

# **New Zealand Police Workplace Survey 2011**

## **Summary of Findings: Financial Crime Group**

---

**June 2011**



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



## RESPONSE RATE

	Financial Crime Group 2011	Financial Crime Group 2010	NZ Police 2011 (Total Org)
Number of Responses	48	24	9503
Response Rate	92.3%	92.3%	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. **Red font** indicates the score is statistically lower. 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 FINANCIAL CRIME GROUP AS A PLACE TO WORK

Section	Financial Crime Group 2011	Financial Crime Group 2010	NZ Police 2011 (Total Org)
Performance Index	62.4	58.2 (+4.2)	64.2 (-1.8)
1. Vision and Purpose + Communication and Cooperation	59.9	53.8 (+6.1)	59.2 (+0.7)
2. My Supervisor	69.7	67.4 (+2.3)	72.3 (-2.6)
3. My Work Group	69.6	69.9 (-0.3)	74.7 (-5.1)
4. My Job	62.7	59.1 (+3.6)	62.7 (0.0)
5. Respect & Integrity in the Workplace	69.3	52.3 (+17.0)	68.1 (+1.2)
6. Learning and Development	53.8	55.0 (-1.2)	60.1 (-6.3)
7. Performance and Feedback	60.9	59.0 (+1.9)	66.7 (-5.8)
8. Recognition	54.1	48.3 (+5.8)	53.1 (+1.0)
9. Final Thoughts	66.8	62.7 (+4.1)	70.5 (-3.7)
10. The Survey - Your Views	43.2	39.1 (+4.1)	42.8 (+0.4)

## HIGHEST RATED AREAS WITHIN THE FINANCIAL CRIME GROUP

Section	Financial Crime Group 2011	Financial Crime Group 2010	NZ Police 2011 (Total Org)
2.4: My supervisor treats staff with respect	81.8	72.9 (+8.9)	77.1 (+4.7)
1.7: I intend to continue working at NZ Police for at least the next 12 months	80.7	81.3 (-0.6)	85.3 (-4.6)
3.2: I can rely on the support of others in my work group	79.2	77.1 (+2.1)	78.3 (+0.9)
5.1: Staff in my workgroup respect employee diversity	79.2	70.8 (+8.4)	73.3 (+5.9)
4.8: I am able to maintain a balance between my personal and working life	78.6	66.7 (+11.9)	67.0 (+11.6)
3.7: People in my workgroup conduct themselves in accordance with the values expected by NZ Police	78.1	70.8 (+7.3)	78.6 (-0.5)
9.3: I take an active interest in what happens in NZ Police	77.1	68.8 (+8.3)	74.8 (+2.3)
2.3: My supervisor behaves in a way that is consistent with the values of NZ Police	76.0	70.8 (+5.2)	76.3 (-0.3)
2.5: My supervisor supports and encourages me in my job	75.5	69.8 (+5.7)	74.7 (+0.8)
9.5: I feel a sense of commitment to NZ Police	74.0	68.8 (+5.2)	76.2 (-2.2)

## LOWEST RATED AREAS WITHIN THE FINANCIAL CRIME GROUP

Section	Financial Crime Group 2011	Financial Crime Group 2010	NZ Police 2011 (Total Org)
10.2: Changes in response to the 2010 Workplace Survey have had a positive impact on my workgroup	38.6	35.4 (+3.2)	40.8 (-2.2)
6.1: NZ Police provides adequate training for the work I do	45.8	43.8 (+2.0)	54.8 (-9.0)
8.5: People here are appointed to positions based on merit	46.4	44.8 (+1.6)	43.7 (+2.7)
1.10: NZ Police is interested in the views and opinions of its staff	46.9	39.6 (+7.3)	45.3 (+1.6)
10.1: I believe actions will be taken based on the results of this survey	47.9	42.7 (+5.2)	44.8 (+3.1)
7.3: Poor performance is dealt with effectively in my work group	49.0	47.9 (+1.1)	56.5 (-7.5)
6.6: I am satisfied with my learning and development opportunities in NZ Police	49.5	53.1 (-3.6)	57.9 (-8.4)
1.11: Work groups in NZ Police work well together	49.5	40.6 (+8.9)	51.9 (-2.4)
8.3: NZ Police has appropriate ways of recognising outstanding achievement	50.5	41.7 (+8.8)	52.9 (-2.4)
6.5: There are career and personal development opportunities for me in NZ Police	51.6	49.0 (+2.6)	61.1 (-9.5)

