

# **New Zealand Police Workplace Survey 2012**

## Summary of Findings: National Intelligence Centre

---

**April 2012**



**Kenexa® | JRA**

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

## RESPONSE RATE

	National Intelligence Centre 2012	National Intelligence Centre 2011	NZ Police 2012 (Total Org)
Number of Responses	56	50	9393
Response Rate	94.9%	94.3%	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. **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 NATIONAL INTELLIGENCE CENTRE AS A PLACE TO WORK

Section	National Intelligence Centre 2012	National Intelligence Centre 2011	NZ Police 2012 (Total Org)
Performance Index (average of all questions in the survey)	70.3	67.6 (+2.7)	67.7 (+2.6)
1. Vision and Purpose + Communication and Cooperation	67.3	64.0 (+3.3)	63.9 (+3.4)
2. My Supervisor	74.9	76.1 (-1.2)	75.6 (-0.7)
3. My Work Group	75.7	72.3 (+3.4)	76.7 (-1.0)
4. My Job	67.2	66.0 (+1.2)	65.7 (+1.5)
5. Respect & Integrity in the Workplace	74.9	68.9 (+6.0)	71.2 (+3.7)
6. Learning and Development	67.8	65.4 (+2.4)	62.7 (+5.1)
7. Performance and Feedback	72.8	66.7 (+6.1)	69.4 (+3.4)
8. Recognition	63.6	60.1 (+3.5)	58.0 (+5.6)
9. Final Thoughts (Engagement)	78.1	74.2 (+3.9)	73.3 (+4.8)
10. The Survey - Your Views	56.5	52.5 (+4.0)	49.6 (+6.9)

## HIGHEST RATED AREAS WITHIN NATIONAL INTELLIGENCE CENTRE

Question	National Intelligence Centre 2012	National Intelligence Centre 2011	NZ Police 2012 (Total Org)
9.5: I feel a sense of commitment to NZ Police	83.9	77.5 (+6.4)	78.1 (+5.8)
5.1: Staff in my workgroup respect employee diversity	83.5	77.0 (+6.5)	76.2 (+7.3)
1.7: I intend to continue working at NZ Police for at least the next 12 months	82.6	83.5 (-0.9)	85.8 (-3.2)
3.7: People in my workgroup conduct themselves in accordance with the values expected by NZ Police	81.3	77.0 (+4.3)	80.0 (+1.3)
7.1: NZ Police expects high standards of performance from its people	80.8	73.0 (+7.8)	79.3 (+1.5)
9.3: I take an active interest in what happens in NZ Police	80.8	76.5 (+4.3)	76.7 (+4.1)
9.4: I feel inspired to go the extra mile to help NZ Police succeed	80.4	76.0 (+4.4)	73.1 (+7.3)
2.3: My supervisor behaves in a way that is consistent with the values of NZ Police	79.1	82.0 (-2.9)	79.2 (-0.1)
5.2: I know who to contact to report instances of workplace harassment, bullying or discrimination	79.0	72.0 (+7.0)	75.8 (+3.2)
3.4: I have confidence in the ability of others in my work group	79.0	75.0 (+4.0)	77.5 (+1.5)

## LOWEST RATED AREAS WITHIN NATIONAL INTELLIGENCE CENTRE

Question	National Intelligence Centre 2012	National Intelligence Centre 2011	NZ Police 2012 (Total Org)
1.11: Work groups in NZ Police work well together	48.7	43.0 (+5.7)	56.0 (-7.3)
10.2: Changes in response to the 2011 Workplace Survey have had a positive impact on my workgroup	53.1	50.5 (+2.6)	47.8 (+5.3)
8.5: People here are appointed to positions based on merit	56.4	52.5 (+3.9)	48.2 (+8.2)
1.10: NZ Police is interested in the views and opinions of its staff	57.6	57.0 (+0.6)	51.3 (+6.3)
4.9: The pay and benefits I receive are fair for the work I do	59.4	57.5 (+1.9)	53.0 (+6.4)
10.1: I believe actions will be taken based on the results of this survey	59.8	54.5 (+5.3)	51.5 (+8.3)
1.8: Communication in my District or my Service Centre is open and honest	61.6	59.0 (+2.6)	57.4 (+4.2)
4.4: I have the tools and resources I need to do my job	62.1	60.0 (+2.1)	59.0 (+3.1)
4.5: I am sufficiently involved in decisions that affect the way I do my job	62.1	63.0 (-0.9)	60.3 (+1.8)
6.6: I am satisfied with my learning and development opportunities in NZ Police	62.5	61.5 (+1.0)	59.1 (+3.4)

