New Zealand Police
Workplace Survey 2011
Summary of Findings:
Canterbury District

June 2011

JRA
surveys · analysis · insight
a Kenexa company

NEW ZEALAND
POLICE
Nga Pirihimana O Aotearoa

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

RESPONSE RATE

	Canterbury 2011	Canterbury 2010	NZ Police 2011 (Total Org)
Number of Responses	808	786	9503
Response Rate	77.9%	77.1%	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 CANTERBURY DISTRICT AS A PLACE TO WORK

Section	Canterbury 2011	Canterbury 2010	NZ Police 2011 (Total Org)
Performance Index (average of all questions in the survey)	65.7	60.0 (+5.7)	64.2 (+1.5)
1. Vision and Purpose + Communication and Cooperation	60.6	51.5 (+9.1)	59.2 (+1.4)
2. My Supervisor	75.6	71.2 (+4.4)	72.3 (+3.3)
3. My Work Group	78.3	75.0 (+3.3)	74.7 (+3.6)
4. My Job	63.0	57.9 (+5.1)	62.7 (+0.3)
5. Respect & Integrity in the Workplace	69.7	65.7 (+4.0)	68.1 (+1.6)
6. Learning and Development	61.8	57.5 (+4.3)	60.1 (+1.7)
7. Performance and Feedback	67.9	66.6 (+1.3)	66.7 (+1.2)
8. Recognition	54.0	46.7 (+7.3)	53.1 (+0.9)
9. Final Thoughts (Engagement)	70.9	63.6 (+7.3)	70.5 (+0.4)
10. The Survey - Your Views	40.9	32.4 (+8.5)	42.8 (-1.9)

HIGHEST RATED AREAS WITHIN THE CANTERBURY DISTRICT

Section	Canterbury 2011	Canterbury 2010	NZ Police 2011 (Total Org)
1.7: I intend to continue working at NZ Police for at least the next 12 months	87.8	86.0 (+1.8)	85.3 (+2.5)
3.7: People in my workgroup conduct themselves in accordance with the values expected by NZ Police	81.7	76.5 (+5.2)	78.6 (+3.1)
3.2: I can rely on the support of others in my work group	81.3	79.7 (+1.6)	78.3 (+3.0)
3.1: Staff in my work group work well together	81.2	79.0 (+2.2)	77.5 (+3.7)
2.4: My supervisor treats staff with respect	80.4	77.0 (+3.4)	77.1 (+3.3)
2.3: My supervisor behaves in a way that is consistent with the values of NZ Police	78.8	75.3 (+3.5)	76.3 (+2.5)
3.4: I have confidence in the ability of others in my work group	78.8	77.5 (+1.3)	75.5 (+3.3)
2.6: I have confidence in my supervisor	78.7	74.9 (+3.8)	74.5 (+4.2)
2.5: My supervisor supports and encourages me in my job	78.3	74.0 (+4.3)	74.7 (+3.6)
3.5: I feel part of an effective work group	77.6	73.2 (+4.4)	74.3 (+3.3)

LOWEST RATED AREAS WITHIN THE CANTERBURY DISTRICT

Section	Canterbury 2011	Canterbury 2010	NZ Police 2011 (Total Org)
10.2: Changes in response to the 2010 Workplace Survey have had a positive impact on my workgroup	39.0	32.9 (+6.1)	40.8 (-1.8)
10.1: I believe actions will be taken based on the results of this survey	43.0	31.9 (+11.1)	44.8 (-1.8)
8.5: People here are appointed to positions based on merit	45.1	40.5 (+4.6)	43.7 (+1.4)
1.10: NZ Police is interested in the views and opinions of its staff	46.9	36.2 (+10.7)	45.3 (+1.6)
4.4: I have the tools and resources I need to do my job	47.1	39.1 (+8.0)	53.5 (-6.4)
4.9: The pay and benefits I receive are fair for the work I do	51.1	41.8 (+9.3)	50.8 (-0.3)
8.3: NZ Police has appropriate ways of recognising outstanding achievement	52.2	44.7 (+7.5)	52.9 (+0.7)
4.6: I am satisfied with my physical work environment	53.3	51.0 (+2.3)	59.7 (-6.4)
1.11: Work groups in NZ Police work well together	53.5	47.1 (+6.4)	51.9 (+1.6)
6.1: NZ Police provides adequate training for the work I do	54.8	46.5 (+8.3)	54.8 (0.0)

