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

June 2011

RESPONSE RATE

	Central District 2011	Central District 2010	NZ Police 2011 (Total Org)
Number of Responses	571	561	9503
Response Rate	72.5%	70.0%	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 CENTRAL DISTRICT AS A PLACE TO WORK

Section	Central District 2011	Central District 2010	NZ Police 2011 (Total Org)
Performance Index (average of all questions in the survey)	61.3	61.6 (-0.3)	64.2 (-2.9)
1. Vision and Purpose + Communication and Cooperation	55.9	56.0 (-0.1)	59.2 (-3.3)
2. My Supervisor	70.2	69.6 (+0.6)	72.3 (-2.1)
3. My Work Group	73.2	73.7 (-0.5)	74.7 (-1.5)
4. My Job	60.5	60.6 (-0.1)	62.7 (-2.2)
5. Respect & Integrity in the Workplace	63.5	65.0 (-1.5)	68.1 (-4.6)
6. Learning and Development	56.1	58.0 (-1.9)	60.1 (-4.0)
7. Performance and Feedback	63.7	64.6 (-0.9)	66.7 (-3.0)
8. Recognition	49.3	48.9 (+0.4)	53.1 (-3.8)
9. Final Thoughts (Engagement)	68.4	67.5 (+0.9)	70.5 (-2.1)
10. The Survey - Your Views	38.9	38.7 (+0.2)	42.8 (-3.9)

HIGHEST RATED AREAS WITHIN THE CENTRAL DISTRICT

Section	Central District 2011	Central District 2010	NZ Police 2011 (Total Org)
1.7: I intend to continue working at NZ Police for at least the next 12 months	86.0	89.2 (-3.2)	85.3 (+0.7)
4.3: My job gives me a sense of personal achievement	76.8	76.6 (+0.2)	76.1 (+0.7)
3.2: I can rely on the support of others in my work group	76.4	77.9 (-1.5)	78.3 (-1.9)
3.7: People in my workgroup conduct themselves in accordance with the values expected by NZ Police	76.3	74.2 (+2.1)	78.6 (-2.3)
3.1: Staff in my work group work well together	76.1	77.2 (-1.1)	77.5 (-1.4)
2.4: My supervisor treats staff with respect	74.9	76.3 (-1.4)	77.1 (-2.2)
2.3: My supervisor behaves in a way that is consistent with the values of NZ Police	74.7	74.4 (+0.3)	76.3 (-1.6)
7.1: NZ Police expects high standards of performance from its people	74.4	75.4 (-1.0)	77.0 (-2.6)
4.2: I know how my work contributes to the effectiveness of NZ Police	74.4	73.0 (+1.4)	75.6 (-1.2)
9.5: I feel a sense of commitment to NZ Police	73.9	73.2 (+0.7)	76.2 (-2.3)

LOWEST RATED AREAS WITHIN THE CENTRAL DISTRICT

Section	Central District 2011	Central 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	37.0	38.3 (-1.3)	40.8 (-3.8)
8.5: People here are appointed to positions based on merit	40.4	41.7 (-1.3)	43.7 (-3.3)
10.1: I believe actions will be taken based on the results of this survey	40.7	39.1 (+1.6)	44.8 (-4.1)
1.10: NZ Police is interested in the views and opinions of its staff	41.2	39.5 (+1.7)	45.3 (-4.1)
1.8: Communication in my District/Service Centre is open and honest	46.0	47.6 (-1.6)	52.0 (-6.0)
6.1: NZ Police provides adequate training for the work I do	46.7	47.2 (-0.5)	54.8 (-8.1)
1.4: NZ Police cares about the well-being of its staff	46.9	46.1 (+0.8)	51.9 (-5.0)
8.3: NZ Police has appropriate ways of recognising outstanding achievement	47.4	47.5 (-0.1)	52.9 (-5.5)
4.4: I have the tools and resources I need to do my job	48.5	46.5 (+2.0)	53.5 (-5.0)
4.9: The pay and benefits I receive are fair for the work I do	49.3	46.3 (+3.0)	50.8 (-1.5)

