

National Policing Wellbeing Survey 2021/22

Summary of Evidence and Insights

March 2022

Policing Research Unit

Durham University Business School

Durham University

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank the individual police officers, police staff, PCSOs, special constables, and volunteers who gave up their valuable time to provide the data for this research. We express our gratitude to the policing staff representative bodies for their support for this project and to the National Police Chiefs' Council. Without the hard work and commitment of the individuals in each force we have worked with, the National Wellbeing Survey 2021 would not have been possible. In particular, we thank Ian Hesketh and Jenna Flanagan for their help and support.

We thank the National Police Wellbeing Service, who provided partial funding to support this work.

Les Graham, Marisa Plater and Natalie Brown

Durham University

March 2022

This initial report is intended as a basis for discussion. While every effort has been made to ensure the accuracy of the material contained within, the authors will not be liable for any loss or damage incurred through the use of this report.

Copyright © 2022, Durham University

All rights reserved.

No part of this publication may be reproduced, distributed, or transmitted in any form or by any means, including photocopying, recording, or other electronic or mechanical methods, without the prior written permission of the publisher, except in the case of brief quotations embodied in critical reviews and certain other non-commercial uses permitted by copyright law. For permission requests, write to the research team at the address shown below:

Policing Research Unit
Durham University Business School
Durham University
Mill Hill Lane, Durham
DH1 3LB
United Kingdom

CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
1 Introduction.....	5
2 Methods.....	6
3 Key Findings.....	9
3.1 Introduction to the Key Findings.....	9
3.2 Police Officers and Police Staff	10
3.3 Police Officer Ranks.....	30
3.4 Police Staff Grades	36
3.5 Police Officer Tenure.....	42
3.6 Police Staff Tenure	47
4 Glossary of Key Measures.....	52
5 References	58

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The 2021/22 National Police Wellbeing Survey was conducted by independent researchers from Durham University in collaboration with the National Police Wellbeing Service.

A total of 36,633 responses were received.¹

Police officer wellbeing remains on average less positive than that of police staff.

Following the previous slight increase reported in the 2020/21 results, police officer emotional energy has declined in the past twelve months and is now at a similar average level to that found in the 2019/20 survey.² The emotional energy of Constables and Sergeants were found to be significantly lower than that of other police officer ranks.

No material change was evident in emotional energy for police staff across the three years and little difference across the four police staff grade groups considered is evident.

Average fatigue levels for police officers increased in the past twelve months. For police staff, the average level is unchanged resulting in the difference in average scores between these two groups increasing.

Being able to recover from the demands and challenges faced in the workplace is an important factor for individual wellbeing. Average levels of sleep quality for both police officers and police staff have remained relatively consistent across the three years. Police staff reported experiencing sleep disturbance and insufficient sleep less frequently on average than police officers.

Having less than six hours of sleep (insufficient sleep) was found to be more prevalent for Constables, Sergeants, and Inspectors than for police officers at higher ranks. No material differences were found in sleep quality across police staff grades.

In contrast, individuals' ability to switch off from work outside of working hours was found to decrease by rank with Constables reporting the highest average score and Superintendents and above reporting the lowest average score. A similar trend is evident for police staff, with

¹ This is the highest number of responses received in the National Wellbeing Survey since it was first launched in 2019.

² The 2019/20 survey was conducted before the COVID-19 pandemic.

individuals who identified as practitioners reporting the highest average score for the ability to psychologically detach from their work outside of working hours.

Police officers reported similar average scores for symptoms of anxiety across the three surveys. For police staff, following an increase during the pandemic period, the average scores for anxiety symptoms have improved over the past twelve months and have returned to the level before the COVID-19 pandemic (evident in the 2019/20 survey). For both police officers and staff, levels of depression symptoms have reduced in the past twelve months and are at a similar level between the two groups.

A further encouraging finding is that the average score for relatedness need satisfaction has increased for both police officers and police staff.

Work engagement, which relates to individuals feeling enthusiastic about their work and fully investing their emotional, cognitive and physical energies into their job roles, was again reported at a high average level by both police officers and police staff.

Encountering hindrance stressors at work was found to have detrimental impacts on individuals' wellbeing. Frequencies of encountering hindrance stressors at work were higher on average for police officers than police staff. For police officers, those at the lower ranks of Sergeant and Constable had the highest average level of experiencing hindrance stressors (very high average level). In contrast, the frequency of encountering hindrance stressors for police staff was found to be lowest for practitioners compared with individuals in the three higher grade groups.

Experiencing hindrance stressors was found to be associated with a reduction in individual wellbeing through increased frequency of experiencing negative emotions such as anger, discouragement, and indifference, reduction of sleep quality, and reduction of individuals' sense of being valued or supported by their force.

The frequency of experiencing challenge stressors at work was reported at a very high average level by police officer respondents and a high average level by police staff respondents. Whilst challenge stressors are often considered as 'good' stressors, in contrast to hindrance stressors being 'bad' stressors, the very high average level of challenge stressors for police officer respondents is a concern.

Analysis of the relationship between challenge stressors and burnout confirmed that when challenge stressors were moderately high or lower, then challenge stressors were not found to adversely affect individuals' wellbeing. However, when challenge stressors increased above a high level, the relationship was found to become increasingly detrimental to individuals' wellbeing.

Individuals who indicated high levels of challenge stressors at work were more likely to report higher frequencies of disturbed and insufficient sleep, which negatively affects their wellbeing.

Feeling valued by their *force* was found to be an important factor for individuals' wellbeing and engagement. Police officers reported lower average levels for feeling valued by their *force* than police staff. A small decline is evident for police officers, with the average score back to a similar level to that seen in the 2019/20 survey; no significant change was found for police staff. The extent to which police officers feel valued by their force was found to significantly increase across rank, from a moderately low average level for Constables to a high average level for Chief Superintendents and above.

While the average scores for police officer scores for feeling valued by the *public* have declined sharply over the past three-year period, a small increase in average scores is evident for police staff.

Average scores for job satisfaction have declined for police officers, with a medium effect size, since the 2020/21 survey. A small decline is also evident for police staff.

Consistent with this finding, intention to quit was found to significantly increase over the past twelve months for both officers and staff. While for staff the increase resulted in the average score being at a similar level to that before the pandemic (2019/20 results), for police officers the increase resulted in the highest average level over the past three years.

For police officers, intention to quit was found to increase by length of service. Average scores were at very low level for those with less than one year of service, a moderately low level for one to five years of service, and a moderate average level for police officer respondents with six to twenty years of service, with a slight reduction for officers with over twenty years of service. For police staff, intention to quit was highest for those with three to twenty years of service.

Average scores for feeling valued by *co-workers* and by *supervisors* are at a high level for both police officers and police staff, with no significant change since the previous survey.

However, the percentage of officers reporting that they had experienced being treated in a condescending manner by someone in the force during the past twelve months increased from 62.3% to 75.7%. This was also the case for staff, with an increase from 52.2% to 64.0%.

Frequency of experiencing incivility behaviour from someone at work was reported at higher levels by Constables and Sergeants compared with other police officer ranks and is significantly lower for Chief Superintendents and above. In contrast the highest average frequency of experiencing incivility was reported for individuals in the supervisory manager and middle manager grades.

Experiencing incivility and / or ostracism was found to be associated with lower wellbeing.

Supportive leadership stresses the importance of personal integrity and competence, serving others such as employees and the public, the development of people to their fullest potential, and protection of their followers from harms in the workplace such as experiencing hindrance stressors, incivility and ostracism.

When an individual views their immediate supervisor as having a more supportive leadership style, this was found to be strongly associated with higher levels of wellbeing.

1 INTRODUCTION

The third National Wellbeing Survey was designed to assess the current state of wellbeing from the perspective of the policing workforce within the forty-three Home Office forces in England and Wales.

The research was undertaken to support the benefits realisation of the National Police Wellbeing Service which impacts on, and informs, strategic policing initiatives such as the development of the Police Covenant,³ the Officer Safety Review⁴, Operation Hampshire⁵ and ongoing work on Occupational Health Standards⁶.

A key aim of this study was to investigate significant changes in key measures relating to staff attitudes, motivation, and wellbeing since the National Wellbeing Survey conducted approximately twelve months earlier in November 2020.⁷ Commentary is provided on changes in the average scores for measures included in all three national wellbeing surveys conducted to date.

Additional factors affecting wellbeing were also investigated in the 2021/22 survey and predictive statistical analyses were undertaken to provide findings that can be used to inform future national policing wellbeing programmes.

The research was undertaken by independent researchers from the Policing Research Unit at Durham University Business School in collaboration with the National Police Wellbeing Service and was conducted in accordance with Durham University ethical guidelines for research. Participation in the survey was voluntary, and anonymity and confidentiality for all participants is assured.

³ See <https://www.gov.uk/government/news/priti-patel-to-create-police-covenant-to-protect-officers-and-staff>

⁴ See <https://news.npcc.police.uk/releases/npcc-and-college-of-policing-pledge-to-improve-officer-and-staff-safety-following-largest-ever-survey-of-police-workforce>

⁵ See <https://www.oscarkilo.org.uk/services/wellbeing-at-work/operation-hampshire>

⁶ See <https://www.oscarkilo.org.uk/services/occupational-health>

⁷ It is noteworthy that the previous 2020/21 National Policing Wellbeing Survey was conducted after the declaration of the COVID-19 pandemic.

2 METHODS

The survey was designed using proven academic scales for each of the measures⁸ and circulated online to serving police officers, police staff, police community support officers (PCSOs), specials and volunteers across England and Wales.

The research was undertaken by independent researchers from the Policing Research Unit at Durham University Business School in collaboration with the National Police Wellbeing Service and was conducted in accordance with Durham University ethical guidelines for research. Participation in the survey was voluntary, and anonymity and confidentiality for all participants is assured. All questions within the survey were completely optional; respondents could choose to leave blank and skip any question they did not wish to answer.⁹

Responses were collected over a seven-week completion period from late October 2021.

In total, the survey received 36,633 responses (14.7% response rate, approximately).¹⁰ This is the highest number of individual responses received in the National Wellbeing Survey since it was first launched in 2019.^{11,12}

Analysis to confirm the robustness of, and hence give confidence in the findings for, the changes over time was possible through examination of the differences in reported scores for individuals who completed both this survey and the 2020/21 National Wellbeing Survey.¹³

⁸ 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.

⁹ We thank Durham Constabulary for their support in enabling secure data procedures for distributing and accessing responses from this survey.

¹⁰ Headcount figures used to calculate response percentages at both a force and national level were predominantly sourced from the Home Office Police Workforce Open Data Tables as of 31 March 2021, available at <https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/police-workforce-open-data-tables>

¹¹ The highest force response rate was 55.4%, whilst the lowest was 0.1%. While 16 forces achieved a response rate higher than 20%, 13 forces had a response rate lower than 10%, and six forces had a response rate of less than 5% (of these six forces, two forces informed the NPWS that they would not actively participate in this national survey).

¹² 34,529 responses were received in 2019/20 and 22,895 in 2020/21.

¹³ Responses from 4,517 individuals were matched from the two surveys using the optional respondent-generated anonymous code.

The overall sample size of the 2021/22 National Wellbeing Survey is more than adequate to provide sufficient statistical power to allow confidence in the findings from the predictive analyses conducted.

Whilst in cross-sectional studies it is not possible to establish causality, we adopted an approach of prediction of relationships between variables from consideration of relevant theory and findings from prior research. Having conducted preliminary analyses to check for scale reliability and consistency, we tested predicted relationships using hierarchical linear regression, including mediation, moderation, and conditional PROCESS analysis.¹⁴ Where appropriate, we also conducted exploratory factor analyses. We controlled for the effects of role, gender, and tenure in policing, alongside topic-specific related measures where relevant. The minimum confidence level of significance adopted was $p = .05$.

