & Rohrbaugh, 1983), is there limited support for rational goal climates positive effect on employees’ readiness to change. Knight (2014) found in her doctoral thesis on organizational culture and change readiness, that perceived control cultures (i.e., rational goal) are negatively associated with factors that influence change readiness. Such as lower job satisfaction and increased turnover intentions. Confirming Lund’s (2003) founding that employees who view their organizational culture as dominated by rational goal attributes, will display lower levels of job satisfaction.
Additionally, has rational goal been negatively associated with trust, morale, and equity of reward, and positively related to conflict and resistance to change (Haffar et al., 2014; Patterson et al., 2005; Zammuto and Krakower, 1991). A possible explanation for the findings in this thesis is that employees in the police force perceive focus on internal control and goal achievement as more motivating and necessary, compared to other types of organizations. Through means of planning and goal setting, uncertainty related to organizational change incentives may be reduced. Making it easier for the organization to demonstrate the need for change, and to convince workers that the organization has the capacity to make the changes. Supporting that discrepancy and future vision can create individual change readiness (e.g. Locke & Latham, 2002)

For the human relation climate, the indirect effect of intrinsic motivation fully mediates the relation to employees’ change readiness. This supports the assumption that the human relation climate, with its human capital focus, is closely related self-determination and fulfillment of the employee's basal psychological needs (SDT; Deci & Ryan, 2000). As previous research has shown, foster the human relation climates flexible policies and procedures that give employees influence over decision-making, the experience of support, and focus on developing employees’ skills and knowledge (Eby et al., 2000; Jones et al, 2005; Patterson et al., 2005; Quinn & Rohrbaugh, 1983). Components that are directly compared to the needs of autonomy, relations, and competence. Such indirect effect of intrinsic motivation supports previous findings showing that human relation climate will affect employees’ beliefs, attitudes, and intentions regarding change incentives (Bouckenooghe, 2009; Haffar et al., 2014; Zammuto & O'Connor, 1992).

The results of this thesis support that there is a difference in the perception of human relation and rational goal climate, both conceptually and in degree. The t-test indicates that employees report significant different on the two climate approaches, suggesting that both human relation and rational goal are prominent climate approaches in the three measured police districts. Additionally, the exploratory factor analysis and the test for discriminant validity supports that the constructs are conceptually different, yet highly correlated. These findings fail to support the CVF’s assumption that the quadrats in the model has opposite and competing values. However, these results support the meta-analytic findings made by Hartnell et al. (2011). Showing that the CVF’s approaches cannot be viewed as competing or paradoxical. Instead, they coexist and work together (p. 687). An assumption many
Researchers for the past ten years have agreed upon (e.g. James, et al., 2008; Kuenzi, 2008; Myer, Thoroughgood, & Mohammed, 2016; Patterson et al., 2005; Schneider et al., 2013)

Researchers have pointed out that each of the CVF’s approaches fit organizations and individuals needs differently, and that organizations may consist of different climates within the organization (Cunha & Cooper, 2002; Schneider et al., 2013). Because the thesis examines two of the four CVF approaches at an organizational level of analysis, the two remaining climate approaches’ presences or influence cannot be excluded. For the two chosen climate approaches, the level of analysis makes it difficult to investigate the three police districts climate profile independently, neither between nor within each district. This prevents leaders and change agents from getting useful information about employees’ values and attitudes towards the planned organizational change at a lower level in the organization. Although the Norwegian police have a standard educational system, each police district have several different sections with diverse responsibilities. In this section, employees have various education and experience. This distinction between sections and work tasks create differences in policies, practices, and procedures, resulting in different climates within the organization (Bang, 2013). By measuring climate at a lower level of analysis and including all four of CVF’s approaches, researchers could gain a more holistic picture of the organizational climate within the police organization (Haffar et al., 2014). Making it easier to customize the chosen change method to the different units.

