



Possible Co-productions of Change Among Police Leaders and Police Officers in the Norwegian Police Reform

Cathrine Filstad

Professor, Ph.D., Kristiania University College and Norwegian Police University College

Corresponding author

cathrine.filstad@kristiania.no

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2666-3852>

Tom Karp

Professor, Kristiania University College

tom.karp@kristiania.no

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5234-4353>

Submission date: 07.12.2022

Acceptance date: 03.10.2023

Publication date: 28.11.2023

Abstract

This article investigates role ambiguity, discretion and job crafting among leaders and followers in change processes. Our findings are based on a sample of 464 police officers nested in 261 police leaders among 4495 respondents. We find that high discretion enables job crafting, where job crafting directs police leaders and police officers to positively engage in change and hence to reduce role ambiguity. However, high discretion solely among police officers to ensure job crafting and the reduction of role ambiguity is not supported, and high discretion among both leaders and police officers is only partially supported. Instead, our main finding is that the leader's discretion will moderate police officers' role ambiguity. The leader's work discretion will also ensure that police officers approach job crafting through engagement and coping. Therefore, co-productions of change between the leader's discretion and the followers' job crafting engagement will reduce role ambiguity in implementing change.

Keywords

police leadership, police reforms, discretion, role ambiguity, job crafting

1. Introduction

This article explores possible co-productions of change among police leaders and police officers in implementing the Norwegian police reform. Many northern and western European countries are reforming their police services, resulting in narratives about police leadership to ensure the implementation of such large-scale changes to these police forces (Filstad, 2022; Fyfe et al., 2013; Fyfe, 2019; Terpstra et al., 2019). Given that the most critical responsibility that leaders undertake is organisational change (Beer & Nohria, 2000; Burnes, 2015; Cinite et al., 2009), and that reforming organisational structures represents the most sub-

stantial changes (Armenakis et al., 1993; Cinite et al., 2009; Rafferty et al., 2013; Weiner et al., 2008), we find that the police reform literature is often fuelled by the negativity of change and being doomed to repeat the mistakes of the past (Fyfe, 2019). Addressing the complexity of police reforms, police researchers have also argued that breaking with the traditional ways of organising the police takes time and is complex (Terpstra et al., 2019), and that police leaders at all levels need to be involved as change intermediaries (not just change recipients) in implementing police reform (Filstad et al., 2020; Haake et al., 2015).

We acknowledge the complexity of change in general, and in police reforms in particular, where our study is motivated by getting more knowledge about how leaders and followers co-produce change and what concepts can help in understanding these possible co-productions. Our research investigates three concepts that are often related to change processes. The first is role ambiguity, which will involve both leaders and followers, and might result in negativity and reduced motivation, and thus undermines job performance (Crawford et al., 2010; LePine et al., 2005; Podsakoff et al., 2007). The second is job crafting, which refers to followers' self-initiated efforts to change their job demands, which helps them cope with and contribute more effectively in the context of organisational change as a bottom-up activity (Petrou et al., 2018; Tims et al., 2012; Zhang & Parker, 2019). The third is discretion, which mostly refers to the leader's need for discretion to enact change (Espedal, 2015; Hambrick & Finkelstein, 1987). Our research investigates these three concepts as a possible co-production of change among police leaders and police officers in the Norwegian police reform context. Since we focus on leadership, we consequently refer to police leaders, and not police managers, but recognise that the literature often distinguishes between the two depending upon what task the leader (or manager) undertakes.

The rest of this paper is structured as follows. First, we review the literature on the leader's discretion, job crafting and role ambiguity in change contexts, leading to our hypothesis. Second, we describe the empirical context, research methods and results. Third, we present our results, discussion and conclusion. Finally, the research limitations are described, including suggestions for future research.

2. Literature review and hypothesis

2.1 Leader's work discretion

Most studies of discretion overemphasise discretion as something that leaders formally have or should be given, which underestimates leadership as dynamic and co-productive in the relationships between the leaders and followers in everyday activities (Cunliffe, 2001; Erden et al., 2014; Wangrow et al., 2015; Geilinger et al., 2016). Instead, discretion needs to be explored in relation to what actually happens in these leadership relations (Espedal, 2017; Filstad et al., 2020) as discretionary behaviours (Key, 2002). The formal dimension of discretion is linked to the characteristics of the job, such as job demands and job constraints (Hambrick & Finkelstein, 1987; Stewart, 1989). The subjective dimension of discretion is linked to the leader's and followers' characteristics, such as mindset, motivation and skills (Carpenter & Golden, 1997; Espedal & Kvitastein, 2012).

