

New Zealand Police Workplace Survey 2011

Summary of Findings: Crime

June 2011



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



RESPONSE RATE

| | Crime 2011 | Crime 2010 | NZ Police 2011 (Total Org) |
|---------------------|------------|------------|-------------------------------|
| Number of Responses | 131 | 128 | 9503 |
| Response Rate | 86.2% | 85.3% | 79.2% |

Note: For the tables below **Green font** indicates that the Service Centre'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 CRIME SECTOR AS A PLACE TO WORK

| Section | Crime 2011 | Crime 2010 | NZ Police 2011 (Total Org) |
|--|------------|-------------|-------------------------------|
| Performance Index (average of all questions in the survey) | 66.8 | 66.8 (0.0) | 64.2 (+2.6) |
| 1. Vision and Purpose + Communication and Cooperation | 64.0 | 62.6 (+1.4) | 59.2 (+4.8) |
| 2. My Supervisor | 72.4 | 73.2 (-0.8) | 72.3 (+0.1) |
| 3. My Work Group | 73.5 | 75.3 (-1.8) | 74.7 (-1.2) |
| 4. My Job | 67.9 | 68.2 (-0.3) | 62.7 (+5.2) |
| 5. Respect & Integrity in the Workplace | 70.2 | 69.0 (+1.2) | 68.1 (+2.1) |
| 6. Learning and Development | 58.1 | 59.5 (-1.4) | 60.1 (-2.0) |
| 7. Performance and Feedback | 65.5 | 69.6 (-4.1) | 66.7 (-1.2) |
| 8. Recognition | 60.9 | 59.0 (+1.9) | 53.1 (+7.8) |
| 9. Final Thoughts (Engagement) | 72.1 | 73.0 (-0.9) | 70.5 (+1.6) |
| 10. The Survey - Your Views | 50.3 | 44.1 (+6.2) | 42.8 (+7.5) |

HIGHEST RATED AREAS WITHIN THE CRIME SECTOR

| Section | Crime 2011 | Crime 2010 | NZ Police 2011 (Total Org) |
|--|------------|-------------|-------------------------------|
| 2.4: My supervisor treats staff with respect | 77.9 | 80.9 (-3.0) | 77.1 (+0.8) |
| 4.2: I know how my work contributes to the effectiveness of NZ Police | 77.7 | 82.2 (-4.5) | 75.6 (+2.1) |
| 4.3: My job gives me a sense of personal achievement | 77.5 | 79.7 (-2.2) | 76.1 (+1.4) |
| 3.2: I can rely on the support of others in my work group | 77.3 | 77.9 (-0.6) | 78.3 (-1.0) |
| 3.7: People in my workgroup conduct themselves in accordance with the values expected by NZ Police | 77.1 | 75.2 (+1.9) | 78.6 (-1.5) |
| 7.1: NZ Police expects high standards of performance from its people | 77.1 | 79.1 (-2.0) | 77.0 (+0.1) |
| 1.7: I intend to continue working at NZ Police for at least the next 12 months | 76.7 | 84.4 (-7.7) | 85.3 (-8.6) |
| 3.1: Staff in my work group work well together | 76.7 | 77.9 (-1.2) | 77.5 (-0.8) |
| 9.5: I feel a sense of commitment to NZ Police | 76.3 | 77.9 (-1.6) | 76.2 (+0.1) |
| 2.3: My supervisor behaves in a way that is consistent with the values of NZ Police | 75.8 | 78.3 (-2.5) | 76.3 (-0.5) |

LOWEST RATED AREAS WITHIN THE CRIME SECTOR

| Section | Crime 2011 | Crime 2010 | NZ Police 2011 (Total Org) |
|---|------------|-------------|-------------------------------|
| 10.2: Changes in response to the 2010 Workplace Survey have had a positive impact on my workgroup | 45.3 | 39.5 (+5.8) | 40.8 (+4.5) |
| 6.6: I am satisfied with my learning and development opportunities in NZ Police | 51.1 | 53.1 (-2.0) | 57.9 (-6.8) |
| 6.5: There are career and personal development opportunities for me in NZ Police | 51.5 | 55.9 (-4.4) | 61.1 (-9.6) |
| 7.3: Poor performance is dealt with effectively in my work group | 53.8 | 59.4 (-5.6) | 56.5 (-2.7) |
| 8.5: People here are appointed to positions based on merit | 54.0 | 53.6 (+0.4) | 43.7 (+10.3) |
| 6.1: NZ Police provides adequate training for the work I do | 55.0 | 52.0 (+3.0) | 54.8 (+0.2) |
| 1.10: NZ Police is interested in the views and opinions of its staff | 55.0 | 52.3 (+2.7) | 45.3 (+9.7) |
| 10.1: I believe actions will be taken based on the results of this survey | 55.6 | 49.6 (+6.0) | 44.8 (+10.8) |
| 1.8: Communication in my District/Service Centre is open and honest | 56.7 | 54.1 (+2.6) | 52.0 (+4.7) |
| 6.3: I am encouraged to develop my knowledge, skills and abilities in NZ Police | 57.6 | 59.6 (-2.0) | 60.2 (-2.6) |

HOW ENGAGED ARE STAFF WITHIN CRIME?

