

National Policing Wellbeing Survey 2020

Summary of Evidence and Insights

May 2021

Policing Research Unit

International Centre for Leadership and Followership

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 2020 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, Natalie Brown, and Sara Gracey

Durham University

May 2021

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 © 2021, 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.....	6
2 Methods.....	7
3 Key Findings	9
3.1 Introduction to the Key Findings.....	9
3.2 The Impact of the COVID-19 Pandemic	9
3.3 Police Officers and Police Staff	13
3.4 Police Officer Ranks.....	31
3.5 Police Staff Grades	39
3.6 Occupational Job Types.....	46
3.7 Police Officer Tenure.....	54
3.8 Police Staff Tenure	56
4 Glossary of Key Measures.....	58
5 References	63

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The 2020 National Wellbeing Survey of policing was conducted by independent researchers from Durham University in collaboration with the National Police Wellbeing Service. Participation in the survey was voluntary, and anonymity and confidentiality for all participants is assured.

22,895 responses were received (9.6% response rate). The response rate is lower than that achieved in the first survey, 12 months previously. The highest response rate achieved by a force was 33.1%. Twenty-three forces had a response rate of less than 10%.

The findings indicate that policing have been effective in meeting the challenges presented by the pandemic in relation to supporting the workforce.

A decrease in the average scores for feeling valued by the public can be seen for police officers since the 2019 survey. Although the average score for police staff has increased for this measure, the level of feeling valued by the public is nevertheless still reported at a moderately low average level by both role groups.

The average level reported by police officers and police staff for the extent to which they feel valued by their force has increased over the 12 month period. Feeling valued by their force was found to be more important for individual wellbeing than feeling valued by supervisors, co-workers or the public.

Average scores of work effectiveness were reported to be high for both police officers and police staff.

Work effort was again found to be reported at a very high average level for both groups.

While still at a moderately low average level, police officer wellbeing in terms of their emotional energy improved in the 12 month period.

For police staff, their emotional energy was unchanged and at a moderate average level.

The findings indicate a slight decline in mental health for police staff, with a higher frequency of symptoms of anxiety and depression being experienced than in the previous national survey. Police staff also reported lower average levels of feeling connected to others in their work, which may be associated with home working.

For both police officers and police staff, the average level of physical wellbeing has declined. Average reported scores for job satisfaction have remained at a moderately high level for police officer respondents and a high level for police staff respondents.

Average scores for intention to quit have reduced since 2019 and were reported at a moderately low average level for both police officers and police staff.

No change was evident in the reported average levels of life satisfaction for police officers and police staff.

Reported levels of experienced workplace incivility by someone in their force over the past 12 months decreased slightly since the previous national survey. For example, the percentage of police officers reporting that they had not *experienced being treated in a condescending manner* improved from 33.1% to 37.7%. For police staff, the proportion of respondents indicating that they had not experienced this form of incivility improved from 38.6% to 47.8%.

Predictive analyses supported the negative impact that experiencing incivility has on individuals' wellbeing, attitudes, and motivation.

A positive finding is that, on average, both police officers and police staff have experienced an increased ability to 'switch off' and recharge their energy outside of normal working hours to recover from the challenges they experience in their work.

A further positive finding is that police officer sleep quality has improved since the previous survey. Average reported frequencies for both disturbed sleep and insufficient sleep have reduced. The level of improvement was smaller for police officers working shifts than for those not working shifts.

Whilst still at a more positive level than that found for police officers, an improvement in sleep quality since the last survey was not evident for police staff.

Predictive analyses confirmed the detrimental impact of disturbed and insufficient sleep on individuals' wellbeing. Poor sleep quality was found to be associated with increased general and mental fatigue, reduced emotional energy and lower levels of physical wellbeing. Furthermore, it was found to be negatively associated with job and life satisfaction, work engagement and professional commitment.

Professional commitment has remained at a moderately high average level for police officers and a high average level for police staff.

Levels of fatigue were found to be higher for police officers than for police staff. Of concern is that 29.2% of police officers and 23.5% of police staff indicated that they experienced extremely high levels of fatigue. As expected, predictive analyses indicated that high levels of fatigue were associated with poor sleep and high levels of emotional exhaustion. Both general and mental fatigue were also found to be related to lower levels of job and life satisfaction, engagement at work and professional commitment, and to higher levels of intention to quit.

Average scores for supervisor social support were high for both police officer and police staff respondents. Supervisor support was found to be associated with higher levels of psychological needs fulfilment, mental wellbeing and emotional energy, and with lower levels of fatigue. Police officers and police staff receiving higher levels of supervisor support also reported feeling more valued by their supervisor, had higher levels of work engagement, work effort and professional commitment, and indicated lower levels of intention to quit compared with those experiencing lower levels of supervisor support.

Support from co-workers was also found to be an important predictor of individual wellbeing. Psychological needs can be thought of as nutrients that are essential for individuals' 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.

The results from the statistical analyses conducted supported that when police officers' and police staff psychological needs of *autonomy*, *relatedness* and *competence* were met, this was associated with higher job satisfaction, professional commitment and work effort, lower levels of anxiety and depression symptoms, and reduced exhaustion and fatigue.

Support from both supervisors and co-workers were found to be important factors for police officers' and staff psychological needs fulfilment and hence their wellbeing.

No material changes in scores were evident for *competence* psychological need satisfaction, which remains at a high average level for both police officer and police staff respondents. Average scores for *autonomy* need satisfaction remain moderately high for both role groups.

However, for police staff the average score for *relatedness* need satisfaction has declined since the 2019 national survey.

When individuals are able to openly express their personal identities and behave in ways that are authentic to them, rather than having to suppress their genuine emotions, feelings and needs, this has a positive impact on their wellbeing. Experiencing incivility from somebody in the force was found to negatively impact individuals' ability to be their authentic self at work and had a large negative impact on individuals' wellbeing. Having a supportive supervisor was found to be positively associated with authenticity at work and hence individual wellbeing.

Average levels of self-care, in the form of self-kindness, keeping perspective, and recognition of the need to take care of oneself, were reported at a moderate level for both police officers and police staff. Results of predictive analyses supported the positive impact of self-care on the wellbeing of the policing workforce. Self-care was found to be an important predictor of improved emotional energy, reduced mental and general fatigue, and was also associated with lower levels of anxiety and depression. It was also found to be positively associated with physical wellbeing, and job and life satisfaction.

Similar to the findings from the 2019 National Policing Wellbeing Survey, police officers and police staff who work shifts reported lower average levels of emotional energy and job satisfaction, higher average levels of intention to quit, and higher frequencies of disturbed and insufficient sleep than individuals who indicated that they do not work shifts.

When comparing the wellbeing average scores reported by each police officer rank between the two time points, the results suggest that the patterns of difference between the average scores reported by the rank groups were not materially different from the patterns reported in the 2019 survey.

