

New Zealand Police Workplace Survey 2011

Summary of Findings: Northland District

June 2011



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



RESPONSE RATE

	Northland 2011	Northland 2010	NZ Police 2011 (Total Org)
Number of Responses	289	294	9503
Response Rate	76.1%	74.4%	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 NORTHLAND DISTRICT AS A PLACE TO WORK

Section	Northland 2011	Northland 2010	NZ Police 2011 (Total Org)
Performance Index	62.1	62.2 (-0.1)	64.2 (-2.1)
1. Vision and Purpose + Communication and Cooperation	55.4	55.1 (+0.3)	59.2 (-3.8)
2. My Supervisor	72.7	72.1 (+0.6)	72.3 (+0.4)
3. My Work Group	73.1	73.7 (-0.6)	74.7 (-1.6)
4. My Job	60.3	59.7 (+0.6)	62.7 (-2.4)
5. Respect & Integrity in the Workplace	66.7	65.6 (+1.1)	68.1 (-1.4)
6. Learning and Development	59.0	61.2 (-2.2)	60.1 (-1.1)
7. Performance and Feedback	66.0	69.8 (-3.8)	66.7 (-0.7)
8. Recognition	50.6	50.9 (-0.3)	53.1 (-2.5)
9. Final Thoughts	67.4	66.1 (+1.3)	70.5 (-3.1)
10. The Survey - Your Views	37.8	38.4 (-0.6)	42.8 (-5.0)

HIGHEST RATED AREAS WITHIN THE NORTHLAND DISTRICT

Section	Northland 2011	Northland 2010	NZ Police 2011 (Total Org)
1.7: I intend to continue working at NZ Police for at least the next 12 months	86.5	86.2 (+0.3)	85.3 (+1.2)
2.3: My supervisor behaves in a way that is consistent with the values of NZ Police	77.3	76.7 (+0.6)	76.3 (+1.0)
3.2: I can rely on the support of others in my work group	76.7	78.8 (-2.1)	78.3 (-1.6)
3.7: People in my workgroup conduct themselves in accordance with the values expected by NZ Police	76.5	74.1 (+2.4)	78.6 (-2.1)
2.4: My supervisor treats staff with respect	76.4	76.6 (-0.2)	77.1 (-0.7)
3.1: Staff in my work group work well together	76.3	77.9 (-1.6)	77.5 (-1.2)
2.6: I have confidence in my supervisor	76.2	77.0 (-0.8)	74.5 (+1.7)
7.1: NZ Police expects high standards of performance from its people	75.9	77.1 (-1.2)	77 (-1.1)
2.5: My supervisor supports and encourages me in my job	75.3	74.8 (+0.5)	74.7 (+0.6)
3.4: I have confidence in the ability of others in my work group	74.5	74.4 (+0.1)	75.5 (-1.0)

LOWEST RATED AREAS WITHIN THE NORTHLAND DISTRICT

Section	Northland 2011	Northland 2010	NZ Police 2011 (Total Org)
10.2: Changes in response to the 2010 Workplace Survey have had a positive impact on my workgroup	36.1	37.7 (-1.6)	40.8 (-4.7)
1.10: NZ Police is interested in the views and opinions of its staff	37.8	37.6 (+0.2)	45.3 (-7.5)
10.1: I believe actions will be taken based on the results of this survey	39.5	39.2 (+0.3)	44.8 (-5.3)
8.5: People here are appointed to positions based on merit	44.4	47 (-2.6)	43.7 (+0.7)
1.8: Communication in my District/Service Centre is open and honest	45.1	46.7 (-1.6)	52.0 (-6.9)
1.4: NZ Police cares about the well-being of its staff	45.2	44.3 (+0.9)	51.9 (-6.7)
4.4: I have the tools and resources I need to do my job	46.7	44.6 (+2.1)	53.5 (-6.8)
4.9: The pay and benefits I receive are fair for the work I do	48.6	46.2 (+2.4)	50.8 (-2.2)
1.11: Work groups in NZ Police work well together	49.2	49.4 (-0.2)	51.9 (-2.7)
8.2: We celebrate success in NZ Police	49.9	47.9 (+2.0)	54.1 (-4.2)