## BIGGEST DIFFERENCES WITHIN NATIONAL INTELLIGENCE CENTRE SINCE 2011 - POSITIVE

Question	National Intelligence Centre 2012	National Intelligence Centre 2011	NZ Police 2012 (Total Org)
1.1: NZ Police has a clear vision of where it's going and how it's going to get there	75.4	63.5 (+11.9)	67.8 (+7.6)
3.3: Roles and responsibilities are clearly defined in my work group	69.6	61.5 (+8.1)	73.5 (-3.9)
7.1: NZ Police expects high standards of performance from its people	80.8	73.0 (+7.8)	79.3 (+1.5)
1.9: I feel informed about NZ Police and its activities	68.8	61.0 (+7.8)	62.8 (+6.0)
7.3: Poor performance is dealt with effectively in my work group	66.0	58.5 (+7.5)	60.4 (+5.6)
3.6: The way work is allocated in my workgroup is fair	67.9	60.5 (+7.4)	70.4 (-2.5)
5.2: I know who to contact to report instances of workplace harassment, bullying or discrimination	79.0	72.0 (+7.0)	75.8 (+3.2)
5.1: Staff in my workgroup respect employee diversity	83.5	77.0 (+6.5)	76.2 (+7.3)
9.5: I feel a sense of commitment to NZ Police	83.9	77.5 (+6.4)	78.1 (+5.8)
9.2: Overall, I would recommend NZ Police as a great place to work	77.2	71.0 (+6.2)	71.4 (+5.8)

## BIGGEST DIFFERENCES WITHIN NATIONAL INTELLIGENCE CENTRE SINCE 2011 - NEGATIVE

Question	National Intelligence Centre 2012	National Intelligence Centre 2011	NZ Police 2012 (Total Org)
2.4: My supervisor treats staff with respect	76.8	84.5 (-7.7)	80.0 (-3.2)
4.6: I am satisfied with my physical work environment	70.5	74.0 (-3.5)	63.6 (+6.9)
2.3: My supervisor behaves in a way that is consistent with the values of NZ Police	79.1	82.0 (-2.9)	79.2 (-0.1)
2.1: My supervisor communicates the goals and objectives of our work group effectively	68.6	71.0 (-2.4)	72.4 (-3.8)
6.5: There are career and personal development opportunities for me in NZ Police	69.2	70.5 (-1.3)	62.2 (+7.0)
3.2: I can rely on the support of others in my work group	78.6	79.5 (-0.9)	80.0 (-1.4)
1.7: I intend to continue working at NZ Police for at least the next 12 months	82.6	83.5 (-0.9)	85.8 (-3.2)
4.5: I am sufficiently involved in decisions that affect the way I do my job	62.1	63.0 (-0.9)	60.3 (+1.8)
9.1: Overall, I'm satisfied with my job	73.2	74.0 (-0.8)	72.9 (+0.3)
4.2: I know how my work contributes to the effectiveness of NZ Police	76.8	77.5 (-0.7)	76.9 (-0.1)

## RESPECT AND INTEGRITY WITHIN NATIONAL INTELLIGENCE CENTRE

Question	National Intelligence Centre	NZ Police (Total Org)
5.1: Staff in my workgroup respect employee diversity	91.1	81.0 (+10.1)
5.2: I know who to contact to report instances of workplace harassment, bullying or discrimination	78.6	80.9 (-2.3)
5.3: I am confident that I could raise concerns I had related to workplace harassment, bullying or discrimination without fear of reprisal	76.8	69.4 (+7.4)
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)	67.9	67.1 (+0.8)
5.5: I am confident that any concerns I may need to raise regarding harassment, bullying, discrimination or other inappropriate conduct would be dealt with appropriately	61.8	63.5 (-1.7)

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?

	National Intelligence Centre	NZ Police (Total Org)
Not Applicable	87.5	83.4 (+4.1)
Yes	0.0	4.6 (-4.6)
No	12.5	12.0 (+0.5)

## HOW ENGAGED ARE STAFF WITHIN NATIONAL INTELLIGENCE CENTRE?

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

National Intelligence Centre 2012	National Intelligence Centre 2011	NZ Police (Total Org)
78.1	74.2 (+3.9)	73.3 (+4.8)

Weighted Mean Score (%)

### Engagement Profile

Engagement Group	National Intelligence Centre 2012	National Intelligence Centre 2011	NZ Police (Total Org)
Engaged	35.7	22.0 (+13.7)	27.8 (+7.9)
Ambivalent	57.2	68.0 (-10.8)	59.7 (-2.5)
Disengaged	7.1	10.0 (-2.9)	12.5 (-5.4)

Proportion of Employees (%)

