New Zealand Police
Workplace Survey 2011
Summary of Findings:
Information & Technology

June 2011

NEW ZEALAND POLICE
Nga Pirihimana O Aotearoa

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

RESPONSE RATE

	ICT 2011	ICT 2010	NZ Police 2011 (Total Org)
Number of Responses	245	266	9503
Response Rate	83.3%	88.7%	79.2%

Note: For the tables below **Green font** indicates that the District's score is statistically higher than the average score for NZ Police on that survey section/question, and/or that a score has improved since the 2010 survey. **Red font** indicates the score is statistically lower, and/or has significantly declined since the 2010 survey. The scores in the tables, excluding the response rate, are weighted mean scores (unless otherwise stated). See the glossary on the last page of this report for definitions of all terms used.

OVERALL PERCEPTIONS OF THE INFORMATION & TECHNOLOGY SERVICE CENTRE AS A PLACE TO WORK

Section	ICT 2011	ICT 2010	NZ Police 2011 (Total Org)
Performance Index (average of all questions in the survey)	57.8	62.6 (-4.8)	64.2 (-6.4)
1. Vision and Purpose + Communication and Cooperation	53.3	60.5 (-7.2)	59.2 (-5.9)
2. My Supervisor	61.9	63.6 (-1.7)	72.3 (-10.4)
3. My Work Group	66.9	70.1 (-3.2)	74.7 (-7.8)
4. My Job	58.5	63.8 (-5.3)	62.7 (-4.2)
5. Respect & Integrity in the Workplace	66.2	66.4 (-0.2)	68.1 (-1.9)
6. Learning and Development	50.1	55.5 (-5.4)	60.1 (-10.0)
7. Performance and Feedback	55.5	62.3 (-6.8)	66.7 (-11.2)
8. Recognition	48.5	53.8 (-5.3)	53.1 (-4.6)
9. Final Thoughts	66.4	71.1 (-4.7)	70.5 (-4.1)
10. The Survey - Your Views	33.9	46.2 (-12.3)	42.8 (-8.9)

Weighted Mean Score (%)

HIGHEST RATED AREAS WITHIN INFORMATION & TECHNOLOGY SERVICE CENTRE

Section	ICT 2011	ICT 2010	NZ Police 2011 (Total Org)
3.2: I can rely on the support of others in my work group	73.7	76.0 (-2.3)	78.3 (-4.6)
4.2: I know how my work contributes to the effectiveness of NZ Police	72.7	76.9 (-4.2)	75.6 (-2.9)
9.5: I feel a sense of commitment to NZ Police	72.7	76.3 (-3.6)	76.2 (-3.5)
9.3: I take an active interest in what happens in NZ Police	72.6	74.1 (-1.5)	74.8 (-2.2)
3.7: People in my workgroup conduct themselves in accordance with the values expected by NZ Police	72.3	72.4 (-0.1)	78.6 (-6.3)
5.1: Staff in my workgroup respect employee diversity	71.9	74.0 (-2.1)	73.3 (-1.4)
9.4: I feel inspired to go the extra mile to help NZ Police succeed	71.8	75.0 (-3.2)	70.3 (+1.5)
2.4: My supervisor treats staff with respect	71.6	69.3 (+2.3)	77.1 (-5.5)
7.1: NZ Police expects high standards of performance from its people	71.0	74.1 (-3.1)	77.0 (-6.0)
3.1: Staff in my work group work well together	71.0	72.2 (-1.2)	77.5 (-6.5)

Weighted Mean Score (%)