The final sample consisted of 18,600 police officers (approx. 13.2% response rate), 15,135 police staff (approx. 19.8% response rate), 1,480 PCSOs (approx. 15.3% response rate), 231 special constables (approx. 2.5% response rate) and 131 volunteers (approx. 1.6% response rate).¹⁵

By rank, 13,087 police officer respondents indicated they were Constables, 3,559 were Sergeants, 1,262 were Inspectors, 376 were Chief Inspectors, 165 were Superintendents, 66 were Chief Superintendents, and 31 were Chief Officers. By grade, 11,081 police staff respondents indicated they were practitioners, 2,036 were supervisory managers, 1,062 were middle managers, and 583 were senior managers and above.

In the police officer sample, 619 respondents indicated they had less than one year of service, 1,408 had 1-2 years of service, 2,540 had 3-5 years of service, 1,907 had 6-10 years of service, 7,266 had 11-20 years of service, and 4,826 had over 20 years of service. In the police staff sample, 907 respondents indicated they had less than one year of service, 1,820 had 1-2 years of service, 2,540 had 3-5 years of service, 1,659 had 6-10 years of service, 4,110 had 11-20 years of service, and 4,057 had over 20 years of service.

¹⁴ Hayes (2018).

¹⁵ The number of responses from PCSOs, special constables and volunteers are considered as too small to be able to support robust conclusions and reported findings should be regarded as indicative only.

This 2021/22 National Wellbeing Survey was conducted within the period of the COVID-19 pandemic; however, at the time of data collection, UK restrictions were in the process of easing and guidance around work locations and interactions varied across organisations. Respondents were asked to indicate where they were predominantly situated during their normal working week.

For police officer respondents, 57.3% (10,621) indicated they mainly work in an office within a force location; 31.5% (5,847) mainly work out in the community, face to face with the public; and 6.5% (1,207) mainly work from home.

For police staff respondents, 55.3% (8,332) indicated they mainly work in an office within a force location; 2.6% (390) mainly work out in the community; and 36.7% (5,533) mainly work from home.

3 KEY FINDINGS

3.1 Introduction to the Key Findings

The following section discusses the differences in the key wellbeing measures between police officers and police staff, at different ranks and grades, and by tenure in policing.

For ease of interpretation and comparison, the average scores reported across the key wellbeing measures are discussed against a nine-point classification ranging from *extremely low* to *extremely high*.¹⁶

To assist in understanding the findings of this report, the key wellbeing measures included in this report are discussed in a glossary (see Section 4).

Commentary and discussion on the key findings from the predictive analyses is provided to assist with effective policy change and design of interventions to improve the wellbeing of the policing workforce.

¹⁶ The varying rating scales utilised for each measure in the survey are noted where relevant throughout this report. For ease of interpretation and understanding, each of these has been converted within the discussion text into a standardised nine-point classification which comprises the descriptors *Extremely Low*, *Very Low*, *Low*, *Moderately Low*, *Moderate*, *Moderately High*, *High*, *Very High* and *Extremely High*.

3.2 Police Officers and Police Staff

The average scores for police officer and police staff respondents are presented in Tables 1 and 2.¹⁷

The changes in key measures for police officers and police staff across the past three years are shown in Tables 3 and 4, respectively.

In addition to commentary on the changes in overall average scores between the surveys, analyses to investigate whether there were any significant differences between the average scores for the respondents who completed both the 2020/21 and 2021/22 surveys¹⁸ have been conducted and are commented upon.

Effect sizes¹⁹ of difference between scores for police officer respondents and police staff respondents²⁰ have also been investigated and are commented upon.

¹⁷ Measures shown in Table 1 are repeated topics from the National Wellbeing Survey 2020/21; measures within Table 2 are areas that have been newly introduced into the National Wellbeing Survey design this year, though which may have been studied within previous local collaborative research with some forces.

¹⁸ Responses from the 2020/21 and 2021/22 surveys were anonymously matched using the voluntary unique code generation questions placed at the end of each survey; this provided a matched sample of 4,517 responses, comprising 1,857 police officers and 2,415 police staff.

¹⁹ 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 (1992) for interpretation of .01 relating to a small effect, .06 to a medium effect and .14 to a large effect (Pallant, 2020). 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.

²⁰ As noted in Section 2, response numbers received for PCSOs, special constables and volunteers were too small to support robust conclusions. Commentary on the average scores for these respective populations are provided in footnotes, where appropriate; these should, however, be considered indicative only.

Table 1: Average Scores for Repeated Measures, Police Officers and Police Staff

Measure	Police Officer Respondents (Average)	Score Classification	Police Staff Respondents (Average)	Score Classification
Emotional Energy	3.25	<i>Moderately Low</i>	3.96	<i>Moderate</i>
Fatigue <i>(over the past 2 weeks)</i>	4.99	<i>High</i>	4.53	<i>Moderately High</i>
Symptoms of Anxiety <i>(over the past 3 months)</i> (1-10 scale)	6.25	<i>Moderately High</i>	5.89	<i>Moderate</i>
Symptoms of Depression <i>(over the past 3 months)</i> (1-10 scale)	5.53	<i>Moderate</i>	5.27	<i>Moderate</i>
Physical Wellbeing <i>(over the past 3 months)</i> (1-5 scale)	3.20	<i>Moderate</i>	3.35	<i>Moderately High</i>
Psychological Detachment from Work	3.50	<i>Moderately Low</i>	4.34	<i>Moderately High</i>
Disturbed Sleep <i>(over the past 3 months)</i>	4.80	<i>Moderately High</i>	4.38	<i>Moderately High</i>
Insufficient Sleep (less than 6 hours) <i>(over the past 3 months)</i>	5.04	<i>High</i>	4.34	<i>Moderately High</i>
Job Satisfaction	4.66	<i>Moderately High</i>	5.30	<i>High</i>
Intention to Quit	3.64	<i>Moderately Low</i>	3.43	<i>Moderately Low</i>
Life Satisfaction (1-10 scale)	6.64	<i>Moderately High</i>	7.02	<i>High</i>
Sense of Being Valued by Co-Workers (0-10 scale)	7.49	<i>High</i>	7.58	<i>High</i>
Sense of Being Valued by Supervisor (0-10 scale)	6.73	<i>High</i>	7.03	<i>High</i>
Sense of Being Valued by the Force (0-10 scale)	3.77	<i>Moderately Low</i>	5.12	<i>Moderate</i>
Sense of Being Valued by the Public (0-10 scale)	3.41	<i>Moderately Low</i>	4.32	<i>Moderately Low</i>
Sense of Competence at Work <i>(over the past 3 months)</i>	5.15	<i>High</i>	5.42	<i>High</i>
Sense of Autonomy at Work <i>(over the past 3 months)</i>	4.25	<i>Moderate</i>	4.80	<i>Moderately High</i>
Sense of Relatedness at Work <i>(over the past 3 months)</i>	4.37	<i>Moderately High</i>	4.66	<i>Moderately High</i>
Prosocial Motivation	5.58	<i>High</i>	5.83	<i>Very High</i>
Work Engagement	5.27	<i>High</i>	5.52	<i>High</i>

Notes:

1. All of these measures used a 1 to 7 scale, unless stated.
2. Due to continuous development of question sets, the scale used in 2021/22 to measure psychological detachment is an adapted version of the scale used in 2020/21. Please see Tables 3 and 4 for comparable scores over time.

Table 2: Average Scores for New Measures, Police Officers and Police Staff

Measure	Police Officer Respondents (Average)	Score Classification	Police Staff Respondents (Average)	Score Classification
Vision Clarity	4.18	<i>Moderate</i>	4.73	<i>Moderately High</i>
Perceived Organisational Support	3.37	<i>Moderately Low</i>	4.28	<i>Moderate</i>
Supportive Leadership	5.30	<i>High</i>	5.31	<i>High</i>
Supervisor Listening	4.97	<i>Moderately High</i>	5.17	<i>High</i>
Team Belonging	5.63	<i>High</i>	5.60	<i>High</i>
Challenge Stressors (1-5 scale)	4.16	<i>Very High</i>	3.84	<i>High</i>
Hindrance Stressors (1-5 scale)	4.19	<i>Very High</i>	3.44	<i>Moderately High</i>
Process Improvement Behaviour	5.32	<i>High</i>	5.59	<i>High</i>

Note: All of these measures used a 1 to 7 scale, unless stated.

Table 3: Changes in Average Scores, Police Officers

Measure	2019/20 (Average)	2020/21 (Average)	2021/22 (Average)
Emotional Energy	3.30	3.48	3.25
Fatigue <i>(over the past 2 weeks)</i>	-	4.92	4.99
Symptoms of Anxiety <i>(over the past 3 months)</i> (1-10 scale)	6.37	6.26	6.25
Symptoms of Depression <i>(over the past 3 months)</i> (1-10 scale)	5.76	5.74	5.53
Physical Wellbeing <i>(over the past 3 months)</i> (1-5 scale)	3.26	3.19	3.20
Psychological Detachment from Work	3.71*	3.86*	3.98*
Disturbed Sleep <i>(over the past 3 months)</i>	4.76	4.73	4.80
Insufficient Sleep (less than 6 hours) <i>(over the past 3 months)</i>	5.07	4.91	5.04
Job Satisfaction	4.86	4.84	4.66
Intention to Quit	3.47	3.28	3.64
Life Satisfaction (1-10 scale)	6.53	6.62	6.64
Sense of Being Valued by Co-Workers (0-10 scale)	7.29	7.19	7.49
Sense of Being Valued by Supervisor (0-10 scale)	6.61	6.68	6.73
Sense of Being Valued by the Force (0-10 scale)	3.75	3.87	3.77
Sense of Being Valued by the Public (0-10 scale)	4.33	3.88	3.41
Experienced Workplace Incivility <i>(over the past 12 months)</i> (1-6 scale)	2.36*	2.20*	2.42
Sense of Competence at Work <i>(over the past 3 months)</i>	5.09	5.04	5.15
Sense of Autonomy at Work <i>(over the past 3 months)</i>	4.37	4.35	4.25
Sense of Relatedness at Work <i>(over the past 3 months)</i>	4.16	4.13	4.37
Prosocial Motivation	-	5.61	5.58
Work Engagement	-	5.24	5.27

Notes:

1. All of these measures used a 1 to 7 scale, unless stated.
2. Due to continuous development of question sets, the scales used in 2021/22 to measure psychological detachment and experienced workplace incivility are adapted versions of the scales used in 2020/21 and 2019/20. The average scores marked with an asterisk (*) have been adjusted to factor only directly overlapping question items within these scales for a more accurate indication of change over time, and as such will be different from the full scale average scores reported elsewhere in this report and in the previous years' summary reports.

