

New Zealand Police Workplace Survey 2011

Summary of Findings: Auckland District

June 2011



Safer Communities Together Kaupapa whai Oranga mō te iti me te rahi



RESPONSE RATE

	Auckland District 2011	Auckland District 2010	NZ Police 2011 (Total Org)
Number of Responses	662	656	9503
Response Rate	75.2%	72.0%	79.2%

Note: For the tables below **Green font** indicates that the District's score is statistically higher than the average score for NZ Police on that survey section/question, and/or that a score has improved since the 2010 survey. **Red font** indicates the score is statistically lower, and/or has significantly declined since the 2010 survey. The scores in the tables, excluding the response rate, are weighted mean scores (unless otherwise stated). See the glossary on the last page of this report for definitions of all terms used.

OVERALL PERCEPTIONS OF THE AUCKLAND DISTRICT AS A PLACE TO WORK

Section	Auckland District 2011	Auckland District 2010	NZ Police 2011 (Total Org)
Performance Index (average of all questions in the survey)	64.1	63.7 (+0.4)	64.2 (-0.1)
1. Vision and Purpose + Communication and Cooperation	57.9	57.7 (+0.2)	59.2 (-1.3)
2. My Supervisor	74.6	74.2 (+0.4)	72.3 (+2.3)
3. My Work Group	75.8	74.5 (+1.3)	74.7 (+1.1)
4. My Job	61.1	60.8 (+0.3)	62.7 (-1.6)
5. Respect & Integrity in the Workplace	69.3	67.2 (+2.1)	68.1 (+1.2)
6. Learning and Development	60.6	61.4 (-0.8)	60.1 (+0.5)
7. Performance and Feedback	68.2	69.5 (-1.3)	66.7 (+1.5)
8. Recognition	51.6	51.8 (-0.2)	53.1 (-1.5)
9. Final Thoughts (Engagement)	69.9	68.8 (+1.1)	70.5 (-0.6)
10. The Survey - Your Views	41.8	40.6 (+1.2)	42.8 (-1.0)

HIGHEST RATED AREAS WITHIN THE AUCKLAND DISTRICT

Section	Auckland District 2011	Auckland District 2010	NZ Police 2011 (Total Org)
1.7: I intend to continue working at NZ Police for at least the next 12 months	86.8	87.7 (-0.9)	85.3 (+1.5)
3.2: I can rely on the support of others in my work group	80.2	78.8 (+1.4)	78.3 (+1.9)
3.1: Staff in my work group work well together	80.1	77.7 (+2.4)	77.5 (+2.6)
3.7: People in my workgroup conduct themselves in accordance with the values expected by NZ Police	79.3	76.5 (+2.8)	78.6 (+0.7)
2.4: My supervisor treats staff with respect	78.6	79.7 (-1.1)	77.1 (+1.5)
2.3: My supervisor behaves in a way that is consistent with the values of NZ Police	78.1	78.1 (0.0)	76.3 (+1.8)
2.6: I have confidence in my supervisor	76.9	78.1 (-1.2)	74.5 (+2.4)
2.5: My supervisor supports and encourages me in my job	76.8	76.8 (0.0)	74.7 (+2.1)
3.4: I have confidence in the ability of others in my work group	76.4	74.6 (+1.8)	75.5 (+0.9)
9.5: I feel a sense of commitment to NZ Police	75.7	74.5 (+1.2)	76.2 (-0.5)

LOWEST RATED AREAS WITHIN THE AUCKLAND DISTRICT

Section	Auckland District 2011	Auckland District 2010	NZ Police 2011 (Total Org)
10.2: Changes in response to the 2010 Workplace Survey have had a positive impact on my workgroup	40.7	40.9 (-0.2)	40.8 (-0.1)
8.5: People here are appointed to positions based on merit	41.9	42.5 (-0.6)	43.7 (-1.8)
10.1: I believe actions will be taken based on the results of this survey	43.1	40.4 (+2.7)	44.8 (-1.7)
1.10: NZ Police is interested in the views and opinions of its staff	43.4	41.6 (+1.8)	45.3 (-1.9)
4.9: The pay and benefits I receive are fair for the work I do	44.8	39.2 (+5.6)	50.8 (-6.0)
4.4: I have the tools and resources I need to do my job	47.7	47.5 (+0.2)	53.5 (-5.8)
1.4: NZ Police cares about the well-being of its staff	50.2	49.7 (+0.5)	51.9 (-1.7)
1.8: Communication in my District/Service Centre is open and honest	50.5	50.1 (+0.4)	52.0 (-1.5)
8.2: We celebrate success in NZ Police	51.2	50.3 (+0.9)	54.1 (-2.9)
1.11: Work groups in NZ Police work well together	51.6	51.2 (+0.4)	51.9 (-0.3)