LOWEST RATED AREAS WITHIN INFORMATION & TECHNOLOGY SERVICE CENTRE

Section	ICT 2011	ICT 2010	NZ Police 2011 (Total Org)
10.2: Changes in response to the 2010 Workplace Survey have had a positive impact on my workgroup	30.6	42.0 (-11.4)	40.8 (-10.2)
10.1: I believe actions will be taken based on the results of this survey	37.9	50.5 (-12.6)	44.8 (-6.9)
1.11: Work groups in NZ Police work well together	39.5	47.0 (-7.5)	51.9 (-12.4)
8.5: People here are appointed to positions based on merit	41.0	47.9 (-6.9)	43.7 (-2.7)
1.10: NZ Police is interested in the views and opinions of its staff	42.4	50.5 (-8.1)	45.3 (-2.9)
7.3: Poor performance is dealt with effectively in my work group	42.6	50.3 (-7.7)	56.5 (-13.9)
8.3: NZ Police has appropriate ways of recognising outstanding achievement	42.8	48.3 (-5.5)	52.9 (-10.1)
6.5: There are career and personal development opportunities for me in NZ Police	43.1	48.8 (-5.7)	61.1 (-18.0)
6.6: I am satisfied with my learning and development opportunities in NZ Police	44.1	48.1 (-4.0)	57.9 (-13.8)
1.8: Communication in my District/Service Centre is open and honest	45.2	51.2 (-6.0)	52.0 (-6.8)

JRA
surveys ∖ analysis ∖ insight
a **Kenexa** company

An Analysis of Employee Engagement – Information & Technology
June, 2011
© JRA

SCORES ACROSS INFORMATION & TECHNOLOGY SERVICE CENTRE

Section	Central ICT SC	ICT Service Centre	Northern ICT SC	Southern ICT SC	ICT Service Centre Overall
Performance Index	58.0	56.9	55.7	70.0	57.8
1. Vision and Purpose + Communication and Cooperation	56.1	51.6	55.0	67.2	53.3
2. My Supervisor	56.5	61.6	53.0	83.0	61.9
3. My Work Group	61.0	66.9	65.8	76.4	66.9
4. My Job	62.2	58.1	52.9	64.5	58.5
5. Respect & Integrity in the Workplace	58.8	65.9	67.6	79.4	66.2
6. Learning and Development	52.5	48.9	48.9	62.0	50.1
7. Performance and Feedback	52.2	53.8	63.6	69.8	55.5
8. Recognition	48.9	47.3	47.2	62.8	48.5
9. Final Thoughts	73.2	65.1	60.5	79.2	66.4
10. The Survey - Your Views	42.4	32.8	34.2	35.0	33.9

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.

HOW ENGAGED ARE STAFF WITHIN INFORMATION & TECHNOLOGY SERVICE CENTRE?

Engagement Index (average of all six engagement questions)

ICT Service Centre 2011	ICT Service Centre 2010	NZ Police (Total Org)
66.4	71.1 (-4.7)	70.5 (-4.1)

Weighted Mean Score (%)

Engagement Profile

Engagement Group	ICT SC 2011	ICT SC 2010	NZ Police (Total Org)
Engaged	15.1	19.5 (-4.4)	21.3 (-6.2)
Ambivalent	62.5	65.8 (-3.3)	63.2 (-0.7)
Disengaged	22.4	14.7 (+7.7)	15.5 (+6.9)

Proportion of Employees (%)

RESPECT AND INTEGRITY WITHIN INFORMATION & TECHNOLOGY SERVICE CENTRE?

Question	ICT SC	NZ Police (Total Org)
5.1: Staff in my workgroup respect employee diversity	73.8	75.9 (-2.1)
5.2: I know who to contact to report instances of workplace harassment, bullying or discrimination	69.4	77.6 (-8.2)
5.3: I am confident that I could raise concerns I had related to workplace harassment, bullying or discrimination without fear of reprisal	62.7	64.7 (-2.0)
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)	60.7	62.4 (-1.7)
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	52.7	57.8 (-5.1)

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?

	ICT Service Centre	NZ Police (Total Org)
Not Applicable	84.5	82.1 (+2.4)
Yes	3.7	4.6 (-0.9)
No	11.8	13.3 (-1.5)

JRA
surveys analysis insight
a Kenexa company

WHAT DRIVES EMPLOYEE ENGAGEMENT WITHIN INFORMATION & TECHNOLOGY SERVICE CENTRE?