Table 4: Changes in Average Scores, Police Staff

Measure	2019/20 (Average)	2020/21 (Average)	2021/22 (Average)
Emotional Energy	3.95	4.00	3.96
Fatigue <i>(over the past 2 weeks)</i>	-	4.55	4.53
Symptoms of Anxiety <i>(over the past 3 months)</i> (1-10 scale)	5.85	6.15	5.89
Symptoms of Depression <i>(over the past 3 months)</i> (1-10 scale)	5.33	5.76	5.27
Physical Wellbeing <i>(over the past 3 months)</i> (1-5 scale)	3.40	3.26	3.35
Psychological Detachment from Work	4.69*	4.65*	4.98*
Disturbed Sleep <i>(over the past 3 months)</i>	4.36	4.41	4.38
Insufficient Sleep (less than 6 hours) <i>(over the past 3 months)</i>	4.45	4.33	4.34
Job Satisfaction	5.33	5.39	5.30
Intention to Quit	3.42	3.09	3.43
Life Satisfaction (1-10 scale)	6.84	6.93	7.02
Sense of Being Valued by Co-Workers (0-10 scale)	7.35	7.48	7.58
Sense of Being Valued by Supervisor (0-10 scale)	6.78	7.09	7.03
Sense of Being Valued by the Force (0-10 scale)	4.79	5.07	5.12
Sense of Being Valued by the Public (0-10 scale)	4.02	4.18	4.32
Experienced Workplace Incivility <i>(over the past 12 months)</i> (1-6 scale)	2.21*	1.96*	2.08
Sense of Competence at Work <i>(over the past 3 months)</i>	5.28	5.28	5.42
Sense of Autonomy at Work <i>(over the past 3 months)</i>	4.75	4.76	4.80
Sense of Relatedness at Work <i>(over the past 3 months)</i>	4.47	4.38	4.66
Prosocial Motivation	-	5.89	5.83
Work Engagement	-	5.56	5.52

Notes:

1. All of these measures used a 1 to 7 scale, unless stated.
2. Due to continuous development of question sets, the scales used in 2021/22 to measure psychological detachment and experienced workplace incivility are adapted versions of the scales used in 2020/21 and 2019/20. The average scores marked with an asterisk (*) have been adjusted to factor only directly overlapping question items within these scales for a more accurate indication of change over time, and as such will be different from the full scale average scores reported elsewhere in this report and in the previous years' summary reports.

Emotional energy is a key indicator of individual wellbeing; low levels of emotional energy are an indication of burnout.

Similar to the findings from the previous national wellbeing surveys and consistent with previous research in policing,²¹ police staff reported higher average levels of emotional energy than police officers, with a medium-large effect size of difference.²²

While still at a moderately low average level, as can be seen in Table 3, the average score for emotional energy has declined for police officer respondents (with a medium effect size of difference confirmed in the police officer matched sample) and has returned to a similar level as reported from the 2019/20 survey which occurred before the COVID-19 pandemic.

As can be seen in Table 4, no material change was evident across the average emotional energy scores reported by police staff across the three years, remaining at a moderate average level.

Individuals who indicated perceiving higher levels of support from their force and of being valued by their force generally reported more positive levels of emotional energy.

When an individual's supervisor displayed a more supportive leadership style, this was found to be associated with increased wellbeing.

Dealing with both challenge and hindrance stressors at work was found to reduce individuals' levels of emotional energy. Hindrance stressors were found to be particularly damaging to individuals' wellbeing.

Furthermore, being treated in a condescending manner by co-workers or feeling ignored and excluded at work was found to increase burnout.

Switching off and psychologically detaching from work during non-work hours was found to increase individuals' levels of emotional energy, while poor sleep quality was associated with lower levels of emotional energy.

Lower levels of emotional energy were found to be associated with lower levels of work engagement and process improvement activity, and higher levels of intention to quit.

²¹ See for example, Graham, Plater, Brown, Zheng and Gracey (2019) and Graham, Plater, Brown and Gracey (2021).

²² Reported average levels of emotional energy were moderate for PCSOs, moderately high for specials, and high for volunteers.

Fatigue arises through engaging in demanding activities and can be thought of as an overwhelming sense of being tired, lacking energy and feeling exhausted. Whilst general fatigue is closely related to emotional exhaustion, it differs in that it can be relieved by the use of compensation mechanisms such as working more slowly or taking adequate rest and gaining sufficient sleep.

As seen in 2020/21, levels of fatigue were found to be higher for police officers than for police staff, with a small effect size. This difference in scores between these two groups has increased slightly, with a small increase evident in average police officer scores for fatigue since the previous national wellbeing survey, while average police staff scores have remained relatively consistent.

The responses from 68.8% of police officers indicated that they had experienced high levels of fatigue in the previous two weeks before completing the survey; 56.5% of police staff indicated that this was the case.²³ Of particular concern is that 29.6% of police officers and 21.9% of police staff indicated that they experienced very high levels of fatigue.^{24, 25}

Fatigue and burnout (low levels of emotional energy) were found to be associated with lower levels of job and life satisfaction, work engagement and prosocial motivation, and with higher levels of intention to quit.

Overall, reported levels remain moderately high for **symptoms of anxiety** and moderate for **symptoms of depression** with no significant difference in average scores between police officers and police staff.²⁶

Police officers reported similar average scores for symptoms of anxiety across the three surveys. For police staff, following an increase during the pandemic period, the average scores for anxiety symptoms have returned to the previous level evident in the 2019/20 survey.

²³ Scoring an average of above 4.5 on a 1-7 scale.

²⁴ Scoring an average of above 6 on a 1-7 scale.

²⁵ 55% of PCSO respondents indicated that they had experienced high levels of fatigue, including 20% who indicated experiencing very high levels of fatigue (37% and 8% for specials, and 21% and 5% for volunteers, respectively).

²⁶ For PCSO respondents, reported average levels were moderate for both anxiety symptoms and depression symptoms. For special constabulary respondents, average levels for these measures were moderately low, whilst volunteer respondents reported low average levels.

Average scores for symptoms of depression have improved slightly for police officers since the 2020/21 survey, with a small effect size of change found in the matched sample (no significant difference was found between the 2019/20 and 2020/21 surveys).

Police staff also reported slightly lower average levels for symptoms of depression, with a small effect size; the average score for police staff is similar to pre-pandemic levels, after the increase seen between 2019/20 and 2020/21.

Following the decline seen in average reported levels of **physical wellbeing** during the start of the COVID-19 pandemic (between the 2019/20 and 2020/21 surveys), no significant change in scores was evident this year for police officers or police staff. Police officers reported slightly lower levels of physical wellbeing on average than police staff, with a small effect size of difference.²⁷

Psychological detachment and ‘switching off’ from work outside of normal working hours, not only physically but also mentally, has been found to be a key factor in individuals’ recovery from work stress, giving the opportunity to recharge, replenish internal cognitive resources lost due to work demands, and recover from the challenges experienced at work.²⁸ Our analyses supported that this was the case for the policing workforce; psychological detachment was found to be associated with lower levels of fatigue and burnout.

A very positive finding is that average scores for psychological detachment for both officers and staff have improved since the 2020/21 survey, with a small effect size; average scores within the matched samples suggest a small upwards trend across the three years.²⁹

Police officer respondents reported lower average levels of psychological detachment than police staff respondents, with a medium effect size of difference.³⁰

Similar to the findings from the previous years, this suggests that police officers are generally more likely to become preoccupied by work thoughts during their non-work time than police

²⁷ Average reported physical wellbeing levels were moderately high for PCSOs and high for specials and volunteers.

²⁸ Sonnentag, Binnewies and Mojza (2010).

²⁹ Due to continuous development of question sets, this measure has been slightly adapted across the three surveys. All reported figures, analyses testing significance, and discussions of scores take these differences into account.

³⁰ Average reported levels of psychological detachment during non-work hours were moderate for PCSOs and specials, and moderately high for volunteers.

staff and will be less likely to ‘switch off’ and recover their internal resources, which could have important implications for their long-term wellbeing.

Sleep quality - Individuals were asked to rate the extent to which they experienced disturbed sleep and had insufficient sleep over the past three months.

The difference in proportions of police officers and police staff reporting high frequencies of poor-quality sleep (*very often* or *all of the time*) across the three national wellbeing surveys are presented in Table 5.

Table 5: Change in Sleep Quality and Quantity by Role³¹

Response <i>(Frequency of “very often” or “all of the time”)</i>	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
	%	%	%
Disturbed Sleep <i>(over the past 3 months)</i>			
Police Officer Respondents	26.9	24.6	27.2
Police Staff Respondents	18.9	18.4	18.8
Insufficient Sleep <i>(less than 6 hours) (over the past 3 months)</i>			
Police Officer Respondents	44.8	40.2	43.8
Police Staff Respondents	30.2	28.3	27.9

Average levels of sleep quality for both police officers and police staff have remained relatively consistent across the three years. Police staff reported experiencing sleep disturbance and insufficient sleep less frequently than police officers on average, with a small-medium effect size of difference.

Predictive analyses from this research confirmed the detrimental impact of disturbed and insufficient sleep on wellbeing on individuals’ levels of burnout (emotional energy), fatigue, and physical wellbeing. Poor sleep quality was also negatively associated with job and life satisfaction, work engagement and prosocial motivation.

³¹ Proportions reporting high frequencies (*“very often”* or *“all of the time”*) of disturbed sleep were 22% for PCSO respondents, 8% for specials and 6% for volunteers. For insufficient sleep, proportions were 34% for PCSOs, 21% for specials and 10% for volunteers.

Sleep quality was found to be strongly affected by work overload and negative emotions.

Individuals who indicated high levels of challenge stressors at work were more likely to report higher frequencies of disturbed and insufficient sleep, which negatively affects their wellbeing.

Encountering hindrance stressors at work was found to increase how frequently individuals feel negative emotions such as anger, anxiety, discouragement and indifference. This in turn was found to negatively affect their sleep quality, with a detrimental effect on their levels of burnout.

Both challenge and hindrance stressors, but particularly challenge stressors, were also found to have a negative impact on individuals' ability to switch off and psychologically recover during non-work hours.

Average scores for **job satisfaction** have declined for police officers, with a medium effect size, since the 2020/21 survey.

A small decline is also evident for police staff. Average scores remain higher for police staff respondents than police officer respondents, with a small to medium effect size of difference between these two role groups, suggesting that police staff generally tend to regard their work more positively and are more likely to feel satisfied in their jobs.³²

Intention to quit has increased for police officers, with a large effect size, and is now slightly higher than seen in 2019/20. Police staff also reported higher levels of intention to quit, with a medium-large effect size, with average scores at a similar level to that reported in the first national wellbeing survey.³³

Life satisfaction - No change was evident in average levels of life satisfaction; police staff respondents once again reported slightly higher average levels than police officer respondents, with a small effect size of difference.³⁴

³² Job satisfaction was at a high average level for both PCSOs and specials, and at a very high average level for volunteers.

³³ Intention to quit was reported at a moderate average level by PCSO respondents, while low for specials and very low for volunteers.

³⁴ Average life satisfaction scores were moderately high for PCSOs, high for specials, and very high for volunteers.

Two key categories of workplace stressors were considered in this study. **Challenge stressors** reflect individuals' perceptions of work-related demands, such as workload and responsibility, which although potentially stressful can also be viewed as an opportunity for personal development or the achievement of important outcomes. **Hindrance stressors**, on the other hand, refer to work-related demands that are seen as constraints that hinder performance, such as poorly designed work processes and unnecessary bureaucracy.

As shown in Table 2, frequency of experiencing challenge stressors at work was reported at a very high average level by police officer respondents and a high average level by police staff respondents, with a small-medium effect size of difference.³⁵

Police officers reported facing significantly higher frequencies of hindrance stressors on average than police staff, with a large effect size (very high and moderately high average levels, respectively).³⁶

Hindrance stressors were found to have a large negative impact on individuals' wellbeing. One key way this was found to occur was through an increase in negative emotions such as anger, anxiety, discouragement and indifference. As noted above, one mechanism through which these negative emotions were found to impact wellbeing and levels of burnout was through a detrimental impact on individuals' sleep quality. Negative emotions were also found to have a detrimental impact on job satisfaction and were related to higher levels of intention to quit.