SCORES ACROSS THE AUCKLAND DISTRICT

Section	Auckland City Dist	Auckland Central	Auckland CIB	Auckland DHQ	Auckland East	Auckland West
Performance Index	64.1	64.1	64.5	62.6	65.2	65.0
1. Vision and Purpose + Communication and Cooperation	57.9	58.6	55.5	56.8	58.4	58.4
2. My Supervisor	74.6	75.9	66.1	71.0	75.4	78.0
3. My Work Group	75.8	77.1	77.1	72.3	77.3	77.4
4. My Job	61.1	58.9	65.2	62.6	61.5	61.0
5. Respect & Integrity in the Workplace	69.3	70.0	71.0	67.5	67.8	72.4
6. Learning and Development	60.6	60.3	67.9	57.3	63.5	62.0
7. Performance and Feedback	68.2	69.5	66.7	65.7	69.6	68.5
8. Recognition	51.6	50.6	49.8	50.5	53.2	52.8
9. Final Thoughts (Engagement)	69.9	68.5	74.2	68.9	73.5	68.6
10. The Survey - Your Views	41.8	44.4	38.8	41.1	42.0	39.2

Weighted Mean Scores (%)

Note that for the table above, red scores indicate the lowest performing area within the District on the survey sections – and reflect potentially important intervention areas. Green coloured scores reflect possible 'best practice' areas in terms of the respective survey section.

HOW ENGAGED ARE STAFF WITHIN THE AUCKLAND DISTRICT?

Engagement Index (average of all six engagement questions)

Auckland District 2011	Auckland District 2010	NZ Police (Total Org)
69.9	68.8 (+1.1)	70.5 (-0.6)

Weighted Mean Score (%)

Engagement Profile

Engagement Group	Auckland District 2011	Auckland District 2010	NZ Police (Total Org)
Engaged	18.5	16.4 (+2.1)	21.3 (-2.8)
Ambivalent	64.4	66.8 (-2.4)	63.2 (+1.2)
Disengaged	17.1	16.8 (+0.3)	15.5 (+1.6)

Proportion of Employees (%)

RESPECT AND INTEGRITY WITHIN THE AUCKLAND DISTRICT?

Question	Auckland District	NZ Police (Total Org)
5.1: Staff in my workgroup respect employee diversity	79.2	75.9 (+3.3)
5.2: I know who to contact to report instances of workplace harassment, bullying or discrimination	75.0	77.6 (-2.6)
5.3: I am confident that I could raise concerns I had related to workplace harassment, bullying or discrimination without fear of reprisal	66.9	64.7 (+2.2)
5.4: I am confident that I could raise concerns I had about other inappropriate conduct in the workplace without fear of reprisal (inappropriate conduct may include any actions or behaviours that make you feel uncomfortable in the workplace)	63.4	62.4 (+1.0)
5.5: I am confident that any concerns I may need to raise regarding harassment, bullying, discrimination or other inappropriate conduct would be dealt with appropriately	63.2	57.8 (+5.4)

Level of Agreement (%)

5.6: If you have witnessed or experienced some form of harassment, discrimination or bullying in the workplace in the last 12 months, do you believe it has been dealt with effectively?

	Auckland District	NZ Police (Total Org)
Not Applicable	85.2	82.1 (+3.1)
Yes	4.5	4.6 (-0.1)
No	10.3	13.3 (-3.0)

WHAT DRIVES EMPLOYEE ENGAGEMENT WITHIN THE AUCKLAND DISTRICT?