JRA
surveys \ analysis \ insight
a **kenexa** company

An Analysis of Employee Engagement – Canterbury District
June, 2011
© JRA

2

SCORES ACROSS THE CANTERBURY DISTRICT

Section	Canterbury District	Canterbury DHQ Area	Central Area Canterbury	Mid/South Area Canterbury	Northern Area Canterbury	Southern Area Canterbury
Performance Index	65.7	63.4	66.1	62.4	66.2	72.6
1. Vision and Purpose + Communication and Cooperation	60.6	58.1	60.1	57.0	61.4	68.8
2. My Supervisor	75.6	72.1	78.3	74.0	77.3	79.9
3. My Work Group	78.3	74.6	80.9	75.6	79.0	85.3
4. My Job	63.0	62.7	60.3	59.9	62.2	70.3
5. Respect & Integrity in the Workplace	69.7	66.8	72.3	65.9	71.1	74.8
6. Learning and Development	61.8	59.5	62.2	56.6	61.7	71.3
7. Performance and Feedback	67.9	63.8	72.1	64.9	69.9	73.0
8. Recognition	54.0	52.2	52.9	49.2	54.0	63.3
9. Final Thoughts (Engagement)	70.9	68.8	71.9	68.5	72.1	75.1
10. The Survey - Your Views	40.9	38.5	39.5	34.9	42.0	52.0

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 CANTERBURY DISTRICT?

Engagement Index (average of all six engagement questions)

Canterbury 2011	Canterbury 2010	NZ Police (Total Org)
70.9	63.6 (+7.3)	70.5 (+0.4)

Weighted Mean Score (%)

Engagement Profile

Engagement Group	Canterbury 2011	Canterbury 2010	NZ Police (Total Org)
Engaged	20.5	12.1 (+8.4)	21.3 (-0.8)
Ambivalent	65.3	62.8 (+2.5)	63.2 (+2.1)
Disengaged	14.2	25.1 (-10.9)	15.5 (-1.3)

Proportion of Employees (%)

RESPECT AND INTEGRITY WITHIN THE CANTERBURY DISTRICT?

Question	Canterbury	NZ Police (Total Org)
5.1: Staff in my workgroup respect employee diversity	78.1	75.9 (+2.2)
5.2: I know who to contact to report instances of workplace harassment, bullying or discrimination	79.3	77.6 (+1.7)
5.3: I am confident that I could raise concerns I had related to workplace harassment, bullying or discrimination without fear of reprisal	68.2	64.7 (+3.5)
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)	64.8	63.4 (+1.4)
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	61.0	57.8 (+3.2)

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?

	Canterbury District	NZ Police (Total Org)
Not Applicable	86.3	82.1 (+4.2)
Yes	5.1	4.6 (+5.1)
No	8.7	13.3 (+8.7)

WHAT DRIVES EMPLOYEE ENGAGEMENT WITHIN THE CANTERBURY DISTRICT?

	Rank from 2010	Key Driver Questions	Canterbury 2011	Canterbury 2010	NZ Police (Total Org)
	1	1.3: NZ Police is an enjoyable place to work	70.8	61.2 (+9.6)	68.3 (+2.5)
	6	4.3: My job gives me a sense of personal achievement	77.0	72.5 (+4.5)	76.1 (+0.9)
	2	1.6: I feel a sense of belonging to my District/Service Centre	64.2	55.9 (+8.3)	61.7 (+2.5)
	4	1.2: I feel I am working for an effective organisation	57.8	47.3 (+10.5)	59.7 (-1.9)
	N/A	4.7: The level of work-related stress I experience in my job is acceptable	60.6	49.6 (+11.0)	58.3 (+2.3)
	N/A	4.11: My performance is fairly assessed	62.4	63.7 (-1.3)	60.3 (+2.1)
	N/A	7.1: NZ Police expects high standards of performance from its people	76.3	75.7 (+0.6)	77.0 (-0.7)
	N/A	1.10: NZ Police is interested in the views and opinions of its staff	46.9	36.2 (+10.7)	45.3 (+1.6)
	N/A	7.3: Poor performance is dealt with effectively in my work group	59.4	57.2 (+2.2)	56.5 (+2.9)
	9	6.5: There are career and personal development opportunities for me in NZ Police	64.6	60.7 (+3.9)	61.1 (+3.5)

