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Summary

This thesis sets out to explore how members of the Danish Police make sense of the topic of efficiency and the efficiency goal of their strategy 2011-15: “we focus on the core tasks and increase the quality and efficiency in our work”. Furthermore, the paper discusses indications of organizational change, what it might take to achieve transformational change, and if/how leaders or other actors may intervene in such sensemaking and change.

Based on interviews with members of the Danish Police, and by applying a grounded theory approach and Weick’s sensemaking theory, the paper explores the cues, frames, experiences and logics that go into producing meaning. Four synthesized meaning structures are presented that illustrate how organizational members frame and make sense of the topic of efficiency and the strategic efficiency goal: Efficiency as money and resources, Efficiency as doing the job well, Efficiency as focusing on the core tasks, and Efficiency goal as strategy and change.

Furthermore, the paper highlights that certain parts of the strategy text – process and production concepts – are ignored and provides possible reasons for this. The link between individual and organizational sensemaking is established, and the paper points out that shared meaning is not a prerequisite for collective action, however that organizational action and capability to initiate and/or absorb change may be influenced and constrained by the current framing and meaning.

Grounded in institutional logics theory, and following a discussion of how sensemaking and institutional logics theory may complement each other, the paper discusses that transformational change to organizational thinking and acting requires reflexivity and rebalancing or redefinition of taken-for-granted logics. Such logics become particularly visible when they contradict each other and these contradictions can be used to leverage change. Contradicting logics in the sensemaking related to efficiency, e.g. related to accountability, leadership and identity, and the level of reflexivity of them among the organizational members, are discussed.

Lastly, it is discussed if/how leaders or other actors may intervene in sensemaking and change. Academic ideas such as sensegiving, institutional entrepreneurship and theories related to interaction and plurivocality are reviewed and synthesized into a web of tools and approaches for leaders and others to consider using to successfully facilitate and achieve long-run change.

In the hermeneutic tradition, the paper does not claim to offer an objective, absolute truth however it offers to provide insight to a repertoire of potential sensemaking related to efficiency and the strategic efficiency goal among organizational members of the Danish Police.
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1. Introduction

1.1. Introduction
In February 2009, the Danish Police discovered a major financial deficit for the year 2008. 2008 was the first full operating year after a major organizational reform in 2007, and in February 2009, the Danish Police had to realize that their financial controls had been inadequate. The review that followed did not reveal a specific culprit – it was concluded to have been caused by a multiplicity of factors.

The theme of this thesis is not the deficit and its reasons, but a consequence of the situation: That ‘efficiency’ was put on the agenda in/for the Danish Police.

Having to ask the Ministry of Finance and politicians for money in 2009 drew attention and led to the ‘prescription’ of an external review - to review not only financial controlling but also to identify opportunities for saving money. Or rather, in the political climate saving on the police was not a workable catch phrase. The external review group and consultants were tasked to look for efficiency-enhancing opportunities. The scope was primarily the administrative part of the police and a range of areas were identified where efficiencies could be achieved. In 2010, the Danish Police started up these projects and the fiscal agreement with the Danish State for 2011 dictated specific savings linked to them.

The fiscal agreement for 2011 is for one year only. Traditionally, the Danish Police has worked based on four-year agreements with the Danish State. Advantages are a longer-term planning horizon and more autonomy in short-term prioritizations. The Chief of Danish Police, Jens Henrik Højbjerg, recognizes lack of trust (regarding the ability of the Danish Police to deliver adequate financial control and the efficiency program) as a prohibiting factor for reaching a four-year agreement. One of Højbjerg’s ambitions is to rebuild the trust and gain a four-year agreement for 2012-2015. One way to do so, he argues, is that the Danish Police must demonstrate their willingness to work on efficient resource utilization by their own initiative. Such initiative can also make scarce resources last longer and provide room for investments.

In January 2011, the Danish Police released its strategy for 2011-2015 (see Appendix A2). One of the five goals of the strategy is specifically related to efficiency:

“**We focus on the core tasks and increase the quality and efficiency in our work**”

The accompanying text uses verbs in future tense (“we will”; “increase”), implying that action is called for to deliver this. It involves change compared to the past/present.
1.2. Problem
Scholars and practitioners on strategy, organization and leadership may express many divergent opinions but one thing they could likely agree on is that writing a sentence in a strategy that sets the goal of increasing efficiency does not by itself increase an organization’s efficiency.

Mintzberg (2009) states that intended strategies are not always realized (and realized strategies were not always intended). Stacey (2010) argues that organizational continuity and change emerge unpredictably, rather than as a result of an overall plan. Stacey does not dismiss plans altogether but points out the complexity of human organizing and acting. It involves multiple local interactions in which organizational members communicate and create meaning of what they are doing, and in which they particularize ‘the general’ to the specific situations they encounter. ‘The general’ itself is generated in complex processes, and a goal such as the efficiency goal of the strategy of the Danish Police does not just jump directly into play. Organizational actors are surrounded by an ongoing stream of events and input of which they only notice and act on some (Weick, 1995).

If you accept the complexity of these processes, you could likely agree that it is not possible to build a simple causal map to illustrate change that may follow an articulation of a strategic goal to increase efficiency in the Danish Police. You may, though, inquire into aspects of meaning-creating processes and how they link to action and change - to improve your understanding of where the organization might be headed, how to relate to it and if/how you can influence it.

1.3. Research question and analytical framework
This thesis is guided by the following overriding research question:

How do members of the Danish Police make sense of ‘efficiency’ and the efficiency goal of their strategy 2011-2015, how may this affect organizational strategic change, and how may leaders or other actors potentially intervene in such sensemaking and change?

To answer this question, following sub-questions will be pursued and are motivated as follows:

1) According to Weick (1995), to change a group, one must change what it says and what its words mean. Meaning is embedded in cues, frames and connections. Therefore, I will analyse how organizational members use these elements to create meaning:

- The strategic efficiency goal is not the only input that organizational members are receiving, and the goal contains many words/phrases. What are examples of cues that the organizational members bracket and notice in relation to ‘efficiency’ and the strategic efficiency goal?
How may frames, which are abstract by nature, be visualized? What are examples of frames that organizational members draw on during sensemaking on efficiency and the efficiency goal? What are examples of how frames may influence the extraction of cues in the process?

How are organizational actors connecting cues and frames? What are examples of logics and experiences that serve as connectors during sensemaking?

How does individual sensemaking (theoretically) relate to organizational sensemaking? And how is sensemaking (theoretically) related to potential future action? (Theory in chapter 3).

Organizational change involves change to current thinking and acting by an organization and its members (Gioia & Chittipeddi 1991). I find it relevant to explore if/how the sensemaking among the organizational members contains conditions indicating that the Danish Police may undergo fundamental organizational change (to logics/beliefs). I will look at frames and logics in use and discuss taken-for-granted rules, norms and routines (institutions).

Seo & Creed (2002) draw attention to the paradox of how to change those things we take for granted when those things we take for granted shape the way we think and act (social/institutional embeddedness). Drawing on Benson’s (1977) dialectical perspective and human praxis1, they suggest a framework to explain how contradictions may lead embedded agents to take action for institutional change. On this basis, I seek to add to the analysis by discussing:

How does sensemaking relate to institutional taken-for-granted logics? (Theory in chapter 3)

Are there any signs of contradicting logics and reflexivity in the sensemaking among the organizational members that may open up for change/transformational agency and praxis?

A related question is if/how leaders or other actors may actively intervene in organizational members’ sensemaking and influence organizational change. The intention of the paper is not to be specifically normative but nevertheless discuss the issue, wrapping back up to Weick’s claim that to change a group, you must change what it says and what it means. I will therefore review and discuss:

What are examples of academic ideas of how to influence sensemaking and institutional logics and what may be the implications for the leaders of the Danish Police of this knowledge?

---

1Praxis: That people under some circumstances can become active agents reconstructing their own social relations and ultimately themselves on the basis of rational analysis of both the limits and the potentials of present social forms. (Benson, 1977)
1.4. Definitions
The thesis and its questions are based on following understandings of key concepts:

Efficiency: Can be defined as a function of output compared to input. To increase efficiency is to increase output (amount and/or quality) in proportion to input (resources). Essentially, however, the thesis is not looking for a specific functional definition of (police) efficiency but instead inquiring into the meaning that is ascribed to the concept by the organizational actors.

Notably, in Danish, ‘effektivitet’ (used in the strategic goal) has dual meaning and translates to both ‘effectiveness’ and ‘efficiency’. In the research question, I use ‘efficiency’ because I interpret the strategy goal text to point to this meaning. Danish business dictionaries and public sector documents mostly also point to this. Still, I have deemed it acceptable to also refer to ‘effectiveness’ when this is the meaning that interviewees ascribe to ‘effektivitet’. Partly because I did not want to impose an interpretation on the goal; partly because my experience from working in US and UK is that even native English speakers often blend or confuse the meaning of ‘effectiveness’ and ‘efficiency’; and lastly because ‘effectiveness’ relates to achieving results (output/outcome) which is one of the factors of the efficiency equation.

Efficiency goal: By ‘efficiency goal’, I refer to both header and text of the strategic efficiency goal (see figure 1.4.) although methodologically, I do not limit myself from using header and text separately. I do so because the header is sometimes used, displayed, remembered without the accompanying text. In this way, note the operation of three levels: Efficiency as a general concept, the ‘tag line’ (header) of the efficiency goal, and the full text of the efficiency goal.

Figure 1.4. The strategic efficiency goal from the strategy of the Danish Police 2011-2015

---

2 Cambridge Dictionary (2011), ‘Efficiency’ = “when someone uses time/energy well, without wasting any”; ‘Effectiveness’ = ‘successful or achieving the results that you want’.
3 E.g. Erhvervsfaglig ordbog (dictionary); “Effektriviseringer og kommunale budgetter” on www.bupl.dk; and publications from the Ministry of Finance at www.fm.dk
Members of the Danish Police: Means employees and (middle) managers. I do not distinguish the levels in the research question in order not to presume that sensemaking is aligned with these categories. By the Danish Police I refer to the Police area, but not the Public Prosecution.4

Organizational change: Gioia & Chittipeddi (1991) define it as the “[altering] of the current way of thinking and acting by an organization’s [members]”. Thornton & Ocasio (2008) stress the distinction between changes to logics and to practices – I am looking for the former.

Weick/Quinn (1999) suggest to view organizational change as continuous instead of episodic. I consider change continuous at micro level, while in a macro perspective, one can locate (brief) stabilized states in shared logics/frames. When looking for change, I seek to ‘freeze’5 the ongoing, show patterns in what is happening, and look for signs of reinterpretation that might point to a ‘rebalancing’ of frames compared to the ‘current mode’ (principally already passed).

Institutional logics: I use Friedland & Alford (1991): “the supra-organizational patterns of activity through which humans conduct their material life in time and space and symbolic systems through which they categorize that activity and infuse it with meaning” (1991). It is about socially constructed taken-for-granted rules, norms and routines (see further chapter 3).

1.5. Delimitation

Weick argues that sensemaking allows us to act by providing answers to the questions “what’s the story here” and then “what next?”. This thesis will however not evaluate specific action taken by the sense makers as a consequence of the strategy goal because the strategy is new. The focus of the paper is the sensemaking that relates to “what’s the story here”. The steps that sensemakers might take later will be contingent on context and to conclude on that in the present would be to speculate. I do however believe that the thesis can provide insight to a repertoire of potential meanings and thus insight to possible springboards to action.

Empirically, the thesis focuses on receivers of the strategy and not the authors of the strategy (senior management) because my primary interest is in how the strategy might be perceived by organizational members rather than the committed sensemaking (Weick, 2001) of those who included and formulated the goal. The reader should therefore also not expect any comparison of the sensemaking of the receivers of the strategy and the intentions of those who wrote it. While this could be an interesting insight for further study, it is not the purpose of this thesis.

---

4 The Public prosecution shares the strategy but do not report to the Chief Commissioner of the Danish Police

5 The term ‘freeze’ is different from Lewin’s (1952) intervention theory “Unfreeze-Change-Refreeze” (related to episodic change). Weick & Quinn suggest “Freeze-Rebalance-Unfreeze” intervention in which 1) to Freeze continuous change is to make a sequence visible and to show patterns of what is happening; 2) to Rebalance is to re-interpret, re-label and re-sequence patterns; and 3) to Unfreeze after rebalancing is to resume improvisation, translation and learning which is the ongoing activity.
1.6. Purpose and relevance of thesis
The public sector, in Denmark as well as elsewhere, is under pressure. Budgets are in deficit and government debt is on the rise. Efficiency is on the agenda, not only in the Danish Police, as a remedy to avoid cutbacks in scope and quality of public services and/or increasing taxes.

Academically, the purpose is to use known theory to inquire into ‘unknown empirical territory’. The Danish Police have had inquiries into topics such as culture, leadership styles, and change management but not sensemaking, nor efficiency in general, nor the new strategy.

A Ph.D. thesis (Degnegaard, 2010) on change management and the police reform argues that the Danish Police would have benefitted from having more focus on their social capital so as to use the organizational character and culture in a constructive manner and as an essential driver in reaching organizational targets. I find my thesis relevant in contributing empirical insight of the organizational character to support the achievement of the strategic efficiency goal.

The practical aim is to assist leaders in the Danish Police gain understanding of sensemaking in general and specific meaning related to efficiency and the strategic efficiency goal; and through this, to better understand organizational responses to the goal and strategy. Further, to provide the leaders with an improved basis for potentially seeking to influence the process and direct organizational action towards desired ends.

1.7. Structure of the thesis
Figure 1.7. provides overview of the structure of the thesis.
2. Paradigmatic foundation

Before discussing theory and method, it is appropriate to first clarify the scientific paradigm of the thesis.

2.1. Positivism versus Hermeneutics
A traditional distinction is between Positivistic and Hermeneutic paradigms. Smircich & Morgan (1980) suggest a continuum from objectivist (positivistic) to subjectivist (~hermeneutic) approaches. At the objectivist end, reality is seen as a concrete structure that can be mapped/explained and to which man adapts. At the subjectivist end, the world is an open system that cannot be represented in deterministic relationships but is continuously changing via social processes in which humans take active part – creating, negotiating and modifying symbols and meanings. Hermeneutics is about understanding such meaning processes.

This thesis operates within a subjectivist view and the hermeneutic paradigm.

2.2. Why a hermeneutic approach?
In relating my own work experiences to the SOL curriculum, I experienced high ‘recognition’ in images of organizing such as Boje’s (1995) metaphorical reference to the Tamara-land play which illustrates plurivocal interpretation of organisational stories in distributed and historically contextualized meaning networks. It therefore made sense for me to decide a research question that focuses on understanding meaning and to make theoretical and methodological selections within the hermeneutic paradigm in which the subjective and contextual is acknowledged.

2.3. Granularities
Smircich & Morgan (1980) granulates the subjectivist approach and make a (crude) distinction between man as a symbol creator (social constructivist view) and man as a symbol user (symbolic discourse view). In their more specific descriptions, they loosen up and even within the symbolic discourse view, actors may be symbol creators. A difference is however that the symbolic discourse view is argued to accept a “degree of continuity preserved through the operation of rule-like activities”, while social constructivists view the world as a “continuous process, created afresh in each encounter of everyday life”. This thesis is placed in the social constructivist view, using sensemaking theory which focuses on processes by which a reality is created. But it also steps into the symbolic discourse camp by using institutional logics theory and the ‘rule-like activity’ it implies. I do not consider this a conflict as Smircich & Morgan argue the move between perspectives to be gradual. Theory is discussed further in chapter 3.
Interpretivism and philosophical hermeneutics are two strings within hermeneutics (Schwandt, 2000). Interpretivists draw on the hermeneutic circle but notably find it possible to understand the subjective meaning of others’ actions in an objective manner, i.e. the interpreter remains unaffected and external. Philosophical hermeneutics, on the other hand, has a non-objectivist view of meaning and do not find the interpreter capable of freeing himself from tradition and prejudices. However, in the encounter with that which is being interpreted, the interpreter engages and risks his biases, and so the point is not to rid yourself of prejudices but to be aware of them and leave them open for reframing. I reflect on my prejudices below.

2.4. Implications of a hermeneutic approach
In terms of conclusions and reflections, a key implication of the hermeneutic approach is that the thesis focuses on understanding meaning processes, and the knowledge that is generated is regarded relative and specific to the context. The thesis will not yield an absolute ‘causal law’ for the relationship between the strategic efficiency goal and organizational members’ reactions to it. Nevertheless, it may still provide useful insight about the nature of meaning processes in the Danish Police (and other organizations with similar characteristics).

In terms of methodology, in a hermeneutic perspective, the social world is not seen as a concrete structure that can be objectively described and explained. Therefore, the usefulness of quantitative techniques is restricted because they require accurate, shared definitions and measurements which are problematic in a subjectivist view in which actors are presumed to have varying understandings based on individual contexts. A qualitative approach is typically more appropriate, though not necessarily a simple choice. Methodology is discussed in chapter 4.

2.5. Personal background and prejudices
I had worked in the Danish Police six months when doing the interviews. Past readings about public sector and professionals (eg. in health sector) made me wonder if actors would relate the goal to efficiency or effectiveness (1.4.) – thinking it could be the latter.

I previously worked in a private limited company in which employees/managers were typically generalists with mercantile education. Efficiency was often related to economics, IT, process optimization and KPIs – elements that I found myself waiting for interviewees to mention.

Lastly, the Strategy, Organization and Leadership (SOL) major at CBS uses much hermeneutic literature which has also influenced my theoretical/methodological prejudices and choices.

---

6 Hermeneutic circle: “that to understand the part (the specific sentence, utterance or act), the inquirer must grasp the whole (the complex of intentions, beliefs and desires, or the text, institutional context, practice etc) and vice versa” (Schwandt, 2000)
By being aware of my prejudices and applying a theoretical framework and structured methodology, I have sought to remain open to reframing my prior knowledge and remain critical toward the data collected.
3. Theory

As introduced in chapter 1.3, the analytical framework of this thesis is founded on theories of sensemaking and institutional logics. This chapter will discuss key elements of the theories and argue the relevance of the theories further. The chapter will also address the juxtaposing of the two theories which critics may question the combination of, due to their underlying premises. Critique of the theories is included in that discussion.

3.1. Meaning and sensemaking

Since publishing his book “The Social Psychology of Organizing” in 1967, Karl Weick has been much cited for his ideas of sensemaking and enactment as key elements of organizing. Weick has also elaborated the concepts in later work. In his 2005 article together with Sutcliffe and Obstfeld, they operationalize the sensemaking concept and link it to meaning as follows:

“Sensemaking involves turning circumstances into a situation that is comprehended explicitly in words and that serves as a springboard into action […] Sensemaking is central because it is the primary site where meanings materialize that inform and constrain identity and action”.

This description introduces a more explicit reference to future action (‘springboard to action’) than Weick’s previous work but still does not depart from the premises of the original theory which is centered around the ecological change-enactment-selection-retention model (Weick, 1979) and the seven properties of the sensemaking process (Weick, 1995): that it is grounded in identity, retrospective, enactive, social, ongoing, focused on cues, and driven by plausibility.

Key points are that people seek to make sense of an ongoing chaotic flow of equivocal inputs and they enact this sense into the world to make the world more orderly. In the sensemaking process, they notice some cues over others, bracket and label events, put words to them, ask “What’s the story here?” and then “Now what should I do?” In doing so, they bring meaning into force. The meaning that materializes is driven by plausible (not necessarily accurate) images that rationalize what people are doing, constructed from connecting current experience with retained frames of reference. While sensemaking is regarded a micro-level activity, it is a social process and grounded in identity construction because thoughts, feelings and behavior of individuals are influenced by the actual, imagined or implied presence and judgment of others.

---

7 Weick (1977, 2003, 2005) describes enactment as a noticing and bracketing activity. Once something has been isolated, then that is the environment momentarily for the organization. In his model, there is a reciprocal linkage between the ecological change in the environment and enactment, intended to depict the subjective origin of organizational realities. People in organizations repeatedly impose that which they later claim imposes on them. Adjustment to ecological change happens directly through changing that which is confronted and indirectly through changing oneself (Weick 2003).
Words are important because they mediate social contact and preserve experiences. But, words also constrain the saying and the categories that retain experience. There is always a slippage between words and what they refer to - a reason why sensemaking never stops, says Weick, who also claims that to change a group, one must change what it says and what it means.

Sensemaking goes on all the time but we particularly explicitly search for meaning following a disruption in which the current state of the world is perceived to be different from the expected state of the world or when there is no obvious way to engage the world.

**Figure 3.1. The relationship of enactment, sensemaking and conditions of the process**

I cannot cover all the aspects of sensemaking in depth in this thesis but will introduce and discuss key points of the theory that I deem particularly relevant for the purpose of the thesis:

1) the ‘substance of sensemaking’ (cues, frames and connections)
2) the connection between individual and organizational sensemaking
3) the (retrospect) connection between sensemaking and action

3.1.1. The substance of sensemaking – cues, frames, connections

The ‘substance of sensemaking’ is concerned with the words and vocabularies that people use during sensemaking and the understanding of what people ‘draw on’ to construct meaning.

Weick (1995) suggests three elements necessary to create meaning: frame, cue, and connection:

“Frames and cues can be thought of as vocabularies in which words that are more abstract (frames) include and point to other less abstract words (cues) that become sensible in the context created by the more inclusive words. Meaning within vocabularies is relational. A cue in a frame is what makes sense, not the cue alone or the frame alone”.

Source: Jennings & Greenwood (2003, adapted from Weick 1979, p.132). Also quoted/used by Weick et al. (2005).
Frames tend to be past moments of socialization. Cues are present moments of experience, represented by words and labels that describe circumstances that we noticed. Not only are cues connected to frames to create meaning, the extracted cues and how they are connected to a frame also depend on the frame that is operating. If the frames cannot offer a vocabulary or prototypical past moment to connect a current experience to, the search for meaning is prolonged (a key point of Weick’s 1993 article on the Mann-Gulch disaster).

Weick (1995) proposes that ‘vocabularies’ help actors to focus sensemaking by offering words to guide selection of cues and label experience and/or by offering a frame to place the cues in. He proposes the vocabularies of Society (ideology), Organization (third-order controls\(^8\)), Work (paradigms), Coping (theories of action\(^9\)), Predecessors (tradition) and Sequence & Experience (stories). Stories have multiple uses, acting both as cues, frames and connectors.

Vocabularies and frames represent a link to institutional theory, which is recognized by Weick (1995:36/112/124). I discuss institutional theory in 3.2. I return to cues and frames in chapter 6.

3.1.2. Individual and organizational sensemaking
If sensemaking is a micro-level activity, how is it related to the collective of an organization? How does action become coordinated in a world of multiple realities?

Czarniawska-Joerges (1992) argues that organizational life is taken for granted to a much lesser degree than everyday life. Much of it is fair game for continuous negotiation, justification and rationalizing. Occasions for sensemaking are therefore abundant. Furthermore, sensemaking efforts differ among people and the differences set the stage for much organizational activity: people spending time trying to make their worldviews more similar (Weick, 1979).

