

# **New Zealand Police Workplace Survey 2012**

## Summary of Findings: Counties/Manukau District

---

**April 2012**

**KeneXa® | JRA**



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

**KeneXa® | JRA**

An Analysis of Employee Engagement – Counties/Manukau District  
April, 2012  
© JRA

## RESPONSE RATE

	Counties/Manukau District 2012	Counties/Manukau District 2011	NZ Police 2012 (Total Org)
Number of Responses	1115	1106	9393
Response Rate	85.6%	86.6%	77.1%

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 2011 survey. **Red font** indicates the score is statistically lower, and/or has significantly declined since the 2011 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 COUNTIES/MANUKAU DISTRICT AS A PLACE TO WORK

Section	Counties/Manukau District 2012	Counties/Manukau District 2011	NZ Police 2012 (Total Org)
Performance Index (average of all questions in the survey)	68.8	67.6 (+1.2)	67.7 (+1.1)
1. Vision and Purpose + Communication and Cooperation	66.3	64.6 (+1.7)	63.9 (+2.4)
2. My Supervisor	76.7	76.2 (+0.5)	75.6 (+1.1)
3. My Work Group	78.3	77.3 (+1.0)	76.7 (+1.6)
4. My Job	65.7	64.3 (+1.4)	65.7 (0.0)
5. Respect & Integrity in the Workplace	70.6	69.5 (+1.1)	71.2 (-0.6)
6. Learning and Development	65.5	65.4 (+0.1)	62.7 (+2.8)
7. Performance and Feedback	71.1	69.5 (+1.6)	69.4 (+1.7)
8. Recognition	56.1	54.3 (+1.8)	58.0 (-1.9)
9. Final Thoughts (Engagement)	75.4	74.6 (+0.8)	73.3 (+2.1)
10. The Survey - Your Views	50.6	48.3 (+2.3)	49.6 (+1.0)

## HIGHEST RATED AREAS WITHIN THE COUNTIES/MANUKAU DISTRICT

Question	Counties/Manukau District 2012	Counties/Manukau District 2011	NZ Police 2012 (Total Org)
1.7: I intend to continue working at NZ Police for at least the next 12 months	89.0	89.5 (-0.5)	85.8 (+3.2)
2.4: My supervisor treats staff with respect	81.4	80.5 (+0.9)	80.0 (+1.4)
3.7: People in my workgroup conduct themselves in accordance with the values expected by NZ Police	81.3	80.6 (+0.7)	80.0 (+1.3)
3.2: I can rely on the support of others in my work group	80.7	80.2 (+0.5)	80.0 (+0.7)
2.3: My supervisor behaves in a way that is consistent with the values of NZ Police	80.3	79.6 (+0.7)	79.2 (+1.1)
9.5: I feel a sense of commitment to NZ Police	80.3	79.5 (+0.8)	78.1 (+2.2)
3.1: Staff in my work group work well together	80.1	79.9 (+0.2)	79.1 (+1.0)
7.1: NZ Police expects high standards of performance from its people	80.0	78.6 (+1.4)	79.3 (+0.7)
2.5: My supervisor supports and encourages me in my job	78.7	78.6 (+0.1)	77.6 (+1.1)
3.4: I have confidence in the ability of others in my work group	78.5	76.1 (+2.4)	77.5 (+1.0)

### LOWEST RATED AREAS WITHIN THE COUNTIES/MANUKAU DISTRICT

Question	Counties/ Manukau District 2012	Counties/ Manukau District 2011	NZ Police 2012 (Total Org)
8.5: People here are appointed to positions based on merit	43.4	43.9 (-0.5)	48.2 (-4.8)
4.9: The pay and benefits I receive are fair for the work I do	46.2	45.9 (+0.3)	53.0 (-6.8)
10.2: Changes in response to the 2011 Workplace Survey have had a positive impact on my workgroup	50.0	47.5 (+2.5)	47.8 (+2.2)
10.1: I believe actions will be taken based on the results of this survey	51.4	49.1 (+2.3)	51.5 (-0.1)
1.10: NZ Police is interested in the views and opinions of its staff	52.8	49.9 (+2.9)	51.3 (+1.5)
1.11: Work groups in NZ Police work well together	55.4	55.5 (-0.1)	56.0 (-0.6)
1.4: NZ Police cares about the well-being of its staff	57.5	53.9 (+3.6)	56.9 (+0.6)
8.3: NZ Police has appropriate ways of recognising outstanding achievement	57.7	53.9 (+3.8)	58.8 (-1.1)
8.4: I feel my contribution is valued in NZ Police	58.2	56.4 (+1.8)	59.0 (-0.8)
8.2: We celebrate success in NZ Police	59.4	56.2 (+3.2)	59.7 (-0.3)