Engagement Index (average of all six engagement questions)

| Crime 2011 | Crime District 2010 | NZ Police (Total Org) |
|------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| 72.1 | 73.0 (-0.9) | 70.5 (+1.6) |

Weighted Mean Score (%)

Engagement Profile

| Engagement Group | Crime 2011 | Crime District 2010 | NZ Police (Total Org) |
|------------------|------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Engaged | 29.8 | 25.8 (+4.0) | 21.3 (+8.5) |
| Ambivalent | 52.6 | 60.9 (-8.3) | 63.2 (-10.6) |
| Disengaged | 17.6 | 13.3 (+4.3) | 15.5 (+2.1) |

Proportion of Employees (%)

RESPECT AND INTEGRITY WITHIN CRIME?

| Question | Crime 2011 | NZ Police (Total Org) |
|---|------------|-----------------------|
| 5.1: Staff in my workgroup respect employee diversity | 81.7 | 75.9 (+5.8) |
| 5.2: I know who to contact to report instances of workplace harassment, bullying or discrimination | 79.4 | 77.6 (+1.8) |
| 5.3: I am confident that I could raise concerns I had related to workplace harassment, bullying or discrimination without fear of reprisal | 65.6 | 64.7 (+0.9) |
| 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) | 63.8 | 62.4 (+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 | 57.3 | 57.8 (-0.5) |

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?

| | Crime | NZ Police (Total Org) |
|----------------|-------|-----------------------|
| Not Applicable | 81.7 | 82.1 (-0.4) |
| Yes | 0.8 | 4.6 (-3.8) |
| No | 17.6 | 13.3 (+4.3) |

WHAT DRIVES EMPLOYEE ENGAGEMENT WITHIN CRIME?

| | Rank from 2010 | Key Driver Questions | Crime 2011 | Crime 2010 | NZ Police (Total Org) |
|--|----------------|--|------------|-------------|-----------------------|
| | 3 | 1.3: NZ Police is an enjoyable place to work | 71.4 | 72.4 (-1.0) | 68.3 (+3.1) |
| | N/A | 4.3: My job gives me a sense of personal achievement | 77.5 | 79.7 (-2.2) | 76.1 (+1.4) |
| | N/A | 4.7: The level of work-related stress I experience in my job is acceptable | 66.0 | 66.0 (+0.0) | 58.3 (+7.7) |
| | N/A | 6.1: NZ Police provides adequate training for the work I do | 55.0 | 52.0 (+3.0) | 54.8 (+0.2) |
| | 2 | 1.5: There is a sense of 'common purpose' in NZ Police | 67.1 | 65.6 (+1.5) | 58.1 (+9.0) |
| | N/A | 4.10: I understand how my performance is measured | 61.3 | 64.4 (-3.1) | 60.8 (+0.5) |
| | N/A | 6.2: The work I do makes good use of my knowledge and skills | 70.4 | 73.6 (-3.2) | 68.9 (+1.5) |
| | N/A | 6.5: There are career and personal development opportunities for me in NZ Police | 51.5 | 55.9 (-4.4) | 61.1 (-9.6) |

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 Service Centre. 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 Service Centre'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 | | 1.5: There is a sense of 'common purpose' in NZ Police 1.3: NZ Police is an enjoyable place to work | 6.5: There are career and personal development opportunities for me in NZ Police | |
| Team level | | | | |
| Individual level | | | 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 | 4.10: I understand how my performance is measured 4.7: The level of work-related stress I experience in my job is acceptable |

SUMMARY AND KEY OBSERVATIONS – CRIME

The following summary provides insight into how employees perceive the Crime Service Centre as a place to work and how it compares to the rest of NZ Police. Engagement levels within the Service Centre 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 Service Centre that would likely provide it with the greatest improvement leverage when attempting to make the Crime Service Centre a truly great – and engaging – place to work.

Response Rate

There was an excellent response to the 2011 staff survey from within Crime with a response rate of 86.2%, up from 85.3% in 2010. This high response rate ensures the results presented in this report provide an accurate indication of employee attitude and opinion towards the Service Centre.

How Employees Perceive Crime as a Place to Work

In terms of how staff perceive Crime as a place to work, the average score across all survey questions (the Performance Index) is slightly higher than that of NZ Police overall, and has not changed from 2010. When looking at scores around specific categories, Crime employees are significantly more positive than the NZ Police average in the areas of 'Vision and Purpose + Communication and Cooperation', 'My Job' and 'Recognition'. Continuing this positive theme, the two questions regarding whether staff believe NZ Police will take action on the survey results have improved significantly from last year, and are slightly higher than the NZ Police average. However, they still show that only half the staff in Crime see this commitment to change.

The highest rated questions show the strong team dynamic that exists in Crime with three of the ten questions coming from the 'My Work Group' section and a further two from 'My Supervisor'. Staff are also particularly positive about confidence in their supervisor. These two sections are the highest rated sections of the survey for Crime. These positive results are also reflected in the many comments from Crime staff on People and Team being the best thing about working at NZ Police.