Weick (1995) refers to concepts of the intra-subjective, inter-subjective and generic subjective to understand the synthesizing of meaning and activity at macro/meso level. Inter-subjective meaning becomes distinct from intra-subjective meaning when individual thoughts, feelings and intentions are synthesized in conversations during which the self gets transformed from “I” to “we”. When moving to the generic subjective level, individualized selves are left behind and replaced by standard plots/scripts (routines). Weick argues this to be the meso level of organization - where people can substitute each other and adopt activity and meaning without having taken part in the original construction. Organizational sensemaking in response to

---

\(^8\) Taken-for-granted assumptions and definitions - also see 3.1.2. (Generic Subjectivity).

\(^9\) Tie stimuli to responses; e.g. statements about implications, if-then assertions, and statements describing means-ends.
change (when the generic subjective scripts no longer work) happens at the lower levels and are synthesized in inter-subjective interaction. Thus, interaction/communication are key during times of change. Such sensemaking and interaction at the intra- and inter-subjective levels are shaped/constrained by the generic subjective and at the same time are the means to modify it.

Notably, although sensemaking is social and organizations provide frames within which actors operate, it may not generate shared meaning. Czarniawska-Joerges (1992), however, argues that shared meaning is not crucial for collective action. People can engage in orderly joint action on the basis of compromise, necessity, mutual use of each other to achieve respective ends, etc. Subsequently they will spend time negotiating the sense of that action, intra-subjectively and inter-subjectively, to construct a sensible image of the reality in which they operate.

3.1.3. The link between sensemaking and (future) action
A key point of Weick is that actors, influenced by their frames, notice certain cues, and in doing so define an environment – with constraints – against which they act (enactment). We act all the time and take part in producing the ongoing flux of circumstances. Meaning is however only attached to the circumstances that we notice and put words to.

A fundamental premise is also that sensemaking is retrospective; action precedes cognition; there is no new meaning until an act is talked into existence and loaded with meaning. The pragmatic reader may ask – if action precedes cognition – if we are all running around like headless chicken, acting without thinking first. Well, we act from what we know. We reproduce meaning that we created in other contexts and it allows us to act. Our need for coherence then makes us match portions of that action with potentially new meaning. The process continuously updates our frames which later guide our actions. It is an interdependent process at micro-level.

Still, Weick does not give an easy recipe to understanding future action, although in 2005, he offers that the answer to “now what?” emerges from “presumptions about the future, articulation concurrent with action, and projects that become increasingly clear as they unfold”.

A key point is that the presumptions that we act on are influenced by our frames and what we have retained from earlier experience. We seem to move in the direction of self-fulfilling rather than self-defeating prophecies (Weick, 1979) and, following disruptions, we generally look for reasons that will enable us to resume interrupted activity and stay in action, rather than make deliberate efforts to change our understanding and course. But we do change over time and store new ‘rules’ in our framework. Inquiry into such change processes is what comes next.
3.2. Inquiries into change

3.2.1. The importance of the frames in connection with inquiries into change
One may read from Weick’s theory that a basic premise is that the substance elements of sensemaking, such as the frames, are continuously micro-maintained and meaning individually and continuously produced and reproduced as we interact with each other in everyday life.

Nevertheless, despite continuous updating, the frames can be considered a ‘somewhat durable’ variable and therefore become relevant to look at as the place to locate indications of sustained changes to logics that drive (and constrain) meaning creation and organizational behavior.

3.2.2. Critique/limitation of sensemaking theory in relation to framework changes
Weick is not very informative on what may cause a significant change to frames and/or how they are applied during sensemaking. He argues that sensemaking is more explicitly seen after disruptions but does not address any ‘macro change’ to the framework within which the sensemaker is embedded. May the sensemaker become conscious of a need for change and actively pursue it? Weick assumes agency (but see 3.2.3.) but does not address specifically the sensemaker’s frame awareness or if the sensemaker is aware of having multiple logics and when one is used over another.

I have found institutional logics theory to provide better guidance to the inquiry into how changes to frames and their application may come about. To justify the move to institutional logics theory, which is rooted in institutional theory, I will first discuss the concepts of agency and institutionalization in relation to sensemaking. Subsequently, I introduce institutional logics theory and motivate its use in relation to sub-question 2.

3.2.3. Sensemaking, agency and institutional theory
Institutional theory deals with taken-for-granted rules, norms and routines so powerful that organizations and individuals are apt to automatically conform to them. Macro institutionalists argue that organizations formally structure and act in similar ways based on socially constructed, taken-for-granted ways of operating, in order to gain legitimacy (Meyer & Rowan, 1977) – contrary to organizing and acting rationally in the neo-economical sense of maximizing profits or adjusting structure to the technical task/environment. Zucker (1977) covers similar ground at micro level, within organizations, where she argues that institutionalization also produce common, taken-for-granted understandings about what is appropriate and meaningful behavior. An important point of institutional theory is that we act mindfully and believe
ourselves to be acting rationally but do so within a socially constructed reality which we are embedded in and take part in producing and reproducing.

Following points represent links between institutional theory and sensemaking:

- Weick also argues that we act mindfully based on a socially constructed reality and find plausible, not necessarily accurate, reasons to rationalize actions.
- The plots, routines and meanings stored at the generic subjective level in organizational sensemaking, used by others than those who participated in the original construction, and informing and constraining actions and meaning in the organization, resemble institutions.
- Weick recognizes a link to institutional theory when discussing frames and vocabularies of organizational sensemaking (see 3.1.1).

That is not to say that sensemaking and institutional theory are substitutions but I see relevant parallels in relation to organizational sensemaking and frames.

The role of taken-for-granted and ‘externally imposed’ institutions are however still points for debate in relation to sensemaking. A critical point is the degree of agency during sensemaking. Do we always make our own sense or may we sometimes ‘take on institutionalized sense’?

Seemingly, Weick’s views have changed (slightly) over time: In 1995, he does not embrace institutional forces over individual agency. He argues sensemaking to be the “feedstock of institutionalization”, implicitly rejecting the reverse possibility. Sensemaking is regarded individual and internal although vocabularies of e.g. society may offer input to the sensemaking process. However, in the 2005 article, Weick et al. open up for recognizing institutional forces (that organizational members “can be socialized into expected sensemaking” and “may internalize and adopt whatever is handed to them”) and that previous work on sensemaking “may have exaggerated agency”. Here, Weick recognizes the potential existence of taken-for-granted logics operating across people and sometimes superseding individual sensemaking.

Institutional theory can be criticized for being a black-box with regards to how institutions are created and changed over time. Or as Weick (2003) puts it: “Institutionalists are faulted for positing free-floating reified social facts that mysteriously constrain what people do and mean”. Institutional theory relies on underlying mechanisms, whereas sensemaking theory contains its primary mechanisms within its notion of the process\textsuperscript{10}. Weick et al. (2005) offers

---

\textsuperscript{10} Editors’ (Clegg & Westwood) commentary in “Debating Organizations PointCounterpoint in Organization Studies (2003) in the preface to the two articles in which Weick counters Jennings & Greenwood regarding comparisons of enactment versus institutional theory
sensemaking as one means by which agency alters institutions and environments, pointing to sensemaking as the micro-mechanism that produces macro-change over time.

Another entry to discussing such change is institutional *logics* theory which provides a link between individual agency and cognition and socially constructed institutional practices and rule structures (Thornton & Ocasio, 2008). Institutional logics theory offers to explain sources of heterogeneity and change, contrary to institutional theory’s focus on homogeneity.

### 3.3. Institutional logics and praxis

Institutional logics theory originates from Friedland & Alford (see their definition in 1.4). They focus on societal level logics influencing individuals and organizations, but institutional logics theory also operates at other levels (eg. Suddaby/Greenwood, 2005, use organizational fields).

#### 3.3.1. Institutional logics theory, agency and change

A core assumption of institutional theory is that interests, identities, values and assumptions of individuals and organizations are embedded in prevailing institutional logics. The institutional context both regularizes behavior and provides opportunity for agency and change.

Friedland & Alford suggest multiple, potentially conflicting, logics to be operating at the same time. This creates space for negotiation, inconsistency and tension which are mobilizing factors for agency and change since the taken-for-granted is challenged and the experience of contradictions “*reshapes the consciousness of institutional inhabitants [who] in some circumstances act to transform the present social arrangements and themselves*” (Seo & Creed, 2002).

#### 3.3.2. Praxis and its role in institutional change

The existence of contradictions produces conditions that favor change but they do not lead to change of institutions deterministically.

Seo & Creed argue that *praxis* is the mediating mechanism to drive that change. Praxis is when people under some circumstances become active agents that reconstruct social arrangements and ultimately themselves on the basis of rational analysis of both the limits and potentials of present social forms (Benson, 1977). The process is initiated by the existence of institutional contradictions which may gradually build up inefficiencies, incompatibilities or misaligned interests over time. Or the social world may also be abruptly disrupted, causing institutional crisis that “*create conditions for the revolutionary breakdown of institutional inertia*” (Seo & Creed, 2002). Figure 3.2.2. illustrates that a result may be initiation of praxis.
Praxis involves first reflection and consciousness about inertia of existing frames; then follows actor mobilization and the active use of alternative logics and systems of meaning. Friedland & Alford, like Benson, view humans as creative exploiters of social contradictions, able to mobilize different institutional logics to serve their varying purposes. The last step is a political process of negotiating an accepted new social order; Seo & Creed argue this to happen by means of collective action by a group of institutional challengers or entrepreneurs.

**Figure 3.3.2. Institutional contradictions and praxis as elements of institutional change**

![Diagram of institutional contradictions and praxis]

Source: Adapted from Seo & Creed (2002)

### 3.3.3. Relating institutional logics to the research question

I consider mechanisms by which institutional change come about similar to mechanisms that would be needed to reproduce social arrangements at Weick’s generic subjective (organization) level. So, when looking for indications of change within sub-question 2 of the research question (chapter 7), I see institutional logics theory providing a framework that guides me to look for contradicting logics and reflexivity of the logics/contradictions among agents as an indication that conditions for change are in place (though this does not mean that change will happen).

The focus of the thesis is less on actor mobilization and collective/political action. However, this part of institutional logics theory does inform the discussion for sub-question 3 (chapter 8) regarding the opportunity for leaders or other actors to influence change and action.
3.4. Summing up

This chapter has introduced and argued the relevance of sensemaking theory in relation to meaning and action in organizations. The concepts of cues, frames and connections, which will be used in the analysis (chapter 6) related to sub-question 1, were explained.

To answer the remaining part of sub-question 1, the theoretical link between individual and organizational sensemaking was reviewed as well as the link between sensemaking and action.

The chapter has further discussed and argued the use of institutional logics theory and its focus on contradicting logics and reflexive agents to analyse if conditions exist that indicate that fundamental change may take place - the purpose of sub-question 2 (chapter 7).

The juxtaposing of sensemaking and institutional logics theory was discussed and motivated, highlighting the similar roots related to social construction of meaning and linking ideas of institutional logics theory with sensemaking through frames and the generic subjective level of organizational sensemaking. This answers the theoretical part of sub-question 2 about the relationship between sensemaking and institutional, taken-for-granted, logics. The discussion also contained critique of the two theories.
4. Methodology

This chapter describes and discusses the choices made about methods of data collection and analysis. The purpose is to demonstrate their usefulness for the research study and to allow others to judge reliability and validity of the thesis.

4.1. The motivation for qualitative research and a grounded theory approach

Because the thesis moves within the hermeneutic paradigm (2.1), a qualitative, not quantitative, approach is applied. It provides a richer picture when social reality is viewed as constructed and subjective. However, my aim is not to provide a phenomenological account of individuals’ experiences in raw form. Data collection starts there, with open-ended interviews to inquire into subjective understandings – but the aim is to provide a framework of concepts and relationships among them (cues and frames); notably, without wanting to impose pre-defined structures. In other words, I seek to discover, not verify, patterns in how actors interpret reality.

Grounded theory (Glaser & Strauss, 1967) offers a systematic approach to such study. Here, empirical data is used to generate categories, rather than placing data into categories predefined by theory. Concepts emerge from the data and earn their way into the analysis through iterative sampling and analysis. Hypothesis testing is not used, because a researcher with preconceived ideas of what is likely to be observed risks that he/she sees the intended categories instead of more emergent ones (Suddaby, 2006). Existing theory may, however, be used along the way to inform or challenge the data collection/analysis – as long as categories are grounded in the data.

Grounded theory differs – at least according to Suddaby (2006) - from phenomenological accounts in that “a key element is to identify a higher level of abstraction than the data itself”. Glaser & Strauss speak of generating theory, distinguishing between substantive theory (specific to the context and particular area of research) and formal theory (generalizing).

4.1.1. Critique of Glaser & Strauss

From a hermeneutic perspective, a critique of Glaser & Strauss is that their position can be argued to hold positivistic premises in which an objective, external reality is assumed to exist, waiting to be discovered and described, and that data collection can remain largely unbiased.

To overcome the critique, I take a constructivist approach to grounded theory (Charmaz, 2000) which recognizes that categories and concepts emerge from the researcher’s interactions with the actors and the field. According to Charmaz, “researchers can use grounded theory methods
to further their knowledge of subjective experience and to expand its representation while neither remaining external from it nor accepting objectivist assumptions and procedures”.

On this basis, I recognize that the analysis and conclusions represent only a possible interpretation of how the organizational members define their reality, not an objective truth. I furthermore recognize that through the interviews that I conduct, I influence the interviewees, the organization and the data. By asking into efficiency and the efficiency goal, I take part in increasing focus on the concept of efficiency and the strategic efficiency goal, ‘forcing’ sensemaking (eg cues) that may not have occurred otherwise, or may have occurred differently.

4.2. Key concepts in grounded theory
Glaser & Strauss’ (1967) method has two key concepts: ‘constant comparison’ and ‘theoretical sampling’. Theoretical sampling is “the process of data collection whereby the analyst jointly collects, codes and analyzes data and decides what data to collect next, to develop theory as it emerges” (p. 45). I.e. data collection and analysis is not clearly separated. Simultaneously with data collection, the researcher analyzes data by generating categories, comparing data to and within categories, and redefining and delimiting the frameworks. Gradually categories solidify.

The constant comparative method is about generating and plausibly suggesting, but not testing, categories. No proof is required – data collection continues (only) until ‘category saturation’ is reached and data only adds bulk but not anything new. Glaser & Strauss suggest that this point is “a combination of the empirical limits of the data, the integration and density of the theory and the analyst’s theoretical sensitivity” (p. 62). They add that saturation cannot be attained by studying only one incident or group. Data from multiple groups must be compared.

4.3. My research design and analytical approach, incl. critique
My research design is based on grounded theory, though with some pragmatic modification.

4.3.1. Theoretical sampling, constant comparison and category saturation
I align with grounded theory in that I selected more than one group of organizational actors, and more than one member within each group, to interview (see 4.4.1). I conducted 11 interviews in multiple rounds, in between which I did ongoing, though rough, categorization. The early interviews were based on very open-ended, broad questions and I was conscious of seeking not to direct questions based on own prejudices (see 2.5). As time progressed, I asked a few more specific questions based on previous findings. Categories are grounded in the data.

---

11 Theoretical sensitivity: “the essential tension between the mechanical application of technique and the importance of interpretive insight” (Glaser, 1978 – quoted by Suddaby, 2006).
Following the 11 interviews, I compared the data further in various ways and iteratively reviewed, modified and solidified the categories (see appendix B). Later, I explored literature about professionalism, public sector and police, to consider other angles. Finally, I conducted some less formal inquiries in the organization, aimed at saturating and refining the categories.

4.3.2. Limitations/modifications
I did not have free access to the organization and unlimited interviewees. While grounded theory does not prescribe the data amount it takes to saturate a category, I acknowledge that my theoretical sampling is limited and therefore all categories may not be fully saturated.

I also divert somewhat from grounded theory in my presentation. As Suddaby (2006) states, “in pure form, grounded theory research would be presented as a jumble of literature consultation, data collection and analysis conducted in ongoing iterations that produce many relatively fuzzy categories [over time reduced to fewer structures]”. For space and ‘ease-of-reading’ reasons, the thesis is organized to display the main outcomes. To make up for this, Appendix B shows examples of coding and evolution of categories. Apx. B.1. shows the iterations I went through.

4.3.3. Critique of research design based on grounded theory
Narrative analysts are critical of grounded theory because the coding and categorization is argued to fracture the data, taking “snippets of accounts” (Riessman, 2008) and interpreting them out of context and without the sequential and structural features of narratives. Grounded theory is argued to aim for analysis rather than portrayal of subjects’ experiences in full, and there is a risk that analysts choose evidence selectively (Richardson, 1994) and gloss over meanings within respondents’ stories (Charmaz, 2000). Riessman (2008) acknowledges, however, that her thematic narrative analysis approach shares some features with grounded theory.

In the process of thematizing the interview content (and grouping themes across interviewees), I purposely kept quite long interview passages intact to maintain attention to context. Further, when using quotes in the analysis and selecting quotes for presentation in the paper, I remained conscious of the context in which the quotes originated and on many occasions returned to the full interview transcript to double-check. I also remained aware of my own prejudices (see 2.5).

4.4. Empirical data collection and documentation
4.4.1. Interviewees
I conducted 11 interviews of approx. 1 hour. To allow comparisons across multiple groups, as prescribed in grounded theory, the interviewees represent different groups/functions/roles:
Interviewees are kept anonymous as I have not wanted to expose anyone, nor risk that anyone would hold back reflections for fear of other people’s judgments.

I deliberately did not seek to interview corporate leaders who took part in the original strategy formulation (see 1.5). All the interviewees had been in the Danish Police more than 10 years.12

### 4.4.2. Semi-structured interviews

According to Silverman (2001), open-ended questions are the most effective route towards gaining authentic understanding of people’s experiences. I conducted semi-structured interviews with open-ended questions, asking interviews to relate to the three levels: ‘Efficiency’ in general, the header of the efficiency goal, and the full text of the strategic goal (see 1.4).

### 4.4.3. Data documentation

Interviews were recorded and transcribed13 which provided me with the advantage of being able to go back to details as the analysis progressed. Interviews were conducted and transcribed in Danish, and coding, categorization and analysis were done in Danish to ensure that any subtleness that may lie in native language was appropriately considered. I translated the quotes actively used in the paper to English – seeking to transfer the best possible identical meaning. The quotes presented in the analysis (chapter 6) as well as supplementary quotes are available in Appendix C. The full interview transcripts are available in Appendix X.

### 4.5. Reliability and validity, incl. critique of empirical data scope

Given the hermeneutic paradigm (that I cannot engage fully objectively with the data, and the social world is constantly changing so replication is problematic), the discussion of reliability is

---

12 This is not an uncommon seniority among employees in the Danish Police. As also stated in chapter 5, the staff turnover rate is very low in the organization.
13 One interview was not transcribed due to technical problems with the recording device.
challenging. However, detailed specification and data documentation increases repeatability of a study (Richardson, 1996) and therefore I make interview transcripts (appendix X), categories in use (appendix B) and quotes within each category/analysis point (appendix C) available.

Validity is the extent to which an account accurately represents the social phenomena to which it refers (Silverman, 2001). As stated in 4.1.2., I acknowledge that my analysis represents only a possible interpretation, not an objective truth. The credibility of the study may however be increased by describing data vividly to the reader (Glaser & Strauss, 1967), using multiple sources and comparison groups and documenting the chain of evidence (Richardson 1996; Glaser & Strauss, 1967), seeking out deviant cases (Silverman, 2001; Glaser & Strauss, 1967) and by respondent validation (Silverman, 2001). Riessman (2008), however, argues that the latter is primarily an ethical responsibility as disagreements on conclusions may simply reveal multiple realities and ‘truths’ and not as such render one possible conclusion invalid.

I seek to support credibility of my study by including a range of quotes in the analysis (chapter 6) to make the data vivid, documenting the chain of evidence and how I reach conclusions, and selecting interviewees from multiple groups to allow comparisons and deviant analysis.

My conclusion is based on a synthesis of the sensemaking across the 11 interviewees and I do not claim to provide an objective truth that spans across all organizational members of the Danish Police, however I do consider the study to provide useful insight to a potential repertoire of sensemaking among organizational members of the Danish Police who have similar backgrounds and circumstances to those I interviewed.

For those who favor data triangulation, my empirical data scope may be criticized for lacking observations of the 11 interviewees in daily organizational life or analysis of texts from their hand. It could also be argued that (for purposes of generalizability) the data scope could have been enhanced by reviewing internal strategies, presentations or publications. I de-selected such sources because they often come from the hand of the strategy authors (who are not the subject of this study, see 1.5.), and articles in e.g. the newsletter from the police association are edited in a context which I find difficult to judge. Silverman (2001) suggests that the constant comparative method and comprehensive data treatment are means more appropriate than triangulation to validate field research – means which I have sought to apply to this study.
4.6. Summing up
This chapter has described as well as criticized grounded theory and argued choices made for empirical data collection (through interviews) and research design (inspired by constructivist grounded theory). The chapter has discussed reliability and validity, and highlighted the specification and documentation of data, categorization and chain of evidence in support of this. Further, the chapter recognizes that my analysis and conclusions represent only a possible interpretation of how organizational members define their reality, not an objective truth.
5. Introduction to the Danish Police

The purpose of this short chapter is to introduce the Danish Police organization and provide insight to the context of sensemaking about efficiency in and around the Danish Police.

5.1. The organization

The Danish Police consist of approximately 14,000 employees of which around 11,000 are educated police officers. The remaining professional groups are lawyers, administrative staff and other occupations such as IT personnel, academic staff and service staff.

The Danish Police has one of the lowest staff turnover rates in the Danish public sector – just 4.9%. Police officers remain one of the last professions that are still being employed on civil servant contracts (with three years paid notice period). For years, there has been a politically determined fixed number of police officers. In 2010 it was 11,100. This was maintained by adjusting intake at the police academy. In 2011, the fixed number was removed.

The organization was significantly restructured during a major reform in 2007. The then 54 police districts, who reported to the Ministry of Justice, were consolidated to 12 police districts and now report to the National Police Commissioner.

Following the reform, the National Police is taking up a strategic role while also containing operative departments who assist the police districts with special investigation and duties. The police districts are of a size that allows them to perform most tasks within crime investigation, tactical support (response/emergency) and community policing on their own. One intention of the reform was to decentralize responsibility to the 12 districts who would have enough scale to be relatively autonomous managerial units. At the district level, a move from a local station model with mixed competences to a specialized/centralized model took place, with professions centralized at one or more locations within the district. See organization charts in Appendix A3.

5.2. Efficiency and the Danish Police in context

Contextually, related to ‘efficiency’, one should note that the Danish Police (and the Danish public sector as a whole) is different from e.g. the UK police and public sector in terms of the extent to which performance management, privatization, contracts and other New Public Management concepts have been discussed and implemented. Sehested (2002) claims that “the hard core New Public Management never has entered the Danish reform scene” but instead

---

14 Source: Personalestyrelsen: “Personaleforbrug og -bevægelser 2009”. Average staff turnover across 171 state agencies is 11.3%. Per 2008 statistics from Danish Employer Org., general turnover in the Danish labor market is 28%. Manufacturing has lowest average turnover by 22% while service industry scores approx. 33%.
most efforts in the Danish public sector has been put into internal organizational matters to modernize organizational structures, management methods and working methods. Reff-Pedersen & McGivern (2008) demonstrate, in health services, how the UK has used targeting and performance measurements while Denmark has been using evaluation and standardization. Greve (2000) demonstrates how the Danish public sector has primarily used ‘soft’ contracts based on principles of trust and co-operation and not solely a principal-agent framework.

