

# **New Zealand Police Workplace Survey 2012**

## **Summary of Findings: Road Policing**

---

**April 2012**

**KeneXa® | JRA**



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

**KeneXa® | JRA**

An Analysis of Employee Engagement – Road Policing  
April, 2012  
© JRA

**NOTE: 2011 Trend data was unavailable for Road Policing due to organisational changes between 2011 and 2012**

## RESPONSE RATE

	Road Policing 2012	NZ Police 2012 (Total Org)
Number of Responses	159	9393
Response Rate	68.5%	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 while **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 ROAD POLICING AS A PLACE TO WORK

Section	Road Policing 2012	NZ Police 2012 (Total Org)
Performance Index (average of all questions in the survey)	63.6	67.7 (-4.1)
1. Vision and Purpose + Communication and Cooperation	58.6	63.9 (-5.3)
2. My Supervisor	68.5	75.6 (-7.1)
3. My Work Group	72.5	76.7 (-4.2)
4. My Job	66.1	65.7 (+0.4)
5. Respect & Integrity in the Workplace	66.7	71.2 (-4.5)
6. Learning and Development	57.9	62.7 (-4.8)
7. Performance and Feedback	63.6	69.4 (-5.8)
8. Recognition	56.6	58.0 (-1.4)
9. Final Thoughts (Engagement)	67.3	73.3 (-6.0)
10. The Survey - Your Views	45.8	49.6 (-3.8)

## HIGHEST RATED AREAS WITHIN ROAD POLICING

Question	Road Policing 2012	NZ Police 2012 (Total Org)
1.7: I intend to continue working at NZ Police for at least the next 12 months	77.5	85.8 (-8.3)
5.2: I know who to contact to report instances of workplace harassment, bullying or discrimination	77.4	75.8 (+1.6)
3.2: I can rely on the support of others in my work group	77.1	80.0 (-2.9)
3.4: I have confidence in the ability of others in my work group	75.5	77.5 (-2.0)
7.1: NZ Police expects high standards of performance from its people	75.2	79.3 (-4.1)
3.1: Staff in my work group work well together	73.9	79.1 (-5.2)
3.5: I feel part of an effective work group	73.4	76.7 (-3.3)
3.7: People in my workgroup conduct themselves in accordance with the values expected by NZ Police	73.4	80.0 (-6.6)
4.8: I am able to maintain a balance between my personal and working life	73.3	69.3 (+4.0)
4.2: I know how my work contributes to the effectiveness of NZ Police	72.3	76.9 (-4.6)

## LOWEST RATED AREAS WITHIN ROAD POLICING

Question	Road Policing 2012	NZ Police 2012 (Total Org)
10.2: Changes in response to the 2011 Workplace Survey have had a positive impact on my workgroup	44.9	47.8 (-2.9)
10.1: I believe actions will be taken based on the results of this survey	46.7	51.5 (-4.8)
8.5: People here are appointed to positions based on merit	47.6	48.2 (-0.6)
1.10: NZ Police is interested in the views and opinions of its staff	49.4	51.3 (-1.9)
1.8: Communication in my District or my Service Centre is open and honest	51.0	57.4 (-6.4)
1.4: NZ Police cares about the well-being of its staff	52.8	56.9 (-4.1)
6.6: I am satisfied with my learning and development opportunities in NZ Police	52.8	59.1 (-6.3)
6.5: There are career and personal development opportunities for me in NZ Police	53.2	62.2 (-9.0)
7.3: Poor performance is dealt with effectively in my work group	54.0	60.4 (-6.4)

1.11: Work groups in NZ Police work well together	54.2	56.0 (-1.8)
---	------	-------------

#### BIGGEST DIFFERENCES BETWEEN ROAD POLICING AND NZ POLICE (TOTAL ORG) - POSITIVE

Question	Road Policing 2012	NZ Police 2012 (Total Org)
4.4: I have the tools and resources I need to do my job	67.0	59.0 (+8.0)
4.9: The pay and benefits I receive are fair for the work I do	57.8	53.0 (+4.8)
4.8: I am able to maintain a balance between my personal and working life	73.3	69.3 (+4.0)
4.6: I am satisfied with my physical work environment	66.8	63.6 (+3.2)
4.10: I understand how my performance is measured	66.5	63.9 (+2.6)
6.1: NZ Police provides adequate training for the work I do	60.8	58.9 (+1.9)
5.2: I know who to contact to report instances of workplace harassment, bullying or discrimination	77.4	75.8 (+1.6)