Constables, Sergeants, Inspectors, Chief Inspectors and Superintendents reported a moderately low average level of emotional energy, while the average score for Chief Superintendents and above was slightly higher at a moderate level. On average, moderately high levels were reported by all police officer ranks for general fatigue. Self-care generally increased with rank.

The results suggest that the patterns of average wellbeing scores across police staff grades were also not materially different from those seen in the 2019 survey findings. All police staff

grades reported a moderate average level of emotional energy. Moderately high average levels were reported by all police staff grades for general fatigue.

Police officers working in *Force Command* and *Counter Terrorism* reported the highest average levels of emotional energy. The lowest average scores were reported by police officers working in *Response/Incident Management*, *CID/Local Investigations*, and *Custody and Detention*. Police officers in *Force Command* and *Counter Terrorism* also reported the lowest average scores for fatigue. Average scores for this measure were highest in *Response/Incident Management*, *CID/Local Investigations*, *Custody and Detention*, and *Safeguarding*.

Road Policing alongside *Contact Management* reported slightly higher average levels of experiencing post-traumatic stress symptoms. Police officers in *Contact Management* also reported the highest average scores for symptoms of depression. Average police officer levels of job satisfaction were lowest for *Custody and Detention*.

For police staff, on average, emotional energy was found to be highest in *Operational Support - Other Functions (e.g., Dogs Section)* and *Professional Standards*, whilst lowest for *Custody and Detention*, *Contact Management*, and *Response/Incident Management*. These latter three occupational job types also reported the highest average scores for general fatigue.

Police staff within *Custody and Detention* and *Contact Management* reported lower levels of job satisfaction.

On average, the highest levels of emotional energy and lowest levels of fatigue for police officers were reported by respondents with less than one years' service.

Moderately high average levels of emotional energy were reported by police staff respondents with less than one years' service; police staff respondents with over one years' service reported moderate levels.

On average, disturbed sleep was found to increase with tenure for both police officers and police staff.

Very high average levels of prosocial motivation were reported by police officers with up to two years' service. Police officers with three years' service and above reported a high average level. Prosocial motivation was reported at very high average levels by all police staff tenure groupings.

1 INTRODUCTION

The second 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,¹ the Officer Safety Review² and Operation Hampshire.³ A key aim of this study was to investigate changes in key measures relating to staff attitudes, motivation and wellbeing since the first National Wellbeing Survey conducted twelve months earlier in 2019.

It is noteworthy that the 2020 National Policing Wellbeing Survey was conducted several months after the declaration of the COVID-19 pandemic, whilst the 2019 National Policing Wellbeing Survey was conducted before the COVID-19 pandemic.

Additional factors affecting wellbeing were also investigated in this second 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.

¹ See <https://www.gov.uk/government/news/priti-patel-to-create-police-covenant-to-protect-officers-and-staff>

² 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>

³ See <https://oscarkilo.org.uk/operation-hampshire-protecting-the-protectors/>

2 METHODS

The survey was designed using proven academic scales for each of the measures⁴ and circulated online to serving police officers, police staff, PCSOs, specials and volunteers across England and Wales. Responses were collected over a six-week completion period from mid-November 2020.

In total, the survey received 22,895 responses (9.6% response rate).⁵ The response rate is lower than ideal. This is particularly the case for the 23 forces where the response rate was less than 10%.

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 2019 National Wellbeing Survey.⁶

The overall sample size of the 2020 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.⁷ 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 $p = .05$.

⁴ 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.

⁵ The highest force response rate was 33.1%, whilst the lowest was 0.2%.

⁶ Responses from 4,282 individuals were matched from the two surveys using the optional respondent-generated anonymous code.

⁷ Hayes (2018).

The final sample consisted of 10,774 police officers (7.9% response rate), 10,774 police staff (14.5% response rate), 1,069 police community support officers (PCSOs) (11.4% response rate), 85 special constables (0.9% response rate) and 40 volunteers (0.5% response rate).

It should be noted that the number of responses from PCSOs, special constables and volunteers are too small to be able to support robust conclusions and reported findings should be considered indicative only.

By rank, 7,482 police officer respondents indicated they were Constables, 2,123 were Sergeants, 798 were Inspectors, 256 were Chief Inspectors, 112 were Superintendents, 36 were Chief Superintendents, and 25 were Chief Officers. By grade, 7,754 police staff respondents indicated they were practitioners, 1,432 were supervisory managers, 775 were middle managers, and 417 were senior managers and above. For the response numbers across different occupational job types, for police officers and police staff, please refer to Tables 21 and 22, respectively.

In the police officer sample, 235 respondents indicated they had less than one year of service, 598 had 1-2 years of service, 1,151 had 3-5 years of service, 886 had 6-10 years of service, 4,877 had 11-20 years of service, and 2,993 had over 20 years of service. In the police staff sample, 809 respondents indicated they had less than one year of service, 1,337 had 1-2 years of service, 1,505 had 3-5 years of service, 887 had 6-10 years of service, 3,324 had 11-20 years of service, and 2,887 had over 20 years of service.

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, by occupational job type 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*.⁸

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.

3.2 The Impact of the COVID-19 Pandemic

The 2020 national survey was conducted within the period of the COVID-19 pandemic. The average scores for the measures relating specifically to working during the pandemic are presented in Table 1.

Both police officers and police staff reported moderately high average scores for the extent to which the COVID-19 pandemic had impacted their lives. Uncertainty due to the pandemic was at a moderately high average level for police officers and a high average level for police staff.⁹ As can be expected, respondents who indicated that the pandemic had a larger impact on their lives generally reported higher levels of COVID-19 pandemic uncertainty and higher average scores for the level of exhaustion they experienced.

⁸ For example, for a 1 to 7 scale measure, the average converted descriptions would be 1.00 to 1.67 *Extremely Low*, 1.68 to 2.33 *Very Low*, 2.34 to 3.00 *Low*, 3.01 to 3.67 *Moderately Low*, 3.68 to 4.33 *Moderate*, 4.34 to 5.00 *Moderately High*, 5.01 to 5.67 *High*, 5.68 to 6.33 *Very High*, and 6.34 to 7.00 *Extremely High*.

⁹ Average scores for the impact of the pandemic were also moderately high for PCSOs and specials; volunteers reported a moderate average level. Uncertainty due to the pandemic was reported at a high average level for PCSO respondents whilst at a moderately high level for specials and volunteers.

Table 1: Average Scores for Police Officers and Police Staff

Measure	Police Officers (Average)	Police Staff (Average)
COVID-19 Pandemic Uncertainty	4.91	5.18
Impact of the Pandemic (1-5 scale)	3.32	3.38
Felt Change in Performance due to the Pandemic (1-5 scale)	2.98	3.24
Current Work Effectiveness	5.04	5.55

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).