For the US police forces, the Government Performance and Results Act in 1993 carried with it ideas of managerialism and best value performance indicators. Managerialism in the UK police can be traced back to the 1980s and the 1994 Police and Magistrates Courts’ Act recommended to change the nature of police management from public to business-oriented organization and to introduce efficiency targets (Drake et al. 2004). In the late 1990s, the UK police introduced increased accountability through performance management systems (Butterfield et al. 2005). The German police introduced personal appraisal systems in the 1990s (Jacobs et al., 2008).

In the Danish Police, contracts were introduced with the police reform in 2007 and each police district commissioner now has a contract. Contracts are not used below this level and individual performance measurements are not used. By their own accord, the Danish Police have not been succumbed to particular ‘hard financial scrutiny’ or efficiency targets prior to the deficit related to the 2008 accounts. In an efficiency program, which was a consequence of the 2008 deficit and is running from 2010-2013, outsourcing of service functions (maintenance, garage repairs, etc) will take place. The UK police took steps in this direction in the 1990s.

The point I wish to make here is not that efficiency is synonymous with ‘hard core NPM’, performance measurements, managerialism or outsourcing – or that foreign police forces are more or less efficient than the Danish Police. However, I find it relevant to make the reader aware of these historical and contextual circumstances for the Danish Police – circumstances which are different from foreign police forces discussed in other academic literature (e.g. see authors above) and also other Danish public sector institutions, for whom efficiency initiatives have indeed been associated with some concepts under the NPM umbrella. Sensemaking within the Danish Police should be seen in the light of their organization-specific context and history.
6. Analysis: How actors make sense of efficiency and the efficiency goal

To answer sub-question 1 of the research question, this chapter analyses sensemaking related to efficiency and the strategic efficiency goal.

“Sensemaking is about the embellishment and elaboration of a single point of reference and occurs when [an extracted] cue is linked with a more general idea” (Weick, 1995:57).

In other words, cues, connections and ‘the more general idea’ (frames) become relevant points of analysis. The chapter initially walks through these elements (6.1), introducing and providing examples of them, and discussing how an abstract frame may be visualized. Once established, the chapter moves to analyzing sensemaking in depth, visualizing how organizational members connect cues and frames (6.2), and how frames influence their extraction of cues (6.3).

As the hermeneutic circle\(^\text{15}\) argues, there is interdependency between understanding the parts and the whole. As a reader, please beware that the walkthrough of elements in 6.1. may be clearer after reading the analysis in 6.2 which puts the elements together. Nevertheless, I find that 6.2. benefits from the introduction of the elements in 6.1. first.

6.1. Elements in the sensemaking process

Figure 6.1 demonstrates the relationship between the elements of sensemaking which I use below. It particularly relates to selection and retention in Weick’s model (Figure 3.1.).

Figure 6.1. The sensemaking relationship of cue, connectors and abstract frame(s)

\(^{15}\) Hermeneutic circle: “that to understand the part, the inquirer must grasp the whole and vice versa” (Schwandt, 2000)
6.1.1. Cues

“Extracted cues are simple familiar structures that are seeds from which people develop a larger sense of what may be occurring (Weick, 1995:50)”. Cues tend to be present moments of experience, e.g. “a strategy goal has been put in place” or e.g. a failure, new IT, a choice, etc. I also consider the words and phrases of the strategy text a pool of potential cues to be picked up.

Which cues are extracted is influenced by the frames within which each person operates. Given the interview setting, it must however be recognized that some cues were provided by me, e.g. that “a strategy goal has been put in place”. Indeed, several interviewees had not particularly noticed the new strategy before being asked to participate in interview (see reflection in 6.3). Other effects of the interview setting are that the cues are more generic (related to the strategy text, not real events) and there is less distraction from alternative inputs than in ‘the real world’. This does not make the sensemaking ‘unreal’ but it gave the interviewees more time to reflect widely which might offer broader insight to their possible sensemaking ‘repertoire’.

The interviews provided a great chance to review which cues are noticed from the strategy text. Quite naturally, the three keywords of the header were picked up: The core task, quality and efficiency. But cues were extracted from the text, too. Figure 6.1.1. displays the cues commonly extracted by the interviewees. The square shows general cues. The triangle shows the words from the strategy goal that were extracted to greater/lesser degree. Outside are phrases from the strategy text that had potential to serve as cues but were not bracketed (see reflection in 6.3).

Figure 6.1.1. Extracted cues in conversation about efficiency and the strategic efficiency goal

I am being interviewed and about... There is a strategy goal and it talks about...

6.1.2. Frames

Frames are “the more general, abstract ideas” (about efficiency and strategy, in the case of this thesis) – past moments of socialization – that influence sensemaking by guiding which cues are
extracted and how they are interpreted. Frames are not always coherently formulated and monolithic; thus their use can vary depending on context. They operate implicitly and people typically agree less on the form and rules of a frame than on the exemplars that are associated with it (Weick, 1995). Because of this abstract nature, frames can be difficult to label and describe – and to get closer to doing so becomes a key target of my analysis in 6.2. below.

As a means to describing frames, the exemplars, experiences and logics associated with a frame become important because they are put into words during sensemaking and are used to connect a cue to a frame. I consider these experiences and logics, the *connectors*, to represent *properties of the frame* - they help to visualize and make a frame more concrete.

6.1.3. Connectors (experiences and logics)
My analysis shows that connectors operate at multiple levels. They may be expressed directly by the sensemaker as a story of an experience or a conscious logic, or they may be underlying logics/paradigms that influence the sensemaking implicitly. Some stories exemplify underlying or abstract points. E.g. the hero story of the CFO with a finance degree who was brought in following the ‘morass’ of the 2008 deficit (which is blamed on lack of finance skills among police officers and lawyers who traditionally have managed the Danish Police), is influenced by an *academic paradigm* that values skills gained from formal education. This story/connector may be used in many different contexts – 6.1.4. exemplifies its use in the context of efficiency.

Some of the connectors - abstract logics or e.g. the above academic paradigm - could be argued to be similar to frames because they operate in other contexts, too (the grey cloud in figure 6.1). For sake of clarity, however, they are called *connectors* when they are pulled into current sensemaking about efficiency and become a *property*, a partial concretization, of an efficiency-related frame.

Table 6.1.3. lists examples of connectors used by the interviewees. On their own, they do not carry specific significance. Their meaning and significance is created in the connection with efficiency-related cues and as concretizations/properties of efficiency-related frames (see 6.2).

**Table 6.1.3. Examples of connectors at use among members of the Danish Police**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Connector (abstract or less abstract experiences, logics, vocabularies)</th>
<th>Type*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-perceptions of traits of the organization and nature of police officers (multiple)</td>
<td>Third-order controls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The police reform (multiple examples/variations/experiences)</td>
<td>Story/expressions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The service centers</td>
<td>Story/expressions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The CFO with a finance degree (~ academic paradigm)</td>
<td>Story (~ paradigm)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paradigm of public professionals (flexibility and quality important, measuring results difficult)</td>
<td>Paradigm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our surrounding environment is becoming more and more complex</td>
<td>Societal logic/paradigm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Connectors and frames are influenced by shared (organizational/societal/group) vocabularies/logics/stories but personal experiences also direct an individual’s sensemaking in organizational context. E.g. two of the interviewees had many ideas of IT as a means to gain efficiency – it turned out that one’s husband worked in IT; the other shared a Mac-passion with his sons.

6.1.3.1. Self-perception about the nature of police officers
Prior to the analysis in 6.2., I find it necessary to unfold one particular logic in use which influences several frames in the sensemaking among the organizational members: A self-perception about police officers. Importantly, it contains a duality; two co-existing (contradicting) angles that can spin a story involving police officers (or the organization) in two different directions:

The ‘obstacle angle’ speaks of lack of change mindedness, being stuck in old ways, etc. – e.g.:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview</th>
<th>Quote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 (37)</td>
<td>I mean, the police is not a very change-minded group [...]. We complain about everything and almost as loud as we want...I mean, we cannot get fired anyway...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 (19)</td>
<td>You can force the horses to the trough but they won’t drink. It has to do with ‘that’s the way it has always been’. And, I mean, we have been used to that.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (51)</td>
<td>A great many police officers just need to watch and see for a while...they can be a bit skeptical. We lean back and see what they deliver. That’s very typical.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The ‘opportunity angle’, with the pragmatic, result-oriented problem solvers, is a ‘modifier’:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview</th>
<th>Quote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 (57)</td>
<td>But when the house is on fire, we do what it takes [...] When tasks are really meaningful, something we can stick together about, you can demand anything of police officers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 (9)</td>
<td>…because you have to solve it. And that is what operational policemen are good at. Maybe it wasn’t quite by the book but the task or situation got solved that day.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This modifying effect of the ‘opportunity angle’ is important to bear in mind when people use the ‘obstacle angle’ in their sensemaking. The implicit existence of the positive ‘opportunity angle’ makes it acceptable to use the ‘obstacle angle’ without being disloyal to your colleagues.

The obstacle angle sticks rather consistently to any coupling of police officers with change and may exemplify a key point of Weick’s enactment theory: That embedded logics can constrain how organizations perceive themselves capable of acting. I reflect further on this in chapter 7.

*See Weick’s vocabularies of organizational sensemaking in 3.1.1.

16 The number in parenthesis refers to the interview sequence number from Appendix X (the full transcripts) – Interview 2 (37) can be found as 2.37. in Appendix X.
6.1.4. Sensemaking – an example

When cues and frames are connected, meaning is created, and the connectors – the concrete logics and experiences - are used to explain/justify the connections. The focus of the operation is not accuracy, but plausibility, coherence and reasonableness - within the social world of the actor. The actor is looking for an answer to ‘now what?’ by first asking ‘what’s the story here?’

To illustrate, I start with a relatively simple example (from the collected data) of how a cue, through experiences and logics, is connected to a more general idea (frame) to create meaning:

**What I hear is (cue):** We need to change and become more efficient than before. **What’s the story here?** My general idea (frame) is that change is difficult to achieve with our internal competence. Why do I think that? (connectors): Change is difficult in the police (see 6.1.3.1) / We have poor finances because managers are police officers and lawyers / I have a positive perception of the outcome of hiring a CFO from the outside, and it makes sense – because education matters (see academic paradigm in 6.1.3) / In parallel, there is talk of core tasks and police officers doing more police work (see 6.2.3) / Focus on professional core competences makes sense – because education matters and I also think that police work is to be done by educated police officers. **Now what?** (meaning/springboard to action) We need to bring in people from the outside, with new competences, to help us work on efficiency. How it shows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview 3 (37)</th>
<th>We’ve had officers in both [IT &amp; finance]. It hasn’t turned out so well (smiles)… it’s one reason why we are in this situation, we’ve had people administrating this thing without any great financial insight or education […] You can make it more efficient in various ways, eg. by hiring people specifically for this and not some police officers who took an evening class at community college.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interview 10 (46)</td>
<td>You can be a really good police officer or prosecutor but that doesn’t mean you are structured for reform and efficiency […] I mean, now they’ve employed [CFO] as finance guy and he came from the outside… he is trained in it [finance]. No police officers are trained in efficiency… I think you sometimes need people coming from the outside to say ‘you could also do it like this’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview 6 (55)</td>
<td>Again we do what we’ve always done, we hire lawyers. The smartest people in Denmark (smiles) – I assume, since they’ve been given all top positions in the police! But that’s not what it is about, right. Now it’s about running a business. So we need people who know how to run a business […] What does a law degree have to do with finance? I don’t care who my commissioner is but he must know how to run a business.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen, a cue is connected to a general idea (frame) that change is difficult to achieve with internal capabilities. The connection is justified (retrospectively) by finding logics and experiences to support it. It produces meaning that new competence (outside people) is needed
for the Danish Police to do something about efficiency. Some connectors are directly stated; others draw on underlying logics (e.g. academic paradigm) or unexpressed reasoning. Although the quotes use different connectors, the frame and meaning is similar. Whether the chain of reasoning, cause-effects or conclusion is accurate (e.g. if the CFO actually contributes positively) is less important – plausibility matters. The meaning produced creates coherence by taking a situation where we are at a loss (of how to achieve the goal) and coupling it with a need for new/outside people. In a social world where consultants are traditionally used to legitimize changes and there is skepticism about internal leadership skills (as is the case in the Danish Police), it is socially reasonable to require outside help to deliver this goal.

6.1.5. ‘Meaning structures’
My analysis shows that the answer to “what’s the story here” in relation to the efficiency goal in the Danish Police is not so simple that it can be boiled down to a single cue-frame connection. At the intra-subjective level, the interviewees consider multiple plausible meanings and link cues to several different frames. Across the interviewees, at an implied inter-subjective level, the sensemaking is even more plurivocal; but still, many logics, stories and connections are similar which implies that the organizational members share some references (frames or parts thereof). At both levels, a cue may link to a frame through multiple experiences and logics as was shown in 6.1.4. (1:many:1 relation). In parallel, other cues are connected to the same or other efficiency-related frames, making the overall sensemaking a many:many relation.

I present my analytical findings as ‘synthesized meaning structures’. Each meaning structure synthesizes several connecting relations (one or more cues and multiple connectors) and seeks to visualize an abstract frame. Given the ‘controlling’ nature of the frame (it influences the cues and connectors), I place the meaning structure at the heart of the frame (see figure 6.1.) and as an approximation of the abstract frame. In the analysis, I also synthesize common sensemaking across the interviewees. Therefore, the meaning structures illustrate potential inter-subjective sensemaking (that may feed or be fed by the generic subjective organizational level).

6.2. Analysis – sensemaking about efficiency and the efficiency goal
The four major meaning structures (abstract frames), which I will elaborate below, are:

a) Efficiency as money and resources
b) Efficiency as doing your job well
c) Efficiency as focusing on the core task
d) Efficiency goal as strategy and change

Points a and b are somewhat (but not entirely) substitutions, depending on whether a person sees ‘effektivitet’ as efficiency or effectiveness, while the remaining points are used in parallel.
I settled on these meaning structures after many rounds of iteration in which I categorized and re-categorized interview passages, identified cues and connectors, reviewed connections and gradually solidified the frames and their properties. Below, each section starts with a summary of the meaning structure (frame) and its primary cue(s) and connectors. I then unfold the argument with quotes and comments. Additional quotes for each point are available in Appendix C.

6.2.1. Efficiency as money and resources
The first meaning structure relates efficiency to money and resources. It has a negative angle (saving) and a positive angle (resource utilization). Saving is associated to having something taken away. Resource utilization becomes a positive property of the frame by being associated with an opportunity to doing more police work and an opportunity for getting rid of some structural and colleague-related ‘annoyances’. Reservations (but-ifs) are however attached to it so as to say “I agree that there is potential, I blame it on the system, and I’d really like to weed out some of the things that annoy me but certain actions would make me modify that opinion”.

Figure 6.2.1. Sensemaking: Efficiency as money and resources

As introduced in 1.4, it is common in general business to give the label ‘efficiency’ a financial connotation, something to do with money and resources, and this was also a common reference across the interviewees who typically gave it a dual interpretation, e.g.:

Interview 6 (3) Well, I think a lot of different things. Efficiency is to utilize resources better every day, get more work done for the money. And then I think that it can also have something to do with saving.
Saving could be a general societal logic or logic/experience among public organizations, based on cutbacks in recent years, but it came forward as clearly rooted in internal experience, often lying as a subtle unexpressed expectation but also sometimes expressed directly:

**Interview 1 (5)**  
...efficiency in the Danish Police is to a very high degree related to saving...not saving to do something better but saving to spend less money.

Saving takes a negative turn because it is associated with the experience that saving means taking things away (from us/me). It is further coupled with the sense of saving coming on top of a lack of money for proper equipment (that will make us better at our job), which I return to in 6.2.2. The argument that money taken away from you is spent elsewhere in the Danish Police, and so benefits colleagues and the organization as a whole (and perhaps, some day you will benefit from other people’s savings), has probably been used a number of times before, and has a high risk of being received as a sales statement with a hollow ring to it:

**Interview 1 (19+11)**  
Employees would often associate efficiency, optimization, whatever you call it, with running faster in shorter time. Of course, there are also other places that we expand and I respect that. [...] But typically I am the one being screwed [...] I actually think that the greatest inertia in the Danish Police against change is the lack of a carrot...

Efficiency, however, takes a more optimistic turn when associated with resource utilization. In this perspective, it is framed as an opportunity for getting rid of some ‘daily annoyances’ (implicitly: by finally getting someone to do something about it or an excuse to do it or demand something that has been missing). The daily annoyances are in some cases equipment and IT (see 6.2.2. below) but it also refers to some colleagues who could run faster and who ought to contribute more (indirectly relatively to one self). This is meshed with the characterization of police officers traditionally being, or over time turning, less efficient relative to others:

**Interview 8 (5)**  
... resource utilization... that’s not a negatively laden word to me. I look at is as a treasure chest with many corners that we have not been to yet to find resources.... I think there is [xx-xx\(^{17}\)] % to gain. If we [pushed and motivated them to] give more.

**Interview 6 (19)**  
It would be easier to start at the bottom with the young ones. It’s difficult to change the old horses... to get them to run at a different pace. It’s always been like that. [...] too much time wasted. We can get much better. And we will. It’s just about utilizing the resources that are there. For we are here. It’s just to get them to go up one notch (smiles).

\(^{17}\)The suggested numbers have been removed here because the numbers could take focus away from the point that it being made. The numbers are available together with the quote in Danish in Appendix C and in the full interview transcripts.
People have had to admit that they [the service centers] get more out of an hour of an administrative than a police officer, and they work more efficiently while they are here.

This idea of there being room for some people to run faster may be rooted in reality but it may also be a perception of that being the case elsewhere in the organization. It may be influenced by a traditional characterization, and not uncommon self-description, of police officers as “coffee-drinking complainers” (which is also not an uncommon characteristic in old/funny movies and so seems to be a logic that has been around for long), particularly related to change.

In explaining it, reference is often made to having been spoiled by the politicians for long:

The kingdom is short on money so where can you save. First the municipalities. Then the army. Lastly the police. For the police have not been included earlier. We are not used to efficiency goals at all. [...] We’ve always been given extra money when needed. It’s actually been quite often.

Sometimes reference is made to private organizations – indicating an underlying logic (which is also common perception) that private companies are more efficient than public organizations:

We don’t function like a private company...if we did, many things would be different. [...] I don’t think that there are guilty guys sitting around, saying that we just need to maintain the existing. It’s a spirit in the system that’s wrong. Because it doesn’t function on commercial conditions.

...we can’t get fired. That’s probably an obstacle really [...] whereas in the private sector, you would have been lined up and told you have 5 minutes to align or else you can leave.

It leaves an impression that ‘the system’ and its lack of consequence are to be blamed for an inertia that has led to this situation of inefficiency (which is a socially acceptable perspective).

That inertia is lamented, not for spending too much of tax payers money or taking up public spending that otherwise could have been used by other public institutions to provide welfare, but for not utilizing the granted money well enough to do police work, serving citizens and solving crime. That’s an important angle to the message about agreeing that there is room for increasing efficiency by utilizing resources better. A police officer is a public professional who sees a purpose in delivering quality output/outcome (also see 6.2.2.) (but who is however still enough of a realist to know that sometimes efficiency means savings after all):
**Interview 8 (63)**

*I still think – without cutting finances more – that there are [xx-xx\(^{18}\)]% extra resources to gain in manpower - solving more tasks or putting more quality into the tasks. I just don’t think that’s how the piano plays at the moment. Now... if you can find more, you cut it. You save some more.*

Lastly, some ‘but-ifs’, related to the risk of being asked to run too fast, must be included. Here, the logic of family (Friedland & Alford, 1991) and the Human Resource paradigm are brought into play (and e.g. contrasted to a Tayloristic scientific management regime) to say that there is a limit to how far you can go. They demonstrate a general influence that would also be seen in other (Danish) organizations. In the world of a Danish (public) employee, to say that there is room for running faster *must* likely be combined with a statement that shows empathy and concern for employee well-being, in order for that statement to be socially acceptable:

**Interview 8 (25)**

*The core task is also job satisfaction, work climate and taking care of staff... because if that’s not included, the rest will be tough to achieve.*

**Interview 10 (5)**

*I don’t think [we] should be compromising on work climate. We shouldn’t turn to robots or a conveyor belt but sometimes you can increase efficiency without destroying anything*

**Interview 9 (13)**

*I mean this ethical umbrella that lies on top of all of us, we need to treat each other right, we need to think senior policies and all the stuff you already know about.*

Additionally, police officers make use of an argument that is related to the great demands on police officers in some situations (when the house is on fire) and therefore the need for having room for ‘give-and-take’. There is also the additional story that police officers, after all, today run faster than what they used to in the old days. And, the reference to e.g. terror and COP15:

**Interview 3 (63)**

*Honestly, we do run faster today than just 3 or 5 years ago. [...] It’s also a matter of give-and-take in many situations [...] Yes, there is room for it and we need to increase efficiency but we can’t squeeze the lemon so much that we get a poorer working place, negative employees...so there is a limit.*

**Interview 4 (64)**

*I’m just afraid that sometimes the politicians just buy the messages that McKinsey is calculating – that we don’t need to hire so many police officers etc. Because we have to remember the risk of terror, that there is a war going on with refugees, COP15...and then comes the queen’s birthday etc.*

Overall, you are left with an impression that initiatives that can provide the opportunity to weed out daily annoyances from the system are welcomed, while several arguments are already lined up, should the initiatives go too far. A solid self-confidence of the importance of the police as an institution and the continued need for police officers to do police work means that there is

---

\(^{18}\) The suggested numbers have been removed here because the numbers could take focus away from the point that it being made. The numbers are available together with the quote in Danish in Appendix C and in the full interview transcripts.
no major feeling of personal danger (as might have been the case in other organizations), at least among officers who do not consider themselves at risk of job loss. There is a tendency to expect efficiency to mean saving but a hope that it could also mean better resource utilization. For an overview of the meaning structure, please refer back to figure 6.2.1.

6.2.2. Efficiency as doing the job well
The next meaning structure relates efficiency-related cues to ‘doing the job well’. This is the angle of the professional who sets pride in doing a good job, solving cases with quality work, but lacking proper equipment, time/space or other structural things to do so. Among professionals, there is hope that strategic focus on efficiency will help to further re-gain the quality, and hence pride, that deteriorated during the police reform. Standardization is reviewed positively at macro level however professionals have reservations on standardization if it takes flexibility/autonomy away at micro level. The frame is particularly visible among criminal investigators.

**Figure 6.2.2. Sensemaking: Efficiency as doing the job well**

![Synthesized meaning structure (abstract frame)](image)

Coming at ‘effektivitet’ from the perspective of a public professional, the eye quickly tunes in on the ability to deliver quality output/outcome\(^{19}\) while (to some degree) separating the concept from an economic perspective (the input side):

Interview 2 (3) \[‘Effektivitet’]…well, it’s a complex matter. Because the word is a question for me to look at how good we are at doing our job or how we could do it better.

Interview 5 (61) Well, it’s about ‘effektivitet’ [effectiveness], quality – and not least finance.