#### BIGGEST DIFFERENCES BETWEEN ROAD POLICING AND NZ POLICE (TOTAL ORG) - NEGATIVE

Question	Road Policing 2012	NZ Police 2012 (Total Org)
2.3: My supervisor behaves in a way that is consistent with the values of NZ Police	68.0	79.2 (-11.2)
6.5: There are career and personal development opportunities for me in NZ Police	53.2	62.2 (-9.0)
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	57.7	66.5 (-8.8)
2.4: My supervisor treats staff with respect	71.4	80.0 (-8.6)
1.9: I feel informed about NZ Police and its activities	54.4	62.8 (-8.4)
1.7: I intend to continue working at NZ Police for at least the next 12 months	77.5	85.8 (-8.3)
2.6: I have confidence in my supervisor	69.0	77.1 (-8.1)
4.3: My job gives me a sense of personal achievement	70.3	78.0 (-7.7)
9.3: I take an active interest in what happens in NZ Police	69.3	76.7 (-7.4)
1.3: NZ Police is an enjoyable place to work	63.8	71.1 (-7.3)

#### SCORES ACROSS ROAD POLICING

Section	Commercial Vehicle Invest Unit	PNHQ - Road Policing	Police Infringement Bureau	Road Policing
Performance Index	64.1	65.1	62.8	63.6
1. Vision and Purpose + Communication and Cooperation	57.8	63.1	57.9	58.6
2. My Supervisor	70.6	69.6	66.4	68.5
3. My Work Group	73.1	66.7	73.6	72.5
4. My Job	67.5	67.4	64.7	66.1
5. Respect & Integrity in the Workplace	66.7	65.7	67.0	66.7
6. Learning and Development	59.5	55.9	57.1	57.9
7. Performance and Feedback	61.7	63.6	65.1	63.6
8. Recognition	56.2	57.7	56.5	56.6
9. Final Thoughts	67.7	76.5	64.3	67.3
10. The Survey - Your Views	46.3	55.1	42.8	45.8

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 ROAD POLICING

Question	Road Policing	NZ Police (Total Org)
5.1: Staff in my workgroup respect employee diversity	67.5	81.0 (-13.5)
5.2: I know who to contact to report instances of workplace harassment, bullying or discrimination	81.1	80.9 (+0.2)
5.3: I am confident that I could raise concerns I had related to workplace harassment, bullying or discrimination without fear of reprisal	59.5	69.4 (-9.9)
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	67.1 (-7.6)
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	49.0	63.5 (-14.5)

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?

	Road Policing	NZ Police (Total Org)
Not Applicable	78.0	83.4 (-5.4)
Yes	2.5	4.6 (-2.1)
No	19.5	12.0 (+7.5)

## HOW ENGAGED ARE STAFF WITHIN ROAD POLICING?

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

Road Policing	NZ Police (Total Org)
67.3	73.3 (-6.0)

Weighted Mean Score (%)

### Engagement Profile

Engagement Group	Road Policing	NZ Police (Total Org)
Engaged	22.8	27.8 (-5.0)
Ambivalent	53.1	59.7 (-6.6)
Disengaged	24.1	12.5 (+11.6)

Proportion of Employees (%)

## WHAT DRIVES EMPLOYEE ENGAGEMENT WITHIN ROAD POLICING?

	Key Driver Questions	Road Policing	NZ Police (Total Org)
	1.3: NZ Police is an enjoyable place to work	63.8	71.1 (-7.3)
	1.6: I feel a sense of belonging to my District or my Service Centre	60.1	65.5 (-5.4)
	1.2: I feel I am working for an effective organisation	63.2	65.6 (-2.4)
	4.3: My job gives me a sense of personal achievement	70.3	78.0 (-7.7)
	4.2: I know how my work contributes to the effectiveness of NZ Police	72.3	76.9 (-4.6)
	4.7: The level of work-related stress I experience in my job is acceptable	59.3	61.6 (-2.3)
	4.6: I am satisfied with my physical work environment	66.8	63.6 (+3.2)
	6.4: I am encouraged to try new ways of doing things	57.5	61.9 (-4.4)
	6.2: The work I do makes good use of my knowledge and skills	64.9	71.0 (-6.1)
	6.3: I am encouraged to develop my knowledge, skills and abilities in NZ Police	58.2	63.1 (-4.9)

Weighted Mean Score (%)

Note: The table above shows the results of a statistical analysis identifying those things assessed in the survey that are the most engaging to staff members within the Service Centre. These key drivers are rank ordered. The colour coding for each question reveals if a particular key driver is scoring higher (green), lower (red), or the same (orange) as NZ Police overall. Red key drivers are important to your employees' engagement levels but score poorly compared to the rest of the organisation and hence represents a particularly useful leverage point when attempting to further engage employees. NOTE: due to organisational change over the past year, providing a 'Rank from 2011' for the above key drivers is not appropriate.