Organizational Climate or Organizational Culture. Organizational climate is a discussed concept among researchers (Schneider et al., 2013). Whether this thesis examines the organization's climate, its artifact, or the same as the organization`s culture, is an important issue. As previous distinguished, consists organizational climate of temporary attitudes, feelings, and perceptions made by individuals, while organizational culture is an enduring, slow changeable, core characteristic of organizations (Cameron & Quinn, 2011). This distinction illustrates that organizational climate is the property of the individual, and organizational culture the property of the organization (James, et al., 2008). A dissimilarity and operationalization that makes organizational climate a suitable predictor for measuring individual change readiness, but only on a lower level of analysis. This thesis measures organizational climate at an organizational level, making it reasonable to question whether it is a measure of the organizations climate or culture. However, the questions in the thesis are directed at employees’ observable behavior in relation to the unit’s assumptions, values, and beliefs, making the findings closer related to organizational climate than culture.
**Motivation.** Given that the results related to intrinsic and extrinsic motivation are valid, contributes this thesis to the field of motivation by providing empirical evidence that intrinsic and extrinsic motivation are separate constructs that affects employees differently. Herzberg was possibly the first to provide a two-component motivation theory, similar to the one used in this thesis. Herzberg (1966) proposed a distinction between employee’s hygiene factors and motivators. Hygiene factors, like the extrinsic motivation, were related to pay, conditions of employment, the work environment and other extrinsic features related to the work activities. On the other hand, motivators were related to job challenges, recognition and skill use, features that are similar to intrinsic motivation. Although Herzberg's data and conclusions have been criticized, support the findings in this thesis his fundamental idea that employees are affected both of internal and external motivational forces.

Nevertheless, the thesis findings related to intrinsic and extrinsic motivation are split. Showing significant direct and indirect effects for the intrinsic motivation variable, but nonsignificant effects for the extrinsic motivation variable. These findings partly support the assumption that quality-tasks are linked to intrinsic motivation, and quantity-tasks linked to extrinsic motivation (Cerasoli et al., 2014). A potential explanation for this lies in the shortcomings of the questionnaire. For instance, the questions related to the intrinsic motivational variable includes only two out of three psychological needs (SDT; Deci & Ryan, 2000). Making it more accurate to assume that the two measured climate approaches affects employees’ independence and developmental need. Which makes the need for relations and social support prior of organizational changes not questioned. Additionally, the questions related to the extrinsic motivation addressed only economic incentives. Although salary is recognized as an important motivator, are employees externally motivated by other features as well (e.g., Rynes, Gerhart, & Minette, 2004). For the Norwegian police, such external features could be status, equipment (e.g., car, weapon, uniform), work hours, etc. Thus, variety of existing external incentives were not evident in the questionnaire.

The measurement tool used for measuring employees intrinsic and extrinsic motivation was adopted from Tremblay et al. (2009) "Work Extrinsic and Intrinsic Motivation Scale". The scale measure work-related motivation with 18 items and is theoretically grounded in SDT (Deci & Ryan, 2000). The thesis used in total of six items to measure intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. Of these, three questions viewed intrinsic motivation, and three questions regarded external regulation (Deci & Ryan, 2000). Although the results of the preliminary analysis showed satisfying reliability for both variables, displayed extrinsic
motivation a lower mean and nonsignificant correlations with the two climate approaches and change readiness. In addition, the extrinsic motivation had low discriminant validity, by not being significantly different from neither the human relation nor rational goal variable. Nevertheless, displayed the measurement for extrinsic motivation high factor loadings both in the EFA and CFA. However, showed the SEM analysis nonsignificant effects for extrinsic motivation variable. These results can be a consequence of measuring extrinsic motivation with one out of four regulations presented in the SDT extrinsic motivation (Deci & Ryan, 2000). By applying all four regulations in the thesis, the extrinsic motivation would have had twelve items, against intrinsic motivations three. This could have given other statistical challenges and was therefore not preferred. In sum, the thesis lacking support for the extrinsic motivation variable can be traced to the measurement scales inconsistency with the theoretical framework.

**Change Readiness.** Overall, shows the result of this thesis that employees in the three merging police districts displays a high degree of individual change readiness. With an average above the response scale midpoint (3), a satisfying construct validity, and a small to medium correlation with the other constructs, contributes these findings to the measurement scales credibility. Making the findings more valid.