---

\(^{19}\) Output: The short-term and immediate effect, i.e. the concrete result. Outcome: Long-term results, the longer-lasting effect. (Greve, 2009)
That is not to say that the professional is not aware that there are finances to consider, as shows the last quote, but it becomes a separate consideration; the dominant effect of ‘effektivitet’ is a desire to deliver quality output/outcome (which is often backed up by references to the likeable purpose of keeping society safe and serving Mr. and Mrs. Jensen) and gain professional satisfaction, but not a relation between a (financial) output and input. That debate is also a difficult one, as shows the extended literature on how to measure public services (eg. Greve, 2000). The interviewees do not as such question KPIs but debate their definition and usefulness in steering police work, making several references to the commissioners’ contracts, eg:

**Interview 2 (43)**

*Is it the detection rate, the number of notifications that we drive out to, how fast we respond, how fast we handle Mr. and Mrs. Jensen’s case? To save time... if that’s a goal in itself...there’s nothing in it because we don’t get any quality out of that, right. [...] The way we measure today represents pseudo points for it’s not what the citizen needs...*

Generally, the professionals are yearning for efficiency initiatives to remove the obstacles for doing good work that come from structural issues, e.g. IT, training, time and management:

**Interview 4 (4)**

*To be more efficient, we need new technical tools, especially within IT... we are behind*

**Interview 2 (3)**

*There is no backing for you to do your craft decently. There is not equipment for it. [Time is not given for it]. There is no proper focus on training [in the districts] and so on. It’s sad. [...] You move on to thinking that efficiency is just about saving resources...*

**Interview 4 (58)**

*We train staff managers, not professional managers [now] [...] You don’t have a sparring partner in your field. [...] Well, you don’t have respect for a manager who thinks he leads something but when questions are asked, he has no idea what you are talking about.*

Additionally, there is much sensemaking related to organizational structure and its effect on efficiency/effectiveness and doing a good job. There is an ‘unsettled debate’ about the benefits of centralized units vs. local presence and specialization vs multi-skilling (individual/task level and location level). These reflections lead to a multiplicity of references to the police reform in 2007 which restructured the organization and task distribution significantly20. The reform had negative impact on job satisfaction, citizens’ ratings of the police, etc. It hit professional pride hard, challenged identities and had practical consequences for individuals and so carries a lot of

20 The 2007 reform restructured the Danish Police from 54 autonomous districts and a station model where all professions were placed locally, to 12 larger districts where eg. criminal investigators moved to centralized units at district level. It re-organized from having ‘ordenspoliti’ (local police) and ‘kriminalpoliti’ (criminal police) to a new structure and changed traditional job roles that were integral to many people’s identities. It also carried ideas of the degree to which an officer should follow a case through from start to finish, or specialized units should handle case administration. It also re-defined the role of the National Police and the governance structure of the Danish Police.
emotion with it (but things have settled down now). This paper is not about the reform but the reform is still a significant point of reference and source of stories (across all the interviewees).

What is interesting for sensemaking is not whether the current structure and task distribution are right or wrong. What is interesting is to see which logics are used during sensemaking because the ‘argumentation’ (grounded in the actor’s social world view) gives insight to underlying values. I found it to be most accessible in situations of doubt or criticism. In those situations, interviewees made references to ideals like teamwork, role modeling, ownership, engagement, giving Mr. and Mrs. Jensen good service, ensuring early/preventive involvement, and quality. Following example refers to teamwork, ownership, engagement and quality:

**Interview 4 (20-22)**

Earlier when a police station had both lawyers, investigators, traffic and all, there was a much better mix; you just had to go up the stairs, sit down, present something and get a go or no-go right away, and I take that and you just or come up if...right. That’s not there any longer. Now you sit here and think ‘who can I reach who knows something and has energy to get involved’. You lack ownership [...] I don’t think it should be neglected that when people know each other and work together as a team, they deliver that extra piece of work, with an extra quality detail on it that says A++. That we can be proud of. But if you don’t need to get engaged...

One cue that is picked up on from the strategy text is that of standardization. The professional might see benefits in it for the organization as a whole but has reservations toward it for own work. The below illustrates how the cue is connected to an example of ‘standard concepts’ (standard operating procedures) and to a recently implemented new way of managing police officers’ working hours. The professional’s self-perception of police work is that it is difficult to fit into standard boxes and there is a need to maintain room for professional judgment:

**Interview 5 (7)**

You’ve made an organization without room for individuality and a nuanced approach. Many operational issues are controlled by concepts [whereas] earlier you more often evaluated things individually, placing a police professional angle to it. That’s a disadvantage, I think, and something that doesn’t make all places as efficient.

**Interview 5 (15)**

... one of the recent initiatives...centralized work planning. It can probably be good in many cases and maybe extra good where they do regular shifts but here [criminal investigation], it’s difficult to fit work into different sets of rules. [...] We have to do what the task takes. So although you have some decent rules in many contexts, it often gets rigid and you have to say, here it just won’t work, we must do something else.

---

21 Possibly because society values change mindedness and therefore the socially accepted behavior (at least in front of me) is that you should support present state.
It is possible that the experience of rigidity related to the centralized work hour planning has spurred a \textit{retrospective} coupling of rigidity with other initiatives (e.g. the standard concepts) that are linked to the ‘standardization’ cue – experiences that may not have led to a sense of rigidity earlier. A key point of Weick is exactly that sensemaking is continuous, retrospective and interdependent. It is a challenge to establish firm causal relationships because we reconstruct past events all the time. The strategic ‘danger’ is if it turns into a negative spiral.

When standardization is not framed as a loss of personal autonomy but is framed in a macro perspective at organizational level, the association with standardization (and the related cues of uniformity and streamlining) is generally positive:

\begin{quote}
\textbf{Interview 8 (35)} Streamlining and standardization...that’s something we implemented with the reform. These 12 districts [...] you’ve tried or you’re still trying to get the same case administration. For the coordinated police effort, I think they’re trying to tell the 12 commissioners to march at the same pace so the whole thing is made more streamlined and uniform and we don’t do things differently.
\end{quote}

All in all, the abstract frame that relates efficiency to doing the job well associates a strategic efficiency goal with the possibility of having structural obstacles removed so as to enable the public professional to deliver higher quality work and gain professional satisfaction. The more distant ‘macro standardization’ at organizational level is framed positively but if standardization takes personal autonomy away, it ‘clashes’ against the frame and the sensemaker brings the nature of police work and public professional work into the conversation to explain this.

\textbf{6.2.3. Efficiency as focusing on the core tasks}
The next meaning structure comes from the reference to ‘increasing focus on the core tasks’ that is built into the efficiency goal and probably therefore becomes a central topic. The coupling of efficiency and core tasks spurs sensemaking that gives the police professional hope that the strategy will give opportunity for the organization to do more police work – however, it is also coupled with skepticism after years of perceiving tasks to be only added, never removed. In this perspective, the solution to efficiency is expected to be linked to transferring non-police tasks to other organizations, or transferring tasks to administrative staff or removing obstacles like reporting. It appears to be a common basic assumption that task transfer or removal would not mean reducing the total number of police officers (also see resource discussion in 6.2.1).
‘Focus on the core task’ could mean ‘focus on me and my skills’ and ‘focus on police’ – and so has a positive sound to it in the ears of a police professional who typically identifies strongly with working in the police and believes in the cause.

Among other things, ‘focusing on the core task’ is referred to as the removal of tasks from the organization all together (transferring tasks to other authorities or companies), e.g.:

*Interview 5 (29)*

I guess they are trying to say that what others are better at than the police, should be transferred to public administration elsewhere. It might not make sense for the police to transport prisoners around, when it might as well be done by ISS or Prison Services.

The removal of tasks is seen as only fair since an increasingly complex environment has made it more demanding over time to be an officer and the police’s task scope has increased. This is blamed on the politicians who have added tasks over time without ever removing any and often based on ‘popularity contests’ following single cases or TV documentaries but not listening to what the police deems relevant to prioritize. It is also partly blamed on leaders of the Danish Police for (previously) not prioritizing properly or influencing the political negotiations. While there is still some skepticism about whether something will come of this now, the issue is framed with some optimism based on the new leadership of the Danish Police in recent years:

*Interview 3 (21)*

Through the years, we’ve widened our scope significantly [...] without getting money and resources for it. There they simply haven’t been good enough at... to say that if you want new departments to do this and that, it’ll cost this many headcounts and something needs to be removed. [...] Now they are trying to place themselves in a situation where you seek to handle
only the tasks that are police relevant and seek to outsource what is less police relevant.

A big question is what police relevant work is. “The core tasks” is a rather abstract term and the interviewees’ definitions range from the generic “being police when police is needed” and “serving and helping the citizens, solving cases and moving the cases through the system” to “the politically determined focus areas for the police”, and even training or to motivate staff or having good cooperation across the organization. Overall, all interviewees consider themselves part of the core task – whether in investigation, tactical support or administration.

At the more micro levels, references are related to annoyances with structural issues that take time away from doing good police work – e.g. the investigators whose time is taken away from investigation to be weekend back-ups in the patrolling police (‘sponsor shifts’). Or, the leaders who believe they spend too much time on administration/reporting. Here, the phrase ‘focusing on the core tasks’ becomes a useful rhetorical tool which can fit a lot of different arguments:

Interview 2 (69) ‘Sponsor shifts’… they’re not very popular. And it’s not something that increases efficiency of criminal investigators. So why don’t you choose that one of our core tasks is the gross crime…that’s our focus area… the gross crime must be solved.

Interview 9 (53) And if we are to focus on our core services, I just think there’s been a tendency in recent years to implement more and more reporting systems and documentation requirements that take up a lot of time which is taken away from the core task.

Besides task transfer to external parties, another opportunity for efficiency is seen in the potential to transfer tasks to administrative staff. The ‘standard sense’ is that this would release time for officers to do more police work (and assumes the number of officers to be maintained):

Interview 6 (35) [shift planning]… an administrative could easily do that. Then I could handle more hard core police work… getting out to the crime scenes, make sure [the young officers] improve their case admin/judgment skills, do targeted actions. Then I’d be a police officer. Not a clerk. We need to get officers back to doing police tasks and show the way. I’d like that.

Again, the question is what is police officer work versus administrative police work that could be done by civilian employees. Each person seems to have his/her implicit understanding but it is difficult to determine if it is a shared understanding and to what degree the police profession is actually willing to give up its responsibility for such work or redefine what police work is.
However, some challenge the traditional boundaries, particularly following the success of the service centers\(^{22}\) that were implemented a couple of years ago:

**Interview 6 (41)**

...and now we have the service centers. And it turned out, right, that they could handle police work. They can receive a notification of a crime. They can make sure all the things are included. Indeed, they do it better than police officers.

**Interview 8 (67)**

Get some more administrative. Less police officers. Let police officers do police work. And civilians do all the other things. It turns out, they are fantastically good at it.

The last quote is brave. To suggest that less police officers might be needed. The Danish Police association (union) is a strong player around (and in) the Danish Police organization, and as shown in 6.2.1. and 6.2.2. above, there is a strong professional belief and self-confidence in the important purpose of police officers in society. Some might say that to suggest a reduction of police officers is disloyal to your profession. It is a really strong social constraint in the context.

The personal risk of losing one’s job is not perceived as an issue, certainly not among police officers (while some civilians might perceive a higher risk). On top of having the confidence of the continued need for police officers, the police (typically) enjoy the protection that very few politicians dare to be vocal about cutting the police. Furthermore, police officers are public servants with 3 years notice and thus expensive to cut. An interviewee illustrates it like this:

**Interview 3 (17)**

So when we get past that issue of whether I’m in the danger zone to get fired or not... which we get past very quickly since none of us officers are, unless we [do something outrageous], then...

All in all, focus on the core tasks is welcomed. Everyone feels that they could gain from it for everyone believes they are part of the core task. The phrase can be used rhetorically for making many different points (which also bears a risk that if people experience discouragement, they may apply the phrase sarcastically). To focus on the core task in the context of efficiency is seen as an opportunity to remove tasks that are not police relevant and do not require police skills, so the police officers can do more police work. The potential consequences of doing so (e.g. staff reductions, integration with others, etc), are not of great concern at the moment. Exactly what police relevant work is seems to be an implicit understanding by each individual – but it does not seem to be necessarily a shared, aligned understanding across individuals. The cue ‘streamlining’ led to similar framing and meaning for some people (which surprised me).

---

\(^{22}\) Following the police reform, citizens experienced phones not being answered, etc. when calling for non-emergency issues The Danish Police received a lot of bad press on this issue and the citizens’ rating of the police deteriorated. Following this, it was decided to implement call centers (114) that were staffed with civilian employees instead of police officers. This is generally regarded a great success as staff were employed on the basis of e.g. customer service skills.
6.2.4. Efficiency goal as strategy and change
The last meaning structure relates to the cue “there is a new strategy/goal”. Here, sensemaking relates to strategy and change in general and overall the frame tends to convey the meaning that “there is a long way from words to action”. Key points relate to the keywords of the sentence “IF they are going to do something about it and [if] change is going to come...”. ‘They’ often refers to the leaders of the Danish Police, and the two ifs express doubt of both the leaders’ ability to manage change and the organization’s ability to absorb change. Parallel to the internal implementation capabilities, there is also sensemaking on the reason why an efficiency goal exists and the probability of it being actually forced upon the police. Here, connectors with an external view are applied. It is debated if the politicians (‘they’) will dare to cut down the police which traditionally has not been plausible but which in light of the financial crisis (and the 2008 deficit) may be plausible, despite the important purpose of the police.

Figure 6.2.4. Sensemaking: Efficiency goal as strategy and change

The Danish Police have not had a national, corporate strategy before with vision, mission and goals. So, there is no exact frame of experience to fit the new strategy into. The sensemaking process looks for alternative experiences that can provide plausible insight to what is going on.

One connection is that this could be just another ‘hooray-word’ and change project that does not lead to any major change or improvement. It might not be an entirely accurate evaluation of previous projects but perception sticks. This view may combine with the general perspectives of police officers as being skeptical and lacking change mindedness (see ‘obstacle angle’ in
and it could carry the risk of turning into a self-fulfilling prophecy (Weick, 1979 - see 3.1.3). As this interviewee (manager) acknowledges, it takes an effort to overcome it:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview</th>
<th>3 (73)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All those hooray-words, we just can’t be bothered... not because the police is covered in dust, - you’ve run all sorts of projects to motivate, do things better, differently, over time... - and you know, we've been here long – when something new comes along, then 80% say “yeah yeah, we’ve tried it before, 4 times, it didn’t work”... that’s of course not the full truth, because every time you made new initiatives, there was something new somewhere... you can definitely move a department like this, if it is done right, and you are engaged in it... but it requires effort. It does.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Whether based on reality or (maybe inaccurate) perception on how previous strategic initiatives turned out and how capable police officers and the police organization as a whole are to absorb changes, there is skepticism about the ability to turn the strategy from words into action. The responsibility to provide solutions and define action on how to achieve the goal is, by some, framed as something for management to do, and is sometimes fuelled by disappointment that previous input is perceived to have not led to any change or improvement:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview</th>
<th>4 (54)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It’s a lot of words that look nice on paper. I want to see it translated ... I want to know how you’ve thought this is going to be realized [...] Ownership of the words; they should come with someone who shows the way…that someone tells us ‘this is the way we are going to reach home’.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview</th>
<th>4 (54)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We’ve done leadership evaluations, job satisfaction surveys, we’ve reached a point where we’ve lost interest, and we don’t contribute any longer.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It can be difficult to manage expectations (and live up to them!). The difficulty seems often to be framed as an issue of poor (line) communication skills (of the managers) in the organization:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview</th>
<th>5 (51)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>People need to see the meaning of things and we need to be good at explaining it. Both as department managers but not least top management. Probably there, there’s still some challenge. Maybe you don’t always get things communicated in a way so people understand what’s happening. I think that’s still the biggest challenge.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Another property of the frame is that of ‘strategic strategy’ versus ‘operational strategy’ (targeted police efforts). Self-perception is that the police is actually capable of cascading and implementing operational strategies rather efficiently, while development strategies related to ‘non-police’ issues takes the back seat due to lack of prioritization in the heat of things (there is always heat). As this interviewee recognizes, perhaps this way of prioritizing is not just due to top management but also the receivers of the strategy (middle management and below):
It’s a lot easier to realize operational strategies; there you set clear targets for the districts and districts make action plans. You have the whole set-up all the way down. This thing ends here, right. [...] For we end up falling into the operational world [...] It’s not just a matter of those who make the strategies who need to cascade them down, it’s also us who receive the strategies and say ‘uh, it sounds good but how are we ... we just need to get through our cases first’.

Generally, there is much talk about the importance of employees seeing the “red thread” and managers needing to provide this to them, in relation to the ‘strategic strategy’ level (while it seems to be the assumption that police officers have an easier time making sense of operational strategies). That management are the ones to give directions is in line with a bureaucratic line of thinking (Weber, 1968) as well as paramilitary organization. I return to this in chapter 7.

A last angle to the sensemaking about internal change implementation capabilities is that some connect to the strategy with reference to the new leadership in the Danish Police (from 2008) about whom there is a positive perception. This is then transferred to the view of the strategy:

Everyone in the police has tried having new leadership many times. So people don’t raise their eye brows much that there is new leadership and new structure [...] But it’s different this time. You’ve taken it a step further than just moving around. You’ve taken some things and started rebuilding from the top [...] Now more things are getting into place so people start to look at it more positively. Light at the end of the tunnel. [...] We are far from home yet, but still.

In parallel to the sensemaking concerning the internal implementation capabilities, there is also sensemaking regarding why the strategic efficiency goal is even there and whether it will actually be necessary to do something about it when push comes to shove. This can both be looked at in an internal and an external perspective which are both properties of the frame.

In the internal perspective, it is plausible that someone internally recognized a need for better control of finances following the 2008 deficit, and in line with the above quote, there is some rising possibility that the new leaders might do something about it. In the external perspective (which is more dominant in explaining why the goal is there), sensemaking concerns the plausibility that politicians will actually force change on the police. As covered in 6.2.1., politicians have traditionally been protecting the police by not reducing finances, and the self-perception of the important purpose of the police (see 6.2.1.-3.) provides internal justification for this. On the other hand, the financial crisis is recognized as having a role to play which leads back to the sensemaking related to efficiency as money (saving) and resources (6.2.1.).
Overall, a ‘strategic strategy goal’ is framed as something distant, with words being far from real, beneficial action and change. Managers are expected to try (harder) to explain the red thread of strategic initiatives to create meaning that will let police officers overcome their skepticism of new initiatives and change. A perception of lacking abilities among senior and middle management to cascade information combined with a perception of police officers as lacking interest in absorbing information about strategic change appear to be a socially accepted view on change in the Danish Police (which may contain the risk of turning into a self-fulfilling prophecy). To the organizational members, the frame seems to provide plausible and reasonable sense as to why strategic change related to efficiency in the Danish Police would be difficult to achieve “the carrot way” (internally motivated) while the financial crisis, however, is seen as an external force that may lead to changes “by the stick”.

6.2.5. Summary and discussion of meaning structures
As stated earlier and shown above, the answer to “what’s the story here” is not so simple that it can be boiled down to a single 1:1 cue-frame relation. My analytical findings point to four examples of meaning structures that contain cues and connectors and visualize abstract frames at an implicit inter-subjective level: Efficiency as money and resources, Efficiency as doing the job well, Efficiency as focusing on the core task, and Efficiency goal as strategy and change.

The walkthrough of the four structures shows that multiple experiences and logics are used as connectors in the sensemaking process. They shape/visualize the properties of each abstract frame. Each frame has multiple properties which enable the application of both positive and negative perspectives as well as ‘but-ifs’/boundaries (e.g. when interviewees agree that there is room for running faster but only to a certain limit). The meanings and properties are being negotiated which is characteristic of a situation in which a sense maker faces a new situation or when a situation or goal is ambiguous (as could be said of the header of the efficiency goal).

The frames overlap and one experience or logic may be used as a connector in more than one cue-frame relation. E.g. the story about the service centers is used both in relation to the frame ‘efficiency as money and resources’ and in relation to the frame ‘efficiency and the core task’. The self-perception of police officers is also a logic that is applied in different contexts.

Meaning depends on context and which frame a cue is connected to. E.g., the cue ‘streamlining’ connects to the frame ‘efficiency as doing the job well’ as well as to the frame ‘efficiency and the core task’. This provides two different meanings: in the first case, streamlining is associated
with standard operating procedures and protection of professional autonomy; in the second case, it means transferring tasks to others and reducing non-police work for police officers.

Some frames and logics contradict each other, within the frames (positive/negative views and ‘but-ifs’) and across the frames. I provide examples and discuss this in further depth in chapter 7. One might argue that frames that contain contradicting logics within the frame itself could or should be split into multiple frames, e.g. that “efficiency as money and resources” should be split into “efficiency as money/saving” and “efficiency as resource utilization”. There is no right answer to this, and perhaps over time, as storylines and meanings are negotiated further in the organization and more specific actions are associated with efficiency and the efficiency goal, the meaning will tilt towards one or the other and/or the two perspectives would be better presented as two separate frames. At present, however, it is still being negotiated and the potential is there for it to mean both things (also at the intra-subjective level).

Overall, sensemaking is non-linear and made up of many:many relations. To leave 1:1 relations (one cue, one connector, one frame, one meaning) standing alone would be to caricature and create a simplified picture, not representative of the complexity of the individual as well as the inter-subjective and organizational sensemaking. This also demonstrates why / that action can be difficult to predict because it is not just a matter of following a simple cause map.

Above, Figures 6.2.1.-4. visualized the four synthesized meaning structures (frames) with their associated cues and connectors. Below, Figure 6.2.5. attempts to summarize the properties of the frames and the repertoire of potential meanings that is held within them, and to visualize the complex, interdependent nature of the sensemaking process where frames and logics overlap.

**Figure 6.2.5. Summary of synthesized meaning structures (abstract frames)**
While I consider the four synthesized meaning structures and abstract frames substantive, they are not exhaustive in representing the complete sensemaking across the interviewees (and the Danish Police as a whole) about efficiency and the efficiency goal. The interviews contain additional stories and references that are less dominant but nevertheless important in the context, to one or more individuals. One example is sensemaking regarding lack of budgets at department level and the pro/cons of this, which two interviewees connect to the frame ‘efficiency as money and resources’. Another example is the frame concerning competences that was illustrated in 6.1.4. Further come individual experiences and stories from daily work life in local settings – some were told during the interviews but there are probably also many that did not come up in our conversation. It goes to show the complexity of sensemaking.

6.3. Frames operating on cues
Frames are not only applied to extracted cues to produce meanings. Which cues are noticed and bracketed in the first place is also influenced by the frames, i.e. it is an interdependent process.

In 6.1.1. I mentioned that some of the interviewees had not particularly bracketed the new strategy as a significant event. I believe 6.2.4. provides insight into why that is. There may be no frame that makes a ‘strategic strategy’ particularly relevant, relative to other events around the organizational members, and it seems socially acceptable to distance yourself from it.

In Figure 6.1.1, some phrases were placed outside the triangle because they were not extracted as cues from the strategy text, e.g. *economies of scale, case production* and *cost-efficient operations*. Such concepts would be common in books on operations/process management or Lean (e.g. Slack et al. 2010). But they do not catch on to any of the interviewees – even though there is often quite a lot of case administration work in daily life of a police officer and the organization as a whole, which they bring into their sensemaking on other occasions (see 6.2.) Some interviewees had heard (positive) stories about Lean in the Public Prosecution but for the most part (except one who had been actively involved in the program), the story/perception seemed to be ‘floating around’ without settling in a particular frame about efficiency.