22.4% of police officers and 15.4% of police staff reported feeling that their work performance had declined due to the pandemic. However, a very positive finding is that 77.6% of officers and 84.6% of staff indicated that they felt their performance was relatively unchanged and at a similar level to before the pandemic, while 19.2% of officers and 32.9% of staff indicated that they felt their performance had improved during this time. Average scores for current work effectiveness were high for both police officers and police staff.

628 police officers and 401 police staff reported that they had tested positive for COVID-19 in the period since the pandemic was declared. A further 2,133 police officers and 1,360 police staff indicated that, though not confirmed with a test, they have experienced symptoms of COVID-19 during this period. 8,001 police officer respondents and 8,985 police staff respondents indicated that they have not experienced any COVID-19 symptoms.

Respondents who had COVID-19 (whether tested or suspected from experienced symptoms) reported higher average levels of general and mental fatigue than respondents who did not experience symptoms.

5,195 police officers (49%) and 7,178 police staff (67%) indicated that their work location had significantly changed due to the COVID-19 pandemic, while 5,508 police officers (52%) and 3,495 police staff (33%) indicated that their work location had not been impacted.¹⁰

The proportions by role of where respondents were currently working at the time of the survey are presented in Table 2 below.

¹⁰ For PCSO respondents, 488 indicated that their main work location had changed whilst 568 indicated that they were working in a similar location as before the pandemic.

Table 2: Main work location during COVID-19 pandemic

Role ¹¹	Location changed due to pandemic	At home	Office in force location	Out in the community	Other location
Police Officers	Yes	17% (1,774)	18% (1,970)	12% (1,239)	2% (210)
	No	1% (149)	28% (2,990)	20% (2,186)	2% (174)
Police Staff	Yes	46% (4,884)	18% (1,916)	1% (92)	3% (279)
	No	4% (409)	26% (2,724)	1% (154)	2% (206)

Note: The number of respondents is shown in brackets.

As can be seen, 17% of police officer respondents and 46% of police staff respondents indicated that they were newly working from home, while 18% of police officer respondents and 18% of police staff respondents reported they were newly working in an office building within their force. 32% of police officer respondents indicated that they were mainly working out in the community, face to face with the public, at this time.

Of the respondents who were newly working at home due to the pandemic, approximately two thirds (4,479) indicated they had a dedicated study or separate workspace within their home while one third (2,325) indicated that they were working within a shared living space.

Respondents who indicated that their main work location had significantly changed due to COVID-19 reported moderately high average scores for the extent to which the pandemic had impacted their lives (compared with moderate average levels of respondents whose main work location had not changed). Average scores for levels of uncertainty about the pandemic were higher for respondents whose main work location had changed.

Nevertheless, respondents whose main work location had changed generally reported higher levels of feeling valued by their force. Average scores for this measure were highest for respondents working from home (moderate average level), particularly those with a dedicated workspace within this environment, whilst at a moderate average level for those working in an office within a force location and at a moderately low average level for those working out in the community.

¹¹ Of the PCSO respondents, 46% have continued work out in the community whilst 33% indicated that they were newly out working face to face with the public. 14% were mainly based in an office within their force location (7% new, 7% already in such locations) whilst 6% were newly working from home during the pandemic (1% indicated previously working from home).

Individuals were also asked about their personal concerns or worries in relation to the impact of COVID-19. Across the five main factors investigated, the differences between police officers and police staff were not found to differ materially.

Possible health risks to family and friends were rated highest, with very high scores on average; 84% of respondents selected that this was a concern *to a moderate extent* or above, including 41% indicating concern *to a great extent*. The average score for concern regarding the potential future impact on children or stepchildren (where applicable for respondents) was moderately high, with 55% selecting *to a moderate extent* or above, including 26% who indicated that this was a personal concern *to a great extent*.

Concerns regarding possible health risks to respondents themselves were reported at a slightly lower level (moderate average scores); 52% selected *to a moderate extent* or above, of whom 15% reported they were concerned *to a great extent*. However, mental wellbeing concerns for respondents were at a moderately high average level (60% *to a moderate extent* or above, including 19% *to a great extent*).

The average score for concerns regarding impact on their household finances were moderately low; however, 34% indicated concern *to a moderate extent* or above, including 9% respondents reporting concern *to a great extent*.

A small number of individuals¹² provided additional responses in the free text response option available. Within these responses, the most frequently commented subjects were personal feelings of isolation from friends and family (including feelings of being in limbo, cancellation of major life events, and lack of social activities); broader anxiety around the general long-term impact on the economy and society as a whole; concern for vulnerable friends and family (including living with shielding individuals, acting as a caregiver, and concern for elderly relatives) and worries around increasing risk to loved ones due to working on the frontline; exacerbated difficulties and anxiety due to personal health concerns (including pregnancy, underlying health conditions, and ability to access NHS treatment for non-COVID issues); future personal financial implications (for example, fear of future impact on policing pensions, public sector pay, and requirement for budget cuts); concern for the mental health of family members; and career related concerns (including job security, access to work related training, and opportunities for career progression).

¹² 331 free text responses were received and coded thematically.

3.3 Police Officers and Police Staff

The changes in key measures for police officers and police staff since the 2019 National Wellbeing Survey are shown below in Tables 3 and 4, respectively.

In addition to commentary on the changes in overall average scores between the two surveys, analyses to investigate whether there were any significant differences between the average scores for the respondents that could be identified as having completed each of the two surveys¹³ have been conducted and are commented upon. Effect sizes¹⁴ of difference between scores for police officer respondents and police staff respondents¹⁵ have also been investigated and are commented upon.

Emotional energy is a key indicator of individual wellbeing. Low levels of emotional energy are characterised by feelings of depletion and feeling 'burnout'. Prior research in policing has shown that individual wellbeing is an important factor for discretionary effort.¹⁶ Similar to the findings from the 2019 survey and consistent with findings in previous research in policing,¹⁷ police staff reported higher average levels of emotional energy than police officers, with a medium effect size of difference.¹⁸

Although still at a moderately low average level, as can be seen in Table 3, the average score for emotional energy has increased for police officer respondents. A small to medium effect size of difference since the 2019 National Wellbeing Survey was also confirmed in the police officer matched sample.

As can be seen in Table 4, no material change was evident for the average emotional energy score reported by police staff, which remains at a moderate average level. This was confirmed in the police staff matched sample where no statistically significant change was evident.

¹³ Responses were anonymously matched using the voluntary unique code generation questions placed at the end of each survey; this provided a matched sample of 4,441 responses, comprising 1,950 police officers and 2,336 police staff.

¹⁴ Effect sizes can be considered as being small, medium, or large. In this study we calculated values of Eta-squared and followed the guidelines proposed by Cohen (1988) for interpretation of .01 relating to a small effect, .06 to a medium effect and .14 to a large effect (Pallant, 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.

¹⁵ 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.

