

New Zealand Police Workplace Survey 2012

Summary of Findings: Org Financial Crime Agency NZ

April 2012

KeneXa® | JRA



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

KeneXa® | JRA

An Analysis of Employee Engagement – Org Financial Crime Agency NZ
April, 2012
© JRA

NOTE: 2011 Trend data was unavailable for Org Financial Crime Agency NZ due to organisational changes between 2011 and 2012

RESPONSE RATE

	Org Financial Crime Agency NZ 2012	NZ Police 2012 (Total Org)
Number of Responses	87	9393
Response Rate	85.3%	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, and/or that a score has improved since the 2011 survey. **Red font** indicates the score is statistically lower, and/or has significantly declined since the 2011 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 ORG FINANCIAL CRIME AGENCY NZ AS A PLACE TO WORK

Section	Org Financial Crime Agency NZ 2012	NZ Police 2012 (Total Org)
Performance Index (average of all questions in the survey)	67.1	67.7 (-0.6)
1. Vision and Purpose + Communication and Cooperation	64.2	63.9 (+0.3)
2. My Supervisor	70.9	75.6 (-4.7)
3. My Work Group	70.7	76.7 (-6.0)
4. My Job	67.2	65.7 (+1.5)
5. Respect & Integrity in the Workplace	71.5	71.2 (+0.3)
6. Learning and Development	66.0	62.7 (+3.3)
7. Performance and Feedback	65.5	69.4 (-3.9)
8. Recognition	60.3	58.0 (+2.3)
9. Final Thoughts (Engagement)	73.6	73.3 (+0.3)
10. The Survey - Your Views	49.9	49.6 (+0.3)

HIGHEST RATED AREAS WITHIN ORG FINANCIAL CRIME AGENCY NZ

Question	Org Financial Crime Agency NZ 2012	NZ Police 2012 (Total Org)
1.7: I intend to continue working at NZ Police for at least the next 12 months	86.0	85.8 (+0.2)
9.5: I feel a sense of commitment to NZ Police	78.4	78.1 (+0.3)
9.3: I take an active interest in what happens in NZ Police	77.9	76.7 (+1.2)
4.3: My job gives me a sense of personal achievement	77.6	78.0 (-0.4)
7.1: NZ Police expects high standards of performance from its people	76.7	79.3 (-2.6)
3.2: I can rely on the support of others in my work group	76.7	80.0 (-3.3)
2.5: My supervisor supports and encourages me in my job	75.3	77.6 (-2.3)
3.7: People in my workgroup conduct themselves in accordance with the values expected by NZ Police	75.3	80.0 (-4.7)
5.2: I know who to contact to report instances of workplace harassment, bullying or discrimination	74.4	75.8 (-1.4)
3.1: Staff in my work group work well together	74.4	79.1 (-4.7)

LOWEST RATED AREAS WITHIN ORG FINANCIAL CRIME AGENCY NZ

Question	Org Financial Crime Agency NZ 2012	NZ Police 2012 (Total Org)
10.2: Changes in response to the 2011 Workplace Survey have had a positive impact on my workgroup	47.1	47.8 (-0.7)
1.11: Work groups in NZ Police work well together	48.0	56.0 (-8.0)
8.5: People here are appointed to positions based on merit	50.6	48.2 (+2.4)
10.1: I believe actions will be taken based on the results of this survey	52.6	51.5 (+1.1)
1.10: NZ Police is interested in the views and opinions of its staff	53.4	51.3 (+2.1)
7.3: Poor performance is dealt with effectively in my work group	55.2	60.4 (-5.2)
1.8: Communication in my District or my Service Centre is open and honest	56.8	57.4 (-0.6)
4.9: The pay and benefits I receive are fair for the work I do	56.9	53.0 (+3.9)
8.3: NZ Police has appropriate ways of recognising outstanding achievement	60.9	58.8 (+2.1)
2.7: I get regular feedback on my performance from my supervisor (formal/informal)	61.5	68.7 (-7.2)

BIGGEST DIFFERENCES BETWEEN ORG FINANCIAL CRIME AGENCY NZ AND NZ POLICE (TOTAL ORG) - POSITIVE

Question	Org Financial Crime Agency NZ 2012	NZ Police 2012 (Total Org)
4.4: I have the tools and resources I need to do my job	67.2	59.0 (+8.2)
4.7: The level of work-related stress I experience in my job is acceptable	69.0	61.6 (+7.4)
6.1: NZ Police provides adequate training for the work I do	66.1	58.9 (+7.2)
4.6: I am satisfied with my physical work environment	69.8	63.6 (+6.2)
1.4: NZ Police cares about the well-being of its staff	62.4	56.9 (+5.5)
4.8: I am able to maintain a balance between my personal and working life	73.6	69.3 (+4.3)
6.3: I am encouraged to develop my knowledge, skills and abilities in NZ Police	67.0	63.1 (+3.9)
4.9: The pay and benefits I receive are fair for the work I do	56.9	53.0 (+3.9)
8.4: I feel my contribution is valued in NZ Police	62.6	59.0 (+3.6)
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	69.8	66.5 (+3.3)