### BIGGEST DIFFERENCES WITHIN THE COUNTIES/MANUKAU DISTRICT SINCE 2011 - POSITIVE

Question	Counties/ Manukau District 2012	Counties/ Manukau District 2011	NZ Police 2012 (Total Org)
1.1: NZ Police has a clear vision of where it's going and how it's going to get there	72.0	67.6 (+4.4)	67.8 (+4.2)
4.4: I have the tools and resources I need to do my job	60.0	55.9 (+4.1)	59.0 (+1.0)
8.3: NZ Police has appropriate ways of recognising outstanding achievement	57.7	53.9 (+3.8)	58.8 (-1.1)
1.4: NZ Police cares about the well-being of its staff	57.5	53.9 (+3.6)	56.9 (+0.6)
8.2: We celebrate success in NZ Police	59.4	56.2 (+3.2)	59.7 (-0.3)
4.7: The level of work-related stress I experience in my job is acceptable	64.4	61.5 (+2.9)	61.6 (+2.8)
1.10: NZ Police is interested in the views and opinions of its staff	52.8	49.9 (+2.9)	51.3 (+1.5)
1.2: I feel I am working for an effective organisation	68.4	65.7 (+2.7)	65.6 (+2.8)
1.9: I feel informed about NZ Police and its activities	65.4	62.9 (+2.5)	62.8 (+2.6)
10.2: Changes in response to the 2011 Workplace Survey have had a positive impact on my workgroup	50.0	47.5 (+2.5)	47.8 (+2.2)

### BIGGEST DIFFERENCES WITHIN THE COUNTIES/MANUKAU DISTRICT SINCE 2011 - NEGATIVE

Question	Counties/ Manukau District 2012	Counties/ Manukau District 2011	NZ Police 2012 (Total Org)
6.5: There are career and personal development opportunities for me in NZ Police	68.6	69.9 (-1.3)	62.2 (+6.4)
6.6: I am satisfied with my learning and development opportunities in NZ Police	63.4	64.3 (-0.9)	59.1 (+4.3)
6.3: I am encouraged to develop my knowledge, skills and abilities in NZ Police	65.9	66.8 (-0.9)	63.1 (+2.8)
4.2: I know how my work contributes to the effectiveness of NZ Police	76.6	77.2 (-0.6)	76.9 (-0.3)
8.5: People here are appointed to positions based on merit	43.4	43.9 (-0.5)	48.2 (-4.8)
1.7: I intend to continue working at NZ Police for at least the next 12 months	89.0	89.5 (-0.5)	85.8 (+3.2)
4.3: My job gives me a sense of personal achievement	78.4	78.6 (-0.2)	78.0 (+0.4)
1.11: Work groups in NZ Police work well together	55.4	55.5 (-0.1)	56.0 (-0.6)

## SCORES ACROSS THE COUNTIES/MANUKAU DISTRICT

Section	Counties/ Manukau Central	Counties/ Manukau East	Counties/ Manukau Investigations	Counties/ Manukau Operations and Support	Counties/ Manukau Prevention	Counties/ Manukau South	Counties/ Manukau West	Counties/ Manukau District
Performance Index	64.9	69.6	68.5	68.2	75.4	66.6	70.7	68.8
1. Vision and Purpose + Communication and Cooperation	63.0	66.9	66.3	65.3	72.6	62.0	70.2	66.3
2. My Supervisor	73.4	76.8	79.0	75.0	80.1	77.0	76.4	76.7
3. My Work Group	76.8	79.6	76.0	76.8	82.0	79.5	78.7	78.3
4. My Job	60.8	65.1	67.3	68.3	76.5	60.6	66.4	65.7
5. Respect & Integrity in the Workplace	64.3	74.3	66.6	69.8	77.4	72.0	73.0	70.6
6. Learning and Development	63.0	66.0	65.4	60.6	70.7	63.6	69.6	65.5
7. Performance and Feedback	69.3	71.3	69.0	71.9	76.1	71.2	71.7	71.1
8. Recognition	48.8	57.1	56.8	57.1	65.7	53.5	57.7	56.1
9. Final Thoughts	72.8	77.8	74.0	74.1	81.0	72.2	78.2	75.4
10. The Survey - Your Views	44.4	52.6	50.3	52.4	60.3	46.3	52.9	50.6

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.