Work discretion is widely held as an important resource to enable job crafting, particularly approach crafting (Leana et al., 2009; Solberg & Wong, 2016; Wrzesniewski & Dutton, 2001). In addition, work discretion is found to positively relate to evaluations of organisational change and the commitment to support organisational change by way of increasing proactivity (i.e., personal initiative), and confidence in their ability to carry out a broader and more active role (i.e., role breadth self-efficacy; Hornung & Rousseau, 2007).

We find that the distinction between formal and subjective discretion in the literature can be compared with job crafting as an approach to crafting and avoidance crafting, respectively. More specifically, in this article we measure approach crafting and subjective discretion in how to lead and engage in challenging job demands to enhance and encourage change initiatives, both as managerial and employee behaviours in change contexts.

2.2 Job crafting as employee behaviour

As described earlier, job crafting refers to the self-initiated efforts of followers to shape, change and cope with changes (Petrou et al., 2018; Tims et al., 2012; Zhang & Parker, 2019).

Job crafting is divided between approach crafting and avoidance crafting (Zhang & Parker, 2019). In this paper, we focus on approach crafting as most relevant for our research. Approach crafting is directed towards the improvement or development of resources or oneself in the situation as positive work engagement and adoptive performance (Bruning & Campion, 2018; Petrou et al., 2018; Rudolph et al., 2017; Zhang & Parker, 2019). Approach crafting is reflected in efforts made to increase the resources needed to deal with job demands more effectively (Petrou et al., 2012; Tims et al., 2012). This could include seeking social resources, such as feedback and advice from others at work (Petrou et al., 2012; Tims et al., 2012), and thus in leader–follower relationships.

We would therefore expect that the leader's discretion enables the followers' approach-crafting efforts to reduce role ambiguity, and that, vice versa, followers make greater efforts to take charge of the work changes and co-produce discretion between leaders and followers.

2.3 Role ambiguity

Role ambiguity is generally labelled as a hindering job demand because it is found to relate positively with strain and negatively with motivation, and thus undermine job performance (Crawford et al., 2010; LePine et al., 2005; Podsakoff et al., 2007).

Followers who face hindering job demands are expected to expend less effort on active problem-focused coping because these efforts would be seen as having a low probability of success, or as using up the resources that they need to deal with the excessive strain and distress associated with hindering job demands (LePine et al., 2005). Indeed, studies in the job-crafting literature find that role ambiguity relates negatively with job-crafting efforts aimed at proactively taking charge to improve the efficiency and effectiveness in which work is conducted, in the absence of resources that could promote this more active, problem-focused coping (Solberg & Wong, 2016).

2.4 Discretion as an enabler of followers' approach crafting

We propose that work discretion is a job resource that should enable approach crafting when facing role ambiguity during organisational change because discretion provides the opportunity, motivation and perceived ability to take control of ambiguous and conflicting job demands. This would include approach crafting aimed at increasing social job resources and other structural job resources, such as job-related competency (Tims et al., 2012) or the pursuit of new challenges and responsibilities that result in greater psychological resources, such as perceived meaningfulness of work (Tims et al., 2016). Hence, we hypothesise that:

Hypothesis 1. The relationship between the followers' experience of role ambiguity and their approach to crafting will be moderated by work discretion.

We would also expect that the leader's discretion will enable greater approach crafting among the followers, despite the role ambiguity faced during organisational change. Furthermore, we expect a three-way interaction between experienced role ambiguity, followers' work discretion and the leader's discretion related to job crafting, such that the relationship between role ambiguity and approach crafting is highest when the followers themselves have high levels of work discretion and work with leaders who have high level of discretion. Hence, we hypothesise that:

Hypothesis 2. The experience of role ambiguity, the followers' work discretion and the leader's discretion interact to relate to approach crafting. The relationship will be strongest when both the followers' work discretion and the leader's discretion is high.

Finally, we look at a change implementation as something that both the followers and leaders enact in a joint process. We predict that when the followers experience uncertainty and strain as a result of the change initiative, leaders who have discretion will better facilitate the change-oriented behaviours needed for the followers to respond to and implement organisational changes into their own work roles. However, we also predict that followers who do not have discretion will be more proactive in engaging themselves in these behaviours to improve their own discretion in uncertain and ambiguous change contexts. Thus, we examine how leaders who have discretion and followers who do not have discretion facilitate change implementation through their collective efforts. Hence, we hypothesise that:

Hypothesis 3. The relationship between role ambiguity, demands and approach crafting will be moderated by the leader's discretion.