	Rank from 2010	Key Driver Questions	Auckland District 2011	Auckland District 2010	NZ Police (Total Org)
	1	1.3: NZ Police is an enjoyable place to work	67.8	67.9 (-0.1)	68.3 (-0.5)
	N/A	4.3: My job gives me a sense of personal achievement	75.0	74.0 (+1.0)	76.1 (-1.1)
	3	1.6: I feel a sense of belonging to my District/Service Centre	60.0	60.1 (-0.1)	61.7 (-1.7)
	7	7.1: NZ Police expects high standards of performance from its people	75.2	76.8 (-1.6)	77.0 (-1.8)
	N/A	7.3: Poor performance is dealt with effectively in my work group	60.6	60.9 (-0.3)	56.5 (+4.1)
	N/A	6.2: The work I do makes good use of my knowledge and skills	69.0	67.7 (+1.3)	68.9 (+0.1)
	2	1.2: I feel I am working for an effective organisation	56.4	57.0 (-0.6)	59.7 (-3.3)
	7	6.1: NZ Police provides adequate training for the work I do	56.0	54.5 (+1.5)	54.8 (+1.2)
	9	6.5: There are career and personal development opportunities for me in NZ Police	62.5	65.5 (-3.0)	61.1 (+1.4)
	N/A	7.2: People are held accountable for their performance in my work group	68.5	71.1 (-2.6)	66.4 (+2.1)

Weighted Mean Score (%)

Note: The table above shows the results of a statistical analysis identifying those things assessed in the survey that are the most engaging to staff members within the District. These key drivers are rank ordered. The colour coding for each question reveals if a particular key driver is scoring higher (green), lower (red), or the same (orange) as NZ Police overall. Red key drivers are important to your employees' engagement levels but score poorly compared to the rest of the organisation and hence represents a particularly useful leverage point when attempting to further engage employees. The rank of key drivers that were identified in 2010 is shown in the column headed "Rank from 2010".

ANATOMY OF A GREAT WORKPLACE™

Over a decade of research by JRA on what makes a great workplace in New Zealand reveals there are four common characteristics – Vision & Values, a strong sense of Community, a focus on employee Development, and a strong Performance Culture. The table below illustrates where the District's engagement drivers tend to fall and whether there is a specific pillar or more that should be targeted when looking for change targets.

	Vision and Values	Community	Development	Performance Culture
Organisation level		1.3: NZ Police is an enjoyable place to work	6.5: There are career and personal development opportunities for me in NZ Police	7.1: NZ Police expects high standards of performance from its people 1.2: I feel I am working for an effective organisation
Team level				7.3: Poor performance is dealt with effectively in my work group 7.2: People are held accountable for their performance in my work group
Individual level		1.6: I feel a sense of belonging to my District/Service Centre	6.2: The work I do makes good use of my knowledge and skills 4.3: My job gives me a sense of personal achievement 6.1: NZ Police provides adequate training for the work I do	

PRIORITY AREAS – KEY DRIVER SCORES ACROSS KEY DEMOGRAPHIC GROUPS

Reading across the table, red scores indicate the lowest performing area within the District on the key drivers of employee engagement – and reflect potentially important intervention areas. Green coloured scores reflect possible 'best practice' areas in terms of the respective key driver.

Question	Auckland Central	Auckland CIB	Auckland DHQ	Auckland East	Auckland West	Auckland City Dist	Total Organisation
1.3: NZ Police is an enjoyable place to work	66.7	70.0	66.4	71.1	67.4	67.8	68.3
4.3: My job gives me a sense of personal achievement	73.0	82.5	75.8	76.5	74.6	75.0	76.1
1.6: I feel a sense of belonging to my District/Service Centre	59.4	47.5	58.2	62.2	61.9	60.0	61.7
7.1: NZ Police expects high standards of performance from its people	75.3	80.0	73.8	77.6	74.0	75.2	77.0
7.3: Poor performance is dealt with effectively in my work group	62.2	55.0	57.9	61.0	62.5	60.6	56.5
6.2: The work I do makes good use of my knowledge and skills	68.4	80.0	67.7	71.9	67.6	69.0	68.9
1.2: I feel I am working for an effective organisation	52.9	55.0	57.7	58.1	57.8	56.4	59.7
6.1: NZ Police provides adequate training for the work I do	54.4	70.0	55.8	54.8	59.0	56.0	54.8
6.5: There are career and personal development opportunities for me in NZ Police	61.3	70.0	54.6	71.2	65.2	62.5	61.1
7.2: People are held accountable for their performance in my work group	70.5	65.0	65.3	70.0	68.8	68.5	66.4

