CULTURE AT WORK SURVEY 2019

NORTH YORKSHIRE POLICE, FIRE & CRIME

COMMISSIONER

REPORT

January 2020

Dr Les Graham

Natalie Brown

Marisa Plater

Dr Sara Gracey

Durham University Business School

CONTENTS

1   INTRODUCTION

The Office of the North Yorkshire Police, Fire and Crime Commissioner and Durham University Business School have agreed to collaborate on a research project to understand the impact of fair treatment at work through an evidence-based approach. The research project was conducted by independent researchers from Durham University Business School in collaboration with personnel from the Office of the North Yorkshire Police, Fire and Crime Commissioner.

The study has been conducted in accordance with the Office of the North Yorkshire Police, Fire and Crime Commissioner Policy and Durham University ethical guidelines for research. Participation in the survey was voluntary, and anonymity and confidentiality for all participants is assured.

2   METHODS

The survey was designed using proven academic scales[1] for each of the measures and circulated online to employees of the Office of the North Yorkshire Police, Fire and Crime Commissioner, North Yorkshire Police and North Yorkshire Fire and Rescue Service using a server hosted independently by Durham Constabulary. Responses were collected from early December 2019, with a 4 week completion period.

In total, 80 survey responses were received (49.4% response rate[2]); this can be considered as a relatively good response rate. From the total responses, 37 work for North Yorkshire Police, 11 work for The Office of the Police, Fire & Crime Commissioner, and 29 work for North Yorkshire Fire & Rescue Service.

---

[1] The measures have either been developed by the research team, or are based on or adapted from peer reviewed academic scales which have been selected and tested in this context. The research team are available to discuss the measures further, as appropriate.

[2] The Office of the Police, Fire & Crime Commissioner, circulated the link for the survey to 162 people.

3   DISCUSSION OF THE KEY MEASURES

To assist in understanding the results and findings in this report, the key measures included in the survey are briefly discussed below.

3.1   Inclusion Climate

The most inclusive organisations adopt a belief that people's diverse backgrounds act as a source of learning and knowledge that should be utilised to improve organisational functioning. ***Inclusion in decision making*** refers to the extent to which perspectives from diverse groups are actively and authentically sought and integrated in decision making procedures. In inclusive climates, perspectives that might upset the status quo are not viewed as a threat, but rather as a valuable source of information. ***Integration of differences*** reflects expectations and norms regarding the openness with which employees can engage their self-identities without suffering adverse consequences at work. Integration of differences ensures the differences between individuals are respected and valued. When employees invest considerable effort into exploring their differences and are committed to educating each other, the workforce are able to enhance their thinking with greater integration of differences.

3.2   High Performance Expectations from the Organisation

High performance expectations refer to the extent to which organisations demonstrate expectations from their people that they will perform at the highest level they can and will maintain high quality standards.

3.3   Interactional Justice

Interactional justice concerns the fairness of the ways that individuals feel they are treated by people at work. Whether individuals feel treated in a polite manner, with respect and dignity, and improper remarks or comments are not made.

3.4   Fairness Propensity

Fairness propensity is considered to be a personal characteristic. Individuals with this characteristic typically view events, people, and organisations as fair. Fairness propensity plays an important role in informing a person's fairness perceptions; individuals who score highly on fairness propensity have a tendency to perceive fairness and those who score low have a tendency to perceive unfairness.

3.5   Sense of Being Valued

Value is defined as the relative importance or worth that a person is considered to be deserving of. We asked individuals to rate the extent to which they feel valued by their co-workers, supervisor, organisation and the public.

3.6   Experienced Incivility Behaviour

Incivility is defined as low intensity deviant behaviour, which can be verbal or non-verbal, directed toward individuals with ambiguous intent to harm. Uncivil behaviours include being rude, discourteous and displaying a lack of respect for others. It is believed that workplace incivility is related to decreased job performance, job dissatisfaction, decreased employee health and well-being, and increased turnover intentions. In this study, we measure incivility experienced by individuals.

3.7   Silencing Self

Silencing self-behaviours include putting the interests of others first and repressing genuine emotions and needs. Individuals who engage in silencing behaviours are exposed to losing their sense of self which in turn can result in negative outcomes, such as depression.