The increase in negative emotions due to encountering hindrance stressors at work was found to be stronger with higher frequencies of challenge stressors; when an individual is dealing with high levels of workload and responsibility, they are more likely to feel negative emotions to a larger extent in reaction to encountering barriers and constraints at work.

Whilst challenge stressors are often considered as 'good' stressors, in contrast to hindrance stressors being 'bad' stressors,³⁷ the very high average level (4.16) of challenge stressors for police officer respondents is a concern. Analysis of the relationship between challenge stressors and burnout confirmed that when challenge stressors were moderately high or lower, then challenge stressors were not found to adversely affect individuals' wellbeing.

³⁵ Frequency of experiencing challenge stressors were, on average, moderately high for PCSOs and specials, and moderately low for volunteers.

³⁶ Similar to police staff, PCSO respondents reported a moderately high average level of hindrance stressors at work. Average scores were high for special constables. Volunteers indicated a low average level of hindrance stressors.

³⁷ Cavanaugh, Boswell, Roehling and Boudreau (2000); Lockey, Graham, Zheng, Hesketh, Plater and Gracey (2021).

However, when challenge stressors increased above a moderately high average level, the relationship was found to become increasingly detrimental to individuals' wellbeing.

As previously mentioned, high levels of challenge stressors also impact on individual wellbeing through a negative impact on individuals' ability to switch off from work and their sleep quality.

Alongside the detrimental impact on wellbeing, encountering hindrance stressors at work was found to have a negative impact on levels of work engagement; when individuals experience higher levels of constraint at work, which are perceived as blocking them from doing their job, they are likely to feel less able and willing to fully invest their emotional, cognitive and physical energies into their work and job roles. This in turn was found to reduce the extent to which they engaged in process improvement activity.

In contrast, challenge stressors were found to have a positive relationship with engagement. This suggests that when individuals perceive high levels of responsibility and workload expected of them, although they may find this a strain, they may also view this as an opportunity for the achievement of their valued objectives.

Encountering hindrance stressors at work was also found to reduce the extent to which individuals feel supported by their force/organisation.

How employees are treated by their organisation affects their views concerning the extent to which the organisation values them and their contributions.³⁸ **Perceived organisational support** refers to individuals' beliefs regarding the degree to which the organisation values their contributions and cares about their wellbeing. It also refers to a feeling of assurance that the organisation will provide support when individuals face particularly difficult or challenging circumstances when carrying out their duties. In contrast, when individuals feel they are regarded as 'just a number', this is associated with low levels of feeling valued or supported by their organisation. Consistent with prior research, in this survey perceived organisational support was found to be an important predictor of individual wellbeing.³⁹

³⁸ Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchison and Sowa (1986).

³⁹ Brown, Graham, Zheng, Lockey and Hesketh (2020); Marchand and Vandenberghe (2016).

Average scores for perceived organisational support were higher for police staff than police officers, with a medium-large effect size of difference; average levels for this measure were moderately low for police officers and moderate for police staff.⁴⁰

When individuals work in an environment with a positive organisational tone, they are more likely to feel valued and respected, and will reciprocate with higher levels of discretionary effort.

Experiencing high levels of hindrance stressors was found to have a detrimental impact on individuals' perceptions of organisational support.

Feeling valued - Individuals were asked to indicate the extent to which they feel valued by their co-workers, supervisor, force, and the public.

Further to the findings mentioned above, regarding the importance of perceived organisational support, feeling valued by their force was the most important factor for wellbeing and engagement.⁴¹

Individuals who indicated feeling valued by their force and by their supervisor to a greater extent generally reported higher levels of job satisfaction.

Police officers reported lower average levels for feeling valued by their *force* than police staff, with a medium effect size. A small decline is evident for police officers, with the average score back to a similar level to that seen in the 2019/20 survey; no significant change was found for police staff.

For police officer respondents, feeling valued by the public was found to have a small positive impact on levels of job satisfaction.⁴²

As can be seen in Table 3, average police officer scores for feeling valued by the *public* have declined over the past three-year period. Following the decline during the pandemic, average scores have decreased further in the past 12 months with a medium effect size in the matched sample.

⁴⁰ Perceived organisational support was reported at a moderate average level by PCSO respondents, a moderately high average level by specials, and a high average level by volunteers.

⁴¹ When controlling for the effects of the other three foci of feeling valued.

⁴² This relationship was non-significant within the police staff sample.

In contrast, a small increase in average scores for feeling valued by the public is evident for police staff (see Table 4). Though still at a moderately low average level for both role groups, police staff now score significantly higher for this measure than police officers on average, with a small effect size of difference (in contrast to that seen in the 2019/20 survey).⁴³

Average scores for feeling valued by *supervisors* and by *co-workers* are at a high level for both police officers and police staff, with no significant change since the previous survey.

Team belonging relates to whether individuals feel accepted by and feel connected to other members of their work team. Average scores were high for this measure, with no material difference between police officer and police staff respondents.⁴⁴

Supportive leadership stresses the importance of personal integrity and competence, serving others such as employees and the public, the development of people to their fullest potential, and protection of their followers from harms in the workplace such as experiencing hindrance stressors, incivility and ostracism. Supportive leaders serve as role models who build trust, understand each person's different characteristics, strengths and interests, and provide feedback and resources to their people.

Average scores for supportive leadership, relating to the supervisory behaviour of direct line managers, were high for both police officers and police staff (see Table 2).⁴⁵

Furthermore, **supervisor listening** behaviour from direct supervisors was reported at a moderately high average level by police officers and a high average level by police staff (no material difference in average scores between the two role groups).⁴⁶

When an individual views their immediate supervisor as having a more supportive leadership style, this was found to be strongly associated with higher levels of wellbeing.

⁴³ Average reported levels of sense of feeling valued for PCSOs, specials and volunteers were, respectively, (co-workers) high, very high, very high; (supervisor) moderately high, high, very high; (force) moderately low, moderately high, high; (public) moderate, moderately high, moderately high.

⁴⁴ Average scores were also high for PCSOs and specials, while very high for volunteers.

⁴⁵ PCSO and specials similarly scored a high average level for the extent to which they view their direct supervisor as supportive. Volunteers reported a very high average level.

⁴⁶ Supervisor listening was, on average, reported at a high level by PCSOs and specials and a very high level by volunteers.

A key mechanism through which supportive leaders were found to improve their team members' wellbeing was through the reduction of hindrance stressors.

Supportive leadership and authentic listening behaviour from supervisors were also found to have a strong positive effect on individuals' autonomy, relatedness and competence need satisfaction, which in turn positively impact individual wellbeing.

Workplace incivility can be thought of as a generalised form of low-intensity, subtle, harmful behaviour directed towards others, which can be verbal (being rude or disrespectful) or non-verbal (excluding or ignoring someone). We asked individuals how frequently they had experienced being treated in a condescending manner by someone in their force over the past 12 months. The frequencies of reported experiences of this form of incivility behaviour for police officers and police staff over the past three national wellbeing surveys are presented below in Tables 6 and 7.

As can be seen, the percentage of police officers reporting that they had *not* experienced being treated in a condescending manner declined from 37.7% to 24.3% between 2020/21 and 2021/22. This was also the case for police staff, with a decline from 47.8% to 36.0%.⁴⁷

Moreover, the percentage of respondents who reported having experienced this form of incivility once or twice during the past 12 months increased from 37.0% to 45.3% for police officers and 32.9% to 42.8% for police staff.

Experiencing incivility behaviour from co-workers, and feelings of exclusion and ostracism at work, were found to be associated with adverse consequences for individuals' wellbeing and motivation. When individuals reported experiencing higher frequencies of incivility in their workplace,⁴⁸ this was associated with lower levels of emotional energy, job satisfaction and work engagement and increased levels of intention to quit. One mechanism through which this was found to occur was through a negative impact on individuals' psychological needs satisfaction (feelings of competence, autonomy and relatedness).

⁴⁷ For PCSO respondents, 30% indicated they had been put down or treated in a condescending manner by someone in their force monthly or more frequently by someone in their force in the past 12 months, including 12% on a weekly or more frequent basis. 28% of PCSO respondents indicated they had not experienced this form of incivility behaviour at any point during the past 12 months (33% for specials and 80% for volunteers).

⁴⁸ Being treated in a condescending manner by co-workers. This negative impact on key wellbeing and motivation measures was also found for ostracism at work (individuals feeling excluded and ignored by other members of their work team).

Table 6: Change in Experienced Workplace Incivility, Police Officer Respondents

Response	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
	%	%	%
Experienced being put down or treated in a condescending manner			
Never	33.1	37.7	24.3
Once or twice	37.9	37.0	45.3
Monthly or a few times a month	16.3	15.3	19.5
Weekly or more frequently	12.8	9.9	10.9

Notes:

1. Individuals were asked to indicate their experiences of general workplace incivility by someone in their force over the past 12 months.
2. Due to continuous development of question sets, the scale used in 2021/22 to measure experienced workplace incivility is an adapted version of the scale used in 2020/21 and 2019/20. The frequencies above have been adjusted to factor only directly overlapping question items within these scales for a more accurate indication of change over time, and as such will be different from the full scale percentages reported in the previous years' summary reports.

Table 7: Change in Experienced Workplace Incivility, Police Staff Respondents

Response	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
	%	%	%
Experienced being put down or treated in a condescending manner			
Never	39.0	47.8	36.0
Once or twice	35.8	32.9	42.8
Monthly or a few times a month	14.2	11.8	14.5
Weekly or more frequently	11.0	7.5	6.7

Notes:

1. Individuals were asked to indicate their experiences of general workplace incivility by someone in their force over the past 12 months.
2. Due to continuous development of question sets, the scale used in 2021/22 to measure experienced workplace incivility is an adapted version of the scale used in 2020/21 and 2019/20. The frequencies above have been adjusted to factor only directly overlapping question items within these scales for a more accurate indication of change over time, and as such will be different from the full scale percentages reported in the previous years' summary reports.

Psychological needs – A psychological need can be thought of as a nutrient that is essential for an individual’s adjustment, integrity and growth.⁴⁹ Satisfaction of psychological needs are essential for individual wellbeing. When fulfilment of these needs is frustrated, this results in individuals becoming defensive or passive and suffering from ill-health.⁵⁰

Three basic psychological needs have been identified:⁵¹ The *first* of these, the need for *autonomy*, is fulfilled when individuals feel able to be choiceful and feel able to make decisions and act in a manner that is consistent with their personal beliefs and values, rather than through feeling controlled or pressurised, to do things or behave in a certain way. The psychological need of *relatedness* is achieved when an individual feels a sense of belonging, and of being respected, valued, and cared for. *Finally*, the need for *competence* is met when individuals feel skilful, have purpose, and feel that what they do is meaningful.

No material changes in scores were evident for *competence* need satisfaction, which remains at a high average level for both police officer and police staff respondents.⁵²

Average scores for *autonomy* need satisfaction were reported at a moderate average level by police officers and a moderately high average level by police staff, with a small effect size of difference between the two role groups.^{53, 54}

An encouraging finding is that the average score for *relatedness* need satisfaction has increased with a small effect size for both police officers and police staff.⁵⁵

⁴⁹ Ryan (1995).

⁵⁰ Ryan and Deci (2000).

⁵¹ Deci and Ryan (2000).

⁵² PCSOs and specials also reported a high average level of competence need satisfaction; volunteers reported a very high average level.

⁵³ The average autonomy need satisfaction score for police officers has declined slightly since the previous national survey.