3. Methods

3.1 Empirical context

The Norwegian police reform (2016–2021) consisted of two parts: a structural reform reducing the number of police districts from 27 to 12, and a reform to ensure quality through developing knowledge-based police services. The main goals of the police reform were to standardise the police services by reducing the number of local offices and merge police districts to create centres of expertise. Smaller geographical units were organised in larger centralised units. New priorities for police services were implemented with the goal of providing uniform police services for the whole of Norway. Therefore, police leaders face increased responsibilities for new departments and police services and have a greater number of police officers to manage. Other police leaders lost their leadership position or have experienced major changes in both their staffing and responsibilities for police services. These changes in leadership positions are due to the substantial reduction in the number of police officers locally. Instead, police officers have been transferred to larger centralised units in the 12 new police districts. This is in line with other police reforms in Europe that have called for greater centralisation, efficiency and structural rationalisation of the police services (Christensen, 2018; Fyfe 2013). The ambitions and overall goals of the police reform were to establish: increased availability; increased quality and uniformity of the police services throughout Norway; goal-oriented police services with regard to crime prevention, crime investigation and counter-terrorism; develop the police as a knowledge-based and learning organisation; increased efficiency, and use of new methods and new technology; and good leadership and active followers, with the establishment of a police culture that is characterised by openness and trust.

3.2 Sample and procedures

This study was conducted in the Norwegian police service (NPS) in the midst of the police reform. At the time of the study, NPS had just reduced the number of geographic locations into 12 police districts in Norway. It had also initiated and standardised knowledge-based police tasks to ensure similar police services independent of where the Norwegian citizens live.

This study consists of data collected with two electronic questionnaires that were issued at two points in time as part of a larger project concerned with analysing the reform initiative. A link to the initial questionnaire (time 1) was sent to all 13,436 in the police districts and 314 respondents in the Police Directorate via work email addresses that had been provided to one of the study's authors, together with additional information regarding the study, and the security and privacy of their data. One month later, the second questionnaire (time 2) was sent to those who had responded to the first questionnaire. The first part of the survey (time 1) was administered in October 2018 (with two survey reminders following the first distribution). The second part of the survey (time 2) was administered in November 2018 (also with two survey reminders following the first distribution of the second survey) to those who had responded to the first survey. The items relevant to the present study were distributed between the two questionnaires. The measure for discretion was in the time 1 questionnaire. Measures of role ambiguity and job crafting were in the time 2 questionnaire, but were separated proximally by a number of other measures.

Of those who received the time 1 questionnaire, 4,495 responded. Almost 50% of the police leaders responded. After accounting for a number of challenges concerning firewalls, not being able to open the survey, and mail addresses not being in use, the respond rate was about 35–40% of the total population. The 4,495 respondents went on to receive the time 2 questionnaire, which generated 2,580 responses, representing a response from 57% of the time 1 respondents. Because our interest in this study was to test if work discretion experienced by leaders and followers moderates the relationship between role ambiguity and job crafting, our next step was to create a matched dataset where the followers' data relating to work discretion, role ambiguity and job crafting were paired with work discretion data collected from their respective formal leaders. The matched data set yielded a final sample of 464 employees matched with 261 leaders.

To assess the possible bias of the smaller matched data set, we conducted mean comparison t-tests to assess if there were significant differences in the demographic backgrounds of the respondents who were included in the leader-matched data set compared to respondents who could not be matched with leader responses or if there were significant differences in the mean values of the study variables between these two groups. We found no significant differences in the respondents' gender (from 57.6% to 61% female respondents), age or education between these two groups. Organisational tenure was slightly higher in the leader-matched data set (mean = 2.62) than in the unmatched data set (mean = 2.53) but was not substantively different because both values indicated organisational tenure between 2–10 years. Furthermore, we found no significant differences in the mean values of the study variables between these two groups.

The descriptive data are given in Table 1:

Table 1. The leader-matched dataset

Gender	61% female	39% male	
Age	7% under 29	56% 30-49	37% 50+
Education	16% high school	65% bachelor	18% master
Work experience	4% less than 2 years	30% 2-10 years	66% 10+
Position	56% followers	18% leaders without personnel responsibility	27% leaders with personnel responsibility

3.3 Measures

Role ambiguity was measured using three items from Rizzo et al. (1970): ‘I know what my responsibilities are’, ‘I know exactly what is expected of me in my role’, and ‘What I need to do in the job has been explained to me.’ Responses were measured on a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree), and then reverse-scored to reflect role ambiguity and not role clarity (Tracy & Johnson, 1981).

Multiple measures of job crafting exist in the literature, yet none of them includes each of the five different types of job crafting behaviour addressed in this study. Therefore, we assembled our measure of job crafting from different studies. Job crafting aimed at reducing hindering demands, increasing social resources and increasing challenging demands were measured with three items each, taken from Tims et al. (2012) and Petrou et al. (2012). Job crafting aimed at increasing structural resources is primarily concerned with developing new competency (Tims et al., 2012). Therefore, the learning-oriented items from Griffin et al.’s (2007) measure of adaptive performance provided the basis for these items. Finally, taking charge of job demands was measured through three items developed by Griffin et al. (2007) to measure task proactivity, because these items were developed based on the taking-charge construct (Morrison & Phelps, 1999) and corresponded closely to the taking-charge crafting described in the literature (Leana et al., 2009; Solberg & Wong, 2016). All items can be found in the Appendix. They were measured on a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (never) to 5 (very often).