¹⁶ Hesketh, Cooper and Ivy (2017).

¹⁷ See for example, Graham, Plater, Brown, Zheng and Gracey (2019).

¹⁸ Reported average levels of emotional energy were moderate for PCSOs, moderately high for specials, and high for volunteers.

Police officers reported similar average scores for symptoms of post-traumatic stress, anxiety, and depression as was reported in 2019.

Police staff reported higher average scores for symptoms of anxiety and depression than previously. In the matched sample, the increase in the average value for experiencing symptoms of anxiety was found to be significant and to have a small effect size. Experiencing symptoms of depression was found to have increased with a small to medium effect size.

Overall, reported levels are now 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.¹⁹

Police staff also reported higher average scores for the frequency of experiencing post-traumatic stress symptoms than reported in 2019, with a small effect size of difference.

64.1% of police officer respondents and 54.9% of police staff respondents²⁰ scored an average level which meets or exceeds the threshold for a positive screen and indicates that evaluation for PTSD could be beneficial.²¹

Physical wellbeing - Although still at a moderately high average level overall, reported levels of physical wellbeing have decreased since the 2019 survey. A small effect size was found for police officers and a small to medium effect size was found for police staff in each of the respective matched samples.

Job satisfaction - Average reported scores for job satisfaction have remained at a moderately high level for police officer respondents and a high level for police staff respondents, with a small to medium effect size of difference between these two role groups.²² As noted in the findings from the 2019 survey, this suggests that a large proportion of the policing workforce regard their work positively and feel satisfied in their jobs.

¹⁹ For PCSO respondents, reported average levels were moderately high for anxiety symptoms, moderate for depression symptoms, and low for post-traumatic stress symptoms. For special constabulary respondents, average levels for these measures were moderate, moderately low, and very low, respectively, whilst volunteer respondents' average levels were moderately low, moderately low, and very low, respectively.

²⁰ 56% of PCSO respondents scored four or above for symptoms of post-traumatic stress.

²¹ For a Short Guidance Document on Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD) and Policing see Hesketh, Tehrani, Harrison, Brewin, and Miller (2018). Available at <https://oscar.kilo.org.uk/3886-2/>

²² Job satisfaction was reported at a high average level by both PCSOs and specials, and at a very high average level by volunteers.

Table 3: Changes in Average Scores, Police Officers

Measure	2019 (Average)	2020 (Average)
Emotional Energy	3.30	3.48
Post-Traumatic Stress Symptoms <i>(past 12 months)</i> (2-10 scale)	4.90	4.84
Symptoms of Anxiety <i>(past 3 months)</i> (1-10 scale)	6.37	6.26
Symptoms of Depression <i>(past 3 months)</i> (1-10 scale)	5.76	5.74
Physical Wellbeing <i>(past 3 months)</i> (1-5 scale)	3.26	3.19
Job Satisfaction	4.86	4.84
Intention to Quit	3.47	3.28
Life Satisfaction (1-10 scale)	6.53	6.62
Sense of Being Valued by Co-Workers (0-10 scale)	7.29	7.19
Sense of Being Valued by Supervisor (0-10 scale)	6.61	6.68
Sense of Being Valued by the Force (0-10 scale)	3.75	3.87
Sense of Being Valued by the Public (0-10 scale)	4.33	3.88
Experienced Workplace Incivility <i>(past 12 months)</i> (1-6 scale)	2.68	2.46
Autonomy - Psychological Need Satisfaction <i>(past 3 months)</i>	4.37	4.35
Competence - Psychological Need Satisfaction <i>(past 3 months)</i>	5.09	5.04
Relatedness - Psychological Need Satisfaction <i>(past 3 months)</i>	4.16	4.13
Psychological Detachment	3.21	3.86
Disturbed Sleep <i>(past 3 months)</i>	4.76	4.73
Insufficient Sleep (less than 6 hours) <i>(past 3 months)</i>	5.07	4.91
Professional Commitment	4.91	4.86
Work Effort	5.95	5.79

Notes:

1. 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*).
2. Due to continuous development of question sets, the scale used in 2020 to measure psychological detachment is a slightly adapted version of the scale used in 2019 (previously a part of the sustained activation scale). All reported figures and analyses testing significance take these differences into account.

Table 4: Changes in Average Scores, Police Staff

Measure	2019 (Average)	2020 (Average)
Emotional Energy	3.95	4.00
Post-Traumatic Stress Symptoms <i>(past 12 months)</i> (2-10 scale)	4.04	4.29
Symptoms of Anxiety <i>(past 3 months)</i> (1-10 scale)	5.85	6.15
Symptoms of Depression <i>(past 3 months)</i> (1-10 scale)	5.33	5.76
Physical Wellbeing <i>(past 3 months)</i> (1-5 scale)	3.40	3.26
Job Satisfaction	5.33	5.39
Intention to Quit	3.42	3.09
Life Satisfaction (1-10 scale)	6.84	6.93
Sense of Being Valued by Co-Workers (0-10 scale)	7.35	7.48
Sense of Being Valued by Supervisor (0-10 scale)	6.78	7.09
Sense of Being Valued by the Force (0-10 scale)	4.79	5.07
Sense of Being Valued by the Public (0-10 scale)	4.02	4.18
Experienced Workplace Incivility <i>(past 12 months)</i> (1-6 scale)	2.46	2.16
Autonomy - Psychological Need Satisfaction <i>(past 3 months)</i>	4.75	4.76
Competence - Psychological Need Satisfaction <i>(past 3 months)</i>	5.28	5.28
Relatedness - Psychological Need Satisfaction <i>(past 3 months)</i>	4.47	4.38
Psychological Detachment	4.01	4.65
Disturbed Sleep <i>(past 3 months)</i>	4.36	4.41
Insufficient Sleep (less than 6 hours) <i>(past 3 months)</i>	4.45	4.33
Professional Commitment	5.33	5.37
Work Effort	6.20	6.13

Notes:

1. 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*).
2. Due to continuous development of question sets, the scale used in 2020 to measure psychological detachment is a slightly adapted version of the scale used in 2019 (previously a part of the sustained activation scale). All reported figures and analyses testing significance take these differences into account.

Average scores for **intention to quit** have reduced since 2019 and are at a moderately low average level for both police officers and police staff.²³ Moreover, this reduction was found to be significant in the matched samples, where the effect sizes were calculated to be small for both groups.

Life satisfaction - No change was evident in average levels of life satisfaction; although police staff respondents once again reported slightly higher average levels than police officer respondents, with a small effect size of difference. Average life satisfaction scores remain at a moderately high level for both role groups.²⁴

Feeling valued - Individuals were asked to indicate the extent to which they feel valued by their co-workers, supervisor, force, and the public. As can be seen in Table 3, a decrease in the average scores for feeling valued by the public can be seen for police officers since the 2019 survey. Although the average score for police staff has increased for this measure, the level of feeling valued by the public is nevertheless still reported at a moderately low average level by both role groups.

