

New Zealand Police Workplace Survey 2011

Summary of Findings: Training Service Centre

June 2011



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



RESPONSE RATE

	Training Service Centre 2011	Training Service Centre 2010	NZ Police 2011 (Total Org)
Number of Responses	214	205	9503
Response Rate	82.0%	79.2%	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, 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 TRAINING SERVICE CENTRE AS A PLACE TO WORK

Section	Training Service Centre 2011	Training Service Centre 2010	NZ Police 2011 (Total Org)
Performance Index (average of all questions in the survey)	62.8	60.4 (+2.4)	64.2 (-1.4)
1. Vision and Purpose + Communication and Cooperation	56.9	51.4 (+5.5)	59.2 (-2.3)
2. My Supervisor	66.4	68.5 (-2.1)	72.3 (-5.9)
3. My Work Group	70.8	70.7 (+0.1)	74.7 (-3.9)
4. My Job	64.3	63.0 (+1.3)	62.7 (+1.6)
5. Respect & Integrity in the Workplace	66.8	64.4 (+2.4)	68.1 (-1.3)
6. Learning and Development	57.6	55.5 (+2.1)	60.1 (-2.5)
7. Performance and Feedback	63.4	62.0 (+1.4)	66.7 (-3.3)
8. Recognition	53.4	50.2 (+3.2)	53.1 (+0.3)
9. Final Thoughts	73.7	67.5 (+6.2)	70.5 (+3.2)
10. The Survey - Your Views	42.4	39.2 (+3.2)	42.8 (-0.4)

HIGHEST RATED AREAS WITHIN TRAINING SERVICE CENTRE

Section	Training Service Centre 2011	Training Service Centre 2010	NZ Police 2011 (Total Org)
1.7: I intend to continue working at NZ Police for at least the next 12 months	82.9	80.7 (+2.2)	85.3 (-2.4)
9.5: I feel a sense of commitment to NZ Police	81.3	73.8 (+7.5)	76.2 (+5.1)
9.3: I take an active interest in what happens in NZ Police	81.0	74.8 (+6.2)	74.8 (+6.2)
4.3: My job gives me a sense of personal achievement	78.0	77.3 (+0.7)	76.1 (+1.9)
4.2: I know how my work contributes to the effectiveness of NZ Police	77.7	76.3 (+1.4)	75.6 (+2.1)
7.1: NZ Police expects high standards of performance from its people	76.3	73.4 (+2.9)	77.0 (-0.7)
9.4: I feel inspired to go the extra mile to help NZ Police succeed	75.6	68.4 (+7.2)	70.3 (+5.3)
3.7: People in my workgroup conduct themselves in accordance with the values expected by NZ Police	75.4	73.8 (+1.6)	78.6 (-3.2)
3.2: I can rely on the support of others in my work group	75.0	75.5 (-0.5)	78.3 (-3.3)
5.2: I know who to contact to report instances of workplace harassment, bullying or discrimination	75.0	74.4 (+0.6)	73.4 (+1.6)

LOWEST RATED AREAS WITHIN TRAINING SERVICE CENTRE

Section	Training Service Centre 2011	Training Service Centre 2010	NZ Police 2011 (Total Org)
10.2: Changes in response to the 2010 Workplace Survey have had a positive impact on my workgroup	37.7	36.3 (+1.4)	40.8 (-3.1)
8.5: People here are appointed to positions based on merit	42.3	40.5 (+1.8)	43.7 (-1.4)
1.10: NZ Police is interested in the views and opinions of its staff	44.1	37.6 (+6.5)	45.3 (-1.2)
10.1: I believe actions will be taken based on the results of this survey	47.4	42.0 (+5.4)	44.8 (+2.6)
1.11: Work groups in NZ Police work well together	48.3	45.2 (+3.1)	51.9 (-3.6)
1.8: Communication in my Centre/Service Centre is open and honest	49.5	40.6 (+8.9)	52.0 (-2.5)
1.4: NZ Police cares about the well-being of its staff	50.6	44.5 (+6.1)	51.9 (-1.3)
6.5: There are career and personal development opportunities for me in NZ Police	51.8	48.6 (+3.2)	61.1 (-9.3)
7.3: Poor performance is dealt with effectively in my work group	51.8	50.2 (+1.6)	56.5 (-4.7)
8.4: I feel my contribution is valued in NZ Police	53.9	52.8 (+1.1)	54.5 (-0.6)

SCORES ACROSS TRAINING SERVICE CENTRE

Section	Training Service Centre	Central TSC	Northern TSC	RNZPC TSC	Southern TSC
Performance Index	62.8	63.9	64.6	62.5	61.0
1. Vision and Purpose + Communication and Cooperation	56.9	54.1	58.1	57.5	53.2
2. My Supervisor	66.4	69.8	66.7	64.6	75.3
3. My Work Group	70.8	66.9	73.4	70.2	72.2
4. My Job	64.3	67.9	70.7	62.7	61.2
5. Respect & Integrity in the Workplace	66.8	71.7	66.9	66.9	62.5
6. Learning and Development	57.6	59.7	59.6	57.9	51.3
7. Performance and Feedback	63.4	70.6	64.5	62.8	60.2
8. Recognition	53.4	52.0	51.7	54.2	51.8
9. Final Thoughts	73.7	76.4	76.5	72.9	71.4
10. The Survey - Your Views	42.4	41.7	36.2	46.0	31.8

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.