Work discretion was measured with three statements that were adapted from Morgeson and Humphrey’s (2006) measures of decision making and work methods autonomy. These items reflect the extent to which respondents perceive they have the discretion to make decisions and choose how work is done. These statements were: ‘I have the opportunity to use my personal initiative and judgement in carrying out my work’, ‘I have considerable freedom to make a lot of decisions in planning and managing my work’, and ‘I have the freedom to decide myself how to carry out the various work tasks I am responsible for’. The responses were measured on a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (completely disagree) to 5 (completely agree).

4. Results

Table 2 provides the means, standard deviations, Cronbach’s alpha and correlations of the employee-rated study variables. The bivariate correlations indicate that the followers’ experienced work discretion is negatively correlated with role ambiguity ($r = -.18, p < .01$). Meanwhile, the followers’ experienced work discretion is positively correlated with increasing structural job resources ($r = .12, p < .05$), increasing challenging demands ($r = .11, p < .05$) and taking charge of job demands ($r = .18, p < .01$). Moreover, all of the job-crafting variables are significantly and positively correlated.

Table 2. Study descriptive statistics and correlations

Variable	Mean	Std. Dev.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. Role overload		.76							
2. Reducing hindering demands	1.21		.25***						
3. Increasing social job resources	.57	.09	.42***						
4. Increasing structural job resources	1.08	.03	.39***	.56***					
5. Increasing challenging demands	.90	.15*	.49***	.62***	.50***				
6. Taking charge of job demands	.83	.06	.40***	.44***	.66***	.58***			
7. Experienced work discretion	.75	-.18***	-.02	.08	.11	.14*	.18**		
8. Leader position	.77	.00	.03	.00	.13*	.13*	.15**	.08	

Note. * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$.

Our data consists of 464 follower responses nested within 261 leaders. Therefore, we analysed our data using “complex” analysis in Mplus version 8.3 because this allows for specification of a cluster-level variable in the model (i.e., leader) and calculates cluster robust standard errors (CR-SEs) that account for the non-independence of observations that results from this clustering. This approach is argued to be a good alternative to hierarchical linear modelling, particularly when cluster-specific inferences and random effects are not of substantive interest in the research (McNeish et al., 2017), which they are not in the present study. The models including moderation were constructed using the Mplus syntax provided by Stride et al. (2015) for modelling basic and multiple moderation using latent variables.

As a first step, a confirmatory factor analysis was conducted to confirm the factor structure of the follower-rated study variables. A seven-factor model was specified, which included role ambiguity, reducing hindering demands, increasing social resources, increasing structural resources, increasing challenging demands, taking charge of job demands, and follower work discretion. The results indicated that the seven-factor measurement model fit the data very well ($\chi^2 (168, N=464) = 269.77$; CFI = .97; TLI .96; RMSEA = .04; SRMR .04). Furthermore, all items in the eight-factor model loaded significantly on the latent variables (all p 's < .001).

Hypothesis 1 predicted that the relationship between role ambiguity and approach crafting would be moderated by work discretion, such that followers with higher levels of work discretion would engage in more approach crafting. Finding an interaction term between role ambiguity and work discretion that was positively and significantly related to the approach-crafting outcomes would support this hypothesis. However, we found no significant interaction terms for any of the approach-crafting outcomes. Accordingly, hypothesis 1 was not supported.

Hypothesis 2 predicted a three-way interaction between role ambiguity, followers work discretion and leader discretion as related to approach crafting, such that the relationship between role ambiguity and approach crafting would be strongest when both the leader's and followers' discretion was high. We only find partial support for hypothesis 2 concerning positive interaction between the followers' discretion and approach crafting to reduce role ambiguity. Hypothesis 3 predicted that the relationship between role ambiguity and approach crafting would be moderated by the leader's discretion, which was supported. This means that followers working with leaders having higher levels of discretion would engage in more approach crafting when facing role ambiguity. Therefore, the result of our study is that leaders need discretion, while followers rely on their leaders' discretion to undertake job crafting, where the co-production of the two moderate role ambiguity and enhance approach crafting in change implementation.

5. Discussion

This study hypothesised different forms of leader–follower relationships of job crafting, role ambiguity and work discretion in how to reduce hindering job demands in implementing police reform. As demonstrated in the literature, positive relationships between the three will increase job crafting (as approach crafting). This means that job crafting can be characterised by followers who are fully capable of voicing their opinions and goals and undertaking strategies that enable them to look after themselves and reduce hindering job demands. This is evident in our study, and thus we confirm the strategic choices in followers as argued in the literature (Alvesson et al., 2017; Karp, 2021; Uhl-Bien, 2006). This is also in line with previous research findings on the importance of job crafting in dealing with changing job demands (Solberg & Wong, 2016; Tims et al., 2012), and that the change literature needs to further address the self-initiated engagement of followers to shape and cope with change (By et al., 2016; By, 2020; Filstad, 2022).