## 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	6.3: I am encouraged to develop my knowledge, skills and abilities in NZ Police	1.2: I feel I am working for an effective organisation
<b>Team level</b>		4.6: I am satisfied with my physical work environment	6.4: I am encouraged to try new ways of doing things	
<b>Individual level</b>	4.2: I know how my work contributes to the effectiveness of NZ Police	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	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	Commercial Vehicle Invest Unit	PNHQ - Road Policing	Police Infringement Bureau	Road Policing	NZ Police 2012 (Total Org)
1.3: NZ Police is an enjoyable place to work	61.3	64.8	65.6	63.8	71.1
1.6: I feel a sense of belonging to my District or my Service Centre	58.8	68.2	58.9	60.1	65.5
1.2: I feel I am working for an effective organisation	59.2	64.8	65.9	63.2	65.6
4.3: My job gives me a sense of personal achievement	74.6	76.1	65.1	70.3	78.0
4.2: I know how my work contributes to the effectiveness of NZ Police	69.6	77.3	73.1	72.3	76.9
4.7: The level of work-related stress I experience in my job is acceptable	60.8	59.1	58.2	59.3	61.6
4.6: I am satisfied with my physical work environment	65.8	78.4	64.3	66.8	63.6
6.4: I am encouraged to try new ways of doing things	59.2	56.8	56.5	57.5	61.9
6.2: The work I do makes good use of my knowledge and skills	71.3	63.6	60.4	64.9	71.0
6.3: I am encouraged to develop my knowledge, skills and abilities in NZ Police	58.3	58.3	58.1	58.2	63.1

Weighted Mean Score (%)

## SUMMARY AND KEY OBSERVATIONS – ROAD POLICING

The following summary provides insight into how employees perceive the Service Centre as a place to work and how it fares to the rest of NZ Police. Engagement levels within the Service Centre are examined, along with the results of a statistical analysis looking for the key drivers of engagement. A cursory examination of employee comments is also provided. The section concludes with an overall summary that highlights the key issues within the Service Centre that would likely provide it with the greatest improvement leverage when attempting to make the Service Centre a truly great – and engaging – place to work.

### Response Rate

There was a good response to the 2012 staff survey from Road Policing. Of the 232 employees asked to participate, 159 responded, representing a response rate of 68.5%. While this rate is lower than NZ Police overall, it does provide a good indication of employee attitude and opinion towards Road Policing.

### How Employees Perceive Road Policing as a Place to Work

Due to significant organisational changes in establishing Road Policing over the past year, we have not examined the trend data from the areas that now make up Road Policing so reflection on the results will take a “fresh look” and will look at the current year’s results and how they compare to overall NZ Police results.

In terms of how staff perceive Road Policing as a place to work, the average score across all survey questions (the Performance Index) is 63.6% which is significantly below that of NZ Police overall (i.e., 67.7%). In fact all but two sections of the survey are significantly below 2012 NZ Police norms, the two exceptions being on par. Looking at the scores around specific sections, of note Road Policing opinions are significantly below that of NZ Police average in ‘My Supervisor’ (-7.1), ‘Performance and Feedback’ (-5.8), ‘Vision and Purpose + Communication and Cooperation’ (-5.3), and ‘Final Thoughts (Engagement)’ (-6.0).

Digging further, we can examine item level scores within these sections to determine what is driving these lower results. Of the lowest rated items four of the ten relate to ‘Communication and Cooperation’, including ‘NZ Police are interested in the view and opinions of its staff’ and ‘Communication in my District or my Service Centre is open and honest’ both scoring lower than 50%. A number of items relating to ‘My Supervisor’ make up some of the largest negative gaps to NZ Police averages, like the largest difference of all items across the survey ‘My supervisor behaves in a way that is consistent with the values of NZ Police’ (-11.2). Others are ‘My supervisor treats staff with respect’ (-8.6) and ‘I have confidence in my supervisor’ (-8.1).

The team dynamic in Road Policing rates highly for Road Policing with five of the top ten rated items from ‘My Workgroup’. However a number of them have sizable negative differences to NZ Police averages indicating an opportunity for these to be improved upon, in particular ‘The people in my workgroup conduct themselves in accordance with the values expected by NZ Police’ and ‘People in my work group work well together’.

On an encouraging note, Road Policing staff feel better equipped to do their jobs. ‘My Job’ rates well with staff having a more positive view compared to NZ Police norms on aspects of their jobs such as being provided with the required tools and resource, work environment, pay and benefits as well as work/life balance.