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	1.10: NZ Police is interested in the views and opinions of its staff	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
Individual level		1.6: I feel a sense of belonging to my District/Service Centre	4.3: My job gives me a sense of personal achievement	4.11: My performance is fairly assessed 4.7: The level of work-related stress I experience in my job is acceptable

JRA
surveys ∖ analysis ∖ insight
a kenexa company

An Analysis of Employee Engagement – Canterbury District
June, 2011
© JRA

4

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	Canterbury DHQ Area	Central Area Canterbury	Mid/South Area Canterbury	Northern Area Canterbury	Southern Area Canterbury	Canterbury District	Total Organisation
1.3: NZ Police is an enjoyable place to work	68.0	72.6	67.2	71.5	77.3	70.8	68.3
4.3: My job gives me a sense of personal achievement	75.1	77.8	74.5	78.1	81.2	77.0	76.1
1.6: I feel a sense of belonging to my District/Service Centre	60.8	65.9	58.1	66.7	72.3	64.2	61.7
1.2: I feel I am working for an effective organisation	56.2	56.3	55.9	58.1	64.5	57.8	59.7
4.7: The level of work-related stress I experience in my job is acceptable	60.7	56.5	58.6	59.7	67.4	60.6	58.3
4.11: My performance is fairly assessed	62.0	62.9	59.3	60.8	67.8	62.4	60.3
7.1: NZ Police expects high standards of performance from its people	73.9	78.4	76.2	76.9	78.9	76.3	77.0
1.10: NZ Police is interested in the views and opinions of its staff	45.9	45.0	42.9	45.6	56.4	46.9	45.3
7.3: Poor performance is dealt with effectively in my work group	54.1	64.1	54.7	62.6	66.3	59.4	56.5
6.5: There are career and personal development opportunities for me in NZ Police	59.6	65.9	59.0	67.5	75.4	64.6	61.1

Weighted Mean Score (%)

An Analysis of Employee Engagement – Canterbury District
June, 2011
© JRA

JRA
surveys \ analysis \ insight
a **kenexa** company

5

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 excellent response rate the 2011 staff survey for the Canterbury District finished with a total of 808 people participating in the survey. This represents 77.9% of all those invited in the district and is up on 77.1% 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 Canterbury District as a Place to Work

The 2011 results indicate that staff in the Canterbury District have a much more positive perception of the District as a place to work, compared to that of NZ Police overall. This is a turnaround from 2010 when perceptions of the Canterbury District were much lower. This year the District's 'Performance Index' – the average score across all questions across all employees – is 65.7% (up from 60.0%), while for NZ Police the overall Performance Index is 64.2% (63.1% in 2010). These differences are all statistically significant.

All section scores improved significantly since the 2010 survey. The sections with most improvement include 'Vision and Purpose + Communication and Cooperation'; 'My Job'; 'Recognition'; 'Final Thoughts (Engagement)' and 'The Survey – Your Views', all of which had increases on last year of over 5%. The only section of the survey that the District had a score that was less than the overall NZ Police result was in 'The Survey – Your Views'. At 40.9% it is behind the NZ Police result of 42.8%. It must be noted however that the District result of 40.9% is a big improvement on the previous year of 32.4%.

On examination of the District's highest rated questions we see that they are *all* significantly better than in 2010, and are also stronger when compared to the NZ Police overall results. Intention to stay at NZ Police is the top ranked question within the District at 87.8%. The next 9 top ranked questions come from just 2 of the survey sections 'My Supervisor' and 'My Work Group', with the largest increases coming from 'People in my workgroup conduct themselves in accordance with the values expected by NZ Police' (up 5.2%), 'I feel part of an effective workgroup' (up 4.4%), and 'My supervisor supports and encourages me in my job' (up 4.3%).