3.8   Cognitive Depletion

Cognitive depletion relates to the cognitive resources available to an individual to self-regulate their behaviour. A reduction in available resources can result in individuals adopting a selfish mind-set, experiencing a loss of empathy, and being unable to morally self-sanction. When a high level of cognitive depletion is present, individuals have less cognitive resources available to them to allow engagement in complex reasoning. This makes them less able to evaluate how others should be treated, and less aware of the implications of their actions.

3.9   Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction is simply defined as how content an individual is with their job. In this study, we measured a single dimension of affective job satisfaction to represent an overall emotional feeling individuals have about their job.

3.10   Optimism

We asked individuals the extent to which they generally feel optimistic about their life and their future. Optimism is seen as closely linked to general psychological well-being, and has been suggested to in turn influence positive behaviour and improve physical well-being.

3.11   Psychological Needs Satisfaction

Research has suggested that people have three universal psychological needs of autonomy, competence, and relatedness, which need to be satisfied to maintain optimal performance and well-being. ***Autonomy*** relates to a having the opportunity to make personal choices or through endorsement of external requests when a meaningful rationale is provided, and individuals' feel that their views and feelings have been listened to. ***Competence*** relates to an individual's feelings of skilfulness and effectiveness directed towards the achievement of outcomes that they consider meaningful. ***Relatedness*** refers to a need to feel a sense of belonging and being part of a team where they feel respected and valued.

3.12   Perceived Value of Change

We asked individuals to rate the extent to which they perceived value, importance and benefit in the establishment of the collaborative services between North Yorkshire Police and North Yorkshire Fire & Rescue Service.

3.13   Experienced Mistreatment

Unacceptable behaviour in the workplace can be considered as a form of mistreatment which is derogatory or demeaning in nature and results in an individual feeling distress, anxiety or humiliation. Experiencing unacceptable behaviour from others, particularly when the other person is perceived as more powerful, may result in the individual feeling that they have been treated unfairly and provokes a sense of injustice. Experiencing unacceptable behaviour from

others has been shown to be related to decreased job performance, job dissatisfaction, decreased employee health and well-being, and increased turnover intentions.

3.14   Levels of Internal / External Coping

In many cases, particularly where the level of mistreatment is high and causes significant distress and anxiety, prior research has shown that fear of retaliation results in a very low occurrence of formal complaints being made. This makes dealing with these issues very difficult and challenging. Individuals are more likely to internalise the mistreatment and try to resolve it themselves without seeking external help or support. In doing so, this may result in the mistreatment either continuing or having the potential to reoccur which can cause significant stress and anxiety and affect individuals' well-being and performance.

4   DESCRIPTIVE RESULTS

4.1   Introduction

The descriptive statistics for the key measures for all respondents are presented in Table 1. Table 2 presents individuals' responses to mistreatment at work. Discussion of the average scores are presented below.

4.2   Discussion of Average Scores for Key Measures

As can be seen in Table 1, the average score for inclusion in decision making is reported at a very high level. This implies that individuals feel that their perspectives are actively and authentically sought and integrated in decision-making procedures. Moreover, the average score for integration of differences between people is reported at a very high level. This suggests that the differences between individuals are respected and valued in the workplace. The very high average score for perceived interactional justice supports these positive findings. This suggests that individuals perceive that they are treated with respect and dignity in the workplace.

The extent to which individuals feel competent in the workplace is reported at a high average level, whilst moderately high average levels are reported for the extent to which individuals feel a sense of autonomy and relatedness at work. These findings suggest that over the past 3 months individuals generally felt as though they are autonomous, competent and feel a sense of relatedness and belonging at work; all of which have been identified as universal psychological needs that, when satisfied, lead to optimal performance and well-being. A high average level is reported for fairness propensity. This suggests that individuals typically view events, people, and organisations as fair.

While the average level of experienced incivility (e.g. not being listened to, being interrupted, being doubted, or being put down) over the past 12 months is low, thirty individuals (38.5%) reported experiencing mistreatment by someone at work, which they felt was unfair, derogatory or demeaning. As can be seen in Table 2, encouragingly, 55.2% of these individuals responded to the mistreatment by discussing the matter with their supervisor or staff representative; it should be noted that only 10.7% of individuals responded by making a

formal complaint to the organisation. The responses also suggest that individuals are more likely to just put up with the situation (55.2%) or try to forget about the occurrence (75.9%).