	Rank from 2010	Key Driver Questions	ICT SC 2011	ICT SC 2010	NZ Police (Total Org)
	7	4.3: My job gives me a sense of personal achievement	68.4	73.6 (-5.2)	76.1 (-7.7)
	1	1.3: NZ Police is an enjoyable place to work	65.4	69.6 (-4.2)	68.3 (-2.9)
	5	1.2: I feel I am working for an effective organisation	54.9	64.3 (-9.4)	59.7 (-4.8)
	10	4.6: I am satisfied with my physical work environment	60.8	63.5 (-2.7)	59.7 (+1.1)
	9	6.2: The work I do makes good use of my knowledge and skills	66.6	69.8 (-3.2)	68.9 (-2.3)
	NA	6.5: There are career and personal development opportunities for me in NZ Police	43.1	48.8 (-5.7)	61.1 (-18.0)
	NA	4.11: My performance is fairly assessed	53.2	61.4 (-8.2)	60.3 (-7.1)
	NA	4.2: I know how my work contributes to the effectiveness of NZ Police	72.7	76.9 (-4.2)	75.6 (-2.9)

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		1.3: 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
Team level		4.6: I am satisfied with my physical work environment		
Individual level	4.2: I know how my work contributes to the effectiveness of NZ Police		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	4.11: My performance is fairly assessed

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	Central ICT SC	ICT Service Centre	Northern ICT SC	Southern ICT SC	ICT Service Centre Overall	NZ Police (Total Org)
4.3: My job gives me a sense of personal achievement	80.4	66.4	60.5	84.4	68.4	76.1
1.3: NZ Police is an enjoyable place to work	72.7	63.9	57.9	81.3	65.4	68.3
1.2: I feel I am working for an effective organisation	62.0	52.7	55.3	68.8	54.9	59.7
4.6: I am satisfied with my physical work environment	75.0	59.8	57.9	56.3	60.8	59.7
6.2: The work I do makes good use of my knowledge and skills	73.9	65.9	60.5	71.9	66.6	68.9
6.5: There are career and personal development opportunities for me in NZ Police	47.8	42.0	38.2	54.7	43.1	61.1
4.11: My performance is fairly assessed	58.7	52.4	43.4	65.6	53.2	60.3
4.2: I know how my work contributes to the effectiveness of NZ Police	80.4	71.3	72.4	78.1	72.7	75.6

Weighted Mean Score (%)

SUMMARY AND KEY OBSERVATIONS – INFORMATION & TECHNOLOGY SERVICE CENTRE

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

There was an excellent response to the 2011 staff survey from within Information & Technology. Of 294 employees asked to participate, 245 responded, representing a response rate of 83.3%. This high response rate ensures the results presented in this report provide a very accurate indication of employee attitude and opinion towards the Service Centre.

How Employees Perceive Information & Technology as a Place to Work

In terms of how staff perceive Information & Technology as a place to work, the average score across all survey questions (the Performance Index) is significantly lower than that of NZ Police overall. When looking at scores around specific areas, Information & Technology employees are substantially less positive than the NZ Police average in all but one section (which is on par with the average). Areas that are most significantly lower include those concerning 'My Supervisor', 'Learning and Development', and 'Performance and Feedback'. Scores for many sections are also substantially lower for Information & Technology staff in 2011 when compared to 2010, especially 'The Survey – Your Views'. Considering that in 2010 the ICT Service Centre was on a par with the NZ Police average, or exceeded the average in some areas, 2011's scores represent significant negative changes in the opinions of staff about their workplace. When we examine section scores across Service Centres within Information & Technology, the Southern centre consistently scores significantly higher than others across nine of the ten sections.

The highest rated questions show that although scores on many specific areas are lower than the NZ Police average within the ICT Service Centre, staff are generally as committed, interested and inspired to go the extra mile as any other NZ Police staff. These items are three of the six questions used to determine levels of employee engagement, suggesting that a strong base exists on which to build engagement in the future.

When examining the lowest rated questions we note that Information & Technology staff are significantly below the NZ Police overall scores regarding positive outcomes from the survey. The Service Centre also

scores much lower than the average on issues of learning and career development opportunities, and on recognition of outstanding performance.