Weighted Mean Score (%)

SUMMARY AND KEY OBSERVATIONS – AUCKLAND DISTRICT

The following summary provides insight into how employees perceive the District as a place to work and how it fares to the rest of NZ Police. Engagement levels within the District are examined, along with the results of a statistical analysis looking for the key drivers of engagement. A cursory examination of employee comments is also provided. The section concludes with an overall summary that highlights the key issues within the District that would likely provide it with the greatest improvement leverage when attempting to make the District a truly great – and engaging – place to work.

Response Rate

Building on last year's response rate the 2011 staff survey for the Auckland District finished with a total of 662 people participating in the survey. This represents 75.2% of all those invited in the district and is up on 72.0% from 2010. A high response rate like this again ensures that the results presented in this report provide an accurate indication of employee attitude and opinion towards the District.

How Employees Perceive the Auckland District as a Place to Work

The 2011 results indicate that staff in the Auckland District tend to feel about their District much as they did in 2010. This District's 'Performance Index', for example (the average score across all questions across all employees) in 2011 is statistically equivalent to its Performance Index in 2010 (64.1% and 63.7%, respectively). That is not to say, however, that there have not been improvements in some areas within the District. For example, perceptions have improved significantly across the Division in terms of work group members working well together, work group members behaving in accordance with the values expected by NZ Police, and pay and benefits in particular (although the latter is still low scoring in general). At the survey section level, significant change has also occurred for 'Respect and Integrity in the Workplace', up from 67.2% in 2010 to 69.3% in 2011.

When the District's results are compared to NZ Police overall we see that 'My Supervisor' and 'Performance and Feedback' are significantly higher for the District, while 'My Job' and 'Recognition' are the two sections that the District is significantly lower in.

On examination of the District's highest rated questions we see intention to stay at NZ Police remains the top ranked question for the District at 87.7%, which is still significantly higher than the overall NZ Police result of 85.3%. Of particular interest for the District is that 8 out of 10 highest rated questions come from the sections 'My Supervisor' and 'My Work Group'. And compared with NZ Police overall, a clear majority of questions were rated significantly higher by District staff.

Looking at the lowest ranked questions for the District we see that four of the lowest ranked questions come from the 'Vision and Purpose + Communication and Cooperation'. Also of note, the lowest ranked question overall was 'Changes in response to the 2010 Workplace Survey have had a positive impact on my workplace', indicating that the District will need to focus this year on ensuring results this year are used effectively to implement improvements in the workplace. Whilst there have been a few significant improvements from the District's 2010 results, this year's scores show that most of the District's lowest rated questions are significantly below those of NZ Police overall.

Results across the District are interesting in that there is some significant variation in how employees across the District perceive their respective workplaces. Auckland West and Auckland East generally outperform other areas across most survey sections, while Auckland DHQ scores lower across most items. Auckland Central and Auckland CIB are a mixed bag with some sections scoring higher and other sections scoring lower than the District.

Respect and Integrity within the Auckland District

The Auckland District results are better than the overall NZ Police result across most 'Respect and Integrity in the Workplace' survey items. In the Auckland District, 4 out of 5 respondents agree that 'Staff in my workgroup respect employee diversity', which is significantly higher than NZ Police overall. Three quarters agree they know who to contact to report instances of workplace harassment, bullying or discrimination. Confidence in the District that people can raise issues in confidence without fear of reprisal, or that appropriate actions will be taken in response are higher than NZ Police overall. Although, knowing who to contact to report incidents is lower than the rest of NZ Police. For those people who had witnessed or experienced some form of harassment, discrimination or bullying in the workplace, they perceived the handling of those incidents to be better than NZ Police overall with less people thinking that issues were not handled effectively.