## SCORES ACROSS THE FINANCIAL CRIME GROUP

Section	Fcg: Central Aru	Fcg: Northern Aru	Fcg: Southern Aru	Financial Crime Group Hq	Financial Crime Group
Performance Index	63.0	66.6	54.8	61.2	62.4
1. Vision and Purpose + Communication and Cooperation	61.4	65.4	48.1	58.4	59.9
2. My Supervisor	75.5	66.5	76.2	68.2	69.7
3. My Work Group	69.4	74.1	65.5	67.1	69.6
4. My Job	62.0	68.5	53.4	61.0	62.7
5. Respect & Integrity in the Workplace	65.0	71.3	60.8	71.8	69.3
6. Learning and Development	53.6	61.5	41.0	51.5	53.8
7. Performance and Feedback	71.4	65.1	47.2	57.9	60.9
8. Recognition	53.6	57.8	44.2	54.2	54.1
9. Final Thoughts	63.7	73.4	60.4	64.5	66.8
10. The Survey - Your Views	42.9	42.5	33.3	47.2	43.2

Weighted Mean Scores (%)

Note that for the table above, red scores indicate the lowest performing area within the FCG on the survey sections – and reflect potentially important intervention areas. Green coloured scores reflect possible 'best practice' areas in terms of the respective survey section.

## HOW ENGAGED ARE STAFF WITHIN THE FINANCIAL CRIME GROUP?

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

Financial Crime Group 2011	Financial Crime Group 2010	NZ Police (Total Org)
66.8	62.7 (+4.1)	70.5 (-3.7)

Weighted Mean Score (%)

### Engagement Profile

Engagement Group	Financial Crime Group 2011	Financial Crime Group 2010	NZ Police (Total Org)
Engaged	14.6	0.0 (+14.6)	21.3 (-6.7)
Ambivalent	68.7	79.2 (-10.5)	63.2 (+5.5)
Disengaged	16.7	20.8 (-4.1)	15.5 (+1.2)

Proportion of Employees (%)

## RESPECT AND INTEGRITY WITHIN THE FINANCIAL CRIME GROUP?

Question	Financial Crime Group 2011	NZ Police (Total Org)
5.1: Staff in my workgroup respect employee diversity	85.4	75.9 (+9.5)
5.2: I know who to contact to report instances of workplace harassment, bullying or discrimination	77.1	77.6 (-0.5)
5.3: I am confident that I could raise concerns I had related to workplace harassment, bullying or discrimination without fear of reprisal	62.5	64.7 (-2.2)
5.4: I am confident that I could raise concerns I had about other inappropriate conduct in the workplace without fear of reprisal (inappropriate conduct may include any actions or behaviours that make you feel uncomfortable in the workplace)	64.6	62.4 (+2.2)
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	64.6	57.8 (+6.8)

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?

	Financial Crime Group 2011	NZ Police (Total Org)
Not Applicable	81.3	82.1 (-0.8)
Yes	2.1	4.6 (-2.5)
No	16.7	13.3 (+3.4)

## WHAT DRIVES EMPLOYEE ENGAGEMENT WITHIN THE FINANCIAL CRIME GROUP?

	Key Driver Questions	Financial Crime Group 2011	Financial Crime Group 2010	NZ Police (Total Org)
	1.3: NZ Police is an enjoyable place to work	67.6	65.6 (+2.0)	68.3 (-0.7)
	4.3: My job gives me a sense of personal achievement	67.7	68.8 (-1.1)	76.1 (-8.4)
	1.6: I feel a sense of belonging to my District/Service Centre	60.9	55.4 (+5.5)	61.7 (-0.8)
	1.2: I feel I am working for an effective organisation	60.4	57.3 (+3.1)	59.7 (+0.7)
	6.2: The work I do makes good use of my knowledge and skills	63.5	65.6 (-2.1)	68.9 (-5.4)
	6.4: I am encouraged to try new ways of doing things	58.3	62.5 (-4.2)	57.8 (+0.5)
	4.7: The level of work-related stress I experience in my job is acceptable	62.5	57.3 (+5.2)	58.3 (+4.2)
	6.5: There are career and personal development opportunities for me in NZ Police	51.6	49.0 (+2.6)	61.1 (-9.5)
	6.1: NZ Police provides adequate training for the work I do	45.8	43.8 (+2.0)	54.8 (-9.0)