In exploring job crafting among followers and how this related to leader–follower relations as co-productive implementation processes, we find that work discretion is relevant for two reasons. First, the discretion literature for the most part appoints the leader's need for discretion in enacting change (Espedal, 2015; Hambrick & Finkelstein, 1987) and refers to the leader's range of choices, which might relate to proactivity in job crafting. Second, discretion mostly refers to leader discretion as a top-down activity, while job crafting often refers to the activities of the followers.

We find that our first hypothesis on whether the relationship between hindering job demands and approach crafting is moderated by work discretion, and therefore the followers' own discretion rather than the leader's discretion, was not supported. This finding suggests that when 'isolated', providing discretion to an individual to self-manage hindering demands is not sufficient in change contexts. However, when we test relationship between hindering job demands and approach crafting, we find a significant and positive relationship that is moderated by the leader's discretion. Therefore, the important role of the leader's discretion embedded in leadership as an enabler of proactive job crafting is evident. This confirms the critical arguments that the leader's discretion is something static and something that the leaders own, instead of understanding discretion as processual, dynamic, and constructed as a co-production in everyday practice of leadership (Cunliffe, 2001; Erden et al., 2014; Geilinger et al., 2016). However, our study does not find, as might be expected, that the followers' discretion moderates the relationship between job hindering demands and approach crafting. Instead, we find that the moderation is from the leader's discretion. Hence, the relationship between hindering job demands and approach crafting being strongest when both the followers work discretion and the leader's discretion is high is not supported. Instead, the mediation of role ambiguity and job crafting is rooted in the leader's discretion. Therefore, the critical role of leadership is highlighted (Armenakis et al., 1993; Espedal, 2015), even when the followers perceive their own discretion to be sufficient. Instead, the leader's discretion may promote the followers' collective willingness to proactively deal with job demands due to a sense of responsibility. Moreover, the majority of extant research has focused on the followers' perceptions of the leader's support as an antecedent of proactive behaviour (e.g., Griffin et al., 2010; Parker et al., 2006) and job crafting (Petrou et al., 2012; Wrzesniewski & Dutton, 2001). Extending these findings, we demonstrate how leaders and followers co-produce discretion that positively influences proactive efforts.

Our final hypothesis also develops from the arguments which suggest that the followers are active agents and co-producers of leadership, such that the followers create leaders and the leaders create followers in joint leadership processes (Alvesson et al., 2017; Carsten et al.,

2010; Karp, 2021; Ospina & Sorenson, 2006). Given such a view on leadership, the followers need to involve themselves in job crafting to obtain agency to co-produce change. We find that the relationship between role ambiguity, challenge seeking, task proactivity and learning were all positively mediated by leader support. Therefore, an important finding is that leaders' and followers' co-production of change relies on leadership discretion, which in turn results in the followers' approach of seeking challenges, task opportunities and learning to ensure proactivity among employees in change contexts. Such job crafting among the followers represents a more pragmatic explanation of why and how change happens in many organisations as co-productions of implementing change initiatives (Carsten & Uhl-Bien, 2012; Filstad et al., 2020; Shamir, 2007).

6. Conclusion

We have investigated the co-production of change among police leaders and police officers in the Norwegian police reform. In doing so, we contribute to the change literature and add new knowledge when including concepts such as job crafting, role ambiguity and work discretion, and the possible relationships between these concepts in elaborating the co-production of change among leaders and followers. We find that police leaders and police officers craft their jobs, co-create discretion and conduct agency to reduce hindering demands. In doing so, they enhance approach crafting, seek challenges, engage in task proactivity and co-produce change as interconnected, collective and complex relationships of police leadership.

When the police leader's discretion was included as influencing the police leader-police officers' co-production, therefore positively affecting hindering job demands and resulting in approach crafting, we find support for police leader's discretion moderating this relationship so that police leaders with higher levels of discretion will engage more in job crafting. Meanwhile, police leaders' discretion also leads to more job crafting among police officers. We also found that employee role ambiguity was moderated by the police leader's discretion.

Our main finding is that the leader's discretion will moderate the police officers' role ambiguity. The leader's work discretion will also ensure police officers' approach crafting of engagement, control and coping. Therefore, the co-production of change among the leader's discretion and the followers' job crafting to reduce role ambiguity is evident.