Employee Engagement within the Auckland District

Employee engagement levels for the District have increased this year with 18.5% of the District ticking agree and strongly agree to the six engagement questions, up from 16.4% in 2010. Whilst a significant and positive increase, this result is still significantly below NZ Police overall of 21.3%. The proportion of 'disengaged' staff is 17.1% which is also significantly above the overall NZ Police figure of 15.5%. Below we provide the results of an analysis that identifies the issues that engage the District's employees the most – information which serves as a targeted means for increasing current engagement levels.

Key Drivers of Employee Engagement – Leverage Points for Performance Improvement

Key driver analysis identifies via statistical analysis those survey items that have the greatest impact on employee engagement, while at the same time determining how NZ Police is performing against those same items.

Ten survey items have been identified as being key drivers of engagement for staff in the District. As in 2010, having 'an enjoyable place to work' is the most important item to staff. In total 6 of this year's key drivers were determined to be just as important to staff back in 2010.

In 2011 a 'Performance Culture' is very important to people in the District, with 4 of the key drivers falling into this 'Anatomy of a Great Workplace' category. The District performs well against 2 of these; 'Poor performance is dealt with effectively in my work group' and 'People are held accountable for their performance in my work group'. In contrast, the District is performing poorly against the remaining 'Performance Culture' items, including 'NZ Police expects high standards of performance from its people' and 'I feel I am working for an effective organisation, both of which are below NZ Police scores overall by - 1.8% and -3.3%, respectively.

All other key drivers fall into the categories of 'training and development' and a 'sense of community', with the District performing about the same as NZ Police overall on these items. These represent significant areas of opportunity. For example at the Individual level 'The work I do makes good use of my knowledge and skills', 'My job gives me a sense of personal achievement' and 'NZ Police provides adequate training for the work I do' are all developmental areas that Auckland CIB performs particularly well in, and may have initiatives and best practices in place may be of assistance to other Auckland areas.

Employee Comments

Similar to the 2010 survey comments, many staff make specific reference to the people that they work with. Comments such as camaraderie, team work, colleagues, the people and the work they for the public are frequently made as things that make working for NZ Police great. Many people take real pride in the work that they do for NZ Police.

Among the things that that people felt NZ Police could do better included more frontline staffing, and paying more attention to the opinions of those who are 'policing' on the front line - *'Make the senior management, seniors and above and decision makers more in touch with the guys and girls on the ground'*. More resources are mentioned in general, with references to equipment and policing tools, and some perceptions come through that there are too many high level or irrelevant jobs in NZ Police at the expense of frontline officers.

Note that this is a cursory analysis and it is recommended that you read respondent comments in detail.

Summary

As with last year there is an obvious sense of camaraderie within the Auckland District with the mention of the people they work with highly prevalent. As with NZ Police overall a great number of staff take great pride in serving their communities and doing it with good people in their work groups. Key Driver analysis shows that having a high 'Performance Culture' is important to staff, and while the District is doing well in some of these areas, opportunities do exist to strengthen this further. To help in this regard, the District can look to:

- Inspire and instil the high standards of performance expected by NZ Police of its people
- Emphasise the good things that NZ Police is achieving in the community, highlighting the effectiveness of good policing and showing how staff are making a real difference to the people of Auckland

Within the District the Auckland East and Auckland West Areas stand out as possible best practice groups across many survey sections, and some information sharing on past survey initiatives may be of assistance

to other areas. Auckland DHQ for example is an area that scores relatively low for the District, while Auckland Central and Auckland CIB perform above and below the District on different survey sections.

Where to Next?

The key to driving any change or improvement effort is in following a suitable **action plan**. An action planning template is provided over the page and allows you to detail the key issues to be addressed (focus areas), along with specific actions to occur, expected benefits, accountabilities, timeframes and progress reporting. Districts that adopt a standard action planning approach, provide support to those involved, and review the quality of planning output are those far more likely to see greater improvement in their subsequent survey results.

The following are some of the strategies we suggest need to be kept in mind when using survey results to drive change. Whilst there can never be one 'best' approach to the post-survey process that will suit all organisations, there are nevertheless a range of strategies that experience has shown leads to the greatest likelihood of performance improvement.