⁵⁴ Autonomy need satisfaction was at a moderately high average level for both PCSOs and specials, and a very high average level for volunteers.

⁵⁵ Average scores for relatedness need satisfaction were moderately high for police officers, police staff, PCSOs and specials, while high for volunteers.

Prosocial motivation⁵⁶ which refers to the extent to which individuals feel motivated by a core desire to help and benefit others in society, was once again reported at a high average level by police officers and a very high average level by police staff, with a small effect size of difference.⁵⁷

A further positive finding is that **work engagement**⁵⁸ was again reported at a high average level by both police officers and police staff; this measure relates to individuals feeling enthusiastic about their work and fully investing their emotional, cognitive and physical energies into their job roles.⁵⁹

Process improvement activity, relating to individuals going beyond formal role requirements to proactively engage in improvement behaviour, was found to be at a high average level for both police officers and police staff.⁶⁰

Policing can be considered as meaningful work, and prosocial motivation was found to relate positively to engagement in process improvement activity.

Vision clarity, which refers to how clear and easy to understand individuals think their force's vision and objectives are, was also found to be positively associated with work engagement and process improvement activity. Vision clarity was reported at a moderate average level by police officer respondents and a moderately high average level by police staff respondents (small effect size of difference).⁶¹

Furthermore, individuals with higher levels of emotional energy (lower levels of burnout) were more likely to report higher levels of engagement in process improvement activity. Challenge stressors were found to increase this discretionary effort, while hindrance stressors were found to have a detrimental impact.

⁵⁶ Wright, Hassan and Park (2016).

⁵⁷ PCSOs, specials and volunteers reported a very high average level of prosocial motivation.

⁵⁸ Rich, Lepine and Crawford (2010).

⁵⁹ Average reported levels of work engagement were high for PCSOs and very high for specials and volunteers.

⁶⁰ PCSOs, specials and volunteers also reported high average levels of process improvement activity.

⁶¹ Average vision clarity scores were moderately high for PCSOs and specials, and high for volunteers.

3.2.1 Shift Working

Similar to the findings from the prior National Wellbeing Surveys,⁶² police officers and police staff who work shifts reported lower average levels of emotional energy, higher average levels of fatigue, and higher frequencies of disturbed sleep and insufficient sleep than individuals who indicated that they do not work shifts (see Tables 8 and 9).

Perceptions of organisational support in particular were reported at lower average levels by both police officers and police staff working shifts, compared with those not working shifts.

Average scores for job and life satisfaction were lower for police officer and police staff respondents who work shifts, and intention to quit was reported at a higher average level than for individuals not working shifts.

Table 8: Shift Work by Role

Role	Measures	Shift Work	Non-Shift Work
Police Officer	Emotional Energy	3.15	3.52
	Fatigue <i>(over the past 2 weeks)</i>	5.04	4.88
	Physical Wellbeing <i>(over the past 3 months) (1-5 scale)</i>	3.20	3.22
	Job Satisfaction	4.51	5.03
	Life Satisfaction <i>(1-10 scale)</i>	6.55	6.86
	Intention to Quit	3.73	3.41
	Perceived Organisational Support	3.19	3.83
Police Staff	Emotional Energy	3.60	4.10
	Fatigue <i>(over the past 2 weeks)</i>	4.85	4.42
	Physical Wellbeing <i>(over the past 3 months) (1-5 scale)</i>	3.20	3.40
	Job Satisfaction	4.94	5.44
	Life Satisfaction <i>(1-10 scale)</i>	6.81	7.10
	Intention to Quit	3.81	3.29
	Perceived Organisational Support	3.72	4.49

Note: All measures used a 1 to 7 scale unless stated (e.g., 1 - *Strongly Disagree*, 2 - *Disagree*, 3 - *Slightly Disagree*, 4 - *Neither Agree nor Disagree*, 5 - *Slightly Agree*, 6 - *Agree*, 7 - *Strongly Agree*).

⁶² Graham, Brown, Plater, Gracey, Legate and Weinstein (2020); Graham, Plater, Brown and Gracey (2021).

While the average scores for police officers for physical wellbeing were similar between those who work shifts and those who do not, police staff who work shifts generally reported lower scores than their non-shift counterparts and were at a similar average level to police officers.

Table 9: Sleep Quality and Quantity by Shift Work and Role

Role	Shift Working	Disturbed Sleep (Frequency of “very often” or “all of the time”)	Insufficient Sleep (Frequency of “very often” or “all of the time”)
		%	%
Police Officer	Shifts (n = 13,258)	28.5	47.7
	Not Shifts (n = 5,205)	23.9	33.6
Police Staff	Shifts (n = 4,093)	24.9	39.2
	Not Shifts (n = 10,915)	16.5	23.6

As can be seen in Table 10, the frequency of experiencing incivility was higher for both police officers and police staff working shifts compared with those who do not work shifts.

Table 10: Frequency of Experienced Workplace Incivility, by Shift Work and Role

<i>Experienced being put down or treated in a condescending manner</i>	Shift Work	Non-Shift Work
	%	%
Police Officer Respondents		
Never	21.5	31.3
Once or twice	45.3	45.2
Monthly or a few times a month	21.0	16.0
Weekly or more frequently	12.2	7.5
Police Staff Respondents		
Never	28.3	38.8
Once or twice	43.0	42.8
Monthly or a few times a month	18.3	13.1
Weekly or more frequently	10.4	5.2

3.3 Police Officer Ranks

The average scores across police officer ranks are shown in Tables 11 and 12.⁶³ The frequencies by rank for experienced workplace incivility and for sleep quality are shown in Tables 14 and 13, respectively. The main areas of difference are discussed briefly below.

Though at a moderately low average level across the majority of ranks, emotional energy was found to be significantly lower for Constables and Sergeants. Chief Superintendents and above reported the highest average emotional energy score, at a moderate average level.

Unlike the trends seen for most measures across ranks, psychological detachment was found to decrease by rank. Though still at a moderately low average level, Constables reported the highest average score for ability to switch off after work; average scores were lowest for the ranks of Superintendent and above (low average level).

Table 13 shows the difference in proportions of police officer ranks who reported experiencing high frequencies of disturbed and insufficient sleep (*very often or all of the time*). As can be seen, there is minimal difference in frequency of disturbed sleep across ranks, though slightly more positive on average for police officers at the ranks of Superintendent and above. Having less than six hours of sleep (insufficient sleep) was more prevalent for Constables, Sergeants and Inspectors than for police officers at higher ranks.

Job satisfaction was found to increase significantly across ranks, from a moderately high average level reported by Constables to a very high average level reported by Chief Superintendents and above.

Similarly, intention to quit was found to decrease by police officer rank, from a moderate average level for Constables to a very low average level for Chief Superintendents and above.

Average scores for vision clarity increased steadily across police officer ranks, with Constables reporting a moderate average level while Chief Superintendents reported a very high average level.

⁶³ Measures shown in Table 11 are repeated topics from the National Wellbeing Survey 2020/21; measures within Table 12 are areas that have been newly introduced into the National Wellbeing Survey design this year, though which may have been studied within previous local collaborative research with some forces.

Table 11: Average Scores by Police Officer Rank

Measure	Constable	Sergeant	Inspector	Chief Inspector	Superintendent	Chief Superintendent and above
Emotional Energy	3.23	3.25	3.41	3.42	3.60	3.95
Fatigue <i>(over the past 2 weeks)</i>	4.99	5.08	4.93	4.90	4.82	4.26
Symptoms of Anxiety <i>(over the past 3 months)</i> (1-10 scale)	6.33	6.18	5.96	5.98	5.41	5.00
Symptoms of Depression <i>(over the past 3 months)</i> (1-10 scale)	5.61	5.51	5.16	5.02	4.47	3.80
Physical Wellbeing <i>(over the past 3 months)</i> (1-5 scale)	3.18	3.20	3.33	3.34	3.45	3.72
Psychological Detachment from Work	3.62	3.35	3.15	2.87	2.69	2.71
Disturbed Sleep <i>(over the past 3 months)</i>	4.77	4.89	4.84	4.79	4.57	4.49
Insufficient Sleep (less than 6 hours) <i>(over the past 3 months)</i>	5.05	5.10	4.95	4.72	4.46	4.48
Job Satisfaction	4.59	4.67	5.00	5.23	5.67	6.17
Intention to Quit	3.72	3.66	3.27	2.94	2.39	2.15
Life Satisfaction (1-10 scale)	6.53	6.75	7.05	7.31	7.58	8.12
Sense of Being Valued by Co-Workers (0-10 scale)	7.46	7.58	7.38	7.72	7.85	8.53
Sense of Being Valued by Supervisor (0-10 scale)	6.70	6.74	6.69	7.19	7.65	8.05
Sense of Being Valued by the Force (0-10 scale)	3.56	3.90	4.56	5.20	6.33	7.37
Sense of Being Valued by the Public (0-10 scale)	3.33	3.37	3.71	4.58	4.91	5.70
Experienced Workplace Incivility <i>(over the past 12 months)</i> (1-6 scale)	2.47	2.39	2.19	2.14	2.04	1.85
Sense of Competence at Work <i>(over the past 3 months)</i>	5.05	5.32	5.42	5.48	5.62	5.99
Sense of Autonomy at Work <i>(over the past 3 months)</i>	4.21	4.21	4.46	4.84	5.09	5.71
Sense of Relatedness at Work <i>(over the past 3 months)</i>	4.35	4.34	4.42	4.70	4.89	5.36
Prosocial Motivation	5.48	5.70	5.94	6.20	6.30	6.58
Work Engagement	5.17	5.42	5.58	5.84	5.96	6.27

Note: All of these measures used a 1 to 7 scale, unless stated.

Table 12: Average Scores by Police Officer Rank, New Measures

Measure	Constable	Sergeant	Inspector	Chief Inspector	Superintendent	Chief Superintendent and above
Vision Clarity	4.03	4.31	4.76	5.13	5.27	5.79
Perceived Organisational Support	3.22	3.51	3.95	4.45	4.79	5.47
Supportive Leadership	5.29	5.28	5.29	5.48	5.65	5.83
Supervisor Listening	4.97	4.93	4.90	5.16	5.37	5.40
Team Belonging	5.59	5.73	5.70	5.77	6.10	6.32
Challenge Stressors (1-5 scale)	4.12	4.25	4.22	4.30	4.42	4.55
Hindrance Stressors (1-5 scale)	4.21	4.27	4.04	3.88	3.80	3.41
Process Improvement Behaviour	5.16	5.59	5.87	6.07	6.18	6.31

Note: All of these measures used a 1 to 7 scale, unless stated.

Table 13: Frequencies of Disturbed Sleep and Insufficient Sleep by Police Officer Rank

Rank	Disturbed Sleep (Frequency of “very often” or “all of the time”)	Insufficient Sleep (Frequency of “very often” or “all of the time”)
	%	%
Constable	26.9	44.2
Sergeant	28.8	45.3
Inspector	26.5	40.8
Chief Inspector	25.5	31.9
Superintendent	21.8	26.7
Chief Superintendent and above	20.6	27.8

Perceptions of organisational support also increased significantly by rank, from moderately low average levels for Constables to high average levels for Chief Superintendents and above.

The extent to which police officers feel valued by their force was found to significantly increase across rank, from a moderately low average level for Constables to a high average level for Chief Superintendents and above.

Furthermore, sense of being valued by the public also was found to increase by rank; Constables and Sergeants reported the lowest average scores (low average level), increasing to a moderately high average level for Chief Superintendents and above.