My reflection is that the reason why these potential cues are not extracted is grounded in identity (one of the 7 properties of sensemaking, see 3.1). Identity-wise, police officers work in human relations, not case administration or production. They do not pick up on process terminology because they do not identify with it and (currently) they do not have a frame that makes it significant. If they had been forced to reflect on process and production concepts (or
when they later might have to), it might take longer for them to make sense of them or negotiate a shared organizational meaning. It may also mean that an initiative that the authors of the strategy (top management) sees as directly linked to the strategy could be perceived differently by organizational members who might link such initiative to other frames.

6.4. Summing up
This chapter has provided examples of cues which organizational members notice in relation to efficiency and the strategic efficiency goal, and has presented four synthesized meaning structures that approximate abstract frames that influence the process of extracting cues and the process of making cues sensible in the context. I have shown examples of how cues and frames are connected through experiences and logics and argued that these connectors help visualize the properties of the otherwise more abstract frames. Some of the frames and logics are contradictory, both within and across the frames, which I discuss further in chapter 7.

The chapter has demonstrated how cues and frames are connected to create plausible, coherent and reasonable meaning in the social context of the actor, meaning which is being searched for and negotiated among multiple plausible options. I noted that particularly because the strategy is new and the goal header is ambiguous, it is natural that different angles are explored.

I believe that the four meaning structures provide insight to a possible repertoire of sense-making about efficiency and the strategic efficiency goal among members of the Danish Police. A key point is that the sensemaking is contextual and interdependent and cannot be represented as a single 1:1 cue-frame connection but is better understood as many:many relations.
7. Discussion: Contradicting logics and reflexivity

To answer sub-question 2 of the research question, this chapter discusses contradicting logics and reflexivity in the sensemaking among the organizational members about efficiency. The purpose is to discuss if conditions exist that may affect change to (taken-for-granted) organizational thinking. Change is assumed needed to achieve the strategic efficiency goal (see 1.2-1.3).

The theory about institutional logics (3.3.) established that consciousness about inertia of existing frames – which may arise from contradicting logics – may lead to praxis and reconstruction of taken-for-granted rules, norms and routines. Chapter 3 also discussed the link between sensemaking and taken-for-granted logics, and argued that particularly frames represent and influence logics in use (3.2.) which actors may be more or less conscious of.

Importantly, multiple and contradictory frames/logics exist in all organizations (and in society – Friedland & Alford, 1991). The purpose of this chapter is not to claim that a particular logic is more appropriate than another. Change does not necessitate one logic to eradicate its contradiction(s). E.g. Cooper et al. (1996) suggest that sedimentation of archetypes, rather than replacement, takes place during organizational change. Logics may however need redefinition. The point this chapter makes is to identify contradicting logics, which may cause tension/incompatibility, which may give rise to reflection, which may lead to a redefinition of how frames are applied in certain contexts and in that way, lead to new ways of thinking and acting.

7.1. Contradicting logics

7.1.1. Accountability

One contradiction is that of personal vs. collective accountability. This also contains the discussion about the measurability of public services.

Chapter 6.2.1. demonstrated sensemaking about resource utilization and people’s contributions. Some interviewees also talked about the challenge of being cost conscious when budgets are not broken down to department level\(^{23}\). These issues contain an under-current of discussion of how to achieve more (personal) accountability (and more firm consequence for non-performing individuals) – in the interest of organizational efficiency as well as motivation for its members.

This is a contrast to the collective role as ‘crime fighters’ who put their lives at risk for society and therefore expect special care (Jacobs et al. 2008), and to the bureaucratic, input-oriented

\(^{23}\) Interview 9 (17-21), Interview 1 (41), Interview 6 (53)
assumption that everyone does his or her best at work. A typical discussion is if employees can or should be held accountable for results that they may not entirely control and generally if the value of public services can be (economically) measured. This is part of the sensemaking in 6.2.2. in relation to the commissioner contracts and measurement of police tasks. Also, public servant contracts (security) contradict the risk of personal consequence for non-performance.

Jacobs et al. (2008) studied how implementation of personal accountability impacted identity in the German police, creating a hybrid of the crime fighting, the bureaucratic and the managerial identities (see Appendix D). One might say that the managerial identity has not been applied to middle management and employees in the Danish Police to the same degree as eg. in Germany, as personal performance appraisals and contracts are not used below commissioner level. Perhaps this is the reason why reflection on the underlying contradiction between personal and collective accountability is limited among the actors (focused on commissioner contracts) even though some annoyance with the lack of personal accountability comes to light.

Two of the interviewees did however reflect upon financial visibility and lack of departmental budgets in relation to controlling spending and saving. One also reflected on what decentralized budget responsibility might mean and the challenge (but also possibility) of implementing it:

Interview 9 (65)

...that the economic aspect becomes a common element in our considerations. And then it is our task to ensure that it doesn’t become dominating. That we don’t compromise on safety. That we can say, ok this is what it costs but this is our threat pattern and intelligence about this event that just makes it necessary to spend this and that. [...] But there will be many who would be terrified of being made financially responsible. Terrified of getting the budget cascaded down. So it is a question of educating our leaders to handle that part.

None of the reflection referred directly to identity. Given that this topic is the source of much academic literature about change in foreign police forces, it may be worthwhile to bear in mind in future change initiatives if they influence how accountability is applied in the organization.

7.1.2. Professional boundary and identity
Another source of tension is that of professional boundaries and identity which is closely linked to the discussion of the core task in 6.2.3.

Here, you have the case of the service centers (6.2.1./6.2.3.).
that made organizational members reflect on professional boundaries and skills and strengths of police officers compared to other professional groups, and sensemaking about outsourcing and transfer of tasks to other authorities or firms (6.2.3). Reflection on potential consequences of task transfer was limited, e.g. less police officers or a smaller organization overall (might also affect other professions). Therefore, explicit reflection on the contradicting force of self- or public interests to maintain the size of your own professional group or the organization was limited, although one person did point out the interest in maintaining enough scale to handle a terror attack or a new COP15 (6.2.1.). (Whether it has to be police officers was not reflected on). If reductions are experienced, this contradiction will likely become more explicit.

In 6.2.3 I called an interviewee brave for challenging social order by accepting that there might be less of his own kind in the future. The remaining part of the quote demonstrates reflection that challenges existing professional boundaries. Such reflection may be what is needed to change the (socially constructed) definition of professional boundaries – this way or another:

Interview 8 (67) Why could a civilian not go to court? Why can only police officers go to court? They prepare the cases for them anyway. So why is it only officers that can proceed in court... for the less complicated cases...typically traffic cases, etc. Why does it have to be like that? Well, because that’s the way it’s always been. It’s tradition.

Related to professional boundaries is the discussion about what the core task actually is. And related to this is again the identity reflection from 6.3. – where I argued that the reason why some cues were not extracted from the strategy goal could be the identification by police officers (and members of the organization in general) with working in human relations more than being case administrators in a ‘production site’. Today, each case is seen as unique – which is said to be “what Mr. and Mrs. Jensen expect”.

Lack of consciousness of and reflection on these contradicting logics and identities could be problematic for change in relation to the strategic efficiency goal because any communication, action or initiatives referring to ‘production terminology’ or expecting a process orientation might seem distant, non-applicable or difficult in the eyes of many organizational members.

---

24 In June 2011, 2 months after the interviews, the National police announced that the efficiency programme initiated in 2010 would lead to a reduction of employees by 700-800 FTEs by 2015 (of which approx. 50% were police officer positions). This might change the level of reflection.
7.1.3. Leadership & legitimacy

Another contradiction is that of expectations of management to guide, explain and lead changes and provide solutions (a degree of bureaucratic thinking - Weber, 1968) in contrast to a degree of underlying questioning of the legitimacy of management to ‘know what is best’. The latter may originate in the public professional’s need for certain levels of autonomy, combined with the orientation towards collective (and union) participation in decision making.

The expectation for (top) leaders to guide change was shown in 6.2.4. with comments about needing to explain ‘the red thread’ and ensure better line communication\(^{25}\) (in line with much literature about strategy cascading\(^{26}\)). In 6.2.2. sensemakers speak of structural obstacles to be removed (by management) and in 6.2.1. there is hope that action taken by management might provide opportunity to do something about resource waste. In parallel, there is sensemaking on rising trust in the current leaders (6.2.4) but also skepticism grounded in history and tradition.

In a bureaucracy, the agent provides legitimacy to the principal on the basis of superior technical knowledge (Weber, 1968) and the agent follows the directions of the principal based on that legitimacy\(^{27}\). Leader-follower theory adds that legitimacy is not only gained from hierarchical, legal position but is socially constructed and emerges when the managed assign leadership to managers (Meindl, 1993). In both perspectives, if you are looking for leaders to be a guiding light and provide solutions, it takes some faith in the legitimacy and superiority of their ideas.

Autonomy and collective decision processes based on participation and consensus is principally contradicting followership and bureaucratic hierarchy; and unions protect the interests of the agents ‘toward’ the principal. The autonomous professional’s and the collective’s demand for influence and control influences the way legitimacy is granted to leaders and their ideas. All organizations contain bureaucratic as well as collective traits, and the point I wish to make is not that collective institutions are problematic for efficiency and change (eg. much literature shows how leaders can improve legitimacy through employee involvement). But if you want leaders to be a guiding light, it requires that you are willing to grant them legitimacy, and to do

\(^{25}\) The topic of line communication is common in the organization and is typically problematized as something that the organization needs to get better at. The concept as a way of communicating change was ‘implemented’ in connection with change management in the police reform.


\(^{27}\) I am aware that pure bureaucracies do not exist and that there is extensive literature on (the conflicts in) the principal-agent relationship
so may require a shift in the balance between these forces (which need not eradicate employee representation but it may shift how the role of such institutions is socially defined and used).

Notably, this contradiction is not explicitly reflected on, at least not in the open. How the collective/consensus orientation might be influencing decision processes or change capabilities (for better or worse) generally did not come up. I only have one small interview segment on it:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview 2 (57-61)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I2: When something was rolled out from Esplanaden, I guess that Maersk people didn’t just do what each wanted to do. B: Well, there were similar conflicts …but indeed, police officers seem independent by nature [which I suppose the job requires]. I2: The difficulty is that it may turn on us as a boomerang…because it’s like…it’s almost communism in pure form… everyone needs to be asked… B: There are many committees… I2: The union almost has…they have a lot of power.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While there is not much (open) reflection related to contradictions in decision making, there is sensemaking on professional autonomy vs. standardization (6.2.2.) which may lead to further reflections on how to balance the two alternatives right. It is however difficult to say if it reaches the underlying logical dilemma that you want to protect personal autonomy jointly with liking the positive effects of standardization at macro level. In any case, subsiding to standards requires trust/legitimacy and therefore carries some of the same contradiction as the above, too.

Another reflection related to leadership and change implementation was demonstrated in 6.2.4 where one interviewee reflected on the need for the receivers of the strategy (and not just the senders) to prioritize to take action on ‘strategic strategy’. This is a reflection that places the receivers of the strategy as active participants in the realization of the strategy and the initiation of actions required to realize it (as opposed to bureaucratic rule followers). In such case, the organizational members would put their (collective) professionalism to use in leveraging the leaders’ ideas and legitimacy rather than such professionalism being a potential obstacle. Both leaders and employees might benefit from such ‘redefinition’ of the logics.

7.1.4. Organizational structure

The organizational structure contains tensions that were brought up in 6.2.2. related to doing the job well (or being prevented from doing so due to structural issues). Likely because the structure is

---

28 The interviewee knew that I (the interviewer) had worked for Maersk previously
relatively new and the reform challenged identities (6.2.2), reflection is more active.

The tensions contain a web of national vs. district interests and district vs. local interests. At the same time, these centralization/decentralization and specialization/generalization issues are classic in organizational design. People in the Danish Police speak of it as a cyclical pendulum in the public sector, expecting that functions which are centralized now will at some point be decentralized again and vice versa. Perhaps this expectation is what is preventing reflection on other, perhaps more profound, underlying logics, such as the issues of identity and legitimacy. Changing from a centralized to a decentralized set-up or vice versa involves a lot of efforts and focus for a while, but maybe it does not in the long run truly lead to improved efficiency.

7.1.5. Other examples of contradictions
Other examples of contradictions that may give rise to reflection which may – or may not – shift ‘how things work around here’ include the family logic and HR paradigms vs. capitalistic logics of maximized resource utilization (6.2.1.), the negative saving angle vs. the positive resource utilization angle (6.2.1.), and the (lack of reflection on) possible contradictions and challenges between having a relatively closed organization skill-wise (police officers and lawyers) today vs. a potentially more diverse organization with a greater mix of competences and/or more integrated interaction with other public authorities or private firms (6.2.3).

Lastly, comments about organizational capabilities to implement operational strategies but not strategic strategies (6.2.4) contain contradiction. The perception is that police officers and the organization as a whole can be result-oriented on operational tasks but are skeptical and lack change mindedness in relation to strategic changes. As stated in 6.1.3., the ‘obstacle angle’ sticks quite consistently to coupling of the police with change and may exemplify Weick’s concept of enactment: That embedded logics can act as constraints for how organizations and actors perceive themselves capable of acting and engaging with their environment. For, imagine what might come of a reflection that the operational capabilities and result-orientation might also be deployed to implement ‘strategic strategy’…?

Interestingly, interviewees were aware of this contradiction but also largely seemed to accept that this is just how things are. Praxis requires a desire to change and challenge institutions but this does not appear to be the case – maybe because it is an embedded logic that is difficult to shed, or it seems like an overwhelming task to change it, or because it is, after all, nice to have
an explanation/excuse, which is already socially negotiated, as to why changes are difficult to implement (a difficulty that other large organizations might however also face/experience).

An ‘institutional challenger’ may be what this interviewee is, by challenging behavior patterns:

Interview 8 (11)

...some time ago, I suggested to some of the other leaders that what if we tried not to say ‘no’ to each other...that that was a possibility... like when you call and ask ‘can I borrow him for 14 days’ or ‘could you take over this case’...then when you say ‘no’, just try to say ‘yes’ instead. And see how... that could be fun. It was a small provocation. Sometimes things tighten up, you know. Despite the fact that we are more open now, after the reform.

7.1.6. The contradictions in a consolidated view

All in all, there are many contradicting logics in the sensemaking related to efficiency and the efficiency goal. Some are reflected upon to greater or lesser degree while others are not.

Figure 7.1.6. provides a consolidated overview of the contradicting logics from 7.1.1.-5. The contradictions are represented by the arrows and each of the frames from chapter 6 is represented by colors (same colors as figure 6.2.5.). The non-colored circles represent the logics that were added above.

The purpose of the figure is to visualize that:

a) multiple contradictions exist (many arrows),
b) contradictions operate both within and across the frames (arrows within and across colors), and
c) there are underlying logics to be aware of, too (the non-colored circles) which are not explicitly brought into sensemaking but may nevertheless be implicitly operating or come to light at some point.

See figure in full scale in Appendix E
7.2. The police reform as a source of reflection
As is the case on many occasions in the sensemaking by the organizational members, the quote by the ‘institutional challenger’ above pulls in the police reform to demonstrate a perceived organizational development – a before and an after. Across ten interviews, the interviewees relate/return to the police reform on more than 45 separate occasions. Clearly this major change has led to a great deal of sensemaking and reflection. Among other things, there is reflection about change capabilities (some saying that now that things have settled down, the reform showed that the organization and its members can change) – and such reflection may in the end also benefit the implementation of the new strategic efficiency goal. This quote exemplifies:

Interview 7 (64) I think that once you’ve been through the reform, it takes a lot for something to be big. People were really shaken. I think that people are more ready now, and probably also more open to the possibility that it might not be done with that. So in that way, I think that it will be big when it needs to be implemented. But I also think that people are ready for it in a different way, actually.

Similarly, other actions/situations outside of the context of efficiency may alter organizational thinking and affect (for better or worse) change and action related to efficiency, too.

7.3. Is it enough reflection to lead to transformational organizational change?
It is difficult to say whether there is ‘enough’ reflection in the current sensemaking, and enough organizational members who might become institutional challengers and mobilizing agents, to generate significant change to current thinking and acting by the organizational members which may lead to the achievement of sustained, greater efficiency – in general and/or in line with the strategic efficiency goal. Perhaps it is doubtful on the basis of what is demonstrated above.

Yet, one should not necessarily expect a ‘revolution’ in thinking and acting in the short-term. Change often happens gradually rather than as ‘episodic revolution’ (see 1.4).

As pointed out in 3.1.2., shared meaning is not necessary for collective action, and a revolution in organizational thinking may not be necessary for organizational members to implement actions and initiatives to enhance efficiency in the short run. However, for the action and change to be absorbed and sustained, and turned into ‘the way we do things around here’, there is a probably a need to modify and negotiate a redefinition or rebalancing of taken for granted logics. Otherwise such efficiency-targeted initiatives (and the strategy) may continue to appear as ‘alien measures’ that cause uncertainty and ambiguity, which drains us and slows us down.
because we resist the initiatives and actions and/or continuously feel that we need to make sense of them.

The sensemaking among the organizational members do at times reach and challenge the more underlying and taken for granted organizational logics. If it is widespread in the organization cannot be said from the 11 interviews however they demonstrate that there is potential for reflexivity and possibly praxis. Chapter 8 builds on this and discusses if and how managers or others may intervene in such processes.

7.4. Summing up
This chapter has discussed contradictions and reflexivity. Several contradictions were identified to be operating – explicitly or implicitly – for example, contradictions related to accountability, profession, identity, leadership and legitimacy, organizational structure, resource utilization, skill and boundary composure of the organization, and strategy implementation capabilities. The police reform is another source of reflection. The contradictions exist both within and across the meaning structures and frames identified in chapter 6.

Some contradictions lead to more reflection than others. Whether they lead to enough tension and reflexivity to give rise to praxis by institutional challengers, and ultimately give rise to transformational organizational change that will support the achievement of higher efficiency and the implementation of efficiency as ‘something we just do around here’ is more difficult to judge. But there is a potential.
8. Review: Intervening in sensemaking and organizational change

To answer sub-question 3 of the research question, this chapter discusses how leaders or others may intervene in the thinking and acting by the organizational members and thereby influence organizational change, e.g. by utilizing the knowledge about sensemaking, contradicting logics and reflexivity. The discussion is based on a review of academic ideas that may give insight to how ‘one may change what a group says and what is means’ (Weick, - see 3.1.). The purpose of the paper is not to be specifically normative but nevertheless the chapter will reflect on what the implications for the leaders of the Danish Police might be of this knowledge.

8.1. Academic ideas about influencing sensemaking and change

8.1. Sensegiving and mise-en-sens

Gioia & Chittipeddi (1991) proposed ‘sensegiving’ as the “process of attempting to influence sensemaking and meaning construction of others toward a preferred redefinition of organizational reality”. Here, top management plays a crucial role in disconfirming existing interpretive schemes and proposing a revised scheme – first, by making sense for themselves, and then, by taking actions to influence stakeholders to adopt the new interpretation of reality as their own. Suggested action includes a captivating vision and symbolic action by top management, eg. speeches, key staff appointments, and selecting committees with whom to meet or not to meet.

Sensegiving is criticized for assuming that you can give sense to others, which indicates that management can own it and that sense can be produced without intervention on the part of the audience. Corvellec & Risberg (2007) instead propose the concept of mise-en-sens (meaning and direction) which is about proposing, but not giving or controlling, sense, by offering cues to the audience(s). Activities include use of narratives, rhetoric and other devices for conveying meaning – using the right words to label projects and argue for them, creatively inventing arguments, and intentionally and systematically pointing audiences in the direction of accept.

I do not find the criticism of Gioia & Chittipeddi entirely warranted as they, too, speak of sensegiving and sensemaking taking place in iterative, reciprocal fashion and that the original vision is further defined and modified in interaction (negotiation) between sensegivers and sensemakers. That being said, Gioia & Chittipeddi do embrace a sender-centered view of sense.

Overall, both sensegiving and mise-en-sens are so closely linked to sensemaking theory that they, like sensemaking, can be argued not to truly address the challenge of how to generate change to taken-for-granted logics (see 3.2.). Theory of institutional entrepreneurship does.
8.2. Institutional entrepreneurship and rhetorical strategies
Institutional entrepreneurship is closely linked to institutional logics theory and the discussion of how contradicting logics can be put skillfully to use to drive change. Institutional entrepreneurs are often illustrated as actors at the periphery of a field – marginalized or less powerful actors within existing institutional arrangements (Seo & Creed, 2002) – however, they may also be at the center (Boxembaum et al. 2008). Thus, I find this theory also able to inform leaders who want to influence change or understand interventions by others in meaning processes.

Suddaby & Greenwood (2005) suggest that strategic use of persuasive language, rhetoric, is a means by which shifts in institutional logics are secured, and that rhetorical strategies have two dimensions: First, creation of *institutional vocabularies* which use identifying words and referential texts to expose and amplify contradictory logics in existing institutional arrangements in order to displace a dominant logic. Importantly, however, the institutional entrepreneur cannot be too radical; new proposed frames must be sufficiently resonant with existing systems of belief to mobilize substantial support/resources (Seo & Creed, 2002). Suddaby & Greenwood (2005) proposes that this is done rhetorically through *theorizations of change* whereby the institutional entrepreneur connects selected aspects of the new frame to broader cultural templates such as ‘the context of a grand plan’ (teleological), ‘the inevitable’ (cosmological), ‘ethics and greater good’ (value-based), tradition or history (historical), or ‘what “logically” can/cannot co-exist’ (ontological). In doing so, the entrepreneur uses the uncertainty implied by an innovation and makes new forms comprehensible by naturalizing some contradictions and suppressing others. Notably, to embed change within existing frames does not mean giving up on innovation. Institutions are seldom created entirely new; they are transformed within socially accepted frames (Seo & Creed, 2002).

Institutional entrepreneurs must possess social skills and empathy to be able to identify with the states and interests of others (Boxembaum et al. 2008), at times having to find common ground among several fragmented groups. It is a political process which involves formal and informal power relations, and the successful institutional entrepreneur is typically a ‘warranted voice’ and/or is central in the network, or makes use of such actors (Phillips et al. 2004).

8.3. Interaction and plurivocality
The last perspective focuses on the sensemakers and supports Weick’s claim that inter-subjective interaction is needed to drive change to generic subjective, organizational, meaning (3.1.3.).
Stacey (2010) is adamant in arguing that population-wide patterns emerge in local communicative interactions and that effective leaders *widen and deepen communication* between members of a group by *interacting in reflective and imaginative ways* and exercising conversation skills that keep opening up the possibility of new meaning rather than closing down on exploration.

Smircich & Stubbart (1985) encourage more reflective, self-conscious practice of organization. They propose *managerial analysis* to challenge assumptions; *creation of context* rather than focus on objectives to promote deliberation about the present; *encouraging multiple realities* and enlarging organizational capacities for novel interpretations by varying metaphors, hiring experts from other industries and encouraging conflicting viewpoint; and periodically *testing and experimenting* assumptions about what works (or doesn’t) and what we can do (or can’t) by acting as if counter assumptions are viable (like the quote in 7.1.5. about saying ‘yes’ instead of ‘no’).