Looking at the lowest ranked questions for the District it is pleasing to see that every one of the lowest ranked questions has had a significant improvement on 2010. For example 'NZ Police is interested in the views and opinions of its staff' and 'I believe actions will be taken based on the results of this survey' have seen increases of over 10%. As heartening as this is, the 'I believe actions will be taken based on the results of this survey' score of 43.0% is still significantly less than the overall NZ Police result of 44.8%. Focussing on actions resulting from the survey is still an area to target for improvement. Having the tools and resources to do their job, and satisfaction with the physical work environment are another two areas of 'My Job' that are significantly lower than the overall NZ Police result.

Results across the District are interesting in that there is variability between areas. In particular the Southern Area outperforms all other areas across all survey sections. Interestingly the Southern Area was an area where focussed attention was recommended as a result of the 2010 survey results, with 41.3 of respondents in the area agreeing that 'Changes in response to the 2010 Workplace Survey have had a positive impact on my workgroup' compared with just 5.3% a year prior. This year the Mid/South and DHQ are areas that are scoring significantly lower than the overall District, while the Central and Northern areas more in line with the District average.

Respect and Integrity within the Canterbury District

The Canterbury District results are better than the overall NZ Police result across all 'Respect and Integrity in the Workplace' survey items. Staff in the District have significantly greater confidence than NZ Police overall in raising concerns in regard to workplace harassment, bullying, discrimination or inappropriate conduct without fear of reprisal, and having those concerns dealt with appropriately. 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 that of NZ Police overall.

Employee Engagement within the Canterbury District

Employee engagement levels for the District are similar to that of NZ Police overall with 20.5% of the District ticking agree and strongly agree to the six engagement questions. This is, however, a large increase upon last year's result for the District of 12.1%, with significant increases across all six engagement questions. 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.

In 2011 a 'Performance Culture' is very important to people in the District, with 5 of the 10 key drivers falling into this 'Anatomy of a Great Workplace' category. The District performs well against 3 of these; 'dealing with poor performance'; 'being fairly assessed'; and 'acceptable levels of work related stress'. The District aim should be to remain strong in these questions, while continue to build on 'I feel I am working for an effective organisation' which has improved greatly since last year (up 10.5%), but still below that of NZ Police overall.

A 'sense of community', and training and development remain important to people, but to a lesser extent than in 2010. An enjoyable workplace, a sense of belonging, and career and personal development opportunities are all important, and the results indicate that the District is delivering on these items, compared to NZ Police overall. There is also potential for improvements in the areas of 'sense of personal achievement' as well as 'being interested in the views and opinions of staff' which are performing on par with the rest of NZ Police.

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 people felt NZ Police could do better included more frontline staffing, and paying more attention to the opinions of those at the 'coal face'. Other resources that are mentioned include computers, cars and other policing tools. Accountability and dealing with poor performance is again mentioned, as with last year.

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 Canterbury District, and a great number of staff take great pride in serving their communities. 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 the District can look to:

- Inspire and instil the high standards of performance expected by NZ Police of its people
- Involve staff where possible in decisions, asking for feedback on their views and opinions on things that affect their job
- 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 Canterbury

The Southern Area is a stand out performer this year, and has made significant improvements across the board over the last year. Attention should be paid to what has occurred in this area over the last 12 months, and seeing what 'best practice' initiatives can be implemented in other areas

As noted previously there are comments about front-line resourcing that need to be looked into. The Christchurch earthquakes have naturally had a large impact on the workload of NZ Police. While tragic events such as this can pull people together in times of great need, the District must pay attention to the needs of its people and ensure they remain looked after at a time when the rest of the community is heavily reliant upon them

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 different 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 (%)

JRA
surveys \ analysis \ insight
a Kenexa company

An Analysis of Employee Engagement – Canterbury District
June, 2011
© JRA

9

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.