Police staff respondents also reported higher average scores across the other three measures of feeling valued (co-workers, supervisor, and force) compared with the average values reported in 2019, with a large effect size of change in the matched sample for each average score.

Average scores of feeling valued by supervisors and by co-workers are at a high level for both police officers and police staff.

It is noteworthy that both police officers and police staff reported feeling more valued by their force than they did in 2019. Although improved, the average scores for this measure are still only at a moderately low average level for police officers and a moderate average level for police staff, with a medium effect size of difference between the two role groups.²⁵

²³ Average reported scores for intention to quit were moderately low for PCSOs, low for specials, and very low for volunteers.

²⁴ Life satisfaction was reported at a moderately high average level by PCSO respondents and a high average level by both special constabulary respondents and volunteer respondents.

²⁵ Average reported levels of sense of feeling valued for PCSOs, specials and volunteers were, respectively, (co-workers) high, high, very high; (supervisor) high, moderately high, very high; (force) moderately low, moderate, high; (public) moderate, moderately high, moderate.

Prior research in policing has highlighted that when individuals do not feel valued by their force, this has negative implications for their wellbeing.^{26, 27} This relationship was supported by the findings from predictive analyses conducted in this study. Respondents who felt more valued by their force reported higher levels of wellbeing than those who did not feel valued. Furthermore, the findings indicated that feeling valued by their force had a larger impact on individual wellbeing compared to the impacts of feeling valued by each of the three other foci of their supervisor, co-workers, or the public.

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 measured individuals' experiences of workplace incivility by someone in their force over the past 12 months. The frequencies of reported experiences of incivility behaviour for police officers and police staff are presented below in Table 5.

Reported levels of workplace incivility have decreased slightly since the previous national survey. For example, the percentage of police officers reporting that they had not *experienced being treated in a condescending manner* improved from 33.1% to 37.7%. This was also the case for police staff which improved from 38.6% to 47.8%. Moreover, this trend was confirmed in the matched data for the total measure of incivility²⁸ where a small effect size was found for police officers and a small to medium effect size for police staff in the matched samples.

However, there are still 25.2% of police officer respondents and 19.3% of police staff respondents who reported 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 9.9% of police officers and 7.5% of police staff who reported experiencing this form of incivility on a weekly or more frequent basis.

Furthermore, 38.4% of police officers and 28.6% of police staff reported they had experienced not being listened to when expressing their views or opinions monthly or more frequently by someone in their force in the past 12 months, including 13.4% of officers and 10.0% of staff who reported experiencing this form of incivility on a weekly or more frequent basis.

²⁶ Brown, Graham, Zheng, Lockey and Hesketh (2020).

²⁷ Graham, Plater, Brown, Zheng and Gracey (2019).

²⁸ The overall measure of incivility was calculated by confirming the Cronbach alpha value for the scale and then calculating the average value of the scores for the three items.

Table 5: Frequency of Experienced Workplace Incivility, by Role²⁹

Response	Police Officer Respondents		Police Staff Respondents	
	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>
Experienced being put down or treated in a condescending manner				
Never	37.7	4,056	47.8	5,129
Once or twice	37.0	3,979	32.9	3,525
Monthly or a few times a month	15.3	1,649	11.8	1,261
Weekly or more frequently	9.9	1,069	7.5	805
Experienced being interrupted and not allowed to finish what they were saying				
Never	25.9	2,777	38.1	4,084
Once or twice	40.1	4,312	36.8	3,944
Monthly or a few times a month	19.7	2,115	15.5	1,661
Weekly or more frequently	14.4	1,538	9.5	1,026
Experienced not being listened to when expressing views and opinions				
Never	16.8	1,810	29.3	3,141
Once or twice	44.7	4,812	42.1	4,520
Monthly or a few times a month	25.0	2,691	18.6	1,994
Weekly or more frequently	13.4	1,446	10.0	1,076

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

34.1% of police officers and 25.0% of police staff reported that they had experienced being interrupted and not allowed to finish what they were saying monthly or more frequently, including 14.4% of police officers and 9.5% of police staff who reported experiencing this form of incivility on a weekly or more frequent basis.

Experienced incivility was found to be associated with adverse consequences for individuals' wellbeing, attitudes, and motivation. As expected, when experienced incivility was higher, this

²⁹ For PCSO respondents, 27% 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 13% on a weekly or more frequent basis. 31% reported they had experienced not being listened to when expressing their views or opinions monthly or more frequently, including 11% on a weekly or more frequent basis, whilst 32% indicated they had experienced being interrupted and not allowed to finish what they were saying monthly or more frequently, including 15% on a weekly or more frequent basis.

was associated with lower levels of psychological needs satisfaction, a reduced ability of individuals to express their authentic self at work, reduced sleep quality, and higher levels of general and mental fatigue. Furthermore, it was associated with lower levels of job and life satisfaction, a higher intention to quit, and reduced prosocial motivation, professional commitment, and individuals' preparedness to invest their mental, physical, and emotional energies into their work.

Psychological needs – A psychological need can be thought of as a nutrient that is essential for an individual's adjustment, integrity and growth.³⁰ 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.³¹

Three basic psychological needs have been identified:³² 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.

Psychological needs have been shown to be important for emotional wellbeing, physical wellbeing, overcoming stress, commitment and workplace performance in previous research.³³ The findings from predictive analyses of the sample in this research were consistent with these findings.

When police officers' and police staff psychological needs of *autonomy*, *relatedness* and *competence* were met, this was associated with higher job satisfaction, professional commitment and work effort, lower levels of anxiety and depression symptoms, and reduced exhaustion and fatigue.

Support from both supervisors and co-workers were found to be important factors for police officers' and staff psychological needs fulfilment and hence their wellbeing.

³⁰ Ryan (1995).

³¹ Ryan and Deci (2000).

³² Deci and Ryan (2000).

³³ Weinstein and De Haan (2014).

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.

Average scores for *autonomy* need satisfaction remain moderately high for both role groups.

However, (as can be seen in Table 4 above) for police staff the average score for *relatedness* need satisfaction has declined since the 2019 national survey. This decline was confirmed in the matched sample and the effect size was found to relate to a small to medium decrease.³⁴ Despite this decline the average score for police staff was still higher (moderately high average level) than that for police officers (moderate average level).³⁵

Psychological detachment - An important factor for individual wellbeing is the ability to recharge internal resources outside of normal working hours and recover from the challenges experienced at work.³⁶ Our analyses supported that this was the case for the policing workforce. Psychological detachment was found to be associated with lower levels of exhaustion and reductions in both general and mental fatigue.