SCORES ACROSS THE NORTHLAND DISTRICT

Section	Northland District	Far North Area	Northland DHQ	Whangarei Area
Performance Index	62.1	61.8	66.8	61.1
1. Vision and Purpose + Communication and Cooperation	55.4	54.3	63.4	54.2
2. My Supervisor	72.7	73.6	72.7	72.0
3. My Work Group	73.1	74.8	76.2	70.8
4. My Job	60.3	60.2	67.1	58.6
5. Respect & Integrity in the Workplace	66.7	67.5	67.8	65.8
6. Learning and Development	59.0	56.8	60.6	60.5
7. Performance and Feedback	66.0	67.8	70.5	63.2
8. Recognition	50.6	49.6	56.9	49.8
9. Final Thoughts	67.4	65.6	71.5	67.9
10. The Survey - Your Views	37.8	35.5	51.4	36.1

Weighted Mean Scores (%)

Note that for the table above, red scores indicate the lowest performing area within the District 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 NORTHLAND DISTRICT?

Engagement Index (average of all six engagement questions)

Northland 2011	Northland 2010	NZ Police (Total Org)
67.4	66.1 (1.3)	70.5 (-3.1)

Weighted Mean Score (%)

Engagement Profile

Engagement Group	Northland 2011	Northland 2010	NZ Police (Total Org)
Engaged	15.9	12.9 (+3.0)	21.3 (-5.4)
Ambivalent	66.5	67.4 (-0.9)	63.2 (+3.3)
Disengaged	17.6	19.7 (-2.1)	15.5 (+2.1)

Proportion of Employees (%)

RESPECT AND INTEGRITY WITHIN THE NORTHLAND DISTRICT?

Question	Northland 2011	NZ Police (Total Org)
5.1: Staff in my workgroup respect employee diversity	71.6	75.9 (-4.3)
5.2: I know who to contact to report instances of workplace harassment, bullying or discrimination	78.2	77.6 (+0.6)
5.3: I am confident that I could raise concerns I had related to workplace harassment, bullying or discrimination without fear of reprisal	63.3	64.7 (+1.4)
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)	59.5	62.4 (-2.9)
5.5: I am confident that any concerns I may need to raise regarding harassment, bullying, discrimination or other inappropriate conduct would be dealt with appropriately	57.1	57.8 (-0.7)

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?

	Northland 2011	NZ Police (Total Org)
Not Applicable	83.7	82.1 (1.6)
Yes	4.5	4.6 (-0.1)
No	11.8	13.3 (-1.5)

WHAT DRIVES EMPLOYEE ENGAGEMENT WITHIN THE NORTHLAND DISTRICT?

	Rank from 2010	Key Driver Questions	Northland 2011	Northland 2010	NZ Police (Total Org)
	1	1.3: NZ Police is an enjoyable place to work	64.9	64.0 (+0.9)	68.3 (-3.4)
	NA	1.4: NZ Police cares about the well-being of its staff	45.2	44.3 (+0.9)	51.9 (-6.7)
	4	8.4: I feel my contribution is valued in NZ Police	51.6	52.7 (-1.1)	54.5 (-2.9)
	NA	1.8: Communication in my District/Service Centre is open and honest	45.1	46.7 (-1.6)	52.0 (-6.9)
	NA	1.9: I feel informed about NZ Police and its activities	52.7	53.7 (-1.0)	57.1 (-4.4)
	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	62.2	61.3 (+0.9)	63.0 (-0.8)
	NA	8.5: People here are appointed to positions based on merit	44.4	47.0 (-2.6)	43.7 (+0.7)
	6	8.2: We celebrate success in NZ Police	49.9	47.9 (+2.0)	54.1 (-4.2)
	NA	5.1: Staff in my workgroup respect employee diversity	71.4	70.5 (+0.9)	73.3 (-1.9)
	NA	5.2: I know who to contact to report instances of workplace harassment, bullying or discrimination	72.9	72.8 (+0.1)	73.4 (-0.5)