Frequency of experiencing incivility behaviour from someone at work was reported at higher levels by Constables and Sergeants compared with the other police officer ranks, while particularly low for Chief Superintendents and above. The frequencies by rank of experienced workplace incivility are shown in Table 14. As can be seen, the proportion of police officer respondents who reported experiencing being put down or treated in a condescending manner by someone in their force in the past 12 months on a monthly or more frequent basis was higher for Constables at 31.9% and Sergeants at 29.1%, in comparison with 23.9% for Inspectors, 21.3% for Chief Inspectors, 20.5% for Superintendents, and 11.4% for Chief Superintendents and above.

Table 14: Frequency of Experienced Workplace Incivility by Police Officer Rank

Response	Constable	Sergeant	Inspector	Chief Inspector	Superintendent	Chief Superintendent and above
	%	%	%	%	%	%
Experienced being put down or treated in a condescending manner						
Never	23.8	23.6	27.1	29.9	32.1	40.2
Once or twice	44.3	47.3	49.1	48.7	47.3	48.5
Monthly or a few times a month	20.2	18.9	17.4	14.9	15.1	8.3
Weekly or more frequently	11.7	10.2	6.4	6.4	5.5	3.1

Note: Individuals were asked to indicate their experiences of general workplace incivility by someone in their force over the past 12 months.

Frequencies of encountering hindrance stressors at work were highest on average for Sergeants and Constables (very high average level), while reported at a moderately high average level by police officers of Chief Superintendent rank or higher.

Changes by rank since the previous national survey

When comparing the average scores between 2020/21 and 2021/22, the changes between the two time points were in general consistent across police officer ranks. Noteworthy findings of differences are reported below.

Job satisfaction was found to have declined for Constables, Sergeants and Inspectors. For Chief Inspectors, no change was evident, while for higher ranks, in particular for Superintendents, job satisfaction was found to have increased.

The increase in average intention to quit scores was also found to be predominantly within the ranks of Constable to Inspector, with minimal change at higher ranks.

The decline in average police officer scores for sense of being valued by the public was found to be particularly significant for Sergeants, Inspectors and Chief Inspectors.

While a small overall decrease was evident for the extent to which police officers feel they are valued by their force, this was not found at the highest ranks; in particular, a significant increase can be seen in the average score for Superintendents.

A small improvement in average scores for symptoms of depression was evident across all police officers; this positive decrease in scores appears to particularly be the case for the ranks of Superintendent and above where a slightly larger difference between average scores is visible between the two time points.

3.4 Police Staff Grades

As staff grade structures vary across police forces and organisations, a more generalised set of groupings was utilised to define staff grades, similar to the previous two national surveys, to be as widely applicable and clear as possible; police staff were asked to select which description best describes the grade of their current job role from the options of '*practitioner*', '*supervisory manager*', '*middle manager*' and '*senior manager and above*'.

The average scores across police staff grade groups are shown in Tables 15 and 16.⁶⁴ The main areas of difference are discussed briefly below.

Emotional energy was reported at a moderate average level across all the police staff grade groups.

Average scores for fatigue were moderately high across grade groups but were found to be slightly higher for police staff identifying as supervisory managers.

Psychological detachment from work during non-work hours was found to decline at higher grades. Police staff who identified as practitioners reported a moderately high average level for their ability to switch off from work, while those who identified as senior managers and above reported a moderately low average level for this measure.

Table 17 shows the difference in proportions of police staff grade groups who reported experiencing high frequencies of disturbed and insufficient sleep (*very often or all of the time*). As can be seen, minimal difference was found in sleep quality across grades.

Job satisfaction, though at a high level across all groups, was found to increase by police staff grade. Furthermore, police staff at higher grades on average reported lower levels of intention to quit, from a moderately low average level for practitioners to a low average level for senior managers and above.

Average scores for vision clarity increased steadily across police staff grades, from a moderately high average level for practitioners to a high average level for senior managers and above.

⁶⁴ Measures shown in Table 15 are repeated topics from the National Wellbeing Survey 2020/21; measures within Table 16 are areas that have been newly introduced into the National Wellbeing Survey design this year, though which may have been studied within previous local collaborative research with some forces.

Table 15: Average Scores by Police Staff Grade

Measure	Practitioner	Supervisory Manager	Middle Manager	Senior Manager and above
Emotional Energy	4.00	3.82	3.92	3.95
Fatigue <i>(over the past 2 weeks)</i>	4.52	4.65	4.51	4.42
Symptoms of Anxiety <i>(over the past 3 months)</i> (1-10 scale)	5.93	5.86	5.77	5.45
Symptoms of Depression <i>(over the past 3 months)</i> (1-10 scale)	5.32	5.28	4.94	4.83
Physical Wellbeing <i>(over the past 3 months)</i> (1-5 scale)	3.34	3.32	3.43	3.44
Psychological Detachment from Work	4.52	3.89	3.71	3.49
Disturbed Sleep <i>(over the past 3 months)</i>	4.36	4.47	4.40	4.41
Insufficient Sleep (less than 6 hours) <i>(over the past 3 months)</i>	4.33	4.42	4.23	4.25
Job Satisfaction	5.26	5.34	5.54	5.63
Intention to Quit	3.49	3.43	3.12	2.94
Life Satisfaction (1-10 scale)	6.95	7.08	7.35	7.49
Sense of Being Valued by Co-Workers (0-10 scale)	7.57	7.58	7.62	7.84
Sense of Being Valued by Supervisor (0-10 scale)	6.96	7.08	7.42	7.74
Sense of Being Valued by the Force (0-10 scale)	5.02	5.11	5.67	6.15
Sense of Being Valued by the Public (0-10 scale)	4.32	4.20	4.27	4.62
Experienced Workplace Incivility <i>(over the past 12 months)</i> (1-6 scale)	2.08	2.15	2.05	2.00
Sense of Competence at Work <i>(over the past 3 months)</i>	5.40	5.45	5.48	5.67
Sense of Autonomy at Work <i>(over the past 3 months)</i>	4.73	4.84	5.14	5.35
Sense of Relatedness at Work <i>(over the past 3 months)</i>	4.64	4.67	4.78	4.89
Prosocial Motivation	5.78	5.93	6.05	6.28
Work Engagement	5.46	5.63	5.73	5.95

Note: All of these measures used a 1 to 7 scale, unless stated.

Table 16: Average Scores by Police Staff Grade, New Measures

Measure	Practitioner	Supervisory Manager	Middle Manager	Senior Manager and above
Vision Clarity	4.66	4.85	5.00	5.22
Perceived Organisational Support	4.20	4.37	4.71	4.96
Supportive Leadership	5.28	5.33	5.47	5.57
Supervisor Listening	5.15	5.17	5.32	5.38
Team Belonging	5.57	5.70	5.69	5.84
Challenge Stressors (1-5 scale)	3.75	4.07	4.09	4.29
Hindrance Stressors (1-5 scale)	3.38	3.65	3.63	3.72
Process Improvement Behaviour	5.47	5.88	6.05	6.22

Note: All of these measures used a 1 to 7 scale, unless stated.

Table 17: Frequencies of Disturbed Sleep and Insufficient Sleep by Police Staff Grade

Grade	Disturbed Sleep (Frequency of “very often” or “all of the time”)	Insufficient Sleep (Frequency of “very often” or “all of the time”)
	%	%
Practitioner	18.7	28.0
Supervisory Manager	19.9	29.0
Middle Manager	16.6	24.2
Senior Manager and above	17.3	26.3

Perceptions of organisational support were also found to increase by grade, with police staff who identified as practitioners reporting a moderate average level, while those who identified as senior managers reported a moderately high average level.

Furthermore, the extent to which police staff reported feeling valued by their force was significantly lower for practitioner and supervisory manager respondents.

The frequencies by grade of experienced workplace incivility are shown in Table 18. As can be seen, only minimal differences were evident across the police staff grade groups. Though the proportions of police staff who reported having experienced being put down or treated in a condescending manner by someone in their force at some point during the past 12 months were slightly higher for those who identified as supervisory managers (68.8%) or middle managers (67.5%) compared with practitioners (63.0%) and senior managers and above (61.6%), the proportions of police staff respondents who reported experiencing this form of workplace incivility on a monthly or more frequent basis were similar across the grade groups (21.2% for practitioners; 23.2% supervisory managers; 19.7% middle managers; 19.5% senior managers and above).

Table 18: Frequency of Experienced Workplace Incivility by Police Staff Grade

Response	Practitioners	Supervisory Managers	Middle Managers	Senior Managers and above
	%	%	%	%
Experienced being put down or treated in a condescending manner				
Never	37.0	31.2	32.5	38.4
Once or twice	41.9	45.7	47.7	42.2
Monthly or a few times a month	14.3	16.5	14.6	14.0
Weekly or more frequently	6.9	6.7	5.1	5.5

Note: Individuals were asked to indicate their experiences of general workplace incivility by someone in their force over the past 12 months.

Reported frequencies of challenge stressors at work were found to increase significantly by staff grade, from a high average level for practitioners to a very high average level for senior managers and above, with supervisory managers and middle managers reporting very similar levels of challenge stressors.

In contrast to the findings relating to police officers at lower ranks experiencing the highest levels of hindrance stressors at work compared with police officers at higher ranks, the frequency of encountering hindrance stressors for police staff was found to be lower on average for practitioners than for those in the three higher grade groups.

Changes by grade since the previous national survey

When comparing the average scores between 2020/21 and 2021/22, the changes between the two time points were in general consistent across police staff grades. Noteworthy findings of differences are reported below.

Average scores for symptoms of depression improved overall for all staff grades. The improvement was smaller for senior managers and above compared with the other three staff grade groups. For the grade groups of practitioners and supervisory managers, the average scores were reported at a moderate level, compared with a moderately low average level for the two higher grade groups.

The improvement in average police staff scores for feeling valued by the public was larger for middle managers and senior managers and above.

3.5 Police Officer Tenure

The average scores across police officer tenure groups are shown in Tables 20 and 21.⁶⁵ The frequencies by tenure for sleep quality and for experienced workplace incivility are shown in Tables 19 and 22, respectively. Key findings across tenure are briefly discussed below.

On average, emotional energy was found to decline from a moderate to a moderately low level between the less than 1 year and 1-2 years tenure groups. Average scores then remain at a moderately low level, with a small increase for police officers with over 10 years of service.

Police officers with less than 1 year of service also reported the lowest average levels of fatigue, at a moderate level, with average scores increasing to moderately high level for those with 1 to 2 years of service and a high level for officers with 3 or more years of service.

Furthermore, police officers with less than 1 year of service reported the lowest average levels of anxiety and depression symptoms, the lowest frequencies on average of disturbed and insufficient sleep, and the highest average levels of physical wellbeing.

Table 19: Frequencies of Disturbed Sleep and Insufficient Sleep by Police Officer Tenure

Tenure	Disturbed Sleep (Frequency of "very often" or "all of the time")	Insufficient Sleep (Frequency of "very often" or "all of the time")
	%	%
Less than 1 year	12.3	27.7
1 – 2 years	22.5	47.9
3 – 5 years	27.8	50.5
6 – 10 years	26.8	49.2
11 – 20 years	27.4	42.8
Over 20 years	30.0	40.4

⁶⁵ Measures shown in Table 20 are repeated topics from the National Wellbeing Survey 2020/21; measures within Table 21 are areas that have been newly introduced into the National Wellbeing Survey design this year, though which may have been studied within previous local collaborative research with some forces.