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

One of Information & Technology's lowest rated questions was found to have a strong impact upon employee engagement levels – 'There are career and personal development opportunities for me in NZ Police'. This suggests that the very low score on this item is significantly lowering engagement amongst Service Centre staff. This single issue stands out as the area in which the most substantial gains in engagement could be realised through an effective intervention strategy.

When we examine the scores across the Key Drivers for the various Service Centres, we see that the Southern Service Centre is significantly more positive in a number of areas. By contrast, the Northern Centre is generally the least positive, with scores lower than those of both Information & Technology overall and the NZ Police average.

Respect and Integrity within Information & Technology

Information & Technology's results are on par with the overall NZ Police result across three 'Respect and Integrity in the Workplace' survey items, and significantly lower on two items. Staff in the Service Centre are less sure of who to contact regarding harassment, bullying, or discrimination, and are also less confident that such concerns would be appropriately dealt with. For those people who had witnessed or experienced some form of harassment, discrimination or bullying in the workplace, their perceptions of the handling of those incidents are similar to those of NZ Police overall.

Employee Engagement within Information & Technology

Employee engagement levels within Information and Technology are lower than those of NZ Police as a whole, and also lower than they were in 2010. Below we provide the results of an analysis that identifies what engages the District's employees the most – information which serves as a means for increasing current engagement levels.

Key Drivers of Employee Engagement – Leverage Points for Performance Improvement

Possible leverage points are those key drivers of employee engagement identified via statistical analysis. The strongest theme to emerge from the analysis is that it is the work Information & Technology staff do that is most closely linked to their engagement levels, with six of the eight items coming from sections 4 and 6 ('My Job' and 'Learning and Development'). As mentioned above, Service Centre staff are much less positive about career opportunities, and also score lower than the NZ Police average regarding issues of performance appraisal and personal achievement. Five of these six items scored significantly lower than in 2010.

Also of note are the two questions from section 1, which are the second and third highest ranked drivers. Both of these items were also key drivers for Information & Technology in 2010, and both have significantly lower scores than last year, suggesting that a drop in engagement from 2010 is related to less staff feeling NZ Police is an enjoyable and effective environment.

Employee Comments

Examining the comments made by Information and Technology staff we see that, like in other parts of NZ Police, it is the people, camaraderie, teamwork, and the sense of pride and personal achievement they get from working for NZ Police. Job variety and flexibility were also mentioned by a smaller number of people.

A number of issues were raised as things that needed to change. Some of these were related to staffing levels and perceived differences in the way sworn and non-sworn staff are treated. Issues of management and leadership were raised, as was a greater need to break down silos and allow teams to better work together.

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

Summary

There are clearly some issues present within Information and Technology. Its scores and engagement levels have, in the main, gone down substantively since the 2010 survey, and are likewise substantively

less than NZ Police norms. There also appears to exist a sense of cynicism regarding the survey and the likelihood of it leading to changes. Key Driver Analysis clearly reveals the areas where positive change would result in improvements in employee engagement. To achieve such change, it is recommended that:

- Opportunities for advancement are developed and well communicated
- Initiatives be undertaken to build a sense of fun and enjoyment within the Service Centre
- Links between the performance of the Service Centre and front line success are highlighted
- Performance appraisal is reviewed in a way that is relevant to the particular needs of Information & Technology

Within Information & Technology the Southern Centre stands out as a possible best practice group. There would be benefit in investigating what this centre is doing that the others are not and seeing what can be implemented elsewhere. In contrast, the Northern Centre reflects an area that could well benefit from more focussed attention.

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

OVERALL PERCEPTIONS OF THE NZ POLICE AS A PLACE TO WORK

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

Weighted Mean Score (%)

ENGAGEMENT PROFILE

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

Proportion of Employees (%)

JRA
surveys ˅ analysis ˅ insight
a **Kenexa** company

An Analysis of Employee Engagement – Information & Technology
June, 2011
© JRA

9

Workplace Survey

Action Plan Template

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

An Analysis of Employee Engagement – Information & Technology
June, 2011
© JRA

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.