Value is defined as the relative importance or worth that a person is considered to be deserving of. Individuals reported a very high average score for the extent to which they feel valued by their co-workers. Similarly, the extent to which individuals feel valued by their supervisors is also scored at a very high average level. The extent to which individuals feel valued by their organisation and the public is reported at a moderate average level.

Silencing self is reported at a moderately low average level; this suggests that individuals do not feel a need to hide their true feelings and indicates they are comfortable expressing their true needs and feelings at work. A further encouraging finding is that cognitive depletion is reported at a very low average level. Cognitive depletion relates to the cognitive resources available to an individual to self-regulate their behaviour. On average, very low levels of cognitive depletion imply that individuals have the necessary cognitive resources available to them to engage in complex reasoning and allows for more awareness of how their actions impact other people.

Job satisfaction and optimism are reported at very high average levels. These positive findings imply that, on average, individuals are highly satisfied in their roles and feel optimistic about their life and their future.

An encouraging finding is that high performance expectations set by the organisation are reported at a high average level. This suggests that individuals believe their organisation demonstrates high expectations with regards to their work performance and quality standards.

Of note is that, on average, the change to establish the collaborative services between North Yorkshire Police and North Yorkshire Fire & Rescue Service is largely seen as having an important purpose. Perceived value of this change was measured using responses to 4 questions on a 1-7 scale. Encouragingly, 58.5% of respondents indicated that they agreed that the change was beneficial, with an average score above 4; only 13.0% of respondents indicated disagreement[3]. These results suggest that the majority of respondents believe the change to have been of importance, value and benefit.

---

[3] A further 28.5% of respondents reported an average score of 4 suggesting that they neither agreed nor disagreed that the change was beneficial.

Table 1: Average Scores for Key Measures, <u>All Respondents</u>

Measure	All Respondents (Average)
Inclusion Climate – Inclusion in Decision Making	5.77
Inclusion Climate – Integration of Differences	5.75
High Performance Expectations from the Organisation	5.08
Interactional Justice	5.72
Fairness Propensity	5.29
Sense of Being Valued by Co-Workers (0 - 10 scale)	8.19
Sense of Being Valued by the Supervisor (0 - 10 scale)	7.81
Sense of Being Valued by the Organisation (0 - 10 scale)	6.14
Sense of Being Valued by the Public (0 - 10 scale)	5.80
Experienced Incivility Behaviour (1 - 6 scale)	2.23
Silencing Self	3.59
Cognitive Depletion	2.33
Job Satisfaction	5.67
Optimism	5.72
Psychological Needs Satisfaction - Feeling Autonomous	4.96
Psychological Needs Satisfaction - Feeling Competent	5.37
Psychological Needs Satisfaction - Feeling Relatedness	4.80
Perceived Value of Change	4.74

<u>Notes</u>:
1. All measures used a 1 to 7 scale unless where stated *(e.g. 1 - Strongly Disagree, 2 - Disagree, 3 - Slightly Disagree, 4 - Neither Agree or Disagree, 5 - Slightly Agree, 6 - Agree, 7 - Strongly Agree)*.

Table 2: Responses to Mistreatment at Work

Items	Yes	No
Made a formal complaint to the organisation	10.7%	89.3%
Told the person behaving inappropriately to stop	48.3%	51.7%
Talked to someone you trust	92.9%	7.1%
Talked to your supervisor or a staff representative	55.2%	44.8%
Tried to avoid the person behaving inappropriately whenever possible	58.6%	41.4%
Told yourself it wasn't important	42.9%	57.1%
Told the person behaving inappropriately that you didn't like what they were doing	67.9%	32.1%
Made an excuse so the person behaving inappropriately would leave you alone	10.7%	89.3%
Assumed the person behaving inappropriately meant well	27.6%	72.4%
Blamed yourself	20.7%	79.3%
Tried to forget about it	75.9%	24.1%
Decided just to put up with it	55.2%	44.8%

5 RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN KEY MEASURES

5.1 Introduction to Analysis of Relationships between Key Measures

In this section we present the findings of a series of statistical analyses to test relationships between the key measures (a significance level of $p < .05$ is adopted for all reported results). Whilst in a cross-sectional study it is not possible to establish causality, we adopt an approach of prediction of relationships between variables from theoretical considerations and from prior research. Extensive prior research has shown that how people are managed, and their attitudes to their jobs, have a large impact on behaviour and performance. The following subsections outline the key relationships found between measures from this survey.

