

# **New Zealand Police Workplace Survey 2011**

## Summary of Findings: Org Financial Crime Agency NZ

---

**June 2011**



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



## RESPONSE RATE

	Org Financial Crime Agency NZ 2011	Org Financial Crime Agency NZ 2010	NZ Police 2011 (Total Org)
Number of Responses	37	26	9503
Response Rate	92.5%	92.9%	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 ORG FINANCIAL CRIME AGENCY NZ AS A PLACE TO WORK

Section	Org Financial Crime Agency NZ 2011	Org Financial Crime Agency NZ 2010	NZ Police 2011 (Total Org)
Performance Index	69.1	64.5 (+4.6)	64.2 (+4.9)
1. Vision and Purpose + Communication and Cooperation	64.4	62.7 (+1.7)	59.2 (+5.2)
2. My Supervisor	75.3	71.2 (+4.1)	72.3 (+3.0)
3. My Work Group	75.9	66.6 (+9.3)	74.7 (+1.2)
4. My Job	68.7	64.6 (+4.1)	62.7 (+6.0)
5. Respect & Integrity in the Workplace	71.8	68.4 (+3.4)	68.1 (+3.7)
6. Learning and Development	65.1	56.9 (+8.2)	60.1 (+5.0)
7. Performance and Feedback	72.5	65.4 (+7.1)	66.7 (+5.8)
8. Recognition	62.6	56.0 (+6.6)	53.1 (+9.5)
9. Final Thoughts	75.5	72.9 (+2.6)	70.5 (+5.0)
10. The Survey - Your Views	49.0	49.0 (0.0)	42.8 (+6.2)

## HIGHEST RATED AREAS WITHIN THE ORG FINANCIAL CRIME AGENCY NZ

Section	Org Financial Crime Agency NZ 2011	Org Financial Crime Agency NZ 2010	NZ Police 2011 (Total Org)
1.7: I intend to continue working at NZ Police for at least the next 12 months	82.4	76.0 (+6.4)	85.3 (-2.9)
3.7: People in my workgroup conduct themselves in accordance with the values expected by NZ Police	82.4	79.8 (+2.6)	78.6 (+3.8)
9.5: I feel a sense of commitment to NZ Police	80.4	76.0 (+4.4)	76.2 (+4.2)
2.4: My supervisor treats staff with respect	80.4	79.8 (+0.6)	77.1 (+3.3)
3.1: Staff in my work group work well together	79.7	73.1 (+6.6)	77.5 (+2.2)
7.1: NZ Police expects high standards of performance from its people	79.7	76.0 (+3.7)	77.0 (+2.7)
2.3: My supervisor behaves in a way that is consistent with the values of NZ Police	79.1	78.8 (+0.3)	76.3 (+2.8)
2.6: I have confidence in my supervisor	79.1	76.0 (+3.1)	74.5 (+4.6)
3.4: I have confidence in the ability of others in my work group	78.4	72.1 (+6.3)	75.5 (+2.9)
9.3: I take an active interest in what happens in NZ Police	77.7	77.9 (-0.2)	74.8 (+2.9)

## LOWEST RATED AREAS WITHIN THE ORG FINANCIAL CRIME AGENCY NZ

Section	Org Financial Crime Agency NZ 2011	Org Financial Crime Agency NZ 2010	NZ Police 2011 (Total Org)
1.11: Work groups in NZ Police work well together	45.3	44.2 (+1.1)	51.9 (-6.6)
10.2: Changes in response to the 2010 Workplace Survey have had a positive impact on my workgroup	48.0	46.9 (+1.1)	40.8 (+7.2)
10.1: I believe actions will be taken based on the results of this survey	50.0	51.0 (-1.0)	44.8 (+5.2)
1.10: NZ Police is interested in the views and opinions of its staff	54.1	50.0 (+4.1)	45.3 (+8.8)
6.1: NZ Police provides adequate training for the work I do	57.4	54.8 (+2.6)	54.8 (+2.6)
8.5: People here are appointed to positions based on merit	58.1	51.9 (+6.2)	43.7 (+14.4)
1.5: There is a sense of 'common purpose' in NZ Police	60.1	64.4 (-4.3)	58.1 (+2.0)
2.7: I get regular feedback on my performance from my supervisor (formal/informal)	60.4	59.6 (+0.8)	64.2 (-3.8)
1.8: Communication in my District/Service Centre is open and honest	60.8	58.7 (+2.1)	52 (+8.8)
1.9: I feel informed about NZ Police and its activities	61.5	61.5 (0.0)	57.1 (+4.4)

Note that for the table above, red scores indicate the lowest performing area within the Org Financial Crime Agency 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 ORG FINANCIAL CRIME AGENCY NZ?