A key point of both is to accept plurivocality and nurture reflection so that you are not “stuck in repetitive conversation” (Stacey, 2010). Both theories are (like Weick) however limited in addressing how to influence actors to move in a *preferred* direction.

### 8.2. Implications for leaders and other actors in and around the Danish Police

As pointed out in 3.1.2., *shared meaning* is not a condition for collective action, and so, leaders and employees should be careful to make it a prerequisite for action in relation to the efficiency goal. However, *new meaning* is a prerequisite for generating new ideas of ways of operating (e.g. a new process, IT system, way of organizing, etc) and for organizational members to truly absorb a change, acting in new ways and further improve on an innovation.

The theories of ‘interaction and plurivocality’ particularly address ways of bringing about the reflexivity and self-reflection needed for innovation and to become aware of how underlying, potentially contradicting, logics are balanced in the current social arrangements. This allows actors to potentially see ways of overcoming tensions and incompatibilities in current systems, and propose new ways of acting or believing to oneself and others.

Sensegiving and mise-en-sens address ways of diffusing new world views. However, although Corvellec & Risberg speak of offering cues, 6.1.1. and 6.3. (about cues in the strategy text that were not picked up) demonstrated that diffusion takes more than including words/cues in a text. If there is no (new) frame to relate them to, no significance is given to the cues. Institutional entrepreneurship and rhetorical strategies provide insight to how one might offer new frames
and seek to influence the way frames and logics are put to use during sensemaking. This takes careful and skillful consideration of existing frames/logics, interests of fragmented groups and rhetoric. Mise-en-sens also proposes use of rhetoric to influence meaning, and sensegiving theory stresses the importance of interaction which also Stacey and Weick are adamant about.

All in all, the theories spin a web of tools and considerations, summarized in figure 8.2, that should inform change management efforts in the Danish Police—to generate reflexivity and to facilitate change. If one wants to influence sensemaking and change, one must recognize the reciprocal nature of ‘sensegiving’ (proposing ideas) and sensemaking, and the importance of interaction, empathy, social skills, reflection, contradictions, skillful rhetoric and negotiation. Offering cues and frames in one-way communication is not sufficient to generate organizational change – new meaning is produced intra-subjectively and negotiated inter-subjectively and strategic change benefits from facilitating dialogue and communication to help such sensemaking along.

Figure 8.2. Tools and considerations to influence sensemaking and change

Own model based on synthesis/comparison of theories reviewed in 8.1.
The analysis of sensemaking in chapter 6 is a way of understanding the current state, the interests and vocabularies of the organizational members, and the underlying logics for why people act and make sense the way they do in relation to efficiency and the efficiency goal. The discussion of contradicting logics in chapter 7 is a way to bring to light potential reasons for current tensions or incompatibilities as well as offer levelers for reflexivity, reconstruction and rhetoric. Furthermore, chapter 6 and 7 offer a potentially new perspective to otherwise taken-for-granted world views that may provoke further reflection among organizational members and leaders.

8.3. Summing up
This chapter has reviewed academic ideas of how to influence sensemaking and change in a preferred direction. Three theoretical angles – sensegiving/mise-en-sens, institutional entrepreneurship/rhetorical strategies and interaction/plurivocality – were synthesized into a web of tools and approaches which leaders and others may consider to apply. In the end, the chapter pointed out how the knowledge produced in chapter 6 and 7 may be put to practical use by leaders or others who wish to intervene in sensemaking and change.
9. Conclusion

This thesis set out to explore how members of the Danish Police make sense of the topic of efficiency and the efficiency goal of their strategy 2011-15. Four synthesized meaning structures were presented to represent how organizational members frame and make sense of efficiency and the strategic goal: *Efficiency as money and resources, Efficiency as doing the job well, Efficiency as focusing on the core tasks, and Efficiency goal as strategy and change.*

Examples of cues and connectors were provided, and it was discussed how abstract frames are visualized through these connections and how actors create meaning that is plausible, coherent and reasonable in their social context. Furthermore, it was discussed how frames influence sensemaking, and that a reason why some cues in the strategy text – process and production concepts – were ignored could be due to lack of an available frame and a misalignment with the police officer identity which perceives work to be within human relations, not production.

The link between individual and organizational sensemaking was established theoretically but also practically, by demonstrating shared stories and logics in use in the sensemaking across the organizational members. It was argued that organizational meaning is produced and negotiated in inter-subjective interaction, but also that shared meaning is not a prerequisite for collective action and that therefore, efficiency-related initiatives in the Danish Police need not await formation of shared meaning. Organizational members will however continuously seek to make sense of events and align meanings. Furthermore, organizational action and ability to initiate and/or absorb change are influenced and constrained by the operating frames and logics.

It was discussed how sensemaking and frames relate to taken-for-granted (institutional) logics and how transformational change may require reflexivity of contradicting logics in order to generate the redefinition of how frames are applied in certain contexts that will lead to new ways of thinking and acting. Several contradictions were identified to be operating, e.g. related to *accountability, profession and identity, leadership and legitimacy, organizational structure, skill and boundary composure of the organization, and strategy implementation capabilities.*

The level of reflexivity among organizational members of these contradictions was discussed and it was concluded that some contradictions lead to more reflection than others and that it remains an open question whether there is enough tension and reflexivity to open up for praxis and transformational organizational change in the Danish Police related to efficiency.
Lastly, it was discussed if/how one may intervene in sensemaking and change. Academic ideas were reviewed, including *sensegiving, institutional entrepreneurship* and theories related to *interaction/plurivocality*, and synthesized into a web of tools and approaches for leaders and others to consider applying to successfully facilitate and achieve long-run change.

All in all, the paper has provided a synthesis of sensemaking across 11 organizational members in order to provide insight to a potential repertoire of sensemaking related to efficiency and the strategic efficiency goal among members of the Danish Police. It has pointed to underlying and contradicting logics that may need to be reflected upon and rebalanced in order to achieve strategic change and it has provided ideas on how to facilitate and intervene in change.

**10. Reflection**

I believe this paper to contribute practical insight to the organizational character of the Danish Police and how organizational members might respond to not only efficiency-related initiatives and the strategic efficiency goal but strategy and change in general. Many of the connectors illustrated in chapter 6 and the contradicting logics discussed in chapter 7 are not related only to efficiency and they likely also influence sensemaking on other topics in the organization.

Further study could expand on the ‘performative context’, looking at how organizational actors interact and negotiate meaning (e.g. Boje, 1991), e.g. by observing meetings or conversations, to understand inter-subjective dynamics better. To do so, power relations (mentioned in ch.8), legitimacy, roles, etc. should be analyzed. Another subject for further study could be the (committed) sensemaking of the leaders who formulated the goal as well as sensemaking by external constituents, e.g. politicians, the police association or citizens, who all contribute to the social world of the police.

Particularly by addressing and discussing the contradicting logics – which are not solely related to efficiency – in a new constellation and context, and perhaps challenging existing social world views, the paper might provoke reflection among organizational members, leaders or others inside or outside the organization that otherwise might have had another starting point.

Although grounded in sensemaking among members of the Danish Police, I believe that the insights of the paper and the discussion of the contradictions could also be relevant in the context of other public institutions where the challenges of how to measure value and output/outcome of public services, address accountability, deal with professional autonomy, redefine
professional boundaries and balance ethics and resource utilization are also present. It is also my contestation that not everyone working in the private sector is motivated by commercial measures of success (increased revenue/profit) and so, at lower levels of private organizations, sensemaking about efficiency might also circle around effectiveness/quality, how to measure the value of the work you do, that there is a long way from strategy to action, and so on.

In a theoretical perspective, the paper contributes with an example of how sensemaking and institutional logics theory may be combined to investigate and discuss organizational responses to change, and how such framework may inform studies of (police) efficiency and change and bring change management into the ‘meaning arena’.

Other academic literature studies efficiency in (foreign) police forces from an identity angle and this is also one of the factors in this paper. It certainly supports the claims that to work on efficiency in police (and other) organizations takes more than finding the right efficiency KPIs or formulating a strategic goal.
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Appendix A: About the Danish Police – Strategy and organization
This appendix contains three sections:
A1. The original version of the strategic efficiency goal in Danish (and my English translation)
A3. Organization charts – National police (Rigspolitiet) and Police District (Politikreds)

A1. The original version of the strategic efficiency goal in Danish

Vi fokuserer på kerneopgaverne og øger kvaliteten og effektiviteten i vores opgaveløsning

For at sikre en effektiv retshåndhævelse og et velfungerende straffesystem vil vi øge kvaliteten af og samspillet mellem vores organisationers og enheders arbejde og den ydelse, som den samlede 'straffesagskæde' – politi, anklagemyndighed, domstole og kriminalforsorg leverer.

Gennem en professionalisering og strømlining af vores organisationer og vores administrative funktioner sikrer vi, at politikredse od har mulighed for at fokusere på kerneopgaverne. Fælles administrative løsninger og standardisering skal levere forbedret kvalitet og service. Samtidig vil vi udnytte stordriftsfordel og bruge erfaringer og kompetencer på tværs – således at vi skaber stærke faglige miljøer.

Vi frigør yderligere ressourcer til vores kerneopgaver ved at sætte fokus på vores sagsproduktion. Vi vil standardisere dele af sagsproduktionen – dels for at sikre en omkostningseffektiv drift, dels for at sikre borgerne ensartede ydelser med samme kvalitet.

Vi dokumenterer systematisk resultaterne af vores arbejde. Det gør vi for at opnå den tillid hos vores interessenter og få de frihedsgrader i vores styring, som er nødvendige for, at vi løbende kan tilpasse opgaver og ressourcer til det aktuelle brussels- og kriminalitetsbillede.

Målet er, at omverdenen oplever effektivitet, kvalitet og ensartethed i vores ydelser.

My English translation:

We focus on the core tasks and increase the quality and efficiency in our work

To ensure efficient/effective law enforcement and a well-functioning penal system, we will increase the quality of and cooperation between the work of our organizations and units and the service that the complete ‘penal case chain’ – police, prosecution, courts and prison service – delivers.

Through professionalization and streamlining of our organizations and administrative functions, we ensure that the police districts are able to focus on the core tasks. Shared administrative solutions and standardization will deliver an improved quality and service. At the same time, we will exploit economies of scale and use experiences and competences across – so as to create strong professional environments.

We further release resources for our core tasks by focusing on our case production. We will standardize parts of the case production – partly to ensure a cost efficient operation, partly to secure citizens uniform services with the same quality.

We systematically document the results of our work. We do so to gain the trust from our stakeholders and gain the degrees of freedom in our management, which are necessary for us to continuously adjust tasks and resources to the current threat- and crime pattern.

The goal is, that our environment experiences efficiency/effectiveness, quality and uniformity in our services.
Introduction by the Director of Public Prosecution and the National Commissioner

A shared direction
We are pleased to introduce a new shared strategy for the police and the public prosecution. The strategy is a natural step in the change process that we are going through and which must result in creating an even better and more effective/efficient organization. An ambition that requires that we ourselves are setting the direction and prioritize our efforts where we know they have the greatest impact and importance. The strategy sets clear goals for our work in the coming years and encapsulates which areas need special focus for us to reach the goals.

The process of formulating the strategy has been intense and a good learning experience. We have had close dialogue with our partners and key stakeholders, and we have involved the unions and leaders from all parts of the police and the public prosecution. This has provided us with a good overview of the needs and expectations of the citizens and our remaining stakeholders. Likewise it has made visible the important experiences and the knowledge about our tasks and challenges that our leaders and employees hold. Both have been central contributions that now allow us to present a strategy that matches the most important needs and challenges in society.

The strategy is therefore more than a list of well-intentioned declarations of intent. It needs to be a shared platform that all of us work from. And it needs to work as inspiration and direction when we solve our daily tasks. We believe that everyone with their unique competences and capabilities have something to contribute, and make us reach our goals.

The tasks that are not mentioned in the strategy are not forgotten. To the contrary, the strategy needs to leave marks in our entire task accomplishment, our routines, culture and behaviour. The strategy is also not a hindrance for us working innovatively, letting ourselves challenge and adjusting our efforts to the current situation. It is the foundation that ensures that we maintain focus.

Director of Public Prosecution: Jørgen Steen Søresnsen
National Commissioner: Jens Henrik Højbjerg

The central challenges are:

- **A more complex and demanding crime pattern** following e.g. globalization and new technology. It means that we fast and flexibly need to be able to develop new, innovative solutions and move efficiently in when changes in the crime pattern happen.
- **Increasing demands for us to handle our core tasks** – also in relation to prevention, local presence and service. It demands an even greater focus on our core tasks and challenges us to think innovatively about the way in which we work with prevention, service and citizen-proximate tasks.
- **Increasing demands for cooperation and communication with citizens and partners**. A great challenge is therefore to develop our availability, service culture and direct communication, just as we need to work on involving the knowledge and resources of partners in our task accomplishment.
- **Increasing financial pressure** following the expectations to our services. We need to be able to deliver more and better results for fewer or the same resources. This demands efficiency and innovation.
- **More focus on results from the political world** and greater freedom to priorities own actions and resources. It sets new demands for the way we manage ourselves. Our leader behavior needs to reflect the increased result demands and explore the greater degrees of freedom to prioritize on our own.
- **Increasing demands for employees and leaders**. Our competences are being challenged, and we have to be able to ensure a targeted/focused adjustment and development of qualifications in our entire organisation so that we continuously have the right competences to lift our tasks.
I. We fight crime with determination and prevent conflicts, unrest and crime

The trust of the individual citizen to the police and public prosecution is the foundation for us to solve our tasks efficiently/effectively and increase the ‘peace of mind’ of the citizens. Therefore, we prevent and fight the crime that affects the citizens in daily life and we do so by being flexible, efficient/effective and present – locally and nationally. Therefore, we ensure efficient/effective law enforcement and a strong prevention effort, so that unrest and conflicts are as few as possible.

At the same time it is a core task for the police and public prosecution to fight the heavy and cross-border crime which can be destructive for development and the sense of justice. We do so by working analytically, jointly with other authorities and international partners. In doing so, we can develop a holistic fight and prevention of crime.

The goal is to ensure the safety of the public, among other things achieved through an overall reduction in the citizen-proximate crime.

II. We focus on the core tasks and increase the quality and efficiency in our work

To ensure an efficient/effective law enforcement and a well-functioning penal system, we will increase the quality of and cooperation between the work of our organizations and units and the service that the complete ‘penal case chain’ – police, prosecution, courts and prison service – delivers.

Through professionalization and streamlining of our organizations and administrative functions, we ensure that the police districts are able to focus on the core tasks. Shared administrative solutions and standardization will deliver an improved quality and service. At the same time, we will exploit economies of scale and use experiences and competences across – so as to create strong professional environments.

We further release resources for our core tasks by focusing on our case production. We will standardize parts of the case production – partly to ensure a cost efficient operation, partly to secure citizens uniform services with the same quality.

We systematically document the results of our work. We do so to gain the trust from our stakeholders and gain the degrees of freedom in our management, which are necessary for us to continuously adjust tasks and resources to the current threat- and crime pattern.

The goal is, that our environment experiences efficiency/effectiveness, quality and uniformity in our services.

III. We are service-oriented, open and available

To live up to the citizens’ expectations to modern law enforcement, we must take a service-oriented approach to the citizens.

By being open and available, we strengthen the trust in us by the citizens and society and develop understanding and respect of our services. Our professional secrecy and our consideration of the involved, we set natural boundaries for what we can inform about. But within these boundaries, we work determinately to improve our communication and dialogue with our surrounding world, so that our goals, prioritizations and decisions appear clear and understandable to all.

The goal is that the citizens perceive us as service-oriented, open and available authorities who work actively with managing expectations between what we deliver within our core areas and what the citizens and society expect of us.

IV. We are professional, cooperative and solve tasks innovatively

The technological development, the globalization and the developments in society in general place great demands to our professionalism as well as our capabilities to innovate and change. Therefore, we continuously work to develop new methods for crime fighting and prevention.

We solve our future tasks in close dialogue and in partnerships with relevant authorities, companies and...
citizens, and we make use of international experiences and partnerships.
We will catch the most important signals and developments in society, react consistently on them and involve
other resources in society to create holistic solutions.

The goal is to find new ways to efficiently/effectively fight and prevent crime.

V. We are an attractive work place with competent employees and leaders

Good results and high quality is developed by our employees and leaders. By attracting, retaining and
developing competent employees and leaders, we can develop the police and public prosecution in the
direction we want.

We want to be one of the best work places in Denmark – a work place where competences among employees
and leaders efficiently/effectively support and develop our task attendance/management.

We work consistently on being characterized by credibility, orderliness and respect for employees and the
work that is delivered. This includes that we involve the relevant stakeholders when we make changes – to
ensure ownership of the changes but also to ensure that we create the right solution.

The goal is that we are perceived as attractive work places where the tasks are solved by competent
employees and leaders.

Focus areas

A. Specific prioritized effort areas

We will continue to have a strong focus on crime developments, the appearance of new crime types, specific
centers of unrest and on the expectations of the surrounding world of our treatment of specific case areas.
Therefore, we will continuously focus on the most present problem areas.

We will work within the following areas:
- Prevention – combining crime fighting and prevention
- Fighting the citizen-proximate crime
- Fighting the heavy and organized crime

B. Leadership and direction

Skilled leaders, good frames for leadership and effective/efficient leadership tools are important conditions
for us setting directions, working towards our goals and create the right results.

Good leadership ensures:
- Motivated employees
- Effectiveness/efficiency and high quality in our work
- That we focus on good service to the citizens
- That we involve citizens, other authorities and companies in our work

We will work on following areas:
- Good financial controlling and budgeting
- Flexible management
- Relevant and efficient management information system
- Standardization and quality norms
- Shared and efficient administrative solutions
- Leadership development

C. Partnerships and cooperation

By involving citizens, other authorities and companies in the solving of crime and security issues, we can
draw on more resources and more knowledge. This means that we can work coordinated and widely with our
efforts. At the same time we can gain a closer dialogue with the surrounding community about our priorities,
goals, solutions and results – and not least about the societal expectations to us.

We will work within the following areas:
- Establishing committed corporation with other authorities and private companies
- Establishing public-private partnerships
- Involving citizens and groups in local communities
- Aligning expectations
- External communication and dialog

D. Culture
We will continue to focus on retaining our ability to exercise authority fairly and consistently. At the same time, it must be a basic part of our values and culture that we prioritize servicing the citizens. This places great demands on our flexibility and ability to identify with others, and it demands that we ensure the right conditions for being able to demonstrate the necessary flexibility, make the right choices in each situation and be perceived as service-oriented authorities who are able to act.

We will work within the following areas:
- Service culture
- Changemindedness
- Availability
- Openness
- Ethics
- Values

E. Strategic innovation
We must ensure that we are capable of changing along with the appearance of new technologies, new crime types, new crime patterns and the societal development in general. It places demands on us that we continuously, at all times and all levels, together with our partners, challenge the possibilities for development and disseminate new methods and new approaches to our problem solving and task accomplishment, as well as draw on international experiences to a larger degree than before.

We will work within the following areas:
- Innovation inspired by leaders, employees and external partners
- Dissemination of best practice
- Systematic evaluation of solutions and results
- Technological development and IT support

F. Competence development and injection of new competences
Through competence development – and within certain fields through injection of new competences – we will create alignment between our overall goals and the individual employee development, in a way that ensures that the necessary conditions are in place to solve tasks by means of the right competences. This is central to ensure that we are prepared to solve our tasks with high quality and high effectiveness/efficiency, and that we are an attractive work place where employees are confident in their capabilities.

We will work within the following areas:
- Competence mapping
- Career development
- Establishing professional learning environments
- Knowledge sharing
- New basic training
A3. Organization charts – National police (Rigspolitiet) and Police District (Politikreds)
Source: Internal document, published on intranet

A3.1. Organization chart – National police (Rigspolitiet)

A3.2. Organization chart – Police district, standard organization (Politikreds)
Appendix B: Supplements to the Methodology chapter
This appendix contains two sections:
B1. Iterations in the coding/categorization/interpretation process
B2. Examples of development in categories and meaning structures (walkthrough of the loops)

B1. Iterations in the coding/categorization/interpretation process

Figure B1. Approximation of the iterations during coding/categorization/interpretation

| Loop 1 | a) Examining each of the interviewees’ accounts.  
|        | b) Keywords written in the margins of the transcriptions. Loose categories, grounded in the data from each interview.  
|        | c) Listed categories in spreadsheet, incl. marked repeated categories, and from which interview a new category was added. |
| Loop 2 | a) Reviewing data across the interviewees for significant patterns of convergence or divergence.  
|        | b) Grouping/consolidation of listed categories.  
|        | c) Count of number of repetitions of each category.  
|        | d) Sorting by count to gain an idea of relative significance.  
|        | e) Loose marking of categories as cues, frames or meanings |
| Loop 3 | a) Reviewed strategy text for potential cues.  
|        | b) Searched transcriptions for mentioning of strategy words + the identified cues and connectors and counted repetitions to gain idea of relative significance.  
|        | c) Looked for cue-connector relations (when saying X, what comes next?).  
|        | “Started over”… |
| Loop 4 | a) Went through all interviews and picked out passages that I deemed significant and/or that provided good illustration of cues, frames, meanings or connections.  
|        | b) Sorted the selected quotes by (primary) category.  
|        | c) Marked secondary categories in the margins.  
|        | d) Re-organized, let some quotes be mentioned in multiple categories, added new categories, re-named categories. |
| Loop 5 | a) Compared data/interview passages across the interviewees.  
|        | b) Collected related cue-connector relations (1:many) into meaning structures  
|        | c) Consolidated meaning structures with similar properties  
|        | d) Organized meaning structures in table format, with one-liners for each connector and a summary of the abstract frame |
| Loop 6 | a) Initiated the writing process which led to further re-organizing of cue-connector-frame relations |

See illustrations of the different loops in the following pages
B2. Examples of development in categories and meaning structures (walkthrough of the loops)

B2.1 Example of development in categorization / development of categories

Loop 1 included a wide range of loosely defined themes (categories), grounded in each interview:

Loop 2 grouped and sorted categories (consolidation of themes across interviews):
Loop 2 also looked at relativity – which categories/themes were mentioned more often:

| A  | B                              | C | D               | E       | F       | G       | H       | I       | J       | K       | L       |
|----|--------------------------------|---|-----------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| 204| Role exit                       |   | Sum effect      | W primarily |       |         |         |         |         |         |         |
| 206| Kernoptegn             | 34 | Cue / Connector |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |
| 207| Interoperability            | 24 | Connector       |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |
| 208| Poliideform               | 33 | Connector       |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |
| 209| Ömamorganizing            | 19 | Connector       |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |
| 210| Negotiation/relasement      | 18 | Connector       |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |
| 211| Standardization/feasibility | 16 | Cue / Connector |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |
| 212| Service orient            | 13 | Connector     |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |
| 213| Sales         | 14 | Connector       |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |
| 214| Work perspective         | 12 | Cue / Connector |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |
| 215| Newness                      | 12 | Connector       |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |
| 216| Bedrivning, ideer, inno.     | 11 | Connector       |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |
| 217| Utøye, noteboks, m.         | 11 | Connector       |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |
| 218| Difinsering, kap.           | 10 | Connector      |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |
| 219| Incap      | 10 | Connector       |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |
| 220| Downgrade/contr.           | 9  | Connector       |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |
| 221| Negatian                   | 9  | Connector       |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |
| 222| Communication/bridging     | 8  | Connector       |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |
| 223| Extense elementer         | 7  | Cue / Connector |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |
| 224| Resarch                    | 7  | Cue / Connector |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |
| 225| Samfering med delprivate  | 7  | Connector       |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |
| 226| Test focus                | 7  | Connector       |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |
| 227| Rigged/fair reform        | 6  | Connector       |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |
| 228| LønScholar    | 6  | Connector       |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |
| 229| Serivicecenter           | 6  | Connector       |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |
| 230| Material                  | 5  | Cue / Connector |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |
| 231| Lean                      | 5  | Cue / Connector |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |
| 232| Swart at mæl eff.         | 5  | Connector       |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |
| 233| Møkkling               | 4  | Connector       |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |
| 234| Juridic                   | 4  | Connector       |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |
| 235| LønScholar/mer.           | 4  | Connector       |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |
| 236| Samfornde m. andr. ansvar | 4  | Cue / Connector |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |
| 237| Thant, prbjudg, grantor  | 4  | Connector       |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |

Loop 3 looked at sequences – following a cue, what comes next?:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>K</th>
<th>L</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 Cue</td>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2 Connector</td>
<td>Savings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3 Connector</td>
<td>Motivation, they just take the money anyway. Even though it is for greater good, it is not motivating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4 Connector</td>
<td>Comp. with private comp.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>5 Connector</td>
<td>It's always been like this - are we really prepared to change?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>6 Connector</td>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>7 Cue</td>
<td>Strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>8 Connector</td>
<td>Not useful if it is not made clear what the core task is</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>9 Connector</td>
<td>Just words</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>10 Connector</td>
<td>Inconsistency between words and action</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>11 Connector/C</td>
<td>The core task</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>12 Connector</td>
<td>Continuously new tasks added</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>13 Connector</td>
<td>Inconsistency between words and action - great distance between reality and strategy documents/practice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>14 Cue</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>15 Connector</td>
<td>We can only get better if we get better equipment (which we do not)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>16 Connector</td>
<td>“Crying wall” (self perception about employees)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>17 Connector</td>
<td>But we can always get better</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>18 Connector</td>
<td>There is room for efficiencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>19 Connector</td>
<td>But there is great distance between reality and strategy documents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>20 Connector</td>
<td>Lack of good communication (and leadership)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>21 Connector</td>
<td>Strategy needs to be meaningful to people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>22 Connector</td>
<td>But… this is the first time we have a strategy so there is hope</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>23 Connector</td>
<td>However when we have tried launching similar things in the past (in the 90s), it just became a document/folder in the cupboard; it was not translated to action.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>24 Connector</td>
<td>We are good at ops strategies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>25 Connector</td>
<td>There is a “dock with layer” in the organization that prevents us from taking in the strategies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>26 Cue</td>
<td>Strategy goal (why)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>27 Connector</td>
<td>It is necessary to save money</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>28 Connector</td>
<td>It is a way to create uniformity in the organization (a to have a strategy)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Loop 4 picked out interview passages and categorized them by primary and secondary category - see the 28 categories below

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intw</th>
<th>TEMA: Sammenligning med det private</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>vi fungerer jo ikke som en privat virksomhed...hvis vi gjorde var, var der mange ting som ville være anderledes...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>... jeg tror det ligger i årene...jeg tror ikke at der er nogen skyldige nogen steder, der sidder og siger nu skal vi bevare det eksisterende eller nu skal vi tage røven på nogen... det er ikke sådan jeg mener det... det er en and på hele systemet... der fungerer forkert. Fordi det ikke fungerer på kommercielle vilkår. Jeg har jo ikke nogen konkurrenter... altså grundlæggende set kan jeg være lige så langsom som jeg vil, som jeg kan få lov til af sagsbehandlingstidsmæssige årsager... jeg har ingen konkurrenter, der er ikke nogen der kan tage arbejdet for mig...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Det er jo bare anderleds end det private, hvor man bryder det langt længere ned. Og det kan jo også være at det vil blive gjort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>På tegnebrættet så det fint ud og hvis vi havde kunnet linet politifolkene op og man en kultur lidt lige som i militæret eller noget, fordi vi er også meget kaffestue-grædekoncer-tanter... nah men det er vi sgu. Vi kan jo brokke os over alt, og næsten lige som høj som vi vil – vi kan jo ikke blive fyret jo, det er jo nook også en høsmo i virkeligheden... så sker der at det så her har en medarbejderstab som kan tillade sig hvilken som helst holdning hvor i den private sektor, der ville du være blevet linet op og havde fået at vide ved du hvad nu kan du høre, du har 5 min til at rette ind ellers er det ud af.butikken. Det har været et problem. Hvor andre har kulturer hvor man nemmere kunne absorbere det.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>(B: [...] ... nu kommer jeg jo fra Mærsk...) E: Men nu rummer Mærsk vel også...når noget blev udrullet inde fra Esplanaden, så var det vel ikke sådan at de bare hver i sær gørde som de ville.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>...alle ved, og alle har prøvet i politiet mange gange, at der er kommet en ny ledelse, og når der kommer ny ledelse, så er det ikke anderledes end i enhver privat virksomhed, så er der inden for de første periode, hvad skal der ske. ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Så økonomidelen bliver en ... ligesom jeg sagde med beslutningerne før, at økonomidelen bliver en fast del af de overvejelser vi har. [...] Men der vil være nogen, der vil være rædelselslagne for at få budgettet ud. Så det er et spørgsmål om, at vores ledere skal være klædt på til at have den del. Og jeg vil skyde på hos Mærsk, at der var den økonomiske del en fast...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Vi er jo i alt tiden bagud... ting som man lavede for 10 år siden, de begynder at komme nu. Jeg ved ikke hvorfra vil de kan ligge 10 m bagefter det private omkring modernisering af tingene.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intw</th>
<th>TEMA: Arbejdsmiljø, etik, trivsel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>men oprigtigt talt, der bliver simpelthen løbet stærkere idag end for 3 eller 5 år siden. Eeh... Der har også været rum for det, kan man så sige, men på et tidspunkt når man jo også den grænse... hvor effektive er det er rent faktisk at vi skal være, for det er jo så en helt anden problematik i forhold til det der med at være effektive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Så det er jo også et spørgsmål... effektivitet ja, men der er i rigtig mange sammenhænder noget give-and-take... det er jo ligesom på hjemmefronten... sådan er det jo. Vi er bare mennesker. Der skal være en balance. En gang imellem kan man have det godt, for så er man jo også parat til engang imellem at give den en ordentlig skalde. Så når vi taler effektiviseringer her, så ja, der er rum for forbedring, vi skal effektivisere, men vi skal ikke bare presse citronen fuldstændigt ud, fordi så får vi altså en dårligere arbejdsplads, nogle negative medarbejdere... så der er en grænse. Og den skal vi være ekstremt... som personaleledere, operative ledere, skal vi virkelig være opmærksomme på, hvor den grænse den ligger.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>...Kerneopgaven for mig er også....trivsel og personalepleje.... fordi..... hvis ikke du har det med, så får du svært ved det andet. Så får du svært ved at udføre... Det er meget moderne i politiet, hvor det så her har været moderne i det private erhvervsliv i de sidste 20 år.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>At vi kunne selvfølgelig godt holde høj produktivitet ved at stå og piske folk, men det er jo ikke den måde. Der mener jeg de her etiske paraply, der ligger ud over os alle sammen, vi skal behandle hinanden ordentligt og vi skal tænke på seniorpolitik, og alt det der som du ved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Jeg synes ikke at effektivisering skal være, at man går på kompromiss med arbejdsmiljøet og klimaet og vi skal ikke blive roboiper... så der er en grænse. Og den skal vi være ekstremt...os som personaleledere, operative ledere, skal vi virkelig effektivisere, men vi skal ikke blive samlebånd, m ikke sådan at de bare hver i sær gørde som de ville.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The 28 categories included:
- Effektivitet og dansk politi – første indskydelse (Efficiency and Danish Police - first thought)
- Strategimålet – første indskydelse (The strategy goal – first thought)
- Effektivisering betyder besparelse (Efficiency means saving)
- Incitament / motivation (incitement / motivation)
- Kerneopgaven – hvad er den? (The core task – what is it?)
- Øger kvaliteten... (Increases the quality...)
- Øger effektiviteten... (Increases the efficiency...)
- Strategimål (Strategy goal)
- Selvopfattelse af politibetjente og organisation (Self-perception of police officers and organization)
- Kompetencer (Competences)
- Standardisering, strømlining, ensartethed (Standardization, streamlining, uniformity)
- At dokumentere resultatet (To document results)
- Direktørkontrakter (Commissioner’s contracts)
- Borgerne og omverdenen (Citizens and the environment)
- Tverrorganisatorisk samarbejde / eksterne parter (Cooperation across organizations / external parties)
Loop 5-6 synthesized meaning structures as part of the analysis (chapter 6)

For example (from chapter 6.2.2.):

Example of development in the phrasing of synthesized meaning structures

Example: The meaning structure “Efficiency and doing the job well”

1: Efficiency means doing things well. (Re-)gaining pride in our work. We do quality work but need time and tools for it. (Then: Tried to shorten it to a one-liner)

2: Efficiency means ability to do our job well, as we used to – and that takes… (Then: Gave up on the one liner and added standardization)

3: Efficiency means doing things well. (Re-)gaining pride in our work (which comes from knowing that we do quality work). We do quality work if we are given the time and tools for it. Standardization is …okay… as long as you don’t take our flexibility away. (Then: Added the macro perspective related to standardization which was previously placed in another meaning structure however turned out to be lacking from this one)

4: Efficiency means doing things well. (Re-)gaining pride in our work (which comes from knowing that we do quality work). We do quality work if we are given the time and tools for it. Standardization is good for the organization as a whole but don’t take my professional autonomy away.
Appendix C: Selected quotes in English (back-up and supplement to chapter 6)

This appendix includes the quotes used in the analysis chapters (and for those quotes that were cut to fit into the analysis chapter, the full quotes are included here) as well as supplementary quotes from other interviewees that make the same or similar points about each topic.

10 interviews were transcribed. The quotes included here and in the analysis chapter are not an exhaustive representation of all detailed content and meaning expressed across the interviews.

The purpose of this appendix is to demonstrate that more quotes were available for each point than the quotes that were picked out for presentation in the analysis chapters.

All interviews were originally conducted in Danish. The translations below are seeking to convey the same meaning as was originally expressed in Danish.

Quotes are available to back up following analysis sections:

- C1. Unfolding the frame about self-perceptions of police officers in chapter 6.1.3.1.
- C2. Analysis chapter 6.2.1. Efficiency as money and resources
- C3. Analysis chapter 6.2.2. Efficiency as doing the job well
- C4. Analysis chapter 6.2.3. Efficiency as focusing on the core task
- C5. Analysis chapter 6.2.4. Efficiency goal as strategy and change

C1. Quotes to back up chapter 6.1.3.1 (unfolding frame about self-perception of police officers)

The ‘obstacle angle’ speaks of lack of change mindedness, being stuck in old ways, etc. – e.g.:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview</th>
<th>Quote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 (37)</td>
<td><em>I mean, the police is not a very change-minded group [...]</em>. We complain about everything and almost as loud as we want...I mean, we cannot get fired anyway...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 (19)</td>
<td><em>You can force the horses to the trough but they won’t drink. It has to do with ‘that’s the way it has always been’. And, I mean, we have been used to that.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (51)</td>
<td><em>A great many police officers just need to watch and see for a while...they can be a bit skeptical. We lean back and see what they deliver. That’s very typical.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 (82)</td>
<td><em>You just got to sit back and see for a while... That’s very typical.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 (43)</td>
<td><em>And why do they do it better than the police officers? Because police officers turn lazy over time and start taking short-cuts...</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The ‘opportunity angle’, with the pragmatic, result-oriented problem solvers:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview</th>
<th>Quote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 (57)</td>
<td><em>But when the house is on fire, then we do what it takes [...] When we are dedicated, we go. [...] If there is a really meaningful work task, something that makes sense, a task that we can stick together about, you can demand anything of police officers [...]</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 (9)</td>
<td><em>...because you have to solve it. And that is what operational policemen are good at. Maybe it wasn’t quite by the book but the task or situation got solved that day.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (59)</td>
<td><em>Police officers are result people. Things need to happen and it needs to turn into something real and you’ve got to practice what you preach.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 (21)</td>
<td><em>From the outset police officers are... lack of trust... are suspicious and has a healthy suspicion and all this...</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

29 The number in parenthesis refers to the interview sequence number from Appendix X (the full transcripts) – Interview 2 (37) can be found as 2.37. in Appendix X.
C2. Quotes to back up analysis chapter 6.2.1. Efficiency as money and resources

**Efficiency has something to do with money and resources:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 (5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (13)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Interview 6 (3)**

Well...I think a lot of different things. Because efficiency is to utilize resources better every day, get more work done for the money. And then I think that if we are going to become more efficient, it can also have something to do with saving.

**Interview 8 (5)**

Well, then I think savings. I do. I must say. Saving. And...then... focus on resource utilization. The first can be a little negatively laden...and off-hand that’s also how I think about it. But the second, I mean resource savings, that’s not a negatively laden word for me.

**Interview 3 (13)**

Efficiency is a question of cutting off the fat...and then improving the quality of what is left. I think a lot of people make their own evaluation of whether they are in the part where the fat is or whether they would benefit from the efficiencies that are gained.

**Interview 9 (11)**

When you say efficiency, then you could of course say that it’s of course about resource utilization. But at the end of the day, are you thinking of ’kroner-ører’ [money]?

**Efficiency means saving and saving is negative:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 (5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Interview 1 (5)**

...efficiency in the Danish Police is to a very high degree related to saving...not saving to do something better but saving to spend less money.

**Interview 19**

Employees would often associate efficiency, optimization, whatever you call it, with running faster in shorter time. That’s the normal solution to efficiency... I mean that we save to spend less resources or to use less time but not to do things better... it’s always been like that, traditionally, according to my experience, and we definitely haven’t lost that now and certainly not now when the purse is empty and the Kingdom lacks money. [...] And maybe that’s exactly it... how we normally think of efficiency...as something where we are screwed afterwards but not something that is developing the organization. But of course, there are also other places that we expand and I respect that. I mean we also have a leader DNA that tells us to do things smarter – simply because it releases resources, not necessarily for me but for the whole and I also respect that but typically I am the one being screwed and therefore I am not motivated to... I actually think that the greatest inertia in the Danish Police against change is the lack of a carrot for changing.

**Interview 73**

It will always stick to the concept of efficiency that it is a fancy word for saving. And that’s not what it is only about but it could be. And there, one takes part in making it more difficult for oneself...

**Interview 5**

Well, then I think savings. I do. I must say. Saving. And...then... focus on resource utilization. The first can be somewhat negative. And it is...when I think of it...

**Interview 39-41**

...that there is more openness. For if all of us have to save, then you have to choose and say, you know what boys, we need to save on uniforms and we need to save but the National Police also has to save so if you have any ideas... B: Do you associate efficiency with saving? Would that be the fast interpretation? I: Well, it has become that. It didn’t use to. Back then, you could see some point in doing things more rationally and that it was silly to waste enormous resources on solving one case of vandalism.

**Efficiency means resource utilization and there is room to run faster:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8 (5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Interview 8 (5)**

... resource utilization... that’s not a negatively laden word to me. I look at is as a treasure chest with many corners that we have not been to yet to find resources.... I think there is 20-30 % to gain. If we pushed them. That’s what I find exciting about leadership...to motivate people and boosting them to give more.

**Interview 19**

It would be easier to start at the bottom with the young ones and get them to give a little extra. It is. It’s difficult to change the old horses... to get them to run at a different pace. I just have to say. It’s always been like that. It’s a huge challenge. Because you can force the horse to the trough but you cannot make it drink. And that has...that we still suffer from. And we do so as an organization. As the police. Because this is how it has always been. And we have been used to that. And the breaks have always been there stringently and so forth and so forth. There is too much time wasted. We can get much better. And we will. It’s just about utilizing the resources that are there. For we are here. It’s just to get them to go up one notch. Nothing else (smiles).

**Interview 47**

People have had to admit that they [the service centers] get more out of an hour of an administrative than a police officer, and they work more efficiently while they are here.
...I wouldn’t say that we run as fast as we could...any organization always has another 10% to give... but you could ask why you should do it... I mean, what’s in it for me. And should I do it for the Danish Police... well, where did the 10% go?

You won’t get police officers to admit the good periods. It’s been tough times (smiles). Am I busy? Yes, I’m always busy. During my 30 years here, I’ve always been busy. That’s the way everyone feels, right. But then, it’s probably not exactly how it’s been.

Well, then I think it is good. Because I think there is room to become more efficient. But then, I am a person who works rather squarely myself. And it annoys me if things are not working. Because I’ve set time aside to... the worst thing about the becoming more efficient is that we are not modern (IT).

The politicians have always granted money to the police:

Well, first of all, the kingdom is short on money. And then you’ll have to see where you can save. Where we can find efficiencies that allow us to save some money. First come the municipalities. It’s almost like that. And when you have done that, then comes the army. And lastly the police. For the police have not been included earlier. We are not used to efficiency goals at all. We’ve just almost been given what we wanted, because otherwise we couldn’t do the job and who could take responsibility for that, and then the politicians say, well that won’t work, here you have another 200 mio. And that’s the way it has always been done. But now we have to cut. And we need to get up in gear. It’s not too early, you can say. Now that we have been...we’ve been given extra grants all the time. We ought to become self-sustaining at one point.

I know that you talk about these 780 million kroner and say that it is our fault and we did get some extra grants. We did get that. Danish Police have always gotten that. Ever since I was employed, we have been granted extra money when needed. It’s actually been quite often. We can’t dismiss that.

Well, you wouldn’t start up the very dramatic things and the political signals that the police needs to get their act in order and balance things. You cannot expect, which by the way you have been able to for many years, that whenever there was a special problem, you could explain it and the politicians would be ready...

References to private companies:

We don’t function like a private company...if we did, many things would be different. [...] I think it’s in the veins...I don’t think that there are any guilty guys sitting around, saying that we just need to maintain the existing ... It’s a spirit in the system that works wrong. Because it doesn’t function on commercial conditions.

At the drawing board it looked fine and if we could have lined up the police officers and you had a culture like in the military or something...because there’s a lot of ‘coffee drinking complaining aunts’ about it... ah, but really there is. We can complain about almost anything and almost as loud as we want to.... we cannot get fired anyway and that’s probably an obstacle really...for what happens when you have a staff group that can afford to do whatever...whereas in the private sector, you would have been lined up and told you have 5 minutes to align or else you can leave. It’s been a problem. Where in other cultures, they could absorb it more easily.

We are always behind...things others did 10 years ago are starting to arrive now. I don’t know why we always have to be 10 metres behind the private sector about modernizing things.

When you worked in Maersk... I mean...when things were being rolled out from Esplanaden, then I suppose it wasn’t just like everyone would do their own thing.

Combining saving and resource utilization:

I still think – without cutting more of the finances – that there are 20-30 % extra resources to gain in manpower and solving some more tasks/cases or putting some more quality into the tasks. I just don’t think that is how the piano plays at the moment. Now... if you can find more, you cut it. You save some more.

Well...I think a lot of different things. Because efficiency is to utilize resources better every day, get more work done for the money. And then I think that if we are going to become more efficient, it can also have something to do with saving.

Efficiency is a question of cutting off the fat...and then improving the quality of what is left. I think a lot of people make their own evaluation of whether they are in the part where the fat is or whether they would benefit from the efficiencies that are gained.
Ethics, motivation, HR perspective:

Interview 8 (25)  The core task is also job satisfaction, work climate and taking care of staff... because if that’s not included, the rest will be tough to achieve.

Interview 10 (5)  I don’t think [we] should be compromising on work climate. We shouldn’t turn to robots or a conveyor belt but sometimes you can increase efficiency without destroying anything.

Interview 9 (13)  Of course we could maintain high productivity by flogging people but that’s not the way. I mean this ethical umbrella that lies on top of all of us, we need to treat each other right, we need to think senior policies and all the stuff you already know about.

Interview 3 (63)  But really... people do run faster today than 3 or 5 years ago. Ehhh..there has been room for it, indeed, you can say but at some point you also reach a limit ... of how efficient we can actually be and that’s a whole other area of consideration about becoming more efficient.

Interview 3 (63)  It’s also a matter of... efficiency is in a great deal of situations related to give-and-take...a little like at home... it is, right. We are only humans. There must be a balance. Sometimes you can be allowed to have a break, because then you are ready to really give it a go. So when we talk efficiency here, yes indeed there is room for improvement, we need to become more efficient but we cannot simply squeeze the lemon completely, because then we will get a worse working place, negative employees...so there is a limit. And it has to be extremely... we, as personnel managers, operational leaders, have to be really cautious of where that limit lies.

The great demands on police officers, running faster than earlier, references to terror/COP15:

Interview 3 (63)  Honestly, we do run faster today than just 3 or 5 years ago. There’s been room for it, you can say, but at some point you reach a limit. [...] It’s also a matter of give-and-take in many situations [...] When we talk efficiencies here, then yes, there is room to become more efficient, we need to increase efficiency but we can’t just squeeze the lemon so much that we get a poorer working place, negative employees...so there is a limit.

Interview 4 (64)  I’m just afraid that sometimes the politicians just buy the messages that McKinsey is calculating – that we don’t need to hire so many police officers etc. Because we have to remember the risk of terror, that there is a war going on - with refugees, and a COP15...

Interview 10 (42)  But I mean, haven’t we done efficiency initiatives before? I don’t know... I’ve been in this department [x] years... there’s been a development in the way we handle cases. But before those KPI initiatives, we also worked towards a deadline. So we had a fixed deadline. The three years I’ve been here, ...we’ve never spent more time than needed to. So in that way, I am not sure we could have run faster. Or handled the cases faster. For me efficiency is that it must lie in some work flows that are made more efficient and some tools that you need in your daily life that are made more efficient.

C3. Quotes to back up analysis chapter 6.2.2. Efficiency as doing the job well

‘Effektivitet’ as effectiveness:

Interview 2 (3)  [‘Effektivitet’]...well, it’s a complex matter. Because the word is a question for me to look at how good we are at doing our job or how we could do it better.

Interview 5 (61)  Well, it’s about ‘effektivitet’ [effectiveness], quality – and not least finance.

Interview 9 (11)  When you say efficiency, then you could of course say that it’s of course about resource utilization. But at the end of the day, are you thinking of ‘kroner-ærer’ [money]?

Interview 5 (5)  From my chair [criminal investigation] it is about becoming more efficient/effective at solving the very serious cases...murders, robberies [etc.]. And there I’d have to say that we are more efficient/effective than we were before [the reform].

Measurements:

Interview 2 (43)  Is it the detection rate, the number of notifications that we drive out to, how fast we respond, how fast we handle Mr. and Mrs. Jensen’s case? To save time... if that’s a goal in itself...there’s nothing in it because we don’t get any quality out of that, right. [...] The way we measure today represents pseudo points for it’s not what the citizen needs...

Interview 2 (63)  But the question is how they look at ‘effektivitet’? What is the highest? The Round Tower or a crash of thunder? How do you measure it? Efficiency? Is it something to do with getting as many people as possible
I think that efficiency also has a bit to do with starting to look at how to measure the effect of what we do. I mean, I find that interesting. Because are we just doing the things because that’s how we always did it, or do we go in and look at what we actually get out of this and who we are doing it. And if it doesn’t have any effect, should we do something else. That’s really interesting.