A very positive finding is that average scores for psychological detachment for both police officers and staff have increased since the previous survey (see Tables 3 and 4 above).^{37, 38}

Police officer respondents reported lower average levels of psychological detachment than police staff respondents, with a medium effect size of difference.³⁹

Similar to the findings from the previous National Wellbeing Survey (2019), this suggests that police officers are generally more likely to become preoccupied by work thoughts during their non-work time than police staff and will be less likely to 'switch off' and recover their internal resources which could have important implications for their long-term wellbeing.

³⁴ The difference in scores for each of the two time points for police officers for this measure in the matched sample was found to be non-significant.

³⁵ Competence need satisfaction was reported at a high average level by both PCSOs and specials, and a very high average level by volunteers. Average scores for autonomy need satisfaction were moderately high for PCSOs and specials, and very high for volunteers. Finally, relatedness need satisfaction was reported at average levels of moderate for PCSOs, moderately high for specials, and high for volunteers.

³⁶ Sonnentag, Binnewies, and Mojza (2010).

³⁷ This measure was previously part of the sustained activation scale. Due to continuous development of question sets, the measure has been slightly adapted in the 2020 survey to report the opposing concept of psychological detachment. All reported figures, analyses testing significance, and discussions of scores take these differences into account.

³⁸ This trend was confirmed in the matched samples where the effect sizes were found to be large.

³⁹ Average reported levels of psychological detachment during non-work hours were moderate for police officers, moderately high for police staff, PCSOs and specials, and very high for volunteers.

It is worth noting that prior research in policing has highlighted that when individuals consider their work to be meaningful and have high public service motivation, they are likely to have a reduced ability to psychologically switch-off and recover from their work during non-work hours.⁴⁰

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 experiencing high frequencies of poor-quality sleep (*very often* or *all of the time*) are presented in Table 6 below.

A positive finding is that police officer sleep quality has improved since the previous survey. Average reported frequencies for both disturbed sleep and insufficient sleep have reduced.

Whilst still at a more positive level than that found for police officers, an improvement in sleep quality since the last survey was not evident for police staff.

Prior research outside of policing has shown that insufficient sleep (less than 6 hours) and poor-quality sleep result in fatigue and are strong predictors of reduced wellbeing.⁴¹

Table 6: Sleep Quality and Quantity by Role⁴²

Role	Disturbed Sleep (Frequency of “very often” or “all of the time”)	Insufficient Sleep (Frequency of “very often” or “all of the time”)
Police Officer	24.6%	40.2%
Police Staff	18.4%	28.3%

Predictive analysis confirmed the detrimental impact of disturbed and insufficient sleep on individuals’ wellbeing. Poor sleep quality was found to be associated with increased general and mental fatigue, reduced emotional energy and lower levels of physical wellbeing. Furthermore, it was found to negatively affect job and life satisfaction, work engagement and professional commitment.

⁴⁰ Zheng, Wu and Graham (2020).

⁴¹ See for example, Söderström, Jeding, Ekstedt, Perski and Åkerstedt (2012).

⁴² 21% of PCSOs reported high frequencies (“very often” or “all of the time”) of disturbed sleep. 31% of PCSOs reported highly frequently sleeping less than 6 hours.

Professional commitment has remained at a moderately high average level for police officers and a high average level for police staff, with a medium effect size of difference.⁴³ These findings suggest that, on average, members of the police workforce are dedicated to the profession of policing and feel a sense of responsibility to contribute towards its success.

Furthermore, while a small to medium decrease was evident in average levels of **work effort**, both police officers and police staff reported very high average scores for this measure, suggesting that they generally invest their full effort into their duties and responsibilities at work.⁴⁴

⁴³ Professional commitment was reported at a high average level by PCSOs and a very high average level by specials and volunteers.

⁴⁴ Average reported levels of work effort were very high across PCSO, special constabulary and volunteer respondents.

New Topics Included in the 2020 National Wellbeing Survey

The average scores for police officers and police staff for newly introduced topics within the National Wellbeing Survey 2020 are shown below in Table 7.

Table 7: Average Scores for Police Officers and Police Staff (New Topics)

Measure	Police Officers (Average)	Police Staff (Average)
General Fatigue <i>(past 2 weeks)</i>	4.92	4.55
Mental Fatigue <i>(past 2 weeks)</i>	3.97	3.53
Social Support from Supervisor <i>(1-5 scale)</i>	3.76	3.84
Social Support from Co-workers <i>(1-5 scale)</i>	3.82	3.97
Authenticity at Work	4.42	4.68
Self-Care <i>(1-6 scale)</i>	3.56	3.69
Prosocial Motivation	5.61	5.89
Work Engagement	5.24	5.56

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*).

Fatigue⁴⁵ 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.

Prior research has shown that fatigue is associated with a reduced capability to cope with work demands,⁴⁶ increased absence, and in the longer term to workplace disability.⁴⁷

Moreover, fatigued individuals experience reduction in their communication skills, ability to handle stress, decision-making ability, and performance. They are also likely to display a lack

⁴⁵ Fatigue was studied in this research following the request from the NPWS to be able to evaluate the efficacy of several fatigue interventions that are currently under development and will be implemented shortly.

⁴⁶ Zohar, Tzischinsky, Epstein and Lavie (2005).

⁴⁷ Beurskens, Bültmann, Kant, Vercoolen, Bleijenberg and Swaen (2000).

of attention and vigilance, an inability to recall details, increased risk taking, errors of judgment,⁴⁸ and are more likely to have an accident.⁴⁹

Prior research in policing has also demonstrated that high levels of fatigue are associated with an increased likelihood of receiving complaints from the public.⁵⁰

Levels of general fatigue were found to be higher for police officers than for police staff. The responses from 67.0% of police officers indicated that they had experienced high levels of general fatigue in the previous two weeks before completing the survey. 57.3% of police staff indicated that this was the case.

Of particular concern is that 29.2% of police officers and 23.5% of police staff indicated that they experienced very high levels of general fatigue.^{51, 52}

Police staff also reported slightly lower scores on average for mental fatigue, with a small to medium effect size of difference; average reported levels were moderate for police officers and moderately low for police staff.⁵³

As expected, predictive analyses indicated that high levels of fatigue were associated with poor sleep and high levels of emotional exhaustion. Both general and mental fatigue were also found to be related to lower levels of job and life satisfaction, engagement at work, and professional commitment, and was associated with higher levels of intention to quit.

Supervisor social support - Individuals were asked the extent to which they felt their supervisors were approachable, supportive, and could be relied upon when they faced difficulties at work. Average scores for supervisor social support were high for both police officer and police staff respondents.

As expected, supervisor support was found to be associated with higher levels of psychological needs fulfilment, mental wellbeing and emotional energy, and with lower levels of fatigue. Furthermore, both police officers and police staff receiving higher levels of supervisor support reported feeling more valued by their supervisor, had higher levels of work engagement, work

⁴⁸ See Caldwell, Caldwell, Thompson and Lieberman (2019).