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 New Zealand Police (Total Org). These key drivers are rank ordered. The colour coding for each question reveals if a particular Service Centre 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
<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	1.2: I feel I am working for an effective organisation
<b>Team level</b>			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/Service Centre	6.2: The work I do makes good use of my knowledge and skills 4.3: My job gives me a sense of personal achievement 6.1: NZ Police provides adequate training for the work I do	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 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.

Key Driver Questions	FCG: Central Aru	FCG: Northern Aru	FCG: Southern Aru	Financial Crime Group HQ	Financial Crime Group	NZ Police (Total Org)
1.3: NZ Police is an enjoyable place to work	71.4	66.7	58.3	69.7	67.6	68.3
4.3: My job gives me a sense of personal achievement	78.6	78.1	50.0	60.5	67.7	76.1
1.6: I feel a sense of belonging to my District/Service Centre	50.0	70.3	54.2	59.2	60.9	61.7
1.2: I feel I am working for an effective organisation	60.7	62.5	50.0	61.8	60.4	59.7
6.2: The work I do makes good use of my knowledge and skills	67.9	71.9	58.3	56.6	63.5	68.9
6.4: I am encouraged to try new ways of doing things	71.4	62.5	45.8	53.9	58.3	57.8
4.7: The level of work-related stress I experience in my job is acceptable	64.3	71.9	41.7	60.5	62.5	58.3
6.5: There are career and personal development opportunities for me in NZ Police	50.0	64.1	33.3	47.4	51.6	61.1
6.1: NZ Police provides adequate training for the work I do	35.7	51.6	33.3	48.7	45.8	54.8

Weighted Mean Score (%)

## SUMMARY AND KEY OBSERVATIONS – THE FINANCIAL CRIME GROUP

Overall, the results indicate that the Financial Crime Group is scoring on par with the organisation average, but is scoring significantly below the total organisation in the sections of My Work Group, Learning and Development, and Performance and Feedback. These sections have seen little, if any, improvement over the past year. The service centre has seen significant increase in the section scores for Vision and Purpose (+6.1%), Respect & Integrity in the Workplace (+17.0%), Recognition (+5.8%), Final Thoughts (Employee Engagement) (+4.1%), and The Survey – Your Views (+4.1%). Examining the section scores across the areas within the Financial Crime Group reveals that the Southern Aru scores the lowest across the majority of the survey sections, while the Northern Aru scores the highest.

The Financial Crime Group has seen significant improvements in eight of their ten highest rated questions, with only one question scoring significantly below the NZ Police average. Staff within this service centre now appear to have a much better balance between their personal and work life (question score increased 11.9%). The Financial Crime Group has scored significantly below the total organisation on four of their lowest rated questions, with three of the four questions revolving around the issue of learning and development.

The perceptions that staff within the Financial Crime Group have around staff respect and integrity differ in certain areas in comparison to the total organisation. A greater proportion of staff within this service centre feel that employee diversity is respected within their workgroups. They also seem to be more confident that if they raise an issue to do with the occurrence of negative behaviour (bullying, discrimination or harassment), it will be dealt with effectively. Conversely however, a greater proportion of staff that had seen or experienced negative behaviour did not think it had been dealt with effectively.

The level of engagement within the Financial Crime Group can be considered on par with that of the total organisation, but this service centre has also seen a significant increase in engagement since 2010. In 2010 the Financial Crime Group had no engaged staff but this year has seen a decrease in the proportion of disengaged and ambivalent staff, and an increase in the proportion of engaged staff. In order to continue this positive shift in engagement levels, the Financial Crime Group needs to focus on the area of Development from the Anatomy of a Great Workplace model. In particular, those 'red' areas where the service centre is scoring significantly below the NZ Police total organisation score.

## 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 Centres 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.