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

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

2

SCORES ACROSS THE CENTRAL DISTRICT

Section	Central District DHQ	New Plymouth Area	Palmerston North City	Palmerston North Rural Area	Ruapehu Area	Taranaki Rural Area	Traffic Services Central Dist	Wanganui Area	Central District
Performance Index	65.6	62.6	64.5	59.5	67.7	59.1	59.6	55.0	61.3
1. Vision and Purpose + Communication and Cooperation	62.5	56.1	60.8	52.9	66.4	51.7	52.8	48.6	55.9
2. My Supervisor	69.8	72.4	73.5	73.6	70.5	63.1	66.9	66.0	70.2
3. My Work Group	70.1	76.4	76.7	71.0	75.1	75.2	73.5	67.7	73.2
4. My Job	65.9	61.8	63.6	58.6	64.2	58.4	62.1	53.3	60.5
5. Respect & Integrity in the Workplace	69.4	67.8	65.8	60.5	67.9	62.1	59.3	57.4	63.5
6. Learning and Development	59.8	52.8	57.8	57.5	65.0	56.3	54.1	51.1	56.1
7. Performance and Feedback	64.8	62.4	65.4	58.2	73.9	65.5	67.3	60.4	63.7
8. Recognition	57.8	55.4	50.6	44.7	60.3	45.7	44.9	41.7	49.3
9. Final Thoughts (Engagement)	76.5	68.0	71.4	66.6	76.8	67.6	63.3	62.1	68.4
10. The Survey - Your Views	50.0	39.7	46.6	33.5	49.7	33.4	38.7	26.2	38.9

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 CENTRAL DISTRICT?

Engagement Index (average of all six engagement questions)

Central District 2011	Central District 2010	NZ Police (Total Org)
68.4	67.5 (+0.9)	70.5 (-2.1)

Weighted Mean Score (%)

Engagement Profile

Engagement Group	Central District 2011	Central District 2010	NZ Police (Total Org)
Engaged	19.1	15.0 (+4.1)	21.3 (-2.2)
Ambivalent	62.7	66.8 (-4.1)	63.2 (-0.5)
Disengaged	18.2	18.2 (0.0)	15.5 (+2.7)

Proportion of Employees (%)

RESPECT AND INTEGRITY WITHIN THE CENTRAL DISTRICT?

Question	Central District	NZ Police (Total Org)
5.1: Staff in my workgroup respect employee diversity	70.2	75.9 (-5.7)
5.2: I know who to contact to report instances of workplace harassment, bullying or discrimination	75.3	77.6 (-2.3)
5.3: I am confident that I could raise concerns I had related to workplace harassment, bullying or discrimination without fear of reprisal	57.2	64.7 (-7.5)
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)	54.6	62.4 (-7.8)
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	48.1	57.8 (-9.7)

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?

	Central District 2011	NZ Police (Total Org)
Not Applicable	80.7	82.1 (-1.4)
Yes	3.3	4.6 (-1.3)
No	15.9	13.3 (+2.6)

WHAT DRIVES EMPLOYEE ENGAGEMENT WITHIN THE CENTRAL DISTRICT?

	Rank from 2010	Key Driver Questions	Central District 2011	Central District 2010	NZ Police (Total Org)
	1	1.3: NZ Police is an enjoyable place to work	66.0	65.9 (+0.1)	68.3 (-2.3)
	NA	6.3: I am encouraged to develop my knowledge, skills and abilities in NZ Police	55.3	57.9 (-2.6)	60.2 (-4.9)
	3	1.6: I feel a sense of belonging to my District/Service Centre	54.7	56.0 (-1.3)	61.7 (-7.0)
	2	4.3: My job gives me a sense of personal achievement	76.8	76.6 (+0.2)	76.1 (+0.7)
	10	6.2: The work I do makes good use of my knowledge and skills	66.8	69.5 (-2.7)	68.9 (-2.1)
	NA	4.5: I am sufficiently involved in decisions that affect the way I do my job	54.7	57.5 (-2.8)	56.8 (-2.1)
	NA	1.10: NZ Police is interested in the views and opinions of its staff	41.2	39.5 (+1.7)	45.3 (-4.1)
	5	6.5: There are career and personal development opportunities for me in NZ Police	58.1	60.3 (-2.2)	61.1 (-3.0)
	NA	6.1: NZ Police provides adequate training for the work I do	46.7	47.2 (-0.5)	54.8 (-8.1)
	8	6.4: I am encouraged to try new ways of doing things	54.4	56.4 (-2.0)	57.8 (-3.4)