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 District. 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 District'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	1.8: Communication in my District/Service Centre is open and honest	1.4: NZ Police cares about the well-being of its staff 1.3: NZ Police is an enjoyable place to work 5.2: I know who to contact to report instances of workplace harassment, bullying or discrimination 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	8.5: People here are appointed to positions based on merit	8.2: We celebrate success in NZ Police
Team level		5.1: Staff in my workgroup respect employee diversity		
Individual level	1.9: I feel informed about NZ Police and its activities	8.4: I feel my contribution is valued in NZ Police		

PRIORITY AREAS – KEY DRIVER SCORES ACROSS KEY DEMOGRAPHIC GROUPS

Reading across the table, red scores indicate the lowest performing area within the District 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	Far North Area	Northland DHQ	Whangarei Area	Northland District	Total Organisation
1.3: NZ Police is an enjoyable place to work	64.4	73.6	62.9	64.9	68.3
1.4: NZ Police cares about the well-being of its staff	43.3	54.1	44.3	45.2	51.9
8.4: I feel my contribution is valued in NZ Police	48.9	59.5	51.8	51.6	54.5
1.8: Communication in my District/Service Centre is open and honest	45.4	54.7	42.3	45.1	52.0
1.9: I feel informed about NZ Police and its activities	51.5	64.2	50.6	52.7	57.1
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	62.9	62.8	61.4	62.2	63.0
8.5: People here are appointed to positions based on merit	47.0	48.0	41.1	44.4	43.7
8.2: We celebrate success in NZ Police	47.2	54.7	50.9	49.9	54.1
5.1: Staff in my workgroup respect employee diversity	72.2	73.0	70.2	71.4	73.3
5.2: I know who to contact to report instances of workplace harassment, bullying or discrimination	73.1	73.0	72.8	72.9	73.4

Weighted Mean Score (%)

SUMMARY AND KEY OBSERVATIONS –NORTHLAND DISTRICT

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

Response Rate

Building on last year's good response rate the 2011 staff survey for the Northland District finished with a total of 289 people participating in the survey. This represents 76.1% of all those invited in the District and is up on 74.4% from 2010. A high response rate like this again ensures that the results presented in this report provide an accurate indication of employee attitude and opinion towards the District.

How Employees Perceive the Northland District as a Place to Work

The 2011 results indicate that staff in Northland tend to feel about their District much as they did in 2010. This year the District's 'Performance Index' – the average score across all questions across all employees – is 62.1% remains almost unchanged from the District's 2010 Index of 62.2%. One section score did decline significantly – 'Performance & Feedback' (down from 69.8% in 2010 to 66% in 2011).

Compared to NZ Police overall we see that 'Vision and Purpose + Communication and Cooperation', 'Final Thoughts (Engagement)', and 'The Survey – Your Views' are significantly below NZ Police overall. In particular the two survey items that makes up 'The Survey – Your Views' are both lower than NZ Police by more than 5.0% (weighted mean points) on average. This indicates that people are much less likely to feel that the District will act upon the annual Workplace Survey results. This is worth paying attention to given the evidence from the NZ Police survey this year shows that those Districts and Areas with higher or improved employee ratings around post-survey action have concomitant improvements in both employee engagement levels and survey scores generally.

On examination of the District's highest rated questions we see intention to stay at NZ Police remains the top ranked question for the District at 86.5%, which is much in line with the overall NZ Police result of 85.3%. Of particular interest for the District is that 8 out of 10 highest rated questions come from the sections 'My Supervisor' and 'My Work Group', with the 'NZ Police expects high standards of performance from its people' being the remaining item to make it into the highest ten scoring questions. Compared with NZ Police overall all the highest rated questions are scoring about the same.

Looking at the lowest ranked questions for the District we see from the 3 lowest rated items that Northland staff do not believe that their opinions and views really count to NZ Police or that efforts from last year's survey have led to improvements at work. These 3 questions are all significantly below that of NZ Police overall; 'Changes in response to the 2010 Workplace Survey have had a positive impact on my workgroup' (lower by 4.7%); 'NZ Police is interested in the views and opinions of its staff' (lower by -7.5%); and 'I believe actions will be taken based on the results of this survey' (lower by -5.3). Other low scoring items come from 'Vision and Purpose + Communication and Cooperation', 'My Job' and the 'Recognition' with a number of them also scoring below NZ Police overall.