## RESPECT AND INTEGRITY WITHIN THE COUNTIES/MANUKAU DISTRICT

Question	Counties/Manukau District	NZ Police (Total Org)
5.1: Staff in my workgroup respect employee diversity	83.0	81.0 (+2.0)
5.2: I know who to contact to report instances of workplace harassment, bullying or discrimination	76.4	80.9 (-4.5)
5.3: I am confident that I could raise concerns I had related to workplace harassment, bullying or discrimination without fear of reprisal	67.5	69.4 (-1.9)
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)	65.3	67.1 (-1.8)
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	62.2	63.5 (-1.3)

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?

	Counties/Manukau District	NZ Police (Total Org)
Not Applicable	81.2	83.4 (-2.2)
Yes	5.4	4.6 (+0.8)
No	13.4	12.0 (+1.4)

## HOW ENGAGED ARE STAFF WITHIN THE COUNTIES/MANUKAU DISTRICT?

**Engagement Index** (average of all six engagement questions)

Counties/Manukau District 2012	Counties/Manukau District 2011	NZ Police (Total Org)
75.4	74.6 (+0.8)	<b>73.3 (+2.1)</b>

Weighted Mean Score (%)

### Engagement Profile

Engagement Group	Counties/Manukau District 2012	Counties/Manukau District 2011	NZ Police (Total Org)
Engaged	31.8	28.4 (+3.4)	27.8 (+4.0)
Ambivalent	57.4	61.0 (-3.6)	59.7 (-2.3)
Disengaged	10.8	10.6 (+0.2)	12.5 (-1.7)

Proportion of Employees (%)

## WHAT DRIVES EMPLOYEE ENGAGEMENT WITHIN THE COUNTIES/MANUKAU DISTRICT?

	Rank from 2011	Key Driver Questions	Counties/Manukau District 2012	Counties/Manukau District 2011	NZ Police (Total Org)
	1	1.3: NZ Police is an enjoyable place to work	74.0	73.1 (+0.9)	71.1 (+2.9)
	2	1.6: I feel a sense of belonging to my District or my Service Centre	70.6	70.0 (+0.6)	65.5 (+5.1)
	4	4.3: My job gives me a sense of personal achievement	78.4	78.6 (-0.2)	78.0 (+0.4)
	8	6.2: The work I do makes good use of my knowledge and skills	70.2	70.2 (+0.0)	71.0 (-0.8)
	5	1.8: Communication in my District or my Service Centre is open and honest	59.6	58.9 (+0.7)	57.4 (+2.2)
	6	6.5: There are career and personal development opportunities for me in NZ Police	68.6	69.9 (-1.3)	62.2 (+6.4)
	7	6.4: I am encouraged to try new ways of doing things	64.1	62.4 (+1.7)	61.9 (+2.2)
	10	4.7: The level of work-related stress I experience in my job is acceptable	64.4	61.5 (+2.9)	61.6 (+2.8)
	NA	4.6: I am satisfied with my physical work environment	67.0	65.5 (+1.5)	63.6 (+3.4)
	NA	6.1: NZ Police provides adequate training for the work I do	60.7	59.0 (+1.7)	58.9 (+1.8)

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 2011 is shown in the column headed "Rank from 2011".

## 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
<b>Organisation level</b>		1.3: NZ Police is an enjoyable place to work	6.5: There are career and personal development opportunities for me in NZ Police	
<b>Team level</b>	1.8: Communication in my District or my Service Centre is open and honest	4.6: I am satisfied with my physical work environment	6.4: I am encouraged to try new ways of doing things	
<b>Individual level</b>		1.6: I feel a sense of belonging to my District or my Service Centre	4.3: My job gives me a sense of personal achievement 6.2: The work I do makes good use of my knowledge and skills 6.1: NZ Police provides adequate training for the work I do	4.7: The level of work-related stress I experience in my job is acceptable

