New Zealand Police
Workplace Survey 2012
Summary of Findings: Crime

April 2012

NOTE: 2011 Trend data was unavailable for Crime due to organisational changes between 2011 and 2012

RESPONSE RATE

	Crime 2012	NZ Police 2012 (Total Org)
Number of Responses	199	9393
Response Rate	76.5%	77.1%

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 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 CRIME AS A PLACE TO WORK

Section	Crime 2012	NZ Police 2012 (Total Org)
Performance Index (average of all questions in the survey)	70.2	67.7 (+2.5)
1. Vision and Purpose + Communication and Cooperation	68.2	63.9 (+4.3)
2. My Supervisor	73.2	75.6 (-2.4)
3. My Work Group	76.1	76.7 (-0.6)
4. My Job	71.6	65.7 (+5.9)
5. Respect & Integrity in the Workplace	72.2	71.2 (+1.0)
6. Learning and Development	64.5	62.7 (+1.8)
7. Performance and Feedback	68.4	69.4 (-1.0)
8. Recognition	63.8	58.0 (+5.8)
9. Final Thoughts (Engagement)	76.1	73.3 (+2.8)
10. The Survey - Your Views	56.3	49.6 (+6.7)

HIGHEST RATED AREAS WITHIN CRIME

Question	Crime 2012	NZ Police 2012 (Total Org)
4.2: I know how my work contributes to the effectiveness of NZ Police	83.0	76.9 (+6.1)
1.7: I intend to continue working at NZ Police for at least the next 12 months	82.6	85.8 (-3.2)
4.3: My job gives me a sense of personal achievement	80.1	78.0 (+2.1)
9.5: I feel a sense of commitment to NZ Police	79.9	78.1 (+1.8)
9.3: I take an active interest in what happens in NZ Police	79.3	76.7 (+2.6)
7.1: NZ Police expects high standards of performance from its people	79.2	79.3 (-0.1)
3.7: People in my workgroup conduct themselves in accordance with the values expected by NZ Police	78.9	80.0 (-1.1)
3.2: I can rely on the support of others in my work group	78.8	80.0 (-1.2)
3.4: I have confidence in the ability of others in my work group	78.8	77.5 (+1.3)
2.4: My supervisor treats staff with respect	78.3	80.0 (-1.7)

LOWEST RATED AREAS WITHIN CRIME

Question	Crime 2012	NZ Police 2012 (Total Org)
10.2: Changes in response to the 2011 Workplace Survey have had a positive impact on my workgroup	53.1	47.8 (+5.3)
6.6: I am satisfied with my learning and development opportunities in NZ Police	57.1	59.1 (-2.0)
8.5: People here are appointed to positions based on merit	57.3	48.2 (+9.1)
6.5: There are career and personal development opportunities for me in NZ Police	58.1	62.2 (-4.1)
1.10: NZ Police is interested in the views and opinions of its staff	59.0	51.3 (+7.7)
7.3: Poor performance is dealt with effectively in my work group	59.0	60.4 (-1.4)
10.1: I believe actions will be taken based on the results of this survey	59.4	51.5 (+7.9)
1.11: Work groups in NZ Police work well together	60.6	56.0 (+4.6)
8.3: NZ Police has appropriate ways of recognising outstanding achievement	62.7	58.8 (+3.9)
1.8: Communication in my District or my Service Centre is open and honest	63.3	57.4 (+5.9)

BIGGEST DIFFERENCES BETWEEN CRIME AND NZ POLICE (TOTAL ORG) - POSITIVE

Question	Crime 2012	NZ Police 2012 (Total Org)
4.4: I have the tools and resources I need to do my job	70.5	59.0 (+11.5)
4.9: The pay and benefits I receive are fair for the work I do	63.8	53.0 (+10.8)
8.5: People here are appointed to positions based on merit	57.3	48.2 (+9.1)
1.4: NZ Police cares about the well-being of its staff	65.2	56.9 (+8.3)
10.1: I believe actions will be taken based on the results of this survey	59.4	51.5 (+7.9)
4.5: I am sufficiently involved in decisions that affect the way I do my job	68.1	60.3 (+7.8)
1.10: NZ Police is interested in the views and opinions of its staff	59.0	51.3 (+7.7)
1.2: I feel I am working for an effective organisation	72.2	65.6 (+6.6)
4.7: The level of work-related stress I experience in my job is acceptable	68.2	61.6 (+6.6)
6.1: NZ Police provides adequate training for the work I do	65.3	58.9 (+6.4)
8.2: We celebrate success in NZ Police	66.1	59.7 (+6.4)