Of note, staff in the District express cynicism regarding action taken based on the results of last year’s survey and action being taken this year. These are two lowest scoring items in the survey.

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

When we breakdown Road Policing’s results by Area across the survey sections we see, on the whole, a tight set of results with few great differences. What does stand out is the marked positive difference at PNHQ-Road Policing on engagement and perspective on survey impact. Overall PNHQ-Road Policing has expressed more positive opinions throughout the survey.

## **Respect and Integrity within Road Policing**

Road Policing's results for the 'Respect and Integrity in the Workplace' survey items are particularly poor. Beyond people knowing who to contact (which is high at 81.1% and on par with NZ Police overall), the other results for this section stand out as low and significantly behind the NZ Police averages. Staff believe their colleagues respect diversity substantially less than all staff in general. They also believe that likelihood of reprisal should they raise a concern is higher than NZ Police in general and they have considerably less confidence that concerns would be dealt with appropriately.

Proportionally more people in Road Policing have witnessed or experienced some form of harassment, discrimination or bullying in the workplace (22.0% over 16.6% across NZ Police), and of those people fewer (11.4% compared to 27.7% across NZ Police) perceived those incidents had been dealt with effectively.

## **Employee Engagement within Road Policing**

Employee engagement levels within Road Policing are below those of NZ Police as a whole. At 67.3% this indicates on average employees ticked neutral to agree on the six engagement items. Notable is the high proportion of staff identified as Disengaged – nearly one in four. Opportunities to engage are predominately with those already Engaged or identifying as Ambivalent. Below we provide the results of an analysis that identifies what engages Road Policing employees the most – information which serves as a means for increasing current engagement levels.

## **Key Drivers of Employee Engagement – Leverage Points for Performance Improvement**

Possible leverage points are those key drivers of employee engagement identified via statistical analysis.

There is a strong theme coming through for Road Policing around people's engagement being driven by wanting to belong to an enjoyable place to work where people know how they contribute and feel they and the organisation are achieving and effective. This theme is extracted from the top five key drivers specific to Road Policing. Of these, four are underperforming the NZ Police average and one is on par.

There is a secondary theme of exploring personal potential through making good use of what people know and can do, developing that further and allowing people to try new ways. These are scoring closer to neutral and have good room to improve.

Examining the key drivers as they relate to the Areas of Road Policing we see a mixed set of results. Looking to achieve improvement from within Road Policing, a first step to take may be to understand where results are highest - why that is, what that area is doing and what is replicable in other areas. A note of caution however, given the majority of even the highest results within Road Policing are either on par or lower than NZ Police overall, it may not bring the change required here and it could be more effective to look to other high performing Districts/Service Centres for inspiration.

## **Employee Comments**

Examining the comments made by staff many refer to peer camaraderie and support, the ability they have to make a difference in the community as well as the variety that the job offers. Good pay and job stability is also mentioned.

A number of issues were raised as things that needed to change such as addressing poor performance of supervisors and others in general as well as needing better the understanding of each other and working better together. Concern about diversity and respect also emerged as a theme. People mentioned desire for learning and development opportunities as well as concern on how promotions are made. A number recommended taking note of the survey feedback and taking positive action.

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

## **Summary**

What is clear from this report is that the results for Road Policing are generally low and markedly underperforming NZ Police as a whole. There are a range of concerns present from: supervisor level performance, open and honest communications, and appropriate respectful behaviour relating to values and integrity. These areas can sit behind what is coming through as priority areas for Road Policing – the key drivers. The high regard for the job itself and their purpose for being in the Police are encouraging and positive points to draw on.

There is a two pronged approach when looking at the key driver themes – one at high level of working with staff to clarify and develop recommendations on what makes an 'enjoyable place to work' and how to increase their 'sense of belonging', as well as making clear how each and everyone contributes to the effectiveness of NZ Police.

The other approach is to focus addressing personal optimisation, sense of achievement and the development opportunities for Road Policing – through regular conversations with each individual staff member, understanding their development needs at individual and job family levels, and identifying the development opportunities on the job, from within Road Policing and in NZ Police.

We recommend aligning with a District that is performing well in engagement and other performance measures in order to understand their approach to building an engaged workforce and to inspire thinking as to what may work well in Road Policing.

There is cynicism as to the impact surveying staff for their feedback has had at Road Policing in the past because of the perceived lack of acknowledgement and action taken. To make the most of the valuable insight given by staff in the survey, to maintain a good level of response for future surveys and to embark on a journey to improve engagement, leadership across Road Policing needs to be at the forefront of desiring an engaged workforce, being accountable for what happens next and setting the course.



## 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 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.