Our findings do not support discretion as interconnections of both police leaders and police officers' work discretion to ensure implementation of the police reform. Therefore, we encourage further research, preferably qualitative research, to undertake explorative observational field studies and interviews. We acknowledge the need for more in-depth knowledge on what constitutes different co-productions between leader and follower in implementing change. Further research investigating job crafting, role ambiguity and work discretion should include other concepts that might be relevant contributions to the change literature.

7. Limitations

As with all research, our research has observed several limitations. First, while we used a cross-lagged design to reduce the risk of common-method biases (Podsakoff et al., 2007), this does not allow us to draw causal inferences (Pedhazur & Schmelkin, 1991; Shadish et al., 2002). We hope that future studies will address this limitation by examining the relationship between hindering job demands and job crafting using longitudinal or experimental research methods.

Second, several of our study variables (e.g., hindering job demands, job crafting and employee work discretion) are based on the employees' self-reported data. Nevertheless, by

measuring these constructs at two points in time, we have been able to investigate these relationships with a lower risk of common-method bias. Moreover, constructs such as job crafting can be difficult to observe through other methods, such as having leaders or co-workers observe employee behaviour (Berg et al., 2010).

Finally, the generalisability of our findings to other national cultures might be limited. More concretely, country-level characteristics might shape the extent to which employees and managers can exercise discretion at work. However, according to self-determination theory (Ryan & Deci, 2000), autonomy (or work discretion) is a basic psychological need.

References

- Alvesson, M., Blom, M., & Sveningsson, S. (2017). *Reflexive leadership: Organising in an imperfect world*. Sage.
- Armenakis, A. A., Harris, S. G., & Mossholder, K. W. (1993). Creating readiness for organizational change. *Human Relations*, 46(6), 681–703. <https://doi.org/10.1177/001872679304600601>
- Beer, M., & Nohria, N. (2000). Cracking the code of change. *Harvard Business Review*, 78(3), 133–141.
- Berg, J. M., Wrzesniewski, A., & Dutton, J. E. (2010). Perceiving and responding to challenges in job crafting at different ranks: When proactivity requires adaptivity. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 31, 158–186. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.645>
- Bruning, P. F., & Campion, M. A. (2018). A role–resource approach–avoidance model of job crafting: A multimethod integration and extension of job crafting theory. *Academy of Management Journal*, 61(2), 499–522. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2015.0604>
- Burnes, B. (2015). Understanding resistance to change—building on coach and French. *Journal of Change Management*, 15(2), 92–116. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14697017.2014.969755>
- By, R. T., Hughes, M., & Ford, J. (2016). Change leadership: Oxymoron and myths. *Journal of Change Management*, 16(1), 8–17. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14697017.2016.1137425>
- By, R. T. (2020). Organizational change and leadership. *Journal of Change Management*, 20(1), 1–6. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14697017.2020.1716459>
- Carpenter, M. A., & Golden, B. R. (1997). Perceived managerial discretion: A study of cause and effect. *Strategic Management Journal*, 18(3), 187–206. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3088127>
- Carsten, M. K., & Uhl-Bien, M. (2012). Follower beliefs in the co-production of leadership: Examining upward communication and the moderating role of context. *Zeitschrift für Psychologie*, 220(4), 210–220. <https://doi.org/10.1027/2151-2604/a000115>
- Cinite, I., Duxbury, L. E., & Higgins, C. (2009). Measurement of perceived organizational readiness for change in the public sector. *British Journal of Management*, 20(2), 265–277. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8551.2008.00582.x>
- Crawford, E. R., Lepine, J. A., & Rich, B. L. (2010). Linking job demands and resources to memmployee engagement and burnout: A theoretical extension and meta-analytic test. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 95(5), 834–848. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0019364>
- Cunliffe, A. L. (2001.) Managers as practical authors: Reconstructing our understanding of management practice. *Journal of Management Studies*, 38(3), 351–371. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-6486.00240>
- Erden, Z., Schneider, A., & von Krogh, G. (2014). The multifaceted nature of social practices: A review of the perspectives on practice-based theory building about organizations. *European Management Journal*, 32. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.emj.2014.01.005>
- Espedal, B. (2015). Is managerial discretion good or bad for organizational adaptiveness? *Leadership*, 11(2), 142–157. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1742715013514879>