BIGGEST DIFFERENCES BETWEEN CRIME AND NZ POLICE (TOTAL ORG) - NEGATIVE

Question	Crime 2012	NZ Police 2012 (Total Org)
6.5: There are career and personal development opportunities for me in NZ Police	58.1	62.2 (-4.1)
1.7: I intend to continue working at NZ Police for at least the next 12 months	82.6	85.8 (-3.2)
2.7: I get regular feedback on my performance from my supervisor (formal/informal)	65.6	68.7 (-3.1)
2.5: My supervisor supports and encourages me in my job	74.5	77.6 (-3.1)
2.6: I have confidence in my supervisor	74.1	77.1 (-3.0)
2.1: My supervisor communicates the goals and objectives of our work group effectively	70.1	72.4 (-2.3)
2.3: My supervisor behaves in a way that is consistent with the values of NZ Police	76.9	79.2 (-2.3)
3.1: Staff in my work group work well together	76.8	79.1 (-2.3)
6.6: I am satisfied with my learning and development opportunities in NZ Police	57.1	59.1 (-2.0)
3.3: Roles and responsibilities are clearly defined in my work group	71.5	73.5 (-2.0)

SCORES ACROSS CRIME

Section	Crime	Metro Crime	Crime
Performance Index	72.3	66.4	70.2
1. Vision and Purpose + Communication and Cooperation	70.6	63.8	68.2
2. My Supervisor	76.1	67.9	73.2
3. My Work Group	77.8	73.1	76.1
4. My Job	73.1	68.8	71.6
5. Respect & Integrity in the Workplace	74.3	68.4	72.2
6. Learning and Development	64.6	64.3	64.5
7. Performance and Feedback	69.6	66.1	68.4
8. Recognition	66.8	58.3	63.8
9. Final Thoughts	78.5	71.8	76.1
10. The Survey - Your Views	62.2	45.7	56.3

Weighted Mean Scores (%)

Note that for the table above, red scores indicate the lowest performing area within the Service Centre 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 CRIME

Question	Crime	NZ Police (Total Org)
5.1: Staff in my workgroup respect employee diversity	82.9	81.0 (+1.9)
5.2: I know who to contact to report instances of workplace harassment, bullying or discrimination	81.8	80.9 (+0.9)
5.3: I am confident that I could raise concerns I had related to workplace harassment, bullying or discrimination without fear of reprisal	72.9	69.4 (+3.5)
5.4: I am confident that I could raise concerns I had about other inappropriate conduct in the workplace without fear of reprisal (inappropriate conduct may include any actions or behaviours that make you feel uncomfortable in the workplace)	73.4	67.1 (+6.3)
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	64.8	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?

	Crime	NZ Police (Total Org)
Not Applicable	82.4	83.4 (-1.0)
Yes	3.5	4.6 (-1.1)
No	14.1	12.0 (+2.1)

HOW ENGAGED ARE STAFF WITHIN CRIME?

Engagement Index (average of all six engagement questions)

Crime 2012	NZ Police 2012 (Total Org)
76.1	73.3 (+2.8)

Weighted Mean Score (%)

Engagement Profile

Engagement Group	Crime 2012	NZ Police 2012 (Total Org)
Engaged	28.8	27.8 (+1.0)
Ambivalent	62.6	59.7 (+2.9)
Disengaged	8.6	12.5 (-3.9)

Proportion of Employees (%)

WHAT DRIVES EMPLOYEE ENGAGEMENT WITHIN CRIME?

	Key Driver Questions	Crime 2012	NZ Police 2012 (Total Org)
	1.3: NZ Police is an enjoyable place to work	74.4	71.1 (+3.3)
	4.3: My job gives me a sense of personal achievement	80.1	78.0 (+2.1)
	4.4: I have the tools and resources I need to do my job	70.5	59.0 (+11.5)
	4.1: The responsibilities of my job are clearly defined	74.4	73.2 (+1.2)
	1.4: NZ Police cares about the well-being of its staff	65.2	56.9 (+8.3)
	4.9: The pay and benefits I receive are fair for the work I do	63.8	53.0 (+10.8)

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 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.