### 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	Counties/ Manukau Central	Counties/ Manukau East	Counties/ Manukau Investigations	Counties/ Manukau Operations and Support	Counties/ Manukau Prevention	Counties/ Manukau South	Counties/ Manukau West	Counties/Manukau District	Total Organisation
1.3: NZ Police is an enjoyable place to work	72.1	75.6	71.2	71.6	80.2	70.8	78.6	74.0	71.1
1.6: I feel a sense of belonging to my District or my Service Centre	65.9	74.4	69.2	68.6	76.4	65.8	75.7	70.6	65.5
4.3: My job gives me a sense of personal achievement	74.7	79.2	78.3	75.2	84.1	78.2	80.3	78.4	78.0
6.2: The work I do makes good use of my knowledge and skills	66.9	71.6	70.5	66.6	78.8	67.7	72.1	70.2	71.0
1.8: Communication in my District or my Service Centre is open and honest	53.8	60.7	60.5	59.3	74.2	51.5	63.5	59.6	57.4
6.5: There are career and personal development opportunities for me in NZ Police	67.0	72.1	64.4	58.2	70.1	68.6	77.0	68.6	62.2
6.4: I am encouraged to try new ways of doing things	63.0	61.1	65.6	58.5	72.3	61.5	67.8	64.1	61.9
4.7: The level of work-related stress I experience in my job is acceptable	59.4	66.4	66.1	64.3	78.0	57.7	64.9	64.4	61.6
4.6: I am satisfied with my physical work environment	65.7	66.2	66.6	69.5	81.2	61.8	65.9	67.0	63.6
6.1: NZ Police provides adequate training for the work I do	55.0	61.3	64.2	58.9	65.7	57.9	63.0	60.7	58.9

Weighted Mean Score (%)



## SUMMARY AND KEY OBSERVATIONS – COUNTIES/MANUKAU DISTRICT

The following summary provides insight into how employees perceive the Counties/Manukau 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 Counties/Manukau District that would likely provide it with the greatest improvement leverage when attempting to make it a truly great – and engaging – place to work.

### Response Rate

There was an excellent response to the 2012 staff survey from within the Counties/Manukau District. Of 1302 employees asked to participate, 1115 responded, representing a response rate of 85.6%. This high response rate (similar to that achieved in 2011) ensures the results presented in this report provide an accurate indication of employee attitude and opinion towards the Counties/Manukau District.

### How Employees Perceive Counties/Manukau District as a Place to Work

In terms of how staff perceive the Counties/Manukau District as a place to work, the average score across all survey questions (the Performance Index) is 68.8%, an increase of 1.2% from 2011; a statistically significant overall improvement. This score is also significantly above the NZ Police overall Performance Index, which in comparison increased by 3.5% in the same period. When looking at the results across the different sections of the survey, the improvements appear consistent – seven sections had a significant increase in score since 2011, and no sections had a decrease. Just one survey section scores below the NZ Police average, and that is related to Recognition.

The highest rated questions in the survey for the Counties/Manukau District are almost exactly the same as last year – people intend to continue working with the Police, their supervisors treat them with respect, people conduct themselves in accordance with NZ Police values and can be relied on to provide support. The lowest rated questions for the Counties/Manukau District are also very similar to last year, and relate to NZ Police appointing people to positions based on merit, perceptions of pay and benefits, responding to previous survey feedback, cross-teamwork and recognition. It should be noted that most of the lowest rated questions in the survey have received improvements in scores from 2011, particularly regarding faith in the survey process, perceptions that NZ Police cares about staff wellbeing, and recognition. Compared to the NZ Police average there are three questions that score significantly below for Counties/Manukau District – perceptions that people are appointed to positions based on merit, perceptions of pay and benefits, and recognising outstanding performance.

A total of 32 questions have had a significant increase in score for Counties/Manukau District in the past year, and just a single question has had a significant decrease in score. Across the biggest increases, the highlights include stronger scores for the clarity of NZ Police's vision, adequacy of tools and resources, recognising staff and celebrating successes (although these scores are still relatively low), perceptions that NZ Police cares about staff well-being, and improved perceptions of stress. Overall, feedback appears to reinforce that the survey and improvement processes are gaining credibility and momentum. The one question to decrease significantly was regarding the availability of career and personal development opportunities, although this question still scores 6.4% above the NZ Police average.

Results across the areas within Counties/Manukau District vary somewhat, with Counties/Manukau Central often having the lowest scores, and Counties/Manukau Prevention often having the highest scores. At this level of reporting there do not appear to be any standout concerns, although we would certainly recommend a review of the table on page 4.

NZ Police include six questions in the survey regarding Respect and Integrity in the Workplace. In general Counties/Manukau District results are in line with NZ Police averages, scoring slightly below. Counties/Manukau Central scores tended to be lower than other areas, while Counties/Manukau Investigations had an unusually large proportion of staff (24.5%) who felt that inappropriate behaviour over the past 12 months had not been dealt with effectively.

### Employee Comments

The themes coming through the comments made in the survey to the question 'what makes NZ Police a great place to work?' are very similar to last year. Respondents speak of the people that they work with and a sense of camaraderie that exists in work groups. People enjoy the variety/diversity in their work, the sense of achievement inherent in a job well done, the higher order goals of the NZ Police and making a difference in the community.