BIGGEST DIFFERENCES BETWEEN ORG FINANCIAL CRIME AGENCY NZ AND NZ POLICE (TOTAL ORG) - NEGATIVE

Question	Org Financial Crime Agency NZ 2012	NZ Police 2012 (Total Org)
3.3: Roles and responsibilities are clearly defined in my work group	61.6	73.5 (-11.9)
4.1: The responsibilities of my job are clearly defined	63.7	73.2 (-9.5)
1.11: Work groups in NZ Police work well together	48.0	56.0 (-8.0)
2.7: I get regular feedback on my performance from my supervisor (formal/informal)	61.5	68.7 (-7.2)
3.4: I have confidence in the ability of others in my work group	70.4	77.5 (-7.1)
2.4: My supervisor treats staff with respect	73.9	80.0 (-6.1)
3.5: I feel part of an effective work group	71.0	76.7 (-5.7)
3.6: The way work is allocated in my workgroup is fair	64.9	70.4 (-5.5)
2.1: My supervisor communicates the goals and objectives of our work group effectively	67.0	72.4 (-5.4)
7.3: Poor performance is dealt with effectively in my work group	55.2	60.4 (-5.2)

SCORES ACROSS ORG FINANCIAL CRIME AGENCY NZ

Section	Auckland OFCANZ	Org Financial Crime Agency NZ	Org Financial Crime Agency NZ
Performance Index	67.1	67.1	67.1
1. Vision and Purpose + Communication and Cooperation	62.3	66.9	64.2
2. My Supervisor	77.0	62.2	70.9
3. My Work Group	70.0	71.6	70.7
4. My Job	66.7	67.9	67.2
5. Respect & Integrity in the Workplace	72.5	70.0	71.5
6. Learning and Development	66.5	65.3	66.0
7. Performance and Feedback	63.7	67.9	65.5
8. Recognition	58.9	62.4	60.3
9. Final Thoughts	73.6	73.5	73.6
10. The Survey - Your Views	46.3	55.0	49.9

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.

RESPECT AND INTEGRITY WITHIN ORG FINANCIAL CRIME AGENCY NZ

Question	Org Financial Crime Agency NZ	NZ Police (Total Org)
5.1: Staff in my workgroup respect employee diversity	85.1	81.0 (+4.1)
5.2: I know who to contact to report instances of workplace harassment, bullying or discrimination	81.6	80.9 (+0.7)
5.3: I am confident that I could raise concerns I had related to workplace harassment, bullying or discrimination without fear of reprisal	67.8	69.4 (-1.6)
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)	72.4	67.1 (+5.3)
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	70.1	63.5 (+6.6)

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	71.3	83.4 (-12.1)
Yes	11.5	4.6 (+6.9)
No	17.2	12.0 (+5.2)

HOW ENGAGED ARE STAFF WITHIN ORG FINANCIAL CRIME AGENCY NZ?

Engagement Index (average of all six engagement questions)

Org Financial Crime Agency NZ 2012	NZ Police (Total Org)
73.6	73.3 (+0.3)
Weighted Mean Score (%)	

Engagement Profile

Engagement Group	Org Financial Crime Agency NZ 2012	NZ Police (Total Org)
Engaged	31.0	27.8 (+3.2)
Ambivalent	56.4	59.7 (-3.3)
Disengaged	12.6	12.5 (+0.1)
		Proportion of Employees (%)

WHAT DRIVES EMPLOYEE ENGAGEMENT WITHIN ORG FINANCIAL CRIME AGENCY NZ?

	Key Driver Questions	Org Financial Crime Agency NZ 2012	NZ Police (Total Org)
	1.6: I feel a sense of belonging to my District or my Service Centre	64.5	65.5 (-1.0)
	4.7: The level of work-related stress I experience in my job is acceptable	69.0	61.6 (+7.4)
	1.3: NZ Police is an enjoyable place to work	72.7	71.1 (+1.6)
	7.3: Poor performance is dealt with effectively in my work group	55.2	60.4 (-5.2)
	7.1: NZ Police expects high standards of performance from its people	76.7	79.3 (-2.6)
	4.3: My job gives me a sense of personal achievement	77.6	78.0 (-0.4)
		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.

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		7.1: NZ Police expects high standards from its people
Team level				7.3: Poor performance is dealt with effectively in my work group
Individual level		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	4.7: The level of work-related stress I experience in my job is acceptable

PRIORITY AREAS – KEY DRIVER SCORES ACROSS KEY DEMOGRAPHIC GROUPS

Reading across the table, red scores indicate the lowest performing area within the Service Centre on the key drivers of employee engagement – and reflect potentially important intervention areas. Green coloured scores reflect possible 'best practice' areas in terms of the respective key driver.