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	6.3: I am encouraged to develop my knowledge, skills and abilities in NZ Police 6.5: There are career and personal development opportunities for me in NZ Police	
Team level			6.4: I am encouraged to try new ways of doing things	
Individual level	4.5: I am sufficiently involved in decisions that affect the way I do my job	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	Central District DHQ	New Plymouth Area	Palmerston North City	Palmerston North Rural Area	Ruapehu Area	Taranaki Rural Area	Traffic Services Central Dist	Wanganui Area	Central District	NZ Police (Total Org)
1.3: NZ Police is an enjoyable place to work	70.8	68.2	71.5	63.4	76.3	62.0	59.3	58.8	66.0	68.3
6.3: I am encouraged to develop my knowledge, skills and abilities in NZ Police	59.2	51.5	56.1	57.1	67.9	56.0	52.5	49.7	55.3	60.2
1.6: I feel a sense of belonging to my District/Service Centre	61.5	58.5	58.8	45.5	66.4	51.6	56.4	47.8	54.7	61.7
4.3: My job gives me a sense of personal achievement	78.1	78.2	78.9	79.5	84.6	80.4	67.2	69.2	76.8	76.1
6.2: The work I do makes good use of my knowledge and skills	68.9	67.1	68.5	66.1	77.6	67.4	63.2	61.3	66.8	68.9
4.5: I am sufficiently involved in decisions that affect the way I do my job	67.3	52.6	56.3	54.5	64.1	53.8	48.0	48.1	54.7	56.8
1.10: NZ Police is interested in the views and opinions of its staff	52.6	42.0	46.9	37.6	51.3	31.5	37.5	33.5	41.2	45.3
6.5: There are career and personal development opportunities for me in NZ Police	54.6	53.2	62.2	61.8	67.3	59.2	51.5	54.7	58.1	61.1
6.1: NZ Police provides adequate training for the work I do	56.1	41.5	46.3	45.8	54.5	46.7	52.5	41.1	46.7	54.8
6.4: I am encouraged to try new ways of doing things	61.7	53.2	53.9	57.4	59.0	52.7	51.5	49.7	54.4	57.8

Weighted Mean Score (%)

JRA
surveys analysis insight
a Kenexa company

SUMMARY AND KEY OBSERVATIONS – CENTRAL 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

There was a good response to the 2011 staff survey from within the Central District. 571 employees responded, representing a response rate of 72.5%. This high response rate ensures the results presented in this report provide a very accurate indication of employee attitude and opinion towards the District.

How Employees Perceive Central District as a Place to Work

Generally speaking, there has not been any significant change in the way Central District staff perceive their respective workplaces. The Performance Index – representing the average score across all survey questions – remains statistically equivalent across 2011 and 2010 (61.3% and 61.6%, respectively). The District remains significantly below the NZ Police Performance Index overall (64.2%), and also has lower results in each of the ten sections within the Performance Index. This suggests that not only is the Central District generally disillusioned with Police as an organisation, they believe that the survey has little chance of making a difference to the areas they are dissatisfied with.

When looking at scores around specific areas, we see that the greatest differences between Central District employee results and the NZ Police overall results are in the areas of 'Respect and Integrity in the Workplace' and 'Learning and Development'. Furthermore, both of these areas have decreased this year, compared to the 2010 results for the Central District.

The highest rated questions show the strong team dynamic that exists in the District with three of the ten questions coming from the 'My Work Group' section. Staff are also particularly positive about their intent to continue working for NZ Police longer term and their overall commitment to NZ Police.

When examining the District's lowest rated questions we note that the District is significantly below the NZ Police overall score regarding satisfaction with the training provided to do their job and the level of open and honest communication in the District.

It is important to recognise that not all low scoring areas in a survey are necessarily engaging to employees. This report includes the results of a key driver analysis that highlight what things assessed in the survey actually have an impact on how engaged staff members are in the workplace.