Results across the District are interesting in that there is a distinct difference between the Northland DHQ results compared to the other two areas. Whangarei, and the Far North Area to a lesser extent, perform below the average for the Northland District across most survey sections. Interestingly, the Northland DHQ scores significantly higher than the other two areas for the 'The Survey – Your Views' section, possibly indicating that these larger areas may have struggled to implement effective initiatives following the 2010 workplace survey.

Respect and Integrity within the Northland District

On average the Northland District results are about the same as the overall NZ Police result across 'Respect and Integrity in the Workplace' survey items. The one item where Northland scores significantly below NZ Police overall is the 'Staff in my workgroup respect employee diversity' question which is -4.3% below the average. For those people who had witnessed or experienced some form of harassment, discrimination or bullying in the workplace, they perceived the handling of those incidents to be much the same as NZ Police overall.

Employee Engagement within the Northland District

Employee engagement levels for the District have improved significantly compared to 2010. This year the proportion of people ticking agree and strongly agree to the six engagement questions is 15.9%, up from 12.9 % in 2010. As positive as this is, it must be noted that this result is still significantly below NZ Police overall (where 21.3% of respondents tick 'agree' or 'strongly agree' to the six engagement questions). Below we provide the results of an analysis that identifies the issues that engage the District's employees the most – information which serves as a targeted means for increasing current engagement levels.

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.

As with 2010 a 'sense of community' is very important to people in the District. Of the ten identified key drivers for the Northland District, a total of six fall into the 'Anatomy of a Great Workplace' category of 'Community'. This represents a significant leverage point for the district to focus on to improve employee engagement. The 3 most important key drivers 'NZ Police is an enjoyable place to work', 'NZ Police cares about the well-being of its staff' and 'I feel my contribution is valued in NZ Police' all fit into this 'sense of community' category and are each scoring below NZ Police overall. 'Respect and Integrity' questions make up the remainder of this category, and while performing about the same as NZ Police, still represent an area where opportunities for improvement will exist.

The next 2 most important drivers of engagement 'Communication in my District/Service Centre is open and honest', and 'I feel informed about NZ Police and its activities' fall into the 'Vision and Values' category and are both items that the Northland District is underperforming in significantly compared to NZ Police. However, looking across the District we see that Northland DHQ is an area that does much better across these key drivers, and it would be worth investigating the dynamics of the area that allow it to score better than Whangarei and the Far North Areas, to see what best practice initiatives can be shared and implemented across the District.

Employee Comments

Similar to the 2010 survey comments, many staff make specific reference to the people that they work with. Comments such as camaraderie, team work, colleagues, the people and the work they do for the public are frequently made as things that make working for NZ Police great. Many people take real pride in the work that they do for NZ Police. Many people like the variety of their work, and a good number make mention of job security being of importance to them.

Among the things that people felt NZ Police could do better included more frontline staffing, and paying more attention to the opinions of those at who are out on the frontline 'policing' on a daily basis. There are comments that refer to there being too many management positions, when instead there should be more people out in the community. Other resources that are mentioned include computers, cars and other equipment in general. Recognition for a job well done is another theme to come through.

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

Summary

For the overall Performance Index result the Northland District performs similar to that of NZ Police, however levels of 'Engagement' are significantly below NZ Police overall. There are also a good number of key driver items that fall under a 'sense of community' category, but are performing significantly below those of NZ Police. We know that these items are important to staff, and the survey comments given by staff back this up, particularly when many comments make specific reference to the sense of belonging that they get by being a part of NZ Police.

One particular area that the Northland District should focus on is its handling of post survey initiatives resulting from this year's survey. The 3 lowest scoring questions for the District indicate that this is a weak point from last year, and staff do not believe that their opinions and views will make a difference to their workplace.

With a little time and effort going into post survey action planning, and following through on post survey discussions with staff, the District has a great opportunity to improve on key driver items, while at the same time showing staff that their opinions do count, that doing the survey is worthwhile, and that NZ Police cares about making their workplace a better one.

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. Districts 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 event, 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.