⁴⁹ Fekedulegn, Burchfiel, Ma, Andrew, Hartley, Charles, Gu and Violanti (2017).

⁵⁰ Riedy, Dawson and Vila (2019).

⁵¹ Scoring an average of above 6 on a 1-7 scale.

⁵² 54.5% of PCSO respondents indicated that they had experienced high levels of general fatigue, including 19.5% who indicated experiencing very high levels of general fatigue.

⁵³ Average reported levels of mental fatigue were moderately low for PCSOs and specials, and very low for volunteers.

effort and professional commitment, and indicated lower levels of intention to quit compared with those experiencing lower levels of supervisor support.

Support from co-workers was also found to be an important predictor of individual wellbeing. Co-worker social support was reported at a high average level. Police staff reported slightly higher scores on average than police officers, with a small effect size.⁵⁴

Authenticity at work – When individuals are able to openly express their personal identities and behave in ways that are authentic to them, rather than having to suppress their genuine emotions, feelings and needs, this has a positive impact on their wellbeing.⁵⁵ Average scores for the extent to which respondents feel able to be their authentic self at work were reported at a moderately high level. Police staff respondents reported slightly higher scores on average than police officers, with a small effect size.⁵⁶

As expected, predictive analyses supported that when police officers and police staff are able to express an authentic identity at work, this was an important predictor of their wellbeing.

Experiencing incivility from somebody in the force within the past 12 months was found to negatively impact individuals' ability to be their authentic self at work and had large negative impact on individuals' wellbeing.

Having a supportive supervisor was found to be positively associated with authenticity and hence individual wellbeing.

Self-care - Recent research in a non-policing context suggested that self-care, in the form of self-kindness, keeping perspective, and recognition of the need to take care of oneself, may have an important positive impact on psychological health through, for example, reduced anxiety and depression and increased optimism and positive emotional states.⁵⁷

In this research, the positive impact of self-care on the wellbeing of the policing workforce was supported. Self-care was found to be an important predictor of improved emotional energy, reduced mental and general fatigue, and was also associated with lower levels of

⁵⁴ Social support from supervisors was reported at a high average level by PCSO respondents and a very high average level by volunteer respondents, whilst at a moderately high average level for special constabulary respondents. Average reported levels of social support from co-workers were high across all role groups.

⁵⁵ Van den Bosch and Taris (2014).

⁵⁶ Authenticity at work was reported at a moderately high average level by PCSO and special constabulary respondents and at a high average level by volunteer respondents.

⁵⁷ Neff, Kirkpatrick and Rude (2007).

anxiety and depression. It was also found to be positively associated with physical wellbeing, and job and life satisfaction.

Average scores for self-care were reported at a moderate level. Police staff reported slightly higher average levels compared with police officers, with a small effect size of difference.⁵⁸

Prosocial motivation⁵⁹ which refers to the extent to which individuals feel motivated by a core desire to help and benefit others in society, was 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.⁶⁰

Policing can be considered as meaningful work and prosocial motivation was found to relate positively to work effort, engagement, and professional commitment, as well as wellbeing in terms of emotional energy and fatigue. Furthermore, prosocial motivation was found to be positively related to job satisfaction and negatively associated with intention to quit.

A further positive finding is that **work engagement**⁶¹ was reported at a high average level by both police officers and police staff and supports that members of the policing workforce are enthusiastic about their work and invest their emotional, cognitive and physical energies into their job roles.⁶²

⁵⁸ Average scores for self-care were reported at a moderate level by PCSO respondents and special constabulary respondents, and at a moderately high level by volunteer respondents.

⁵⁹ Wright, Hassan and Park (2016).

⁶⁰ Prosocial motivation was reported at a very high average level by PCSOs and at an extremely high average level by specials and volunteers.

⁶¹ Rich, Lepine and Crawford (2010).

⁶² Average reported levels of work engagement were high for PCSOs and very high for specials and volunteers.

3.3.1 Shift Working

Similar to the findings from the 2019 National Policing Wellbeing Survey,⁶³ police officers and police staff who work shifts reported lower average levels of emotional energy and job satisfaction, higher average levels of intention to quit, and higher frequencies of disturbed sleep and insufficient sleep than individuals who indicated that they do not work shifts (see Tables 8 and 9).

Table 8: Shift Work and Wellbeing by Role

Role	Wellbeing Measures	Non-Shift Work	Shift Work
Police Officer	Emotional Energy	3.68	3.39
	Job Satisfaction	5.16	4.70
	Life Satisfaction (1-10 scale)	6.74	6.56
	Physical Wellbeing (past 3 months) (1-5 scale)	3.22	3.18
	Intention to Quit	3.08	3.37
	General Fatigue (past 2 weeks)	4.83	4.96
	Mental Fatigue (past 2 weeks)	3.99	3.96
	Work Engagement	5.41	5.16
Police Staff	Emotional Energy	4.09	3.75
	Job Satisfaction	5.47	5.15
	Life Satisfaction (1-10 scale)	6.99	6.78
	Physical Wellbeing (past 3 months) (1-5 scale)	3.30	3.15
	Intention to Quit	2.99	3.36
	General Fatigue (past 2 weeks)	4.47	4.80
	Mental Fatigue (past 2 weeks)	3.52	3.54
	Work Engagement	5.59	5.47

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*).

⁶³ Graham et al. (2020) National Police Wellbeing Survey 2019: Summary of Evidence and Insights

Furthermore, while the average scores for police officers for general fatigue were similar for those who work shifts and those who do not, the average levels for police staff were significantly different, with those working shifts at a similarly high average level to police officers. Police officer respondents who do not work shifts reported higher scores on average for work engagement than police officers on a shift pattern.

As previously mentioned, police officer sleep quantity was found to have improved since the previous survey. This improvement was smaller for police officers working shifts, compared with those not working shifts.

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

Role	Shift Working	Disturbed Sleep <i>(Frequency of "very often" or "all of the time")</i>	Insufficient Sleep <i>(Frequency of "very often" or "all of the time")</i>
Police Officer	Shifts (n = 12,786)	25.5%	43.5%
	No Shifts (n = 5,054)	22.4%	32.7%
Police Staff	Shifts (n = 3,910)	24.2%	38.8%
	No Shifts (n = 10,425)	16.4%	24.8%

3.3.2 Rest Day Cancellations

The number and proportion of respondents reporting rest day cancellations within the past 12 months are shown in Table 10.

35.7% of the police officers who responded to the survey reported having had two or more rest days cancelled within the past 12 months, within which 12.0% report four or more rest day cancellations in this timeframe. This is a reduction from the percentages seen in the results from the 2019 National Policing Wellbeing Survey⁶⁴ (within which 49.1% reported two or more cancelled rest days, of which 17.7% reported four or more cancelled rest days).