HOW ENGAGED ARE STAFF WITHIN TRAINING SERVICE CENTRE?

Engagement Index (average of all six engagement questions)

Training Service Centre 2011	Training Service Centre 2010	NZ Police (Total Org)
73.7	67.5 (+6.2)	70.5 (+3.2)

Weighted Mean Score (%)

Engagement Profile

Engagement Group	Training Service Centre 2011	Training Service Centre 2010	NZ Police (Total Org)
Engaged	25.7	15.7 (+10.0)	21.3 (+4.4)
Ambivalent	62.2	64.2 (-2.0)	63.2 (-1.0)
Disengaged	12.1	20.1 (-8.0)	15.5 (-3.4)

Proportion of Employees (%)

RESPECT AND INTEGRITY WITHIN TRAINING SERVICE CENTRE?

Question	Training Service Centre	NZ Police (Total Org)
5.1: Staff in my workgroup respect employee diversity	75.7	75.9 (-0.2)
5.2: I know who to contact to report instances of workplace harassment, bullying or discrimination	79.0	77.6 (+1.4)
5.3: I am confident that I could raise concerns I had related to workplace harassment, bullying or discrimination without fear of reprisal	63.6	64.7 (-1.1)
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)	61.2	62.4 (-1.2)
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	50.5	57.8 (-7.3)

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?

	Training Service Centre	NZ Police (Total Org)
Not Applicable	74.8	82.1 (-7.3)
Yes	6.5	4.6 (+1.9)
No	18.7	13.3 (+5.4)

WHAT DRIVES EMPLOYEE ENGAGEMENT WITHIN TRAINING SERVICE CENTRE?

	Rank from 2010	Key Driver Questions	Training Service Centre 2011	Training Service Centre 2010	NZ Police (Total Org)
	1	1.3: NZ Police is an enjoyable place to work	67.7	62.8 (+4.9)	68.3 (-0.6)
	3	1.6: I feel a sense of belonging to my Centre/Service Centre	57.6	52.3 (+5.3)	61.7 (-4.1)
	4	1.2: I feel I am working for an effective organisation	56.0	50.7 (+5.3)	59.7 (-3.7)
	N/A	6.4: I am encouraged to try new ways of doing things	57.9	59.6 (-1.7)	57.8 (+0.1)
	8	4.3: My job gives me a sense of personal achievement	78.0	77.3 (+0.7)	76.1 (+1.9)
	6	1.5: There is a sense of 'common purpose' in NZ Police	55.9	48.9 (+7.0)	58.1 (-2.2)
	N/A	4.5: I am sufficiently involved in decisions that affect the way I do my job	56.2	56.4 (-0.2)	56.8 (-0.6)
	N/A	4.7: The level of work-related stress I experience in my job is acceptable	60.9	55.8 (+5.1)	58.3 (+2.6)
	N/A	4.9: The pay and benefits I receive are fair for the work I do	62.3	54.8 (+7.5)	50.8 (+11.5)
	N/A	4.6: I am satisfied with my physical work environment	63.0	61.7 (+1.3)	59.7 (+3.3)

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 (Delete one). 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 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		1.5: There is a sense of 'common purpose' in NZ Police 1.3: NZ Police is an enjoyable place to work		4.9: The pay and benefits I receive are fair for the work I do 1.2: I feel I am working for an effective organisation
Team level		4.6: I am satisfied with my physical work environment	6.4: I am encouraged to try new ways of doing things	
Individual level	4.5: I am sufficiently involved in decisions that affect the way I do my job	1.6: I feel a sense of belonging to my Centre/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	Central TSC	Northern TSC	RNZPC TSC	Southern TSC	Training Service Centre	Total Organisation
1.3: NZ Police is an enjoyable place to work	66.7	67.9	67.3	70.5	67.7	68.3
1.6: I feel a sense of belonging to my Centre/Service Centre	58.3	55.8	58.8	53.4	57.6	61.7
1.2: I feel I am working for an effective organisation	50.0	57.7	57.5	47.7	56.0	59.7
6.4: I am encouraged to try new ways of doing things	60.0	59.6	58.2	51.1	57.9	57.8
4.3: My job gives me a sense of personal achievement	80.0	84.6	75.5	80.7	78.0	76.1
1.5: There is a sense of 'common purpose' in NZ Police	56.7	57.1	56.4	50.0	55.9	58.1
4.5: I am sufficiently involved in decisions that affect the way I do my job	51.7	62.2	57.1	43.2	56.2	56.8
4.7: The level of work-related stress I experience in my job is acceptable	60.0	65.4	59.4	62.5	60.9	58.3
4.9: The pay and benefits I receive are fair for the work I do	68.3	63.8	61.5	60.2	62.3	50.8
4.6: I am satisfied with my physical work environment	68.3	66.7	62.7	54.5	63.0	59.7

Weighted Mean Score (%)

SUMMARY AND KEY OBSERVATIONS – TRAINING SERVICE CENTRE

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 an excellent response to the 2011 staff survey from within the Training Service Centre. 214 employees responded, representing a response rate of 82.0%. This high response rate ensures the results presented in this report provide a very accurate indication of employee attitude and opinion towards the Centre.