Focus on a limited number of key issues. Look for themes that emerge from your set of key drivers, paying particular attention to your 'red zone' key drivers. Try to distil these themes down to two or three major goals (80/20 principle).

Communication is vital. Do your best to keep everyone fully informed at all stages of the process, from results reporting to issue prioritisation to progress reports. Communicate survey results quickly (staff know you have them). Communicate senior management's initial response and the process to be followed. People want to know what is going to happen, how they will be involved. Have members of the management team present the results to their teams, while encouraging feedback and contribution. Consider using facilitators to assist in the process, and don't overlook the contribution supervisors may make (employees often prefer to receive organisational information directly from their supervisors rather than via emails or newsletters).

Act quickly. Make sure you act on your survey results within three months of survey results being reported. Survey momentum can be short lived and employees will quickly begin to question the relevancy of interventions that come too long after the survey has been completed. Look for the obvious "low-hanging fruit" or "easy fixes," and target them early on. Don't waste time on things you can't change – focus on things you CAN change. More complex issues can be addressed progressively during the year.

Measure your progress. Often desired improvement goals are not met because the survey is regarded as a one-off event, rather than an essential business process and KPI. Sustaining performance improvement requires not only the formulation of relevant and realistic action plans, but also regular monitoring of the impact of those initiatives. On-going measurement not only provides essential feedback on what's working and what's not, it also creates a 'virtuous cycle' where improvement becomes a reinforcing thing. Measurement is also a critical to ensure those responsible for change are held accountable. And there must be consequences – consequences for no change, and consequences for positive change.

Recognise and celebrate success. Often one of the most overlooked aspects of the survey process! And one of the most important. Obviously 'red zone' drivers need urgent attention, but don't overlook those 'green zone' drivers where your above-benchmark performance is something to celebrate (and maintain). One of the features of truly great workplaces is the emphasis they place on celebrating success. And success is all around you – celebrate, and see the difference it makes!

Reinforce the survey follow-up process. Once your post-survey initiatives start to happen, make sure you take every opportunity to communicate and update staff on progress regularly. Too often organisations introduce excellent initiatives post-survey, but forget to tell anyone! Consider a quarterly update, or a section in your staff newsletter where you recap on the goals that were set and provide updates on progress to-date. This, more than anything, will reinforce to staff the value of the survey – the organisation was interested in my views, they have listened, and now they're doing something about them.

TOTAL ORGANISATION RESULTS

RESPONSE RATE

	NZ Police 2011 (Total Org)	NZ Police 2010 (Total Org)
Number of Responses	9503	9280
Response Rate	79.2%	77.1%

OVERALL PERCEPTIONS OF THE NZ POLICE AS A PLACE TO WORK

Section	NZ Police 2011	NZ Police 2010
Performance Index	64.2	63.1 (+1.1)
1. Vision and Purpose + Communication and Cooperation	59.2	57.1 (+2.1)
2. My Supervisor	72.3	71.3 (+1.0)
3. My Work Group	74.7	74.3 (+0.4)
4. My Job	62.7	61.9 (+0.8)
5. Respect & Integrity in the Workplace	68.1	66.8 (+1.3)
6. Learning and Development	60.1	60.2 (-0.1)
7. Performance and Feedback	66.7	67.6 (-0.9)
8. Recognition	53.1	51.6 (+1.5)
9. Final Thoughts	70.5	68.6 (+1.9)
10. The Survey - Your Views	42.8	40.2 (+2.6)

Weighted Mean Score (%)

ENGAGEMENT PROFILE

Engagement Group	NZ Police 2011	NZ Police 2010
Engaged	21.3	17.8 (+3.5)
Ambivalent	63.2	64.4 (-1.2)
Disengaged	15.5	17.8 (-2.3)

Proportion of Employees (%)

Workplace Survey

Action Plan Template

Item #	Focus Area (e.g recognition communication, performance,)	Action Agreed	Progress/completion measured by?	Timeframe for agreed actions	Person Responsible	Outcomes/ Benefits Expected	Relate to existing initiatives? Yes/No	How progress will be communicated to staff