As presented initially, are individual change readiness employees’ independent perception of the organizations’ need and capacity to successfully change (Armenakis et al., 1993). Organizational change readiness, on the other hand, involves the collective interpretation of the organization's ability to positively change (Weiner, 2009). Rafferty et al. (2013) argue that it is essential to understand the implications of change readiness at both an individual and organizational level. In their multilevel framework of change readiness, has individual and organizational change readiness different antecedents, but displays a cross-level relationship. However, found a mixed method thesis conducted on the Norwegian police force that individual and organizational change readiness are significantly different from one other (Fagernæs, 2015). Demonstrating the necessity of measuring change readiness at the appropriate level of interest, and the inconsistency of using data at one level as a basis for assumptions on other level. Because this thesis measured change readiness at an individual level of analysis, it would be inaccurate to make assumptions about the tendencies regarding organizational change readiness in the three police district.

When planning and implementing organizational change, choosing the right change method is critical to achieving a successfully change (Burnes, 2005). Usually this requires a
combination of planned and emergent change approaches (Liebhart & Lorenzo, 2010), or even more complex change theories (Burnes, 2005). Traditionally involves the planned change approach a series of steps, altering the organization and individuals’ behavior. A method that is typically utilized when decision makers have identified the need for change, and analyzing the environments’ inhibiting and enabling forces (Burnes, 2005; Liebhart & Lorenzo, 2010). A similar method used when examining the Norwegian police force needs in the Police-analysis (NOU 2013: 09, 2013), and the implementation of the “Nærpolitireformen” (Prop. 61 LS 2014–2015). This change approach has been found to be most suitable when there is an anticipated need for structural changes (Burnes, 2005). However, structural changes alone are not sufficient to guarantee organizational learning or improved performance nor efficiency. With a more emergent change approach, organizations can continually match the organizations’ resources with environmental opportunities, constrictions and demands. Giving managers and change agents greater opportunity to alter the organization through cultural and political processes (e.g., Hayes, 2002). In the future, this approach could help the Norwegian police force to better meet external requirements with more frequently internal adjustments.

Nevertheless, has it been argued that failure in change initiative are not necessarily “…caused by poor planning or execution or a lack of competence or commitment per se; rather the underlying cause is a clash of values between the organization and the approach to and type of change it has adopted.” (Burnes & Jackson, 2011, p.135). Making lack of individual and organizational change readiness traceable to inconsistency between the chosen type of change and the organizations’ focus and values (Burnes & Jackson, 2011). Clearly demonstrating the need for examine the organizations climate and change readiness prior of a planned change. By doing so, it is possible to develop a more accurate understanding of the likelihood of an effective change, get important diagnostic information and thereby be able to reduce resistance to change and other threats to a successful change implementation (e.g. Armenakis et al., 1993; Rafferty et al., 2013).

**Limitations**

Although the findings reported in this study contributes to the psychological research field, there are several limitations that must be acknowledged. First of all, this is a cross-sectional study where all variables are measured at the same time. Consequently, it is not possible to draw a causal inference regarding the relationship between the variables. The study provides evidence of a positive association between the human relation and rational
goal approaches, intrinsic motivation, and individual change readiness. However, the causal relationship between these constructs can be different than what is hypothesized, or be affected by other variables not included in this thesis.

Second, there is the potential for systematic measurement error. Such as common method variance (CMV), that refers to the variance that is attributable to the measurement method rather than to the construct of interest (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Lee, & Podsakoff, 2003). These method biases are likely to be particularly influential in studies in which the data for both the predictor and criterion variable are obtained from the same person, in the same measurement context, using the same item context, and similar item characteristics. Such as the self-report measurement used in this study. Consequently, the artificial covariance between the predictor and criterion variable can affect the results (Podsakoff et al., 2003).