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		1.3: NZ Police is an enjoyable place to work 1.4: NZ Police cares about the well-being of its staff		4.9: The pay and benefits I receive are fair for the work I do
Team level				
Individual level			4.3: My job gives me a sense of personal achievement	4.4: I have the tools and resources I need to do my job 4.1: The responsibilities of my job are clearly defined

PRIORITY AREAS – KEY DRIVER SCORES ACROSS KEY DEMOGRAPHIC GROUPS

Reading across the table, red scores indicate the lowest performing area within the Service Centre 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	Crime	Metro Crime	Crime	Total Organisation
1.3: NZ Police is an enjoyable place to work	76.7	70.0	74.4	71.1
4.3: My job gives me a sense of personal achievement	80.5	79.3	80.1	78.0
4.4: I have the tools and resources I need to do my job	71.4	68.9	70.5	59.0
4.1: The responsibilities of my job are clearly defined	74.2	74.6	74.4	73.2
1.4: NZ Police cares about the well-being of its staff	66.5	62.9	65.2	56.9
4.9: The pay and benefits I receive are fair for the work I do	68.7	54.8	63.8	53.0

Weighted Mean Score (%)

The following summary provides insight into how employees perceive the Service Centre as a place to work and how it fares 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 Service Centre a truly great – and engaging – place to work.

Response Rate

In 2012 a total of 199 people in the Crime Service Centre completed the survey. This equates to 76.5% of all those invited to participate which is similar to the proportion of participants for New Zealand Police overall (77.1%). This represents a very good response rate, ensuring that 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

On the whole, Crime scores much the same as NZ Police overall. Crime's 'Performance Index' – the average score across all questions across all employees – scores at 70.2%, just above that of NZ Police at 67.7%. However there are a number of survey sections where Crime performs significantly better than NZ Police. Crime scores higher than NZ Police on the survey sections: 'Vision and Purpose + Communication and Cooperation' (+4.3%), 'My Job' (+5.9%), 'Recognition' (+5.8%) and 'The Survey – Your Views' (+6.7%). It is interesting to note that while Crime performs far better than NZ Police for 'The Survey – Your Views' it is still a low scoring section at 56.3%. This means that on average staff are not really able to 'agree' that the survey will have, or has had, a positive impact on their workplace. For the remaining survey sections Crime performs similar to that of NZ Police overall.

The highest rated item across the survey is 'I know how my work contributes to the effectiveness of NZ Police'. At 83.0% people in Crime are on average able to agree strongly to this item. At +6.1% higher than NZ Police overall, people in Crime certainly have a better understanding of their contribution to the effectiveness of NZ Police. Interestingly 'intention to stay' at NZ Police, although another high scoring item, at 82.6% is significantly below NZ Police overall by -3.2%. Items from 'My Supervisor', 'My Work Group', 'Performance and Feedback' and 'Final Thoughts – Engagement' complete the list of the ten highest rated items, against which Crime performs the same as NZ Police.

The lowest ten scoring items lay around whether outcomes of the survey have had, and will have, a positive impact on the workplace; whether people are recognised appropriately through merit based promotion or celebration of achievements; whether poor performance is dealt with effectively; whether the right opportunities exist for learning and development; and whether work groups work well together, communicate with openness and honesty, or whether NZ Police is actually interested in the views and opinions of its people. While these are low scoring items, Crime performs better than NZ Police across seven of these items. 'Career and personal development' is the one lowest scoring item that Crime does not perform as well as NZ Police on.

When looking at the greatest differences compared to NZ Police overall, Crime is doing significantly better on a number of items from the 'My Job' survey section. For example, people in Crime have a far more positive view on their access to 'tool and resources' to do their work, as well as for the 'pay and benefits' they receive in return for doing their job. These items outperform NZ Police by +11.5 and +10.8% respectively. Not only do they feel better about their 'pay' but they have given higher ratings than NZ Police overall for recognising people through the celebration of successes, or the promotion of the right people for the right reasons.

A review of the largest negative differences shows that for Crime, only five items from across the whole survey score significantly below that of NZ Police. 'Career and development opportunities' and 'intention to stay' have the largest negative differences of -4.1% and -3.2. The remaining three are all in regard to 'My Supervisor', namely: 'I get regular feedback on my performance from my supervisor' (-3.1%), 'My supervisor supports and encourages me in my job' (-3.1%) and 'I have confidence in my supervisor' (-3.0%). It should be noted that these two latter items still receive scores of around 75%, meaning people are still on average able to 'agree' to these items, but just not as strongly as NZ Police overall.

Looking at results across Crime it can be seen that there is significant variance between Metro Crime and the rest of the Service Centre in most survey sections. The 'Performance Index' results show that Metro Crime at 66.4% scores on average -5.9% below the rest of Crime across the entire survey.

Respect and Integrity within Crime

'Respect and Integrity in the Workplace' is a survey section that scores on average similar to NZ Police. Over 80% of people in Crime agree that employee diversity is respected within workgroups and that they know who to contact to report instances of workplace harassment, bullying or discrimination. However the results show that over a quarter of respondents were not so confident that they could raise such concerns without fear of reprisal, while over a third of respondents do not believe that concerns raised would be dealt with appropriately.