Well… among other things the task…well, when the core task is handled…to the satisfaction of the citizens. They are the ones we need to serve, right. So…that’s what I think. At that sets the bar for when we have an efficient police. And that can be different. And that’s what makes it so difficult, right. For what does it mean for the individual. I mean at one point there was ‘time in the field’ and response time and visibility, and then suddenly people are scared because they saw them and it had the opposite effect. So, it’s a little funny… Have anyone actually asked people what they think makes the police ‘effektivt’?

There is also a great deal of reporting in what we do. And reporting that is made up of the commissioners result contract and what are the things we do and for him to get through, then those things need to be delivered. What I have unfortunately experienced, is that now we lack that or the other case with the kingpins of prostitution, we’ll make something up, we’ll do something… there are people standing down by the country borders who look for trafficking (people smugglers) …oh no, the rest of December we look for seat belts. We’ve done a targeted effort there… magic magic magic… that effort wasn’t…oh, that’s what you were looking for. Jawohl, that’s because we fulfill the commissioner’s result contract. And I think that it is extremely dangerous that you go out – and they probably also consider that – that you cannot put a template out across the entire country and give all the districts the same… I think our leaders need to dare to be better at telling, dear friends, we have some challenges down here that are about this and that, and those things we’d really like to solve like this, and we’d like to be measured/controlled on whether we solve them well enough.

**Structural obstacles:**

**Interview 4 (4)**

*To be more efficient, we need new technical tools, especially within IT… we are behind. They are trying but we need some integration between these It-systems.*

**Interview 2 (3)**

*There is no backing for you to do your craft decently. There is not equipment for it. [Time is not given for it]. There is no proper focus on training [in the districts] and so on. It’s sad. […] You move on to thinking that efficiency is just about saving resources…*

**Interview 4 (58)**

*We train staff managers, not professional managers [now] […] You don’t have a sparring partner in your field. […] Well, you don’t have respect for a manager who thinks he leads something but when questions are asked, he has no idea what you are talking about.*

**Interview 1 (23)**

*In my area, which is very technically related, the only way we can increase quality is through better equipment. The employees only get better through the craft they have and the equipment they use. But since we do not have money to buy equipment, we don’t get better at what we do. It’s almost a crying wall… we can continue to sit here and cry out our frustration for not getting better. And if we cut further, there will be resistance among the employees because they like going after 100% quality, right. But they have a difficult time improving that quality.*

**Interview 4 (34)**

*Well, I thought that I need a different folder than I have today. I put some things into my folder on my own to solve and manage things because if you look at the shelf of the police for solving an assignment, it’s a little come ci come ca. They’ve chosen a reform that wasn’t allowed to cost any money and that means that when you need something on the shelves, I mean when you need a good torch, when you need a camera, when you need a cord for your computer, when you need to find a computer to solve an assignment…we have to be small Gyro Gearloose’s too much of the way, in order to solve these tasks.*

**Interview 7 (46)**

*I’d say, honestly, that that thing about wanting to document the results of our work systematically… I mean then we need to get better at making some systems that speak the same language. We have huge problems in relation to POLIS and PRES…and if you are then going to change direction… it’s too slow, we cannot measure the things fast enough, if you can put it like that. And then I think there is too big a… right now*

**Interview 10 (5)**

*I get frustrated when the systems that we work in, are not working. I think it is stressful. Especially when we handle cases with a short deadline. So when I hear things like a strategy to become more efficient...well, they talk but it doesn’t help much to want to become more efficient if you don’t want to fill up the bag with all the things that are needed to become more efficient.*

**Organizational structure and police reform:**
Earlier when a police station had both lawyers, investigators, traffic and all, there was a much better mix and you just had to go up the stairs, sit down in a chair, present something and get a go or a no-go right away, and I take that and you just or come up if...right. That's not there any longer. Now you sit here and think 'who can I reach who knows something and has energy to get involved'. You lack ownership of what is going on [...] I don't think it should be neglected that when people know each other and work together as a team, they deliver that extra piece of work, with an extra quality detail on it that says A++. That we can be proud of. But if you don't need to get engaged...

When you handle complicated cases all the time, you build up expertise which you of course won't have if you only handle these types of cases once in a while. There is no doubt that we've become more efficient at solving the more serious crime. We are also better on bikers and different things because we have more volume than before. We are able to have specialists to a much larger degree than before.

It was all very good with the reform and the idea of doing things from the bottom, so if you had a ticket case, you would not pass it on but you would decide on it yourself when you could and you could write the ticket out, so you did it all the way at the bottom. And it also helped my people in the response that we do whatever we can on our own. But then you create new departments that then say 'you don't have to do that anymore' – we'll do that over here. That's not efficient. For when we can do it yourself, and we could do it on our won, you should do that. And then that case is out of the way. Because it is completed.

There is talk about the three pillars in the police area and sticking to them, compared to falling back to the old station model from before the reform where you had all professional groups represented locally. For you can organize either by geography or professionalism. But you've got to stick to it and not mix things up. We've stuck to the professional set-up and I think it works. It has cost a great deal and has a big effort to implement, moving employees and all that, throwing all positions and your own positions up in the air, but I am sure that in the long run, it is the right thing. I have no doubt... this competence-driven / divided set-up... the world today has become specialized, you can't just be a technical investigator – it takes a lot of courses and experience and insight and maintenance and so on. You also can't just be a 112 operator without education and being logged into the system a certain number of times per year. You can't operate the command center without being able to operate the 20-25 IT systems you have there. And it's like that all the way around. You cannot be a finance employee without knowing the accounting systems.

Previously we could do earlier, faster preventative efforts [by being represented locally] – and that solves a lot in the long run. You only do this if you are close to events where you are. You are involved in things that deals with people and personal consequences of actions and people don't always tell things if they don't trust the person they sit across from That you have these people you trust, and that you know you safely can contact the local police officer, well that makes our investigations so much shorter and we can lift cases much faster.

**Standardization:**

You've made an organization without room for individuality and a nuanced approach. Many operational issues are controlled by concepts [whereas] earlier you maybe to a larger degree evaluated things individually, placing a police professional angle to it. That's a disadvantage, I think, and something that doesn't make all places as efficient.

... one of the recent initiatives...centralized work planning. It can probably be good in many cases and maybe extra good where they do regular shifts but here [criminal investigation], it's difficult to fit work into different sets of rules. [...] We have to do what the task takes. So although you have some decent rules in many contexts, it often gets rigid and you have to say, here it just won't work, we must do something else.

And then there is the word 'uniformity'... It's no secret that, at least before the police reform, that you had many many police districts who each did things their own way... But there weren't any uniformity... that has changed by reducing the number of districts and now it's being further speeded up by making a shared strategy for the Danish Police and public prosecution which we haven't had before.

Streamlining and standardization... that's something we already implemented with the reform, I think. These 12 districts [...] you've tried or you are still trying to get the same case administration. For the coordinated police efforts...I think they are trying to tell the 12 district commissioners to march at the same pace...so that the whole thing is made more streamlined and uniform so that we don't do things differently.

When you become part of a big organization, there are of course things where you might feel could become more efficient but which don't get more efficient because of an organization that might be a...
little rigid, and where you don’t have the same level of autonomy to do what was the most practical thing to do… where you have to have great uniformity but would like to treat everyone in the organization the same. Our policies on local salary, supplement structure, should fit into the organization as a whole. Our union has this them that is called ‘best for most people’. But it might also mean that you get the solution which is best for most people but for a few people is unsatisfactory and actually becomes rigid. And we live with that in many different contexts, I think.

C4. Quotes to back up analysis chapter 6.2.3. Efficiency as focusing on the core task

Removing tasks from the organization:

Interview 5 (29)
I guess it’s because they are trying to say that what others are better at than the police, should be transferred to public administration elsewhere. It might not make sense for the police to transport prisoners around, when it might as well be done by ISS or Prison Services.

Interview 4 (6)
We spend a lot of time on the roads, transporting prisoners around. If you arrest someone in [town] in the middle of the night, and want to place him in detention, you drive to [another town] and it takes 1.5 hours to go there and get back. First of all, the area is drained of one patrol unit, and secondly you are spending time driving…I think that if we made some arrangements with the local prison – because they are manned 24-7 – where you could place some drunk like that or someone who did some small scale crime for some hours before someone could get there to question him, then you had the possibility… by cooperating with the prison, you could solve a little task there that saved a lot of hours.

Interview 4 (8)
We transport a lot of prisoners around. We drive for extensions. I believe that the Danish Police could gain something from outsourcing that transport task. It is a huge logistics task in our own system to make it work, and there are a lot of police officers that really could be used for solving the core task in front of the citizens, that need the help of the police. So that they could concentrate on that task.

Interview 4 (12)
We understand the sharp tasks but the loose asks, those you could outsource in some way. I really think that there is a group of people out there in society that would be qualified to solve these tasks. That maybe didn’t need to take a university degree but are structured and have an ok background for them to be able to solve this task for us.

Scope increase (due to lack of prioritization of politicians and/or leaders):

Interview 3 (21)
Through the years, we have widened our scope significantly [...] without getting resources for it, both resource and money wise. There they simply haven’t been good enough at… to say that if you want new departments to do this and that, it will cost this many headcounts and then there’s something that needs to be removed. [...] Now they are trying to place themselves in a situation where you seek to handle only the tasks that are police relevant and seek to outsource what is less police relevant.

Interview 6 (5)
Being a police officer has become much more demanding. The task has become more complex. I mean, it was easier to be a police officer in the old days.

Interview 1 (21)
Giving lower priority to something…that’s a no-go in the Danish Police… there is only something called giving higher priority… we have never reduced priority. The old national police commissioner had a saying where he always said, when we shine our torch into the one area, well, the consequence will be that the other area will be a little bit darker. And that’s what happens, right, but the rhetoric about it is not applicable in the real world. we have a really difficult time focusing on the core tasks, reducing the core tasks…because we keep on widening and defining the core tasks wider… and therefore I think you will continue to have a long distance between strategy documents and what you see in the real world.

Interview 3 (75)
In the last 4-year agreement, a lot of the focus areas were prioritized by politicians who found them important, often on the basis of single cases. It could be a special focus on football and hooligans, animal transports, trafficking, prostitution … some areas where none or relatively few politicians thought…that the police should spend a lot of resources… for it would be completely terrible otherwise…often based on some documentary on TV. And then the leaders of the Danish Police set a direction and when they were negotiating the financial agreements and the future multi-year strategy
for the Danish Police, well, it wasn’t the National Police that set the agenda and said, we want to use our resources in this and that way, judging from a police angle...no, it was from the political angle. Now you have a new commissioner and other managers below him who are saying, this is simply not reasonable... we are spending a lot of resources on things that we, the police, deem them less relevant compared to other areas. There, you have focused on the core tasks.

We also now have tasks that we didn’t do previously... refugees, the whole integration problem, we have football... services that we did not have to handle to the same degree earlier and they drain our resources.

What is the core task:

But yes, we focus on the core tasks... well, that’s very well...but you can just ask, what our core tasks are? I am not 100%... sometimes they say that our core tasks are operations. But you could also say that the core task is education. In my eyes we are not better than the level of our education.

What are the core tasks of the police...well, it is of course to service and help the citizens, but it is of course also to solve the cases and ensure the cases pass smoothly through the system.

Well, it is to be police when police is needed. To solve those completely basic tasks, to ensure the law and order and whatever else is included in the clause with the objectives for the police.

Then of course we should focus on the core tasks. And then we can discuss who determine the core tasks. I would say that 75-80% are determined by the politicians while the police may have been part of deciding the remaining 30%... it’s a little more flexible now, with the new financial agreement for this year.

Well, the core task ... well, I mean, we can talk about the things that the police generally needs to handle and what the law says but the core task, for me, is determined by the police agreement for the year... which is then materialized in the commissioner contract. And that then lines up some core tasks for you to handle in the following year. But I mean, for me it is rather abstract. It’s a lot of things. The core task is for me also... employee well-being and human resource management... because if you don’t include that, you will have a tough time with the rest. And then it’ll be difficult to do... It’s very modern in the Danish Police while it’s been modern in the private sector for 20 years.

Well, it’s a balance... the core task is to get out to people when something has happened, but on the other hand, there is also a murder once in a while and that is extremely resource intensive to investigate. And we must do so of course. We cannot have people walking around killing each other and not being punished for it. So we have to handle that. And so there is this balance all the time. And if we are to focus on our core services, I just think there’s been a tendency in recent years to implement more and more reporting systems and documentation requirements that take up a lot of time and that is taken away from the core task. It’s of course a balance but there is a limit. Do you lead through trust or control.

’Sponsor shifts’... that is not very popular. And it’s not something that increases efficiency of the criminal investigators. So why don’t you chose that one of our core tasks is the gross crime...that’s our focus area... the gross crime must be solved.

Moving tasks from police officers to administrative personnel:

[shift planning]...an administrative could easily do that. Then I could handle more hard core police work... getting out to the crime scenes, make sure [the young officers] improve their case admin/judgment skills, do targeted actions. Then I’d be a police officer. Not a clerk. We need to get officers back to doing police tasks and show the way,

...and now we have the service centers. And it turned out, right, that they could handle police work. They can receive a notification of a crime. They can make sure all the things are included. Indeed, they do it better than police officers.

Get some more administrative. Less police officers. Let police officers do police work. And civilians do all the other things. It turns out, they are fantastically good at it. Why could a civilian not go to court? Why can only police officers go to court? They prepare the cases for them anyway. So why is it only officers that can proceed in court... for the less complicated cases...typically traffic cases, etc. Why does it have to be like that? Well, because that’s the way it’s always been. It’s tradition.

No risk of getting fired:

...So when we get past that issue of whether I am in the danger zone to get fired or not... which we get
past very quickly since none of us police officers are, unless we [do something outrageous], then…

I mean, the police is not a very change-minded group […]. We complain about everything and almost as loud as we want… I mean, we cannot get fired anyway…

We can’t just be a place where people are stored. And that’s how state institutions have been for many years. Obviously you don’t fire a police officer who has three years paid notice.

C5. Quotes to back up analysis chapter 6.2.4. Efficiency goal as strategy and change

Hooray-words and skepticism of strategy:

All those hooray-words, we just can’t be bothered… not because the police is covered in dust, - you’ve run all sorts of projects to motivate, do things better, differently, over time… - and you know, we’ve been here long – when something new comes along, then 80% say ”yeah yeah, we’ve tried it before, 4 times, it didn’t work”… that’s of course not the full truth, because every time you made new initiatives, there was something new somewhere… you can definitely move a department like this, if it is done right, and you are engaged in it… but it requires [management] effort. It does.

It’s a lot of words that look nice on paper but I just want to see it translated/realized …and I want to know how you have thought this is going to be realized […] Ownership of the words; they should come with someone who shows the way…that there is someone who tells us ‘this is the way we are going to reach home’.

We’ve done leadership evaluations, job satisfaction surveys, we’ve reached a point where we’ve lost interest, and we don’t contribute any longer.

It looks good but the words are grand. Haven’t we focused before… I mean, I really think people contribute… and the quality… at least the section I am in, everyone is trying to do a piece of work that fulfills that quality… so I don’t think it’s so new… I mean, compared to the way we work on daily basis.

A great many police officers just need to watch and see for a while… they can be a bit skeptical. We lean back and see what they deliver. That’s very typical.

I think it goes for a lot of police officers that they are not interested in hooray-words. Police officers are result oriented. Things need to happen and it needs to be materialized, and you have to do what you say. And things like this are not result oriented in any way that there is output from it and so they don’t bother to read it.

What do you think will come of the strategy? Well… It’s fine, I guess… Well, I think that things will come… on paper there will be… there you will sketch some models for how to increase quality and efficiency in our work but where it will be on paper and if you went out and measured it, I am not so sure that there will be real substance in it, real quality in it.

Communication and leadership, and the red thread:

People need to see the meaning of the things, and we need to be good at explaining it. Both as department managers but not least top management and probably there, there is still some challenge. Maybe you don’t always get things communicated in a way so people understand what is happening. I think that is still the biggest challenge.

To a lot of people, [the words] are too distant… they are not cascaded down through…

I think it would do good to be able to tell what the red thread is in all of this… visions and missions and strategies are flying around and people are sick of it… because they think it is negative. And I understand that… for the regular employees… also here with us, don’t care. There’s a way to go yet. Compared to the overall strategies for the police and public prosecution. [B: So they haven’t read this?] No no… they might have bumped into it but it isn’t something they worry about… and I am also not sure that they need to in detail. Maybe that’s not where they should focus. They should focus in relation to the department or section they are in.

The visual is important to people. You have to create a value chain between the overall things and all the way down to what makes sense to them. So they don’t read it. It’s a big leadership problem for it isn’t the employee who is to create that value chain, is it, that is to be done by leaders at all levels. It’s all of us who are missing there. Who are not going in… and marching at the same pace… and we don’t do it… for some reason… it is difficult to march with this if you are focused on your own problems and things and if there isn’t anything to connect things… so it is at all levels that people need to cascade it
if it is to work.

Interview 3 (59)  
And I also think that traditionally we’ve really been poor at explaining the connection between what the police districts need to achieve and the districts make action plans and you have the whole set-up all the way down. This thing... this ends here, right. [...] For we end up falling into the operational world and then we say, well then we’ll have to look at it some other time for right now we have too many cases, and so we never prioritize it. It is not just a matter of those who make the strategies who need to cascade them down, it is also us who receive the strategies and say ‘uh, it sounds good but how are we ... and we just need to get through our cases first’. Normally the Rockwool layer is the other way but this is another type of Rockwool layer...

Interview 5 (53)  
We also need to have some sort of line communication all the way down through the organization. But there are many levels of communication to get through before it reaches the man at the bottom somewhere. And depending on how good you are at the different levels to communicate, the poorer or better the message is when it reaches the last guy. That’s at least part of the challenge, I think.

Interview 7 (40)  
I mean, that you can see the red thread all the way from the political level. Where things are coming from. I think this is also important to be focused on. If we are to create that efficiency...

‘Strategic strategy’ versus ‘operational strategy’:

Interview 1 (27)  
It’s a lot easier to realize operational strategies...there you can set some completely clear targets for what the police districts need to achieve and the districts make action plans and you have the whole set-up all the way down. This thing... this ends here, right. [...] For we end up falling into the operational world and then we say, well then we’ll have to look at it some other time for right now we have too many cases, and so we never prioritize it. It is not just a matter of those who make the strategies who need to cascade them down, it is also us who receive the strategies and say ‘uh, it sounds good but how are we ... and we just need to get through our cases first’. Normally the Rockwool layer is the other way but this is another type of Rockwool layer...

Interview 3 (57)  
But when the house is on fire, then we do what it takes [...] When we are dedicated, we go. [...] If there is a really meaningful work task, something that makes sense, a task that we can stick together about, you can demand anything of police officers [...]...

Interview 9 (9)  
...because you have to solve it. And that is what operational policemen are good at. Maybe it wasn’t quite by the book but the task or situation got solved that day.

Interview 4 (54)  
It seems like they are not relating to reality but they present this piece of work further so that you can see that we’ve thought about it. Then rather take 3 points, that you actually achieve and which we can cope with. We cannot cope with 25 that we can’t achieve. But we can cope with 5 where we distribute some. That we can achieve. That’s how we can gain success. That’s what we work hard for. When we have focus, suddenly a lot of other things sort themselves out. We get to work with things that are meaningful, and we can go straight for the finish line with, without being bombarded by a high-speed train which runs through us all the time. For it makes sense. Suddenly we become efficient and I think that efficiency transfers to other things. We just don’t know. But we could do with less areas of focus and success with those. The rest will come. Nice and quiet along the way.

Light at the end of the tunnel / new leadership:

Interview 3 (51)  
Everyone in the police has tried having new leadership many times. So I think people don’t raise their eye brows much that there is new leadership and new structure. We’ve tried it before. But it is different this time. I mean, you’ve taken it one step further than just moving around. You’ve taken some things and started rebuilding it from the top [...] Some have been a little nervous about it but things develop and more and more things are getting into place so people start to look at it more positively. There is light at the end of the tunnel. [...] We are far from home yet, but still.

Interview 7 (74)  
That year in hell 2008-9... there were definitely some plunges....the whole thing was thrown into the air whereas in 2010... [...] it’s clear that things are improving now

Interview 3 (51)  
There’s light at the end of the tunnel. The brand is improving. Things have begun to work – both in the police districts that got a lot of bashing in connection with the police reform and in the National Police where things are also starting to work better and better... we are far from reaching home yet, but still...
**Appendix D: The Hybrid Identity of the German Police Force (referred in Chapter 7)**


---

**Table 1: The hybrid identity of the German police force**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identities</th>
<th>Claims regarding accountability</th>
<th>Claims regarding the use of resources</th>
<th>Claims regarding employee’s satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crime-fighter</td>
<td>Police work is performed according to established standards that are learned in trainings. As long as police officers follow these standards, they are on the safe side.</td>
<td>Primary goal of police work is to do whatever is necessary – regardless of the costs. When there is an emergency, all available resources need to be mobilized.</td>
<td>Police officers pledge to risk their health and lives in the line of duty. Therefore, they can expect a special kind of care, fairness, trust and sympathy from their superiors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bureaucratic</td>
<td>What a police officer must and must not do is codified. As long as officers follow the rules, they are on the safe side.</td>
<td>Civil servants have to observe the rules of thrift and parsimony in their daily work.</td>
<td>Civil servants are entitled to certain benefits and services. There are legal provisions that regulate what civil servants can expect from their employer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managerial</td>
<td>Officers are expected to think like entrepreneurs and pursue effective solutions efficiently and prudently.</td>
<td>Good management is finding the right balance between yield and costs. That also applies to the police. Everything else would mean squandering scarce public resources.</td>
<td>Officers are the primary and most valuable resource to pursue organizational goals. It is good management to see that officers are satisfied and motivated. Motivated officers perform better.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix E: Illustration of contradicting forces (figure 7.1.6.)

Figure 7.1.6. Overview of contradicting forces

The color coding in figure 7.1.6. matches the colors in figure 6.2.5. (Summary of meaning structures):
- Statements/logics that originate from ‘Efficiency as money and resources’ (6.2.1.) are blue
- Statements/logics that originate from ‘Efficiency as doing the job well’ (6.2.2.) are light blue
- Statements/logics that originate from ‘Efficiency as focusing on core tasks’ (6.2.3.) are lime
- Statements/logics that originate from ‘Efficiency goal as strategy and change’ (6.2.4.) are dark blue
- Statements/logics that originate from ‘Efficiency as new competences’ (6.1.3.) are grey
- Statements/logics that are not reflected upon actively during sensemaking in chapter 6 are not colored but marked with a circle that represents the sphere of where it could be discussed/relevant.
Appendix X: Full interview transcripts in Danish – only available to supervisor and censor

The full interview transcripts are only available in the two thesis copies that are handed to Copenhagen Business School for grading purposes, i.e. the copies for supervisor and censor.

Any other public/distributed copy, including the electronic copy of the thesis handed in to Copenhagen Business School, is without the full interview transcripts.

Selected and relevant quotes are available in English in Appendix C without reference to cities or names. Interviewees have been promised to remain anonymous.