5.2 The Impact of Integration of Differences & Inclusion in Decision Making

Table 3 shows the positive impact of the achievement of an inclusive organisational climate characterised by the integration of individuals' differences and inclusion in decision making. Both of these factors can be seen to be positively related to interactional justice, optimism and psychological needs satisfaction (particularly for the psychological needs of autonomy and relatedness). In addition, when integration of differences and inclusion in decision making are present, silencing behaviours and cognitive depletion reduce. Integration of differences and inclusion in decision making are both found to reduce the extent to which individuals experience incivility behaviour at work.

Table 3: The Impact of Integration of Differences & Inclusion in Decision Making

Measure	Integration of Differences	Inclusion in Decision Making
Interactional Justice	++	++
Experienced Incivility Behaviour	- -	-
Silencing Self	- -	- -
Cognitive Depletion	-	- -
Optimism	++	++
Psychological Needs Satisfaction	+++	+++

+ / - denotes whether the impact of the measure is positive or negative

5.3   The Impact of Experienced Incivility Behaviour

Even at a relatively low level of occurrence, experiencing incivility is harmful for individuals' well-being and their attitudes. Table 4 illustrates that experienced incivility behaviour relates to reduced perceived interactional justice. In addition, psychological needs satisfaction and job satisfaction are negatively related to experienced incivility behaviour, whilst cognitive depletion and silencing behaviours increase when experienced incivility is higher.

Table 4: The Impact of Experienced Incivility Behaviour

Measure	Effect
Interactional Justice	- -
Psychological Needs Satisfaction	- -
Job Satisfaction	- -
Cognitive Depletion	++
Silencing Self	+++

+ / - denotes whether the impact of the measure is positive or negative

5.4   The Impact of Experiencing Mistreatment

Unacceptable behaviour in the workplace can be considered as a form of mistreatment which is derogatory or demeaning in nature and results in an individual feeling distress, anxiety or humiliation. As mentioned previously, while 61.5% of respondents reported not experiencing mistreatment in the past 12 months, 38.5% of respondents did report experiencing mistreatment.

The average scores and differences for these two groups are shown below in Table 5. When comparing the differences in average scores reported by those who experienced mistreatment and those who have not experienced mistreatment, the significance is large across all of the key measures. The average scores for job satisfaction, optimism and psychological needs satisfaction are very high for the respondents who reported not experiencing mistreatment in the past 12 months. In contrast, the individuals who reported experiencing mistreatment scored lower (moderately high average levels of job satisfaction, high levels of optimism and moderate psychological needs satisfaction).

Silencing self and cognitive depletion are at higher average levels for the individuals who have experienced mistreatment, when compared to those who have not experienced mistreatment. This suggests that when an individual experiences a form of mistreatment which is derogatory or demeaning in nature, they will be more likely to hide their true needs and feelings at work and their cognitively resources are more likely to become depleted.

Table 5: The Impact of Experiencing Mistreatment

Measure	Experienced Mistreatment (Average)	Not Experienced Mistreatment (Average)	Difference[4] (Effect Size)
Silencing Self	4.36	3.10	L
Cognitive Depletion	2.99	1.91	L
Job Satisfaction	4.90	6.16	L
Optimism	5.14	6.06	L
Psychological Needs Satisfaction	4.19	5.67	L

Notes:

1. The sample for people who responded yes to experiencing mistreatment is 30 and the population of people who responded as not having experienced mistreatment is 48.
2. All measures used a 1 to 7 scale unless where stated *(e.g. 1 - Strongly Disagree, 2 - Disagree, 3 - Slightly Disagree, 4 - Neither Agree or Disagree, 5 - Slightly Agree, 6 - Agree, 7 - Strongly Agree).*
3. If the effect size is significant, it can be small (S), medium (M) or large (L).

---

[4] Analyses to investigate whether there are any differences between scores have been conducted, and the effect sizes of the differences have been calculated. Effect sizes can be considered as being small, medium or large. In this study we calculated values of Eta-squared and followed the guidelines proposed by Cohen (1988) for interpretation of .01 relating to a small effect, .06 to a medium effect and .14 to a large effect (Pallant, 2012). A small effect size suggests there is a real world impact, but is something likely only found through careful study. A large effect size is more substantial and indicates something that we need to take notice of. It suggests the difference between the two sets of scores is substantial and/or consistent enough that it could be found between the two populations quite easily. A medium effect, while noteworthy, is not as important as a large effect size.