The proportion of people who have witnessed some form of harassment, discrimination or workplace bullying, at 17.6% of staff, is slightly more than the NZ Police overall result of 16.6%. Approximately three-quarters of those who have witnessed such an incident do not believe it was dealt with effectively.

Employee Engagement within Crime

Levels of employee engagement for Crime are very similar to that of NZ Police overall. Crime's 'Engagement Index' score of 76.1% shows that on average people are able to 'agree' to the six items that measure employee engagement. The proportion of people who are 'engaged' is 28.8% of staff, compared to 27.8% for NZ Police. The proportion of people who are 'disengaged' is low at 8.6%. In effect this means there are many more positive voices within Crime than negative voices by a ratio greater than 3 to 1.

Key Drivers of Employee Engagement – Leverage Points for Performance Improvement

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

A total of six key drivers of engagement have been identified for Crime. The 'Vision and Purpose + Communication and Cooperation' item of 'an enjoyable place to work' is the highest ranked, and therefore the most engaging item to people in Crime. Caring about the 'wellbeing of staff' is also identified as a key driver from this same survey section. Both of these items perform significantly better than NZ Police. The remaining four key drivers identified all come from the survey section 'My Job'. Having a 'sense of achievement', 'access to tools and resources', 'a clearly defined job' and 'pay and benefits' commensurate with the work undertaken are all important and engaging to Crime staff. The good news is that Crime either performs better than, or similar to NZ Police on these items.

Using the 'Anatomy of a Great Workplace' model, we see that a 'Performance Culture' , a sense of 'Community' and 'Development' are important and engaging to Crime staff and represent significant leverage points for continued improvements in the Service Centre. These key drivers offer Crime a 'springboard' to help lift scores and make improvements in other low scoring survey items, or Areas within Crime that are not performing as well as others. As seen in section scores, it is Metro Crime that in general scores lowest and the same is true for these key drivers of engagement. Attention should be given in assisting this part of Crime to ensure that actions are taken as a result of the survey to identify opportunities for improvement and for agreed actions to be followed through on.

Employee Comments

The elements that people like the best about working at NZ Police in Crime are very similar to those mentioned elsewhere in NZ Police. These include the 'people we work with' and 'camaraderie', the 'diversity and variety of work' and 'serving the community' which are all frequently mentioned in employee comments as elements that make working at NZ Police great. Flexibility of working hours and job security are also mentioned numerous times.

There are a wide variety of comments on the elements where NZ Police could do better. A large number of these refer to resourcing in general, with other comments made specific to staffing levels and workloads. Recognition seems to be another theme, be it in the form of pay, promotion based on merit, or a general appreciation of peoples' efforts. Improved communication from management and comments regarding better management/direct supervisor actions are also mentioned, as is the need for poor performance to be dealt with accordingly.

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

Summary

The 2012 survey results show that Crime is performing similar to that of NZ Police overall, with just under 30% of staff deemed to be 'engaged' employees. There is a low proportion of staff who are 'disengaged' which helps Crime to be a more positive place to work than other Areas within NZ Police.

There are a number of areas where Crime performs better than NZ Police; 'Vision and Purpose + Communication and Cooperation', 'My Job', 'Recognition' and 'The Survey – Your Views'.

The six key drivers of engagement within Crime have all been identified as coming from the two high performing sections of 'Vision and Purpose + Communication and Cooperation' and 'My Job', and put Crime into a good position to benefit operationally from good employee engagement levels. Emphasis should be given to ensure that strong scoring key drivers remain strong, while Crime looks to make improvements in other lower scoring items (such as 'My Supervisor' items), and while focussing on the lower scoring Area of Metro Crime.

While Crime does score higher than NZ Police overall for the 'The Survey – Your Views' section, the reality is that people on average are not really able to 'agree' with the items around survey effectiveness. This means that there is plenty of opportunity for post survey actions to have a greater impact on people's daily work.

Research and experience has shown time and time again the linkage between well implemented post survey actions and initiatives, and improvements in engagement levels in subsequent employee surveys. Crime has a significant opportunity to lift engagement levels by reinforcing the value of the survey, by demonstrating that the results are used for the purpose intended, and that peoples' feedback is taken seriously and that NZ Police is taking the steps required to make it a great place to work.

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 different it makes!

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

TOTAL ORGANISATION RESULTS

RESPONSE RATE

	NZ Police 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 (%)

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.