- Espedal, B. (2017). Understanding how balancing autonomy and power might occur in leading organizational change. *European Management Journal*, 35(2): 155–163. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.emj.2016.08.005>
- Espedal, B., & Kvitastein, O. A. (2012). Rom for læring: Betydningen av handlingsrom for ledelse. *Magma*, 8(12), 30–38. <http://hdl.handle.net/11250/282754>
- Filstad, C., Olsen, T. H., & Karp, T. (2020). Implementing public sector reform: Police managers' construction of manoeuvring space in a contradictory context. *European Management Journal*. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S026323732030150X?via%3Dihub>
- Filstad, C. (2022). *Police leadership as practice*. Routledge: Taylor & Francis
- Fyfe, N. R., Terpstra, J., & Tops, P. (2013). *Centralizing forces? Comparative Perspectives on Contemporary Police Reform in Northern and Western Europe*. Eleven International Publishing.
- Fyfe, N. R. (2019). The challenge of change: Exploring the dynamics of police reform in Scotland. *International Journal of Police Science & Management*, 2(4), 196–205. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461355719889463>
- Geilinger, N., Haefliger, S., von Krogh, G., & Rechsteiner, L. (2016). What makes a social practice? Being, knowing, doing and leading. *European Management Journal*, 34. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.emj.2016.04.006>
- Griffin, M. A., Neal, A., & Parker, S. K. (2007). A new model of work role performance: Positive behavior in uncertain and interdependent contexts. *Academy of Management Journal*, 50(2), 327–347. <https://doi.org/10.5465/AMJ.2007.24634438>
- Griffin, M. A., Parker, S. K., & Mason, C. M. (2010). Leader vision and the development of adaptive and proactive performance: A longitudinal study. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 95(1), 174–182. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0017263>
- Haake, U., Rantatalo, O., & Lindberg, O. (2015). Police leaders make poor change agents: Leadership practice in the face of a major organisational reform. *Policing and Society: An International Journal of Research and Policy*, 27(7), 764–778. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10439463.2015.1099653>
- Hambrick, D. C., & Finkelstein, S. (1987). Managerial discretion: A bridge between polar views of organizational outcomes. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 9, 369–406.
- Hornung, S., & Rousseau, D. M. (2007). Active on the job—proactive in change: How autonomy at work contributes to employee support for organizational change. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 43(4), 401–426. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0021886307307555>
- Karp, T. (2021). The coproduction of leadership: A processual perspective. In A. Overgaard Thomassen, & J. B. Jensen (Eds.), *Processual perspectives on the co-production turn in public sector organizations*. Hershey, PA: IGI Global, 80–99.
- Key, S. (2002). Perceived managerial discretion: An analysis of individual ethical intentions. *Journal of Managerial Issues*, 14(2), 218–233. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40604385>
- Leana, C., Appelbaum, E., & Shevchuk, I. (2009). Work processes and quality of care in early childhood education: The role of job crafting. *Academy of Management Journal*, 52(6), 1169–1192. <https://doi.org/10.5465/AMJ.2009.47084651>
- LePine, J. A., Podsakoff, N. P., & LePine, M. A. (2005). A meta-analytic test of the challenge stressor-hindrance stressor framework: An explanation for inconsistent relationships among stressors and performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 48(5), 764–775. <https://doi.org/10.5465/AMJ.2005.18803921>
- McNeish, D., Stapleton, L. M., & Silverman, R. D. (2017). On the unnecessary ubiquity of hierarchical linear modeling. *Psychological Methods*, 22(1), 114. <https://doi.org/10.1037/met0000078>
- Morgeson, F. P., & Humphrey, S. E. (2006). The work design questionnaire (WDQ): Developing and validating a comprehensive measure for assessing job design and the nature of work. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91, 1321–1339. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.91.6.1321>