Table 20: Average Scores by Police Officer Tenure

Measure	Less than 1 year	1 – 2 years	3 – 5 years	6 – 10 years	11 – 20 years	Over 20 years
Emotional Energy	3.92	3.17	3.12	3.13	3.23	3.34
Fatigue <i>(over the past 2 weeks)</i>	3.89	4.76	4.99	5.13	5.11	4.97
Symptoms of Anxiety <i>(over the past 3 months)</i> (1-10 scale)	5.34	6.50	6.42	6.43	6.28	6.09
Symptoms of Depression <i>(over the past 3 months)</i> (1-10 scale)	3.88	5.47	5.73	5.62	5.62	5.48
Physical Wellbeing <i>(over the past 3 months)</i> (1-5 scale)	3.77	3.35	3.26	3.16	3.13	3.19
Psychological Detachment from Work	3.67	3.37	3.45	3.53	3.55	3.47
Disturbed Sleep <i>(over the past 3 months)</i>	3.82	4.64	4.81	4.78	4.83	4.92
Insufficient Sleep (less than 6 hours) <i>(over the past 3 months)</i>	4.32	5.14	5.26	5.21	5.02	4.95
Job Satisfaction	5.88	4.91	4.55	4.50	4.56	4.70
Intention to Quit	2.08	3.16	3.64	3.86	3.86	3.55
Life Satisfaction (1-10 scale)	7.42	6.55	6.45	6.57	6.57	6.80
Sense of Being Valued by Co-Workers (0-10 scale)	7.88	7.59	7.72	7.46	7.38	7.47
Sense of Being Valued by Supervisor (0-10 scale)	7.45	6.78	6.57	6.71	6.73	6.73
Sense of Being Valued by the Force (0-10 scale)	6.38	4.00	3.21	3.24	3.70	3.98
Sense of Being Valued by the Public (0-10 scale)	5.30	3.70	3.00	2.89	3.32	3.65
Experienced Workplace Incivility <i>(over the past 12 months)</i> (1-6 scale)	2.01	2.67	2.76	2.63	2.37	2.21
Sense of Competence at Work <i>(over the past 3 months)</i>	4.85	4.74	5.21	5.20	5.15	5.25
Sense of Autonomy at Work <i>(over the past 3 months)</i>	4.88	4.32	4.15	4.12	4.22	4.31
Sense of Relatedness at Work <i>(over the past 3 months)</i>	5.11	4.56	4.46	4.27	4.27	4.35
Prosocial Motivation	6.29	5.77	5.56	5.46	5.52	5.60
Work Engagement	6.04	5.46	5.23	5.18	5.19	5.30

Note: All of these measures used a 1 to 7 scale, unless stated.

Table 21: Average Scores by Police Officer Tenure, Additional Measures

Measure	Less than 1 year	1 – 2 years	3 – 5 years	6 – 10 years	11 – 20 years	Over 20 years
Vision Clarity	5.38	4.31	4.08	3.91	4.09	4.28
Perceived Organisational Support	4.65	3.38	2.95	2.98	3.35	3.62
Supportive Leadership	5.74	5.45	5.34	5.34	5.28	5.20
Supervisor Listening	5.45	5.10	4.97	5.02	4.95	4.89
Team Belonging	5.75	5.64	5.78	5.61	5.57	5.65
Challenge Stressors (1-5 scale)	3.92	4.34	4.36	4.24	4.12	4.06
Hindrance Stressors (1-5 scale)	3.52	4.27	4.38	4.40	4.19	4.07
Process Improvement Behaviour	5.33	5.14	5.18	5.22	5.33	5.47

Note: All of these measures used a 1 to 7 scale, unless stated.

Average scores for job satisfaction were significantly higher for police officers with less than 1 year of service (very high average level) than those with longer service (moderately high average level across the other tenure groups).

Intention to quit was found to increase by length of service; average scores were at very low level for those with less than 1 year of service, a moderately low level for 1 to 5 years of service, and a moderate average level for police officer respondents with 6 to 20 years of service, with a slight reduction for officers with over 20 years of service.

Frequency of encountering hindrance stressors at work was highest on average for officers with 3 to 10 years of service. Police officers with less than 1 year of service reported the lowest average scores.

On average, all police officer tenure groupings reported feeling highly valued by their co-workers.

However, frequencies of experienced incivility behaviour from co-workers were found to increase significantly between the less than 1 year and 1-2 years tenure groups. Average incivility scores were highest for police officers with 3 to 5 years of service.

Police officers with 3 to 5 years of service also reported lower levels of feeling valued by their supervisor. Similarly, average scores for sense of feeling valued by the force and by the public were lowest for police officers with 3 to 10 years of service.

Perceived organisational support was reported at a significantly higher average level by police officers with less than 1 year of service (moderately high), with the lowest average scores between 3 to 10 years of service (low average level).

Table 22: Frequency of Experienced Workplace Incivility by Police Officer Tenure

Response	Less than 1 year	1 – 2 years	3 – 5 years	6 – 10 years	11 – 20 years	Over 20 years
	%	%	%	%	%	%
Experienced being put down or treated in a condescending manner						
Never	39.3	16.1	15.4	17.5	25.0	30.9
Once or twice	42.6	45.8	43.1	45.9	46.4	44.8
Monthly or a few times a month	12.3	24.7	26.3	22.8	18.7	15.5
Weekly or more frequently	5.8	13.3	15.2	13.7	9.9	8.8

Note: Individuals were asked to indicate their experiences of general workplace incivility by someone in their force over the past 12 months.

3.6 Police Staff Tenure

The average scores across police staff tenure groups are shown in Tables 24 and 25.⁶⁶ The frequencies by tenure for sleep quality and for experienced workplace incivility are shown in Tables 23 and 26, respectively. The main areas of difference are discussed briefly below.

Similar to the findings for police officer tenure, average scores for emotional energy were found to decline between the less than 1 year and 1-2 years tenure groups, from a moderately high to a moderate average level. Police staff with 11 to 20 years of service reported the highest levels of burnout.

Average levels of fatigue were also found to increase across staff tenure groups.

Furthermore, as can be seen in Table 23, police staff with less than 1 year of service reported the lowest frequencies of disturbed and insufficient sleep on average.

Table 23: Frequencies of Disturbed Sleep and Insufficient Sleep by Police Staff Tenure

Tenure	Disturbed Sleep (Frequency of “very often” or “all of the time”)	Insufficient Sleep (Frequency of “very often” or “all of the time”)
	%	%
Less than 1 year	10.4	18.0
1 – 2 years	13.5	22.4
3 – 5 years	18.1	28.0
6 – 10 years	19.3	31.5
11 – 20 years	21.2	30.3
Over 20 years	20.9	28.6

Average scores for job satisfaction were found to decrease by police staff tenure, with the exception of individuals who have over 20 years of service.

⁶⁶ Measures shown in Table 24 are repeated topics from the National Wellbeing Survey 2020/21; measures within Table 25 are areas that have been newly introduced into the National Wellbeing Survey design this year, though which may have been studied within previous local collaborative research with some forces.

Table 24: Average Scores by Police Staff Tenure

Measure	Less than 1 year	1 – 2 years	3 – 5 years	6 – 10 years	11 – 20 years	Over 20 years
Emotional Energy	4.61	4.18	3.97	3.85	3.78	3.95
Fatigue <i>(over the past 2 weeks)</i>	3.99	4.41	4.57	4.67	4.70	4.46
Symptoms of Anxiety <i>(over the past 3 months)</i> (1-10 scale)	5.56	5.89	6.07	6.22	6.05	5.57
Symptoms of Depression <i>(over the past 3 months)</i> (1-10 scale)	4.66	5.15	5.37	5.58	5.47	5.08
Physical Wellbeing <i>(over the past 3 months)</i> (1-5 scale)	3.62	3.44	3.34	3.32	3.28	3.33
Psychological Detachment from Work	4.72	4.60	4.42	4.26	4.26	4.20
Disturbed Sleep <i>(over the past 3 months)</i>	3.77	4.10	4.30	4.44	4.54	4.51
Insufficient Sleep (less than 6 hours) <i>(over the past 3 months)</i>	3.76	4.08	4.27	4.48	4.46	4.43
Job Satisfaction	5.99	5.50	5.29	5.18	5.15	5.28
Intention to Quit	2.53	3.28	3.62	3.68	3.64	3.27
Life Satisfaction (1-10 scale)	7.25	6.98	6.92	6.93	6.91	7.21
Sense of Being Valued by Co-Workers (0-10 scale)	8.10	7.72	7.57	7.46	7.43	7.61
Sense of Being Valued by Supervisor (0-10 scale)	8.03	7.36	7.03	6.88	6.79	6.96
Sense of Being Valued by the Force (0-10 scale)	6.87	5.71	5.14	4.81	4.73	4.97
Sense of Being Valued by the Public (0-10 scale)	5.28	4.60	4.13	4.09	4.14	4.38
Experienced Workplace Incivility <i>(over the past 12 months)</i> (1-6 scale)	1.73	2.18	2.22	2.25	2.11	1.95
Sense of Competence at Work <i>(over the past 3 months)</i>	5.52	5.45	5.44	5.35	5.31	5.50
Sense of Autonomy at Work <i>(over the past 3 months)</i>	5.40	4.98	4.79	4.65	4.66	4.78
Sense of Relatedness at Work <i>(over the past 3 months)</i>	5.31	4.92	4.70	4.51	4.47	4.61
Prosocial Motivation	6.26	6.00	5.85	5.78	5.76	5.75
Work Engagement	5.88	5.56	5.46	5.42	5.45	5.57

Note: All of these measures used a 1 to 7 scale, unless stated.

Table 25: Average Scores by Police Staff Tenure, Additional Measures

Measure	Less than 1 year	1 – 2 years	3 – 5 years	6 – 10 years	11 – 20 years	Over 20 years
Vision Clarity	5.29	4.91	4.76	4.67	4.64	4.64
Perceived Organisational Support	5.19	4.60	4.26	4.13	4.12	4.19
Supportive Leadership	5.85	5.56	5.37	5.28	5.18	5.19
Supervisor Listening	5.83	5.45	5.23	5.14	5.01	5.03
Team Belonging	5.84	5.68	5.61	5.53	5.49	5.65
Challenge Stressors (1-5 scale)	3.47	3.74	3.85	3.92	3.91	3.84
Hindrance Stressors (1-5 scale)	3.00	3.27	3.43	3.56	3.53	3.49
Process Improvement Behaviour	5.59	5.61	5.54	5.61	5.58	5.61

Note: All of these measures used a 1 to 7 scale, unless stated.

Intention to quit was found to be lowest for police staff with less than 1 year of service. Average scores of intention to quit increased in the next two tenure groups and then remained at a similar level before declining for individuals with over 20 years of service.

Individuals with longer tenure generally also reported lower levels of feeling valued by their force, with a decline from a high average level for police staff with less than 1 year of service to a moderate average level for police staff with 11 to 20 years of service.

Though at a high average level across the other tenure groups, police staff with less than 1 year of service reported the highest average scores for sense of feeling valued by their co-workers and by their supervisor (very high average level for both measures for this group).

Related to this finding, police staff with less than 1 year of service reported the lowest frequencies, on average, of being treated in a condescending manner by their co-workers over the past 12 months (workplace incivility behaviour).

Average scores for relatedness need satisfaction were found to decrease by tenure, from a high average level for police staff with less than 1 year of service to a moderately high average level across the other tenure groups.