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

GLOSSARY

Anatomy of a Great Workplace: Research carried out by JRA over many years into the nature of great workplaces has revealed that best-practice organisations all share four common characteristics. We call these the 'four pillars' of JRA's Anatomy of a Great Workplace™. The four pillars are enduring organisational qualities that are the product of a variety of practices, each of which has been crafted by local leadership according to their organisation's unique circumstances. This model serves as a useful diagnostic and planning tool. In the Anatomy table, each of the key drivers of employee engagement within a particular demographic variable has been shown assigned to its applicable 'Pillar'. Additionally, each key driver has been positioned to indicate whether action should be focused at the individual, team, or organisation level. By examining the concentration of key drivers in each Pillar it is possible to gain further insight into areas where intervention strategies are most likely to deliver significant performance gains.

Employee Engagement: is a multi-dimensional concept that describes the extent to which employees mentally, emotionally and physically apply themselves at work. Engagement is measured by six questions in the survey and includes job satisfaction, organisational commitment, willingness to recommend the organisation as a great place to work, discretionary effort, taking an active interest in the organisation, and general effort.

Engagement Index: The average score across the six engagement questions, across all employees.

Engagement Profile: Employees are categorised as either engaged, ambivalent or disengaged according to their Engagement Index. Employees who score above 87.5% (weighted mean score) are classified as engaged given they respond very positively to most of the engagement questions. Employees above 50% but below 87.5% are classified as ambivalent given they respond with mostly 'neutral' or 'agree' questions (i.e., not *strong* responses to the engagement questions). Disengaged employees are those that score below 50%. These employees are not sufficiently motivated by the organisation to provide an agree to strongly agree response to any of the engagement questions.

Key Driver Analysis: is a statistical technique (multiple regression) that helps in the interpretation of survey data and enables an organisation to put together actionable responses to survey results. It is essentially a tool that allows us to identify what specific dimensions of organisational climate (assessed in a survey) have the greatest impact on engagement levels. By knowing this, managers can prioritise improvement opportunities and prepare a focused number of strategies that will maximise future employee engagement.

'Statistical Significance' versus 'Significance of the Result': A 'statistically significant' result indicates that there is a difference in scores between two groups of respondents. So if your District's weighted mean score was 72% on a particular question and the NZ Police average was 76%, then this is likely to be a large enough difference to reflect a true divergence in employee opinion across the two groups (not just 'random variation in scores'). One group sees things more positively than the other group, so much so that the difference would be identified as 'statistically significant' via statistical analysis. But it is important to recognise that statistical analysis is impacted by the size of the survey sample. Very large survey samples means there is sufficient 'statistical power' to detect even very small differences in scores. For example, if your survey sample had more than 800 respondents, then a difference of just 1% would be found to be 'statistically significant'. But clearly a difference of 1% is not particularly meaningful. In fact, it is probably too small to warrant any great change effort - regardless of whether it was identified as 'statistically significant'. As such, when viewing results online and thinking of 'what's important here', think of those things that represent *substantive* differences. That would likely be differences of around 3.5% or more for smaller groups (100 – 150 employees), and 2% or more for larger groups (above 450 employees).

The Questionnaire: The 2011 New Zealand Police Workplace Survey contained 67 statements designed to measure a workplace on a range of issues in the organisation. Respondents were asked to indicate how much they agreed or disagreed with each statement using a five point rating system. This rating system ranged from Strongly Disagree to Strongly Agree. Questions were separated into 11 sections according to statements that naturally cluster together and measure similar issues.

Weighted Mean Score: The survey scores reported herein are known as 'weighted mean scores'. They range between 0% and 100% and represent a 'strength of agreement' score. The weighted mean score is calculated by first converting each response option into a weighting (strongly agree = 100%, agree = 75%, neutral = 50%, disagree = 25%, and strongly disagree = 0%). All weighted responses are added together, and then divided by the total number of valid respondents (i.e., excluding all 'do not know' responses). A perfect score of 100% is achieved if respondents strongly agree with the statement, while 0% is scored if respondents strongly disagree. A score of around 75% is often desirable given that means most people have responded to a question with an 'agree'. But questions do vary and comparisons to your organisation's norms (the typical score) should be made.