Third, when answering the questionnaire, respondents are affected by what they perceive as culturally acceptable and appropriate behaviors (Crowne & Marlowe, 1964). This social desirability makes respondents answer what they believe is expected, and not what is real. As a result, it will potentially bias the answers, and mask the actual relationships between two or more variables (Ganster, Hennessey & Luthans, 1983). Also, items or constructs are shown to have social desirability. A questionnaire that is perceived as more or less socially desirable may be more related to each other because of their social desirability than the underlying constructs that they were intended to measure. This may have been the case with the extrinsic motivation variables in this thesis, as the wording and the theme of the questions might have been negatively perceived and poorly corresponded with the overall police culture and climate regarding external incentives.

Fourth, the survey measures the variables at different levels of abstraction. This makes it more difficult for the respondent to separate feelings, attitudes, and situations when answering the survey. One method bias that can illustrate this is the consistency effect (e.g. Salancik & Pfeffer, 1977), where the respondent tries to maintain consistency in their response to similar questions and organize information in consistent ways. The respondent does not see the nuances, and respondent gets primed by previous questions. This is particularly problematic when the questions are at different levels of abstraction. Like in this thesis, where the scale measurement for climate is measured at a unit level (e.i. "Vi har lite konflikt mellom oss på enheten"), and the remaining scale measurements are measured at an individual level (e.i. "Fordi jeg får mye glede av å lære meg nye ting"). This makes it more
difficult for the respondent to reevaluate their attitudes, perceptions, and behaviors for each question and concept.

Lastly, the generalizability of the findings needs to be addressed. Even though the thesis displays a satisfying sample size and a response rate of over 50%, the results only show tendencies across the three merging police districts. Although the sample was evenly distributed in gender, age, unit, and seniority, it is possible that the respondents who chose to participate in the study share common characteristics. Such cooperative bias distinguishes those who volunteer to respond and those who do not participate in the survey (e.g., Witherspoon et al., 2013). Those who agree to participate are usually more cooperative, prosocial, or more eager to say their opinion, which in turn might influence how they respond to the questionnaire. This poses a potential threat to the study and thesis generalizability.

Future Research

Based on the thesis’ findings and limitations, future research is needed on the theoretical framework of organizational climate, motivation and change readiness, particularly in more specialized occupations and organizations. For the organizational climate, the thesis examines only two out of four quadrants in the CVF. It would be interesting to see how the remaining two quadrants affect employee motivation and readiness to change. Particularly, since recent studies have indicated that the CVF quadrant are more complementing than competing (Kuenzi, 2008; Patterson et al., 2005; Schneider et al., 2013), and that every organization holds a different amount of values from all four quadrants. Additionally, the findings in this thesis indicate that only rational goal climate has a direct effect on employees’ readiness to change, although, a substantial amount of research has found the human relation climate to predict individual change readiness best. Further research should, therefore, look deeper into the mechanisms that produce this effect in the Norwegian police force, for example by conducting qualitative investigations.

In this thesis, organizational climate is measured at a different level of analysis then motivation and change readiness. Future studies should examine organizational climate at a lower level (e.g., a group level), that is more statistically comparable with variables measured at an individual level, such as motivation and change readiness. A closer level of analyses between the measured variables would positively affect the content validity of the results. Also, a measurement at a lower level is more useful prior and during organizational change implementation.
Further, the findings in this thesis indicate that both employees in a rational goal climate and human relations climate experience intrinsic motivation for organizational change implementations. Precedents that are shown to be important for organizational climate and employees’ change readiness are managerial emphasis and leader behavior (Kuenzi & Schminke, 2009). Future studies should examine the precursors to the CVF climate approaches more in depth, because such insight will provide organizations with knowledge of how to form, affect and change organizational climates to what best fits the organization, especially before organizational changes.

As discussed in theoretical implications, the measurement scale on intrinsic and extrinsic motivation has both theoretical and methodological limitations, making the results in this thesis questionable. Since motivation has so much influence on human behavior, future studies should look at motivation as an essential component of employees change readiness, both directly and indirectly. However, this should be done with a more suitable measurement tool, that better capture motivations intention, strength, and purpose in employees work behavior.