Two of the District's lowest rated questions were found to have a strong impact upon employee engagement levels – 'NZ Police is interested in the views and opinions of its staff' and 'NZ Police provides adequate training for the work I do'. If an intervention or improvement strategy is going to be based solely around the District's lowest rated questions, strong consideration should be afforded to these two issues – they have been shown statistically to have a strong and predictable connection to employee attitudes and behaviour (i.e., 'employee engagement').

When we examine the District's Area scores across the Key Drivers we see that the Wanganui Area is significantly less positive in a six of the ten areas, with particular concern regarding learning and development. In comparison, the Ruapehu Area is significantly more positive in six of the ten areas, compared to other Central District Areas. In particular, their result in the question 'My job gives me a sense of personal achievement' scored 84.6%, compared to 76.8% for the Central District. In addition, the Ruapehu Area's results are higher than the NZ Police overall averages in nine of the ten drivers.

Respect and Integrity within the Central District

Central District's results for the 'Respect and Integrity in the Workplace' survey items are all significantly lower than the NZ Police average. In particular, staff in the District have significantly less confidence that concerns would be dealt with appropriately and without reprisal than their colleagues in the wider NZ Police organisation.

Employee Engagement within Central District

Employee engagement levels within the District are slightly below those of NZ Police as a whole. The Central District's engagement levels have increased from 67.5% in 2010 to 68.4% in 2011. Below we provide the results of an analysis that identifies what engages the District's employees the most – information which serves as a means for increasing current engagement levels.

Key Drivers of Employee Engagement – Leverage Points for Performance Improvement

Possible leverage points are those key drivers of employee engagement identified via statistical analysis. The strongest theme to emerge from the analysis is that of Development within the District. Six of the ten drivers relate to this theme. 90% of the key driver questions were significantly lower than the average across the total organisation and therefore there is significant scope for improvement in all these areas.

Finally, the District should reinforce the key driver in which it is performing the strongest, 'My job gives me a sense of personal achievement'. This was both the 2nd highest scoring question and a key driver question for staff in the District. We do note that this score of 76.8% was also slightly higher than in NZ Police overall (76.1%) and slightly higher than what might be expected in other organisations in New Zealand (75.6%).

Employee Comments

Examining the comments made by staff we gain further insight into what drives their engagement. Many comments refer to camaraderie, teamwork and the sense of personal achievement and pride they get from working in the District. As with the previous survey, staff are also positive about the ability they have to make a difference in the community as well as the variety that the job offers.

A number of issues were raised as things that needed to change. Similar to last year, the most commonly cited area related to resources, including: frontline staffing and computers. A number of staff were concerned at the attitudes and/or perceived excessive numbers of senior management in the district. Reduced bureaucracy and paperwork, better communication, and greater individual accountability for performance were also requested. This year has seen an increased number of staff calling for frontline officers to be armed.

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

Summary

While Central District staff exhibit similar scores to the NZ Police average regarding their sense of personal achievement in their jobs, these survey results suggest that collectively the District is more disengaged than the force as a whole. The lowest rated questions and key driver analysis suggest a sense of cynicism towards the organisation that should be addressed.

Looking at engagement, two-thirds of District staff can be considered Ambivalent (neither fully engaged but not disengaged either). The large size of this group represents a significant opportunity to shift people into the Engaged category. Key Driver analysis suggests that a significant leverage point exists for the District in developing the areas of Recognition, and Learning and Development (Section 1 of the survey). To achieve this you can, by way of example:

- Challenge leaders to work harder at recognising the contributions of their staff
- Place greater emphasis on managing performance, in particular responding to poor performance
- Open channels of communication so staff suggestions are encouraged and visibly acted upon wherever possible – starting with taking action as a result of this survey. District staff felt that little positive impact occurred after the last survey, so the opportunity exists to make a concerted effort this year to improve perceptions of the value of the survey.

This year, the Ruapehu Area stands out within the District as a group which has shown significant increases in a number of sections, most notably 'Recognition' (moving from 49.9% in 2010 to 60.3% in 2011) and 'Performance and Feedback' (moving from 59.9% in 2010 to 73.9%). In comparison, the Wanganui Area is less positive in most areas. There would be benefit in investigating what the Ruapehu Area is doing that Wanganui and other Areas are not and seeing what can be implemented within the other Areas.

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 events, 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.

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

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

8

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 – Central 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

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.