Regarding what needs changing to make NZ Police a great place to work, comments were varied and no one strong theme emerged. Minor themes included communication between groups and from senior management, better understanding between management and frontline staff (including more resourcing), recognition of good work/dealing with poor performance, bureaucracy, pay and merit-based promotions.

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

### **Employee Engagement within Counties/Manukau District**

Employee engagement levels within the Counties/Manukau District are slightly above 2011 results (up 0.8%), and significantly above the NZ Police average for 2012. The proportion of 'engaged' staff in the District has increased 3.4% and is now 4.0% above the NZ Police average. The proportion of 'disengaged' staff in the Counties/Manukau District is also below the NZ Police average, which is a very positive result as well.

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**

Key driver analysis was performed on Counties/Manukau District's results, and this process has highlighted which questions in the survey actually have the strongest relationship with employee engagement scores. If you are able to improve your results on these key questions, they are the most influential to drive improvement in engagement levels. There is a great degree of consistency regarding Counties/Manukau District's key drivers over time – eight questions that were key drivers in 2011 are again key drivers in 2012, which tells us that while the scores for various questions have increased or decreased over the past year, overall the things that are most important to Counties/Manukau District staff have not changed much.

As in 2011, the most important question driving engagement levels is regarding NZ Police being an enjoyable place to work. The score for this question increased by 0.9% between 2011 and 2012, up to 74.0%. Closely related to this question is 'I feel a sense of belonging to this organisation,' which scores at 70.6% (significantly higher than the NZ Police average of 65.5%). Simply, it is important for Counties/Manukau District staff to enjoy their work, and currently people tend to agree that this is happening.

There are a number of job-level questions that also rank as key drivers of engagement. The most important is that people feel a sense of personal achievement in their roles, and on this topic Counties/Manukau District scores on par with the NZ Police average. Counties/Manukau District staff also want their work to make good use of their knowledge and skills, for there to be career and personal development opportunities for them, to be encouraged to try new ways of doing things, to have acceptable stress in their jobs, and to receive adequate training. These questions all speak to the importance of people's day-to-day work in driving their engagement levels, and also the extent to which NZ Police is looking out for their development and future roles.

### **Summary**

Overall the results for Counties/Manukau District have improved from 2011, and there are some very good improvements. Despite the significant improvement in the Performance Index however, it is notable that the Engagement Index has not improved by quite the same degree. We can look for an explanation for this in the changes in scores for the key driver questions, which reveal that of the top six ranked key drivers, none improved significantly. The key drivers are the questions that have the strongest impact on engagement levels, and while the top four ranked key drivers tend to score quite well (all over 70%), there is still scope for reinforcing good work in the areas of building an enjoyable workplace where staff feel a strong bond to a common purpose. Counties/Manukau District staff do have some slightly unique drivers related to personal development leading to their sense of personal achievement in their roles. Some gains have been made in the related area of recognition over the past year, and efforts should be maintained, particularly informal recognition between supervisors and staff and between staff members themselves. From the perspective of comments made in the survey, potentially one visible response to the feedback could be the identification of some areas of work where staff feel that processes could be improved if a collaborative approach is taken between staff and management. Sometimes the best way to improve engagement levels is to address the issues that act to disengage or frustrate staff.

## 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 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 2012	NZ Police 2011
Number of Responses	9393	9503
Response Rate	77.1%	79.2%

### OVERALL PERCEPTIONS OF THE NZ POLICE AS A PLACE TO WORK

Section	NZ Police 2012	NZ Police 2011
Performance Index	67.7	64.2 (+3.5)
1. Vision and Purpose + Communication and Cooperation	63.9	59.2 (+4.7)
2. My Supervisor	75.6	72.3 (+3.3)
3. My Work Group	76.7	74.7 (+2.0)
4. My Job	65.7	62.7 (+3.0)
5. Respect & Integrity in the Workplace	71.2	68.1 (+3.1)
6. Learning and Development	62.7	60.1 (+2.6)
7. Performance and Feedback	69.4	66.7 (+2.7)
8. Recognition	58.0	53.1 (+4.9)
9. Final Thoughts	73.3	70.5 (+2.8)
10. The Survey - Your Views	49.6	42.8 (+6.8)

Weighted Mean Score (%)

### ENGAGEMENT PROFILE

Engagement Group	NZ Police 2012	NZ Police 2011
Engaged	27.8	21.3 (+6.5)
Ambivalent	59.7	63.2 (-3.5)
Disengaged	12.5	15.5 (-3.0)

Proportion of Employees (%)

## 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 2012 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.