Finally, findings in this thesis shows that the Norwegian police force cannot be directly compared with other organizations, demonstrating that established work theories may not apply to all types of occupations and organizations. By identifying such gaps in the organizational development literature, further research can investigate whether the relationships found in this thesis apply to other contexts, specialized organizations or occupations.
Conclusion

The thesis has attempted to address how organizational climate affects employees change readiness and motivation. In addition to examining how motivation indirectly affect the relationship between organizational climate and change readiness, prior of a merge between three Norwegian police districts. This has been done by reviewing and synthesizing the literature on organizational climate, motivation and change readiness. By creating a structural equation model for testing the components theoretical framework, presenting and discussing the findings, and by suggesting directions for future research.

Findings have shown that rational goal climate has a direct positive effect on employees` readiness to changes and that this relationship is indirectly affected by employees` intrinsic motivation. Further, the findings showed no direct effect between the human relation climate and change readiness, but a full mediating effect of intrinsic motivation. Additionally, the results in this thesis do not support the assumptions that extrinsic motivation is an essential motivational component in the workplace. The reason for this is attributed to weaknesses in the framework and measurement tool, making the question about extrinsic motivation in the Norwegian police force uninvestigated.

Lastly, the thesis contributes to psychological research by increasing the knowledge of organizational culture and climate. Specifically, how the two organizational climate approaches, human relation and rational goal, affects employees` change readiness prior to an organizational merger. Showing that perceived organizational climate does affect employees` readiness for organizational change implementations and that motivation for such organizational change is a critical factor for a successful change process. Further, the thesis gives useful evidence that established work theories have limitations when it comes to more specialized organizations, such as the Norwegian police force. Future research is therefore needed in such occupations and organizations.
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APPENDIX 1: Information letter

**UNDERSØKELSE AV ORGANISASJONSKLIMA FOR ENDRING I POLITIET**

Vi viser til tidligere presentasjon på Politisjefmøtet, årets forskningskonferanse og samtaler rundt vårt pågående prosjekt om organisasjonsklima for endring i politiet.

Som beskrevet har vi ut fra funnene i vårt tidligere prosjekt om kvalitet i etterforskning, utvidet prosjektet til å omfatte hele politiorganisasjonen og ikke bare etterforskningsavdelingene.

Forskningsavdelingen ved Politihøgskolen og faggruppen for arbeids- og organisasjonspsykologi ved Psykologisk institutt, Universitetet i Oslo har over flere år hatt et formelt samarbeid.

Ved inngangen til sammenslåingen til nytt politidistrikt, ønsker vi å gjennomføre en spørreundersøkelse blant samtlig ansatte i Østfold politidistrikt.

I denne spørreundersøkelsen fokuserer vi på de organisatoriske sidene ved politiet og faktorer som man fra arbeids- og organisasjonsforskning har funnet viktige for hvordan utvikling, endring og læring kommer til uttrykk. Det betyr at vi vil gjennom spørreskjemaet kartlegge oppfatninger blant politifolk og sivilt ansatte på en rekke temaer knyttet til oppveksten av organisasjonen og arbeidsdagen. Analysene vil se hvordan de ulike temaene vi kartlegger påvirker forhold som motivasjon, endringsvilje, og stress.

Resultatene vil på den ene siden belyse hvordan vi kan forstå den norske politiorganisasjonen i møte med de utfordringene de møter, samtidig som dataene gir et systematisk bilde av de konkrete distriktene som deltar.

Vi ønsker å undersøke et utvalg av politidistrikter som ved årsstifte slåes sammen. Further ønsker vi å gjennomføre denne spørreundersøkelsen i Follo, Romerike og Østfold politidistrikt. Etter samtaler med flere ledere og ansatte i disse distriktene har vi kun møtt positive tilbakemeldinger om deltakelse.

I Østfold politidistrikt har Tom Erik Guttulsrud sagt seg positive til å være kontaktperson, tilrettelegger og aktivt bidra i utsendelse og innsamling av spørreskjemaet.

Datainnsamlingen vil foregå i tråd med forskningsetiske retningslinjer, hvor ingen

Resultatene vil bli publisert i rapporter og fagfellevurderede tidsskrifter. Vi er positive til å formidle resultatene tilbake til politidistriktene når data er samlet inn og analysert. Dato for prosjektslutt er satt til 1. januar 2022.