- Morrison, E. W., & Phelps, C. C. (1999). Taking charge at work: Extrarole efforts to initiate workplace change. *Academy of Management Journal*, 42, 403–419.
- Ospina, S., & Sorenson, G. L. J. (2006). A constructionist lens on leadership: Charting new territory. In G. R. Goethals, & L. J. Sorensen (Eds.), *The quest for a general theory of leadership* (pp. 188–204). Edward Elgar Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.4337/9781847202932.00015>
- Parker, S. K. W., Helen, M., & Turner, N. (2006). Modeling the antecedents of proactive behavior at work. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91(3), 636–652. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.91.3.636>
- Pedhazur, E. J., & Schmelkin, L. P. (1991). *Measurement, design, and analysis: An integrated approach*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Petrou, P., Demerouti, E., Peeters, M. C. W., Schaufeli, W. B., & Heland, J. (2012). Crafting a job on a daily basis: Contextual correlates and the link to work engagement. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 33, 1120–1141. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.1783>
- Petrou, P., Demerouti, E., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2018). Crafting the change: The role of employee job crafting behaviors for successful organizational change. *Journal of Management*, 44(5), 1766–1792. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206315624961>
- Podsakoff, N. P., LePine, J. A., & LePine, M. A. (2007). Differential challenge stressor hindrance stressor relationships with job attitudes, turnover intentions, turnover, and withdrawal behavior: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(2), 438–454. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.92.2.438>
- Rafferty, A. E., Jimmieson, N. L., & Armenarkis, A. A. (2013). Change readiness: A multilevel review. *Journal of Management*, 39(1), 110–135. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206312457417>
- Rizzo, J. R., House, R. J., & Lirzman, S. I. (1970). Role conflict and ambiguity in complex organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 15(2), 150–163. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/2391486>
- Rudolph, C. W., Katz, I. M., Lavigne, K. N., & Zacher, H. (2017). Job crafting: A meta-analysis of relationships with individual differences, job characteristics, and work outcomes. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 102, 112–138. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2017.05.008>
- Ryan, R. & Deci, E. (2000). Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being. *The American Psychologist*, 55, 68–78. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.55.1.68>
- Shadish, W. R., Cook, T. D., & Campbell, D. T. (2002). *Experimental and quasi-experimental designs for generalized causal inference*. Houghton-Mifflin.
- Shamir, B. (2007). From passive recipients to active co-producers: Followers' roles in the leadership process. In B. Shamir, R. Pillai, M. Bligh, & M. Uhl-Bien (Eds.), *Follower-centred perspectives on leadership* (pp. ix-xxxix). Information Age Publishing.
- Solberg, E., & Wong, S. I. (2016). Crafting one's job to take charge of role overload: When proactivity requires adaptivity across levels. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 27, 713–725. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2016.03.001>
- Stewart, R. (1989). Studies of managerial jobs and behavior: The ways forward. *Journal of Management Studies*, 26(1), 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6486.1989.tb00713.x>
- Stride, C. B., Gardner, S., Catley, N., & Thomas, F. (2015). Mplus code for mediation, moderation, and moderated mediation models. http://www.offbeat.group.shef.ac.uk/FIO/models_and_index.pdf
- Terpstra J, Fyfe NR, Salet R (2019) The Abstract Police: a conceptual exploration of unintended change of police organisations. *The Police Journal: Theory, practice and Principle*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0032258X18817999>
- Tims, M., Bakker, A. B., & Derks, D. (2012). Development and validation of the job crafting scale. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 80, 173–186. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2011.05.009>

- Tims, M., Derks, D., & Bakker, A. B. (2016). Job crafting and its relationships with person job fit and meaningfulness: A three-wave study. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 92, 44–53. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2015.11.007>
- Tracy, L., & Johnson, T. W. (1981). What do the role conflict and role ambiguity scales measure? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 66(4), 464–469. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.66.4.464>
- Uhl-Bien, M. (2006). Relational leadership theory exploring the social processes of leadership and organising. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 17(6), 654–676. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2006.10.007>
- Uhl-Bien, M. (2021). Complexity leadership and followership: Changed leadership in a changed world. *Journal of Change Management*, 2021(2), 144–162 <https://doi.org/10.1080/14697017.2021.1917490>
- Wangrow, D. B., Schepker, D. J., & Barker, V. L., III. (2015). Managerial discretion: An empirical review and focus on future research directions. *Journal of Management*, 41(1), 99–135. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206314554214>
- Weiner, Bryan, Amick, Halle, & Lee, Shoou-Yih. (2008). Conceptualization and measurement of organizational readiness for change: A review of the literature in health services research and other fields. *Medical Care Research and Review*, 65(4), 379–436. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077558708317802>
- Wrzesniewski, A., & Dutton, J. E. (2001). Crafting a job: Revisioning employees as active crafters of their work. *Academy of Management Review*, 26(2), 179–201. <https://doi.org/10.2307/259118>
- Zhang, F., & Parker, S. K. (2019). Reorienting job crafting research: A hierarchical structure of job crafting concepts and integrative review. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 40(2), 126–146. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2332>

Appendix

Reducing hindering job demands ^{a,b}

1. Made changes to make sure that my job is emotionally less intense.
2. Made changes to make sure that my job is mentally less intense.
3. Made changes to make sure that my job is physically less intense.

Increasing social resources ^{a,b}

1. Asked colleagues for advice on how to deal with challenges or problems at work.
2. Asked others for feedback on your job performance.
3. Taken initiative to contact other people from work in order to get information that is necessary for doing your work.

Increasing structural resources ^c

1. Developed your knowledge and skills in preparation for changing work tasks.
2. Sought out the training necessary to keep up to date with changing work responsibilities.
3. Learned new skills to help you adapt to changes in your work tasks.

Increasing challenging demands ^{a,b}

1. Offered yourself proactively as a coworker on new projects.
2. Taken initiative to start a new project at work.
3. Taken on extra work or responsibility, on your own initiative.

Taking charge of job demands ^c

1. Initiated better ways to do your work tasks.
2. Come up with ideas for how to improve the way your work tasks are done.
3. Made changes in the way your work tasks are done in order to do them more effectively.

^a. Tims et al. (2012)

^b. Petrou et al. (2012)

^c. Griffin et al. (2007)