## WHAT DRIVES EMPLOYEE ENGAGEMENT WITHIN NATIONAL INTELLIGENCE CENTRE?

	Key Driver Questions	National Intelligence Centre 2012	National Intelligence Centre 2011	NZ Police (Total Org)
	1.3: NZ Police is an enjoyable place to work	74.1	73.5 (+0.6)	71.1 (+3.0)
	4.3: My job gives me a sense of personal achievement	77.2	75.0 (+2.2)	78.0 (-0.8)
	1.6: I feel a sense of belonging to my District or my Service Centre	69.2	69.5 (-0.3)	65.5 (+3.7)
	1.2: I feel I am working for an effective organisation	74.6	68.5 (+6.1)	65.6 (+9.0)
	6.2: The work I do makes good use of my knowledge and skills	70.5	67.0 (+3.5)	71.0 (-0.5)
	6.4: I am encouraged to try new ways of doing things	69.2	67.0 (+2.2)	61.9 (+7.3)
	4.7: The level of work-related stress I experience in my job is acceptable	66.8	63.5 (+3.3)	61.6 (+5.2)
	6.5: There are career and personal development opportunities for me in NZ Police	69.2	70.5 (-1.3)	62.2 (+7.0)
	4.5: I am sufficiently involved in decisions that affect the way I do my job	62.1	63.0 (-0.9)	60.3 (+1.8)
	6.1: NZ Police provides adequate training for the work I do	62.9	57.0 (+5.9)	58.9 (+4.0)

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>	4.5: I am sufficiently involved in decisions that affect the way I do my job	1.6: I feel a sense of belonging to my District or my Service Centre	4.3: My job gives me a sense of personal achievement 6.2: The work I do makes good use of my knowledge and skills 6.1: NZ Police provides adequate training for the work I do	4.7: The level of work-related stress I experience in my job is acceptable

## SUMMARY AND KEY OBSERVATIONS – NATIONAL INTELLIGENCE CENTRE

This year 56 people from the National Intelligence Centre participated in the NZ Police Workplace Survey. On average the Performance Index score for the Centre is not significantly different from the NZ Police overall result. In other words, the average response by National Intelligence Centre staff to the survey is about the same as the organisation as a whole. When looking at the scores achieved across the survey, many survey sections score similar to last year, however there have been significant improvements in 'Respect and Integrity in the Workplace' (up +6.0%), 'Performance and Feedback' (+6.1%) and 'The Survey – Your Views' (+4.0%). Compared to NZ Police overall, staff in the National Intelligence Centre have responded more positively in the areas of 'Learning and Development' (+5.1% higher than NZ Police), 'Recognition' (+5.6), 'Final Thoughts – Engagement' (+4.8%) and 'The Survey – Your Views' (+6.9%).

An interesting aspect of the National Intelligence Centre's highest rated items is the inclusion of three of the Employee Engagement items, each of which have improved significantly from 2011 as well as performing better than NZ Police overall. People are able to agree strongly that they 'feel a sense of commitment to NZ Police', 'take an active interest in what happens in NZ Police' and 'feel inspired to go the extra mile to help NZ Police succeed'. The National Intelligence Centre's lowest rated questions showed some large differences (+/-) compared to the NZ Police average. 'Work groups in NZ Police work well together' has increased from 2011, but is still significantly below the NZ Police average. Meanwhile 'open and honest communication', 'pay and benefits', having an interest in the 'views and opinions of staff', the appointment of 'positions based on merit', the belief that actions taken as a result of the 2011 survey, and the outcomes of this 2012 survey having a positive impact on the workplace are all seen more positively by National Intelligence Centre staff than a year ago.

As mentioned 'Respect and Integrity in the Workplace' is a section to have significantly improved from 2011. Despite this positive trend a significant proportion of staff are unable to agree that any concerns they raise are dealt with appropriately.

In terms of employee engagement levels, a far greater proportion of National Intelligence Centre staff are 'engaged' compared to last year (35.7% compared to 22.0% in 2011). The numbers of 'engaged' people in the National Intelligence Centre outnumber those who are 'disengaged' by a ratio of 5 to 1. In short, there are a far greater number of positive voices compared to negative. The ten key drivers of Employee Engagement come from just three survey sections: 'Learning and Development', 'My Job' and 'Vision and Purpose – Communication and Cooperation', with items performing either better than or the same as NZ Police. The Anatomy of a Great Workplace model shows half of the key drivers clustered in the 'Development' pillar, which overall performs better than NZ Police. This represents an area of significant opportunity for the National Intelligence Centre to leverage as a strength.

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

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

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

Weighted Mean Score (%)

### ENGAGEMENT PROFILE

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

Proportion of Employees (%)



## GLOSSARY

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

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

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

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

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

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

**The Questionnaire:** The 2012 New Zealand Police Workplace Survey contained 67 statements designed to measure a workplace on a range of issues in the organisation. Respondents were asked to indicate how much they agreed or disagreed with each statement using a five point rating system. This rating system ranged from Strongly Disagree to Strongly Agree. Questions were separated into 11 sections according to statements that naturally cluster together and measure similar issues.

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