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

Org Financial Crime Agency NZ 2011	Org Financial Crime Agency NZ 2010	NZ Police (Total Org)
75.5	72.9 (+2.6)	70.5 (+5.0)

Weighted Mean Score (%)

### Engagement Profile

Engagement Group	Org Financial Crime Agency NZ 2011	Org Financial Crime Agency NZ 2010	NZ Police (Total Org)
Engaged	29.7	26.9 (+2.8)	21.3 (+8.4)
Ambivalent	62.2	61.6 (+0.6)	63.2 (-1.0)
Disengaged	8.1	11.5 (-3.4)	15.5 (-7.4)

Proportion of Employees (%)

## RESPECT AND INTEGRITY WITHIN THE ORG FINANCIAL CRIME AGENCY NZ?

Question	Org Financial Crime Agency NZ	NZ Police (Total Org)
5.1: Staff in my workgroup respect employee diversity	81.1	75.9 (+5.2)
5.2: I know who to contact to report instances of workplace harassment, bullying or discrimination	73.0	77.6 (-1.8)
5.3: I am confident that I could raise concerns I had related to workplace harassment, bullying or discrimination without fear of reprisal	75.7	64.7 (+11.0)
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)	75.7	62.4 (+13.3)
5.5: I am confident that any concerns I may need to raise regarding harassment, bullying, discrimination or other inappropriate conduct would be dealt with appropriately	70.3	57.8 (+12.5)

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?

	Org Financial Crime Agency NZ	NZ Police (Total Org)
Not Applicable	94.6	82.1 (+12.5)
Yes	2.7	4.6 (-1.9)
No	2.7	13.3 (-10.6)

## WHAT DRIVES EMPLOYEE ENGAGEMENT WITHIN THE ORG FINANCIAL CRIME AGENCY NZ?

	Key Driver Questions	Org Financial Crime Agency NZ 2011	Org Financial Crime Agency NZ 2010	NZ Police (Total Org)
	1.3: NZ Police is an enjoyable place to work	77.0	74.0 (+3.0)	68.3 (+8.7)
	4.3: My job gives me a sense of personal achievement	74.3	67.3 (+7.0)	76.1 (-1.8)
	1.6: I feel a sense of belonging to my District/Service Centre	64.2	68.3 (-4.1)	61.7 (+2.5)
	1.2: I feel I am working for an effective organisation	68.9	67.3 (+1.6)	59.7 (+9.2)
	6.2: The work I do makes good use of my knowledge and skills	69.6	61.5 (+8.1)	68.9 (+0.7)
	6.4: I am encouraged to try new ways of doing things	66.2	57.7 (+8.5)	57.8 (+8.4)
	4.7: The level of work-related stress I experience in my job is acceptable	70.3	71.2 (-0.9)	58.3 (+12.0)
	6.5: There are career and personal development opportunities for me in NZ Police	66.2	54.8 (+11.4)	61.1 (+5.1)
	6.1: NZ Police provides adequate training for the work I do	57.4	54.8 (+2.6)	54.8 (+2.6)

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/District 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

## SUMMARY AND KEY OBSERVATIONS – THE ORG FINANCIAL CRIME AGENCY NZ

The Org Financial Crime Agency has, on average, scored above the total NZ Police, with significantly higher scores seen in the majority of the survey sections, in particular Recognition (9.5% higher), The Survey – Your Views (6.2% higher), and My Job (6.0% higher). This service centre has also seen significant improvements in the majority of the survey sections since 2010, with the biggest increase seen in the section My Work Group (9.3% higher than in 2010). Following on from this, the majority of the highest rated questions for the Org Financial Crime Agency come from either this same section or My Supervisor. Six of the ten lowest rated questions come from the section Vision and Purpose + Communication and Cooperation.

Within the Org Financial Crime Agency, the staff perceptions of the levels of respect and integrity differ greatly from those expressed by the total organisation. Only a very small proportion of staff felt that any occurrences of harassment, discrimination or bullying that they had witnessed, weren't dealt with appropriately. This reflects the feeling that staff appear to feel more confident in being able to raise any issues related to negative workplace behaviour (bullying, harassment, discrimination), as well as a confidence they appear to have that any issues that are raised will be dealt with appropriately.

The engagement levels within the Org Financial Crime Agency tend to be slightly higher than those of the total organisation. Overall, there does not appear to have been a big change in the level of engagement within this service centre since 2010. However, as the proportion of disengaged staff has decreased and the proportion of engaged staff has increased, it would seem that the service centre is moving in the right direction. In order to continue to see an improvement in the level of engagement year on year, the Org Financial Crime Agency would likely benefit from putting greater focus on the area of Development, within the Anatomy of a Great Workplace. In particular, focusing on providing more training for staff, as well as ensuring that their jobs make use of their individual skills and knowledge. The service centre should also not lose focus of those areas where it is currently performing above the total organisation.

## 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 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.