Table 26: Frequency of Experienced Workplace Incivility by Police Staff Tenure

Response	Less than 1 year	1 – 2 years	3 – 5 years	6 – 10 years	11 – 20 years	Over 20 years
	%	%	%	%	%	%
Experienced being put down or treated in a condescending manner						
Never	56.2	32.9	30.6	29.2	33.7	41.2
Once or twice	29.9	44.0	43.6	45.6	45.0	41.4
Monthly or a few times a month	9.8	15.1	18.2	16.4	14.8	12.0
Weekly or more frequently	4.2	8.0	7.7	8.7	6.4	5.3

Note: Individuals were asked to indicate their experiences of general workplace incivility by someone in their force over the past 12 months.

4 GLOSSARY OF KEY MEASURES

Anxiety and Depression Symptoms

Anxiety refers to feelings of tension and nervousness, worried thoughts and physical changes in relation to thinking about an uncertain outcome or impending event. Depression refers to feelings of sadness, despair, discouragement and worthlessness. Symptoms of anxiety and depression tend to be highly linked. Lower scores on these measures are more desirable.

Challenge and Hindrance Stressors

Challenge stressors reflect individuals' perceptions of work-related demands, such as workload, time pressures, and levels of responsibility. Individuals who experience challenge stressors, although they may find them stressful, will view them as an opportunity for personal gain, such as growth and personal development or achievement of important outcomes.

Hindrance stressors also refer to work-related demands; however, individuals view these demands as constraints that hinder their performance and achievements at work. This impacts strongly on their wellbeing and reduces their engagement in discretionary behaviours. Examples of such constraints include bureaucratic barriers, administrative difficulties and poorly designed work processes, which do not provide individuals with the opportunity for personal gain and prevent achievement of valued goals.

Disturbed Sleep and Insufficient Sleep

The importance of sleep for restorative daily functioning is well-recognised. Exposure to emotionally stressful situations has been shown to be related to reduced sleep quality and higher levels of sleep disturbance. Moreover, when reduced sleep quality occurs, sensitivity to emotional and other stressful situations increases, which can exacerbate the impact of stressors on individual emotional energy and wellbeing. A lack of recovery can have serious impacts on individuals' health, wellbeing and performance. In this study, we asked individuals how often they had less than six hours of sleep, and how frequently they had experienced sleep disturbance, for example in the form of restlessness, difficulty falling asleep, or unintentional early waking. Lower reported frequencies of disturbed sleep and insufficient sleep are more desirable.

Emotional Energy

Emotional energy is central to individuals' wellbeing and can be considered as the amount of emotional and mental energy individuals have available to them to meet the daily demands and challenges they face in their roles. Low levels of emotional energy are manifested by both physical fatigue and a sense of feeling psychologically and emotionally 'drained' at work. Prior research has found that low emotional energy levels are related to reduced organisational commitment, lower productivity and performance, reduced engagement, ill-health, decreased physical and mental wellbeing, increased absenteeism and turnover intentions, and lower levels of persistence in the face of difficulties.

Experienced Workplace Incivility

Workplace incivility can be thought of as a generalised form of low-intensity, subtle, harmful behaviour directed towards others, which can be verbal (being rude or disrespectful) or non-verbal (excluding or ignoring someone). Individuals were asked how frequently they had experienced being treated in a condescending manner by someone in their force while at work over the past 12 months. Lower reported frequencies are more desirable.

Fatigue

Fatigue can be thought of as an overwhelming sense of being tired, lacking energy and feeling exhausted. Fatigue arises through engaging in demanding activities. While fatigue is related to emotional exhaustion, it differs in that it can be relieved by using compensation mechanisms such as working more slowly or taking adequate rest and gaining sufficient sleep. Prior research has shown that fatigue is associated with reduced communication skills, reduced ability to handle stress, increased risk taking, reduced decision-making ability, increased errors of judgment and likelihood to have an accident, an inability to recall details, a lack of attention and vigilance, reduced performance, and increased absence from work. A lower score on this measure is more desirable.

Intention to Quit

We asked individuals whether they were thinking about, or looking for, alternative employment and whether they intend to quit the organisation in the near future. While prior research has shown that intention to quit is moderately associated with individuals leaving

the organisation, it can be considered as a way of assessing their levels of disengagement and withdrawal from their job. A lower score on this measure is more desirable.

Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction is defined as how content an individual is with their job. We measured a single dimension of affective job satisfaction to represent an overall emotional feeling that individuals have about their job.

Life Satisfaction

An individual's judgement of their life satisfaction is dependent on their assessment and views of their personal circumstances. This judgment takes place against an internal standard which they have set for themselves. It can be considered as a measure of an individual's subjective wellbeing and a comment on their feeling of overall satisfaction with life.

Perceived Organisational Support

Perceived organisational support refers to individuals' beliefs regarding the degree to which the organisation values their contributions and cares about their wellbeing. It also refers to a feeling of assurance that the organisation will provide support when individuals face particularly difficult or challenging circumstances when carrying out their duties. When individuals feel valued, their socioemotional needs of respect, being cared for and receiving approval will be met, and they will reciprocate with higher levels of discretionary effort and felt obligation. Perceived organisational support is more strongly related to social exchange rather than economic exchange because it is most affected by discretionary actions by the organisation rather than as a result of external constraints, such as government regulations. Perceptions of positive support from the organisation affect an individual's relationship with the organisation, and have an important impact on individuals' wellbeing and commitment towards the organisation.

Physical Wellbeing

Physical wellbeing refers to the overall condition and functioning of the body. Physical wellbeing has been linked to disease management, nutrition and physical exercise. Respondents rated their general physical health over a three-month period.

Process Improvement Behaviour

Process improvement behaviour is a set of proactive actions aimed at implementing positive, constructive change through finding solutions to organisational problems, making small changes to working procedures and the introduction of new working methods. It is based on personal initiative and conscious decision-making, rather than a formal requirement, and is therefore thought of as an extra-role behaviour.

Prosocial Motivation

Individuals with strong prosocial values are motivated by a core desire to help and benefit others, which influences their actions and decisions. For this measure, we asked whether individuals feel motivated to have a positive impact by helping and benefiting others in society through their work.

Psychological Detachment from Work

Psychological detachment from work refers to an individual's state of mind when they are not working, and their ability to distance themselves from job-related issues, problems or opportunities (such as receiving job-related phone calls at home). It demonstrates an individual's ability to switch off and distance themselves from their job, not only physically but also mentally. There is strong research evidence for the importance of psychological detachment in the recovery from work stress. Such recovery experiences help employees replenish cognitive resources lost due to work demands, which further increases their psychological health and life satisfaction, and decreases the negative impacts from stressors on employees' wellbeing and performance.

Psychological Need 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 wellbeing. *Autonomy* relates to feeling able to act and make choices that reflect one's personal beliefs and values. *Competence* relates to an individual's feelings of being skilful, effective and being able to make a contribution. *Relatedness* refers to a need to feel a sense of belonging and being part of a team where they feel respected and valued. Psychological needs can be thought of as nutrients that are essential for individual's adjustment, integrity and growth. Satisfaction of psychological needs are essential for individual wellbeing. When

the fulfilment of psychological needs is frustrated, this results in individuals becoming defensive or passive and suffering from ill-health. We asked individuals the extent to which each of the psychological needs are met, in general, whilst at work over the past three months.

Sense of Being Valued

Value is defined as the relative importance or worth that people feel they deserve. We asked individuals to rate the extent to which they feel valued by their co-workers, supervisor, force and the public.

Supervisor Listening

Supervisor listening signals to individuals that their supervisor is open, interested and supportive, leading to employees feeling more comfortable when approaching and talking to their supervisor.

Supportive Leadership

Supportive leadership stresses the importance of personal integrity and serving others, such as employees and communities. It focuses on the development of people to their fullest potential through an understanding of each person's different characteristics, strengths and interests.

Supportive leaders serve as role-models, build trust and provide feedback and resources to their people. It is argued that supportive leadership combats negative outcomes associated with the promotion of self-interest which underlies many incidents of unethical behaviour. Supportive leadership behaviour includes showing compassion for their team members and protecting them from harm in the workplace through the reduction of exposure to hindrance stressors, incivility and ostracism.

Team Belonging

Team belonging can be considered as whether individuals feel accepted by other members of their work team, whether they have a sense of belonging to their team and feel connected to team members.

Vision Clarity

Individuals were asked their opinions on how clear the organisation's vision is to them, whether it has defined objectives and whether it is easy to understand.

Work Engagement

Engagement is a measure of an individual's personal expression of their self-in-role. A person is engaged in their work when they are able to express their authentic self and are willing to invest their emotional, cognitive and physical energies into their work and job roles. To do this requires them to feel that the work has meaning, that they feel safe and that they have the necessary resources. Improved engagement can lead to higher individual performance, enhanced wellbeing and reduced staff turnover.

5 REFERENCES

- Brown, N., Graham, L., Zheng, Y., Lockey, S. & Hesketh, I. (2020). *The Importance of Perceptions of Fair Treatment and Organisational Support for Wellbeing and Discretionary Effort in Policing*. (Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=3553689>).
- Cavanaugh, M.A., Boswell, W.R., Roehling, M.V. & Boudreau, J.W. (2000). An empirical examination of self-reported work stress among US managers. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85(1), 65-74.
- Cohen, J. (1992). Statistical power analysis. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 1(3), 98-101.
- Deci, E. L. & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The "what" and "why" of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. *Psychological Inquiry*, 11(4), 227-268.
- Eisenberger, R., Huntington, R., Hutchison, S. & Sowa, D. (1986). Perceived organizational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71(3), 500-507.
- Graham, L., Plater, M., Brown, N., Zheng, Y. & Gracey, S. (2019). *Research into Workplace Factors, Well-being, Attitudes and Behaviour in Policing: Summary of Evidence and Insights*. Durham University, June 2019. Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/front-line-policing-review>
- Graham, L., Brown, N., Plater, M., Gracey, S., Legate, N. & Weinstein, N. (2020). *National Policing Wellbeing Survey 2019: Summary of Evidence and Insights*. Durham University, March 2020. Available on the National Police Wellbeing Service website: <https://www.oscarkilo.org.uk/resources/national-wellbeing-survey/2019-wellbeing-survey>
- Graham, L., Plater, M., Brown, N. & Gracey, S. (2021). *National Policing Wellbeing Survey 2020: Summary of Evidence and Insights*. Durham University, March 2021. Available on the National Police Wellbeing Service website: <https://www.oscarkilo.org.uk/resources/national-wellbeing-survey/2020-national-wellbeing-survey>
- Hayes, A. F. (2018). *An Introduction to Mediation, Moderation, and Conditional Process Analysis*. New York: The Guilford Press.
- Marchand, C. & Vandenberghe, C. (2016). Perceived organizational support, emotional exhaustion, and turnover: The moderating role of negative affectivity. *International Journal of Stress Management*, 23(4), 350–375.
- Pallant, J. (2020). *SPSS Survival Manual. A Step by Step Analysis Using SPSS*. Open University.

- Rich, B.L., Lepine, J.A. & Crawford, E.R. (2010). Job engagement: Antecedents and effects on job performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 53(3), 617-635.
- Ryan, R. M. (1995). Psychological needs and the facilitation of integrative processes. *Journal of Personality*, 63(3), 397-427.
- Ryan, R. M. & Deci, E. L. (2000). The darker and brighter sides of human existence: Basic psychological needs as a unifying concept. *Psychological Inquiry*, 11(4), 319-338.
- Sonnentag, S., Binnewies, C. & Mojza, E.J. (2010). Staying well and engaged when demands are high: The role of psychological detachment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 95(5), 965-976.
- Wright, B.E., Hassan, S. & Park, J. (2016). Does a public service ethic encourage ethical behaviour? Public service motivation, ethical leadership and the willingness to report ethical problems. *Public Administration*, 94(3), 647-663.