How Employees Perceive the Training Service Centre as a Place to Work

In terms of how staff perceive the Training Service Centre as a place to work, the average score across all survey questions (the Performance Index) is slightly lower than that of NZ Police overall (i.e., 62.8% compared to 64.2% respectively).

When looking at scores around specific areas, Centre employees are significantly more positive than the NZ Police average in the area of 'Final Thoughts' (the engagement questions). The score for this section significantly increased this year compared to 2010, when it scored 67.5%. Staff are somewhat less positive with regard to 'Recognition', 'Vision and Purpose + Communication and Cooperation' and 'Learning and Development'.

Digging further, we can examine item level scores within these areas to determine what is driving the less positive results. Within 'Recognition' we see that the question 'People here are appointed to positions based on merit' received an average response of 42.3%, making it the 2nd lowest scored question for the Centre. Within 'Vision and Purpose + Communication and Cooperation' we see that the question 'NZ Police is interested in the views and opinions of its staff' scores at 44.1%, and is the 3rd lowest scored question for the Centre. Looking at items that scored more positively, within 'Final Thoughts' we see particularly positive impressions regarding staff commitment to the organisation. Further, they report taking an active interest in what happens within NZ Police. However, staff in the Centre are significantly less positive

regarding the possibility of actions being taken based on the results of the survey. The question 'Changes in response to the 2010 Workplace Survey have had a positive impact on my workgroup' received the lowest average score for the Centre at 37.7%.

The highest rated questions show Training Service Centre staff are particularly positive about their intent to continue working for NZ Police longer term (82.9%) and their overall commitment to NZ Police (81.3%). Further, the rating of 81.0% to the question 'I take an active interest in what happens in NZ Police' is significantly higher than NZ Police overall (74.8%) and is a significant improvement on the Training Service Centre's 2010 result (74.8%).

When examining the Centre's lowest rated questions, in addition to the question noted above ('Changes in response to the 2010 Workplace Survey have had a positive impact on my workgroup' 37.7%), the result for the question 'People here are appointed to positions based on merit' was the 2nd lowest at 42.3%.

It is important to recognise that not all low scoring areas in a survey are 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.

None of the Training Service Centre's lowest rated questions were found to have a strong impact upon employee engagement levels.

Employee Engagement within the Training Service Centre

Employee engagement levels within the Centre have improved since 2010, with a 10% increase in the proportion of Engaged staff. This improvement results in lifting the Service Centre's results to be on par with the NZ Police average. Below we provide the results of an analysis that identifies what engages the Centre'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

Possible leverage points are those key drivers of employee engagement identified via statistical analysis. The strongest theme to emerge from the analysis is that of sense of Community within the Centre. Four of the ten drivers relate to this theme, in fact two of them ('NZ Police is an enjoyable place to work' 67.7% and 'I feel a sense of belonging to my Service Centre' 57.6%) are within the top three drivers (those questions having the strongest impact on Engagement levels).

Finally, the Centre should reinforce the key driver in which it is performing better than the NZ Police average ('The pay and benefits I receive are fair for the work I do'). This has a positive impact on engagement and the Centre is already on the right track with its current activities.

Employee Comments

Examining the comments made by staff we see the most common thread is 'the people'. Staff in the Training Service Centre comment on the camaraderie, teamwork and the sense of purpose they get from working in the Centre.

A number of issues were raised as things that needed to change. Some of these were related to resources, primarily staffing levels. A number of staff were concerned at the way poor performance was managed and how decisions impacting them have been made at a senior level.

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

Summary

The Training Service Centre can take some satisfaction at the significant increase in survey scores over the last year, particularly in relation to Vision, Communication, Recognition and employees' belief that actions will occur as a result of the annual Workplace Survey. Unfortunately scores around 'My Supervisor' have retreated and that section, along with My Workgroup and Performance & Feedback, fall below NZ Police norms. That said, Centre employees are more engaged this year and several question level improvements now place the Centre above NZ Police norms in a number of areas – such as commitment, taking an active interest and so on. There is a very strong sense of camaraderie within the Training Service Centre and staff have a lot of passion for their jobs. Indeed, Key Driver analysis reveals that a significant leverage point exists for the Centre in the area of developing a stronger Sense of Community. To achieve this you can:

- Instil leaders to work harder at building a team-based culture

- Place greater emphasis on creating an enjoyable work environment
- Implement initiatives that show you care for the well-being of your staff. Some of these are not so easy (e.g., resourcing), but listening to staff members, demonstrating that the Centre values its employees' contributions (no matter how small the gesture), and developing a strong sense of community will aid this end goal

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 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 Centre'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.