Question	Auckland OFCANZ	Org Financial Crime Agency NZ	Org Financial Crime Agency NZ	Total Organisation
1.6: I feel a sense of belonging to my District or my Service Centre	59.8	71.4	64.5	65.5
4.7: The level of work-related stress I experience in my job is acceptable	70.1	67.4	69.0	61.6
1.3: NZ Police is an enjoyable place to work	72.5	72.9	72.7	71.1
7.3: Poor performance is dealt with effectively in my work group	53.9	57.1	55.2	60.4
7.1: NZ Police expects high standards of performance from its people	75.0	79.2	76.7	79.3
4.3: My job gives me a sense of personal achievement	81.4	72.2	77.6	78.0

Weighted Mean Score (%)

SUMMARY AND KEY OBSERVATIONS – ORG FINANCIAL CRIME AGENCY NZ

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

Overall, OFCANZ achieved an excellent response rate to the 2012 Workplace Survey – 85.3%. 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 Org Financial Crime Agency NZ as a Place to Work

Examining staff perceptions of OFCANZ as a place to work reveals that staff have provided scores on par with the NZ Police average across the majority of the survey sections, including the Performance Index (the average score across all survey questions). The Service Centre has however scored significantly below the NZ Police average for the survey sections of 'My Supervisor' and 'My Work Group'. Seven of the ten questions showing the biggest negative difference in score between OFCANZ and NZ Police come from these sections.

A positive sign for the Service Centre is that there is a high level of agreement in staff intention to continue working with NZ Police for the next 12 months. Related to this is the high sense of commitment staff have to the organisation (78.4% weighted mean) and the active interest they have in what happens within NZ Police (77.9% weighted mean).

When we look at the questions where OFCANZ is currently scoring above the NZ Police average, five of the ten questions displayed in this report come from the 'My Job' section, with four (questions 4.4, 4.7, 4.6, and 4.8) of these showing significantly higher scores than the NZ Police average. This indicates a potential strength for the Service Centre to build on going forward. Further to this, two questions from the 'My Job' section (4.7 and 4.3) were found to have a strong impact on employee engagement levels i.e. are key drivers of employee engagement within OFCANZ.

Respect and Integrity within Org Financial Crime Agency NZ

Currently OFCANZ is scoring on par with the NZ Police average in terms of their overall score for the survey section 'Respect and Integrity in the Workplace'. People within the Service Centre tend to agree strongly that employee diversity is respected within workgroups (85.1% level of agreement) and they know who to contact to report instances of inappropriate behaviour (81.6% level of agreement). However, there appears to be less confidence that if an issue is raised, it will be dealt with appropriately and that there won't be any negative backlash as a result of the issue being raised. Importantly, 60% of staff that indicated they had experienced or witnessed some form of harassment, discrimination or workplace bullying, felt that the issue had not been dealt with appropriately.

Employee Engagement within Org Financial Crime Agency NZ

Employee engagement levels within the Service Centre are on par with those of NZ Police as a whole, with an engagement index score of 73.6 (+0.3 above the NZ Police average). 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

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.

The key drivers of employee engagement within OFCANZ come from three separate survey sections: 'My Job' (as previously discussed), 'Performance and Feedback' and 'Vision and Purpose + Communication and Cooperation'. We rarely see the question 'Poor performance is dealt with effectively in my work group' appear as a key driver, and as it is OFCANZ's only 'red' key driver item. This indicates that there is a particular need within the Service Centre around the areas of setting high expectations and then dealing effectively with under-performers.

Reviewing the 'Anatomy of a Great Workplace' model reinforces this message as we see three of the key drivers clustering under the pillar 'Performance Culture'. In addition to this, we see there is a need to continue to develop a sense of 'Community' within the Service Centre by creating a strong sense of belonging for individuals and an overall more enjoyable workplace. Tied to this, is the need to provide individuals with jobs that give them with a greater sense of personal achievement.

Employee Comments

Examining the comments made by staff we see that the things staff perceive as 'great' about the organisation tend to relate to the people that they work with, in particular the supportive nature of their colleagues and the sense of camaraderie that exists within the workplace. Other comments referred to various aspects of the job: the variety of work, the job flexibility, and the sense of achievement that comes from knowing that what you do is helping people and making a difference.

A number of issues were raised as things that needed to change. Staff feel like there needs to be greater alignment across teams and departments, with clearer communication and more cooperation to develop a greater sense of 'togetherness'. Other comments seemed to group around the area of systems and processes, with the feeling being that there is too much bureaucracy and micro management, not enough efficiency, and a lack of resources.

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

Summary

Overall, OFCANZ is scoring on par with the NZ Police average in many areas. The Service Centre's key strengths tend to be related to aspects of the job i.e. staff have adequate tools and resources, the level of work-related stress is acceptable and they have work-life balance. While the employee comments tended to suggest that there is a strong sense of camaraderie within the Service Centre, the survey sections 'My Supervisor' and 'My Work Group' are the only ones where OFCANZ is scoring significantly below the NZ Police average, indicating that there is large room for improvement in this area.

Impacting how people feel about their work group and supervisor will help create a stronger sense of community and belonging within the Service Centre – an area identified through the key driver analysis as requiring focus going forward. Further to this, the key driver analysis also indicates that there is a need to create a stronger culture of performance within the Service Centre (i.e. setting clear expectations around performance standards).

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.