Only one of the highest rated questions has improved year on year, however there have been some significant improvements in other questions this year, such as 'I get regular feedback on my performance from my supervisor (formal/informal)' (up 7.4% to 66%) and 'I have the tools and resources I need to do my job' (up 7.6% to 67.2%).

When examining the Service Centre's lowest rated questions we note that there are 4 questions from the 'Learning & Development' section. Two of these questions, regarding satisfaction with learning and career opportunities, are rated significantly lower than the NZ Police total.

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 parts of the survey have the greatest impact on employee engagement. In particular for Crime, 2 of the lowest rated questions (on Learning and Development).

Employee Engagement within Crime

Employee engagement levels within Crime are slightly higher than NZ Police as a whole, and there are a significantly greater number of 'Engaged' staff than the NZ Police total, increasing by 4% from last year. However the number of disengaged staff in Crime has also increased from last year, now on a par with the NZ Police total.

Respect and Integrity

Staff in Crime are more positive about their workgroup's respect for employee diversity than the NZ Police total, and slightly more confident about knowing the procedures for raising concerns about harassment, bullying, and discrimination. However, one area that they are less positive in, is their confidence that complaints will be dealt with appropriately. This has declined since 2010 by 5.2% to 57.3%, and there has been an increase in fear of reprisal if concerns are raised. This may be related to an increase in people who have said that incidents were not dealt with effectively in the last 12 months up 6.5% to 17.6%. In addition a number of the free text comments made related to discrimination.

Key Drivers of Employee Engagement – Leverage Points for Performance Improvement

In 2011 'Training and Development' is very important to people in Crime, with 4 of the 8 key drivers falling into this 'Anatomy of a Great Workplace' category. This represents a significant area of opportunity. Most people believe their current skills are well utilised in the job, and feel a sense of achievement in what they are doing, but don't see what other opportunities are available either now or in the future, and don't believe they are receiving adequate development for their next move. Staff in Crime rated the key driver question 'There are career and personal development opportunities for me in NZ Police' at only 51.5%, down 4.4% from 2010, and significantly below the NZ Police average by 9.6% This lack of visibility of internal opportunities could be one reason for the 7.7% decline in the question 'I intend to continue working at NZ Police for at least the next 12 months' since last year to 76.7%.

On a positive note, Crime staff rate the level of work-related stress significantly better than the NZ Police average, and also rate the sense of 'common purpose' significantly greater than the NZ Police average – both key drivers of engagement for Crime staff.

Employee Comments

Examining the comments made by staff we see further support for the Key Drivers mentioned above. Many comments refer to a strong sense of camaraderie, teamwork and the satisfaction they get from being able to make a difference in the community.

A number of issues were raised as things that needed to change. More training and career development opportunities were mentioned in many comments. Confidence in management was also a common topic, at a direct and more senior level. In particular, a number of staff were concerned at the way poor performance is managed.

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

Summary

There is a very strong sense of camaraderie within the Crime Service Centre, however the confidence in how poor performance and discrimination/bullying/harassment have been handled in the last year may have impacted engagement for some people. The number of Engaged staff has increased, however the number of disengaged staff has also increased.

The number of staff that indicated they have witnessed harassment, discrimination, or bullying in the last 12 months that was not dealt with effectively, and resulting fear of reprisal has increased significantly. It is important to understand these issues, and ensure all managers are aware of the processes for dealing with such matters. Lack of visibility of how issues are handled can lead to misperceptions of what actually

happened and how the matter was handled. Therefore it is also important to ensure that the *perceptions* of how these issues are dealt with are addressed, and that managers visibly and clearly do not tolerate integrity breaches.

The 'Development' category of the 'Anatomy of a Great Workplace' model offers the biggest opportunity for improving engagement in the Crime Service Centre. Both the lowest rated questions and the key driver analysis reveals a strong desire for more learning opportunities and more career development – not just for their current role, but to give them the sense that they are growing their careers. The annual decline may be related to the increase in people receiving feedback from their manager, making people realise they may need additional training. Managers need to ensure that performance feedback is accompanied by coaching on how to improve and that development opportunities are available for staff. Having discussions with people on what internal career opportunities exist and what experience they need to pursue these opportunities is also necessary to help people develop in the right direction for them. This is particularly important for people in Specialist roles, where a prescribed career path is not obvious, and is reflected in a large proportion of comments on lack of opportunities for non-sworn staff. Lateral career movement, job rotations, and project participation can offer people in specialist roles further opportunities where upward movement isn't always possible.

Importantly, the number of people who believe that the results of this survey will be used to improve the work environment for Crime staff has improved significantly since last year. Further work on making such efforts visible will help to build confidence in the leadership of NZ Police, and belief in their desire to change the culture.

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. Service Centre's 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 difference it makes!

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

TOTAL ORGANISATION RESULTS

RESPONSE RATE

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

OVERALL PERCEPTIONS OF THE NZ POLICE AS A PLACE TO WORK

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

Weighted Mean Score (%)

ENGAGEMENT PROFILE

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

Proportion of Employees (%)

Workplace Survey Action Plan Template

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

| | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|

GLOSSARY

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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