Vi er svært taknemlige og stolte over samarbeidet vi har med norsk politi, og ser fram til å jobbe fram ny viktig kunnskap for etaten. Vi takker for Østfold politidistriks positive ønske om å delta og ber med dette om Politimesterens formelle godkjenningelse til å sende ut spørreskjemaene til de ansatte, som skissert.

Tilbakemelding eller eventuelle spørsmål samt kommentarer til prosjektet, bes rettet direkte til undertegnede (e-mail: trond.myklebust@phs.no, til kontor direkte 23 19 98 55, mobil 930 333 92).

Med vennlig hilser

[Signature]

Trond Myklebust
Politiinspektør/PhD

Vedlegg: Kopi av spørreskjema til de ansatte.

Deres referanse: Vår referanse:
## APPENDIX 2: Scale Measurements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Item name</th>
<th>Item statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CVF</td>
<td>HR 2.01</td>
<td>Vi utvikler støttende, positive arbeidsforhold her på enheten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human relation</td>
<td>HR 2.02</td>
<td>Arbeidsmiljøet er sånn at vi på enheten kommer godt overens med hverandre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HR 2.03</td>
<td>Vi har lite konflikt mellom oss på enheten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HR 2.04</td>
<td>Vi er forpliktet til hverandre her på enheten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HR 2.05</td>
<td>Det er høy moral blant ansatte på enheten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HR 2.06</td>
<td>På min enhet hjelper vi ansatte hverandre når det trengs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HR 2.07</td>
<td>Hver ansatt har muligheter for utvikling her på enheten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HR 2.29</td>
<td>Hver ansatt har muligheter for faglig utvikling her på enheten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVF</td>
<td>RG 2.22</td>
<td>Det er viktig for oss på enheten å nå våre satte mål</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rational goal</td>
<td>RG 2.23</td>
<td>Vi legger vekt på å sette mål for enheten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RG 2.24</td>
<td>Det er viktig at vi på enheten planlegger for fremtiden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RG 2.25</td>
<td>Vi her på enheten har alltid planer om å gjøre forbedringer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RG 2.26</td>
<td>Vi blir belønnet for å nå mål her på enheten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RG 2.27</td>
<td>Vi her på enheten leter etter nye måter å gjøre ting på</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RG 2.28</td>
<td>På min enhet er vi kjent med de langsiktige planene og</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic</td>
<td>IM 8.04</td>
<td>Fordi jeg får mye glede av å lære meg nye ting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>motivation</td>
<td>IM 8.08</td>
<td>På grunn av den tilfredsstillelse jeg får fra å påta meg interessante utfordringer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IM 8.15</td>
<td>På grunn av den tilfredsstillelse jeg opplever når jeg lykkes i å utføre vanskelige oppgaver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extrinsic</td>
<td>EXT 8.02</td>
<td>Fordi denne type arbeid gir meg en økonomisk trygghet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>motivation</td>
<td>EXT 8.09</td>
<td>Fordi det gjør det mulig for meg å tjene penger.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EXT 8.16</td>
<td>På grunn av inntekten jobben gir meg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change Readiness</td>
<td>CHA 9.01</td>
<td>Når endringer skjer på min enhet tror jeg at jeg er klar for å takle dem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CHA 9.02</td>
<td>Jeg prøver vanligvis å overbevise folk på min enhet om å akseptere endring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CHA 9.03</td>
<td>Når endringer skjer på min enhet pleier jeg å klage på dem heller enn å gjøre noe med dem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CHA 9.04</td>
<td>Jeg tror at jeg er mer klar for å akseptere endring enn mine kollegaer på min enhet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CHA 9.05</td>
<td>Jeg er ikke bekymret for endringer på min enhet fordi jeg tror at det er en måte å takle dem på</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CHA 9.06</td>
<td>Når endringer skjer på min enhet har jeg stort sett til hensikt å støtte dem</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 3: Measurement model 1
APPENDIX 4: Measurement model 2