Table 10: Frequencies of Rest Day Cancellations within the past 12 months

Role	Rest Day Cancellations	Reported Occurrences	
		<i>n</i>	% of Respondents
Police Officer	None	5,298	49.3%
	Once	1,610	15.0%
	2 - 3 times	2,550	23.7%
	4 times or more	1,288	12.0%
Police Staff	None	8,985	83.7%
	Once	856	8.0%
	2 - 3 times	715	6.7%
	4 times or more	185	1.7%

⁶⁴ Graham et al. (2020) National Police Wellbeing Survey 2019: Summary of Evidence and Insights

3.4 Police Officer Ranks

3.4.1 The Impact of COVID-19 Results

On average, all police officer ranks reported being impacted by COVID-19 to a moderately high extent. The scores for uncertainty caused by COVID-19 were reported at moderately high levels by all ranks (see Table 11).

On average, performance change due to COVID-19 increased with rank and ranged from moderate for Constables to moderately high for the ranks of Chief Inspector and above.

24.7% of Constables reported feeling their work performance had slightly or strongly declined due to the pandemic. 59.4% indicated they felt their performance was relatively unchanged and at a similar level to before the pandemic, while 15.9% indicated they felt their performance had slightly or strongly improved during this time.

19.2% of Sergeants reported feeling their work performance had slightly or strongly declined due to the pandemic. However, a positive finding is that 57.4% indicated they felt their performance was relatively unchanged and at a similar level to before the pandemic, while 23.4% indicated they felt their performance had slightly or strongly improved during this time.

14.7% of Inspectors reported feeling their work performance had slightly or strongly declined due to the pandemic. However, a positive finding is that 57.2% indicated they felt their performance was relatively unchanged and at a similar level to before the pandemic, while 28.1% indicated they felt their performance had slightly or strongly improved during this time.

12.6% of Chief Inspectors reported feeling their work performance had slightly declined due to the pandemic (no respondents reported feeling their performance had strongly declined). However, a positive finding is that 46.1% indicated they felt their performance was relatively unchanged and at a similar level to before the pandemic, while 41.3% indicated they felt their performance had slightly or strongly improved during this time.

17.0% of Superintendents reported feeling their work performance had slightly or strongly declined due to the pandemic. However, a positive finding is that 48.2% indicated they felt their performance was relatively unchanged and at a similar level to before the pandemic, while 34.8% indicated they felt their performance had slightly or strongly improved during this time.

4.9% of Chief Superintendents and above reported feeling their work performance had slightly declined due to the pandemic (no respondents reported feeling their performance had strongly declined). However, a positive finding is that 54.1% indicated they felt their performance was relatively unchanged and at a similar level to before the pandemic, while 41.0% indicated they felt their performance had slightly or strongly improved during this time. Perceptions of work effectiveness also increased with rank, as such those in lower ranks reported moderately high average levels, while the remaining ranks reported high average levels.

Table 11: Average Scores for COVID-19 Measures by Police Officer Rank

Rank	Impact of COVID-19 (Average)	COVID-19 Uncertainty (Average)	Performance Change (Average)	Work Effectiveness (Average)
Constable	3.30	4.92	2.90	4.94
Sergeant	3.35	4.90	3.08	5.21
Inspector	3.32	4.86	3.18	5.36
Chief Inspector	3.39	4.75	3.39	5.36
Superintendent	3.44	4.81	3.22	5.34
Chief Superintendent and above	3.38	4.77	3.41	5.65

Note: COVID-19 discomfort and work effectiveness are measured on a 1-7 scale; Impact of COVID-19 and Performance Change are measured on a 1-5 scale.

3.4.2 Change Over Time Results

The 2019 and 2020 National Policing Wellbeing Surveys investigated key wellbeing indicators at each time point; this allows comparisons to be drawn for the differences in average scores reported by the police officer ranks populations.

When comparing the wellbeing average scores reported by each police officer rank between the two time points, the results suggest that the pattern of average scores were not materially different across ranks from those reported in the 2019 survey.⁶⁵ The only slight difference is the reported average levels of intention to quit for Chief Inspectors; in 2020, they reported a slightly higher average level than 2019.

⁶⁵ Prior to the declaration of the COVID-19 pandemic.

3.4.3 Descriptive Results

Constables, Sergeants, Inspectors, Chief Inspectors and Superintendents reported a moderately low average level of emotional energy (3.45, 3.53, 3.64, 3.68 and 3.62, respectively). The average score for Chief Superintendents and above was slightly higher at a moderate level (4.14).

On average, moderately high levels were reported by all police officer ranks for general fatigue. Moreover, moderate average levels of mental fatigue were reported by Constables, Sergeants, Inspectors, Chief Inspectors and Superintendents (3.99, 3.94, 3.84, 3.85 and 3.84, respectively), while Chief Superintendents and above reported the lowest average level for mental fatigue (3.22, moderately low).

The frequency of experiencing symptoms of post-traumatic stress decreased in an almost linear fashion between the ranks of Constable and Superintendent (ranging from 4.92 for Constables to 3.68 for Superintendents). Chief Superintendents and above reported an average score of 4.11.⁶⁶

Symptoms of anxiety generally decreased with rank; Constables and Sergeants reported moderately high average levels (6.35 and 6.10, respectively), whilst Inspectors, Superintendents, and Chief Superintendents and above reported moderate average levels (5.93, 5.71 and 5.28, respectively). Chief Inspectors reported a moderately high average level (6.06).⁶⁷

Moderate average levels of depression symptoms were reported by Constables, Sergeants, Inspectors, Chief Inspectors and Superintendents (5.81, 5.67, 5.44, 5.25 and 5.21, respectively). Chief Superintendents and above reported the lowest average levels for symptoms of depression (4.66, moderately low).⁶⁷

Sergeants, Inspectors, Chief Inspectors, Superintendents, and Chief Superintendents and above reported moderately high average levels for physical wellbeing (3.23, 3.35, 3.41, 3.39, and 3.50, respectively), while Constables reported a moderate average level (3.16).⁶⁸

⁶⁶ As previously mentioned, individuals with scores of four or more (indicating people are experiencing PTS symptoms 'a little bit' or more) are considered to screen positive. This is not a diagnosis of PTSD, but it indicates that a more thorough evaluation for PTSD could be beneficial.

⁶⁷ Measured on a 1-10 scale.

⁶⁸ Measured on a 1-5 scale.

Job satisfaction increased with rank; the average scores were moderately high for Constables (4.78), moderately high for Sergeants (4.82), high for Inspectors (5.23), high for Chief Inspectors (5.26), high for Superintendents (5.32), and very high for Chief Superintendents and above (5.92).⁶⁹ Similarly, life satisfaction was found to increase with rank, from Constables reporting a moderately high average score (6.51) to Chief Superintendents and above reporting a high average score (7.66).⁷⁰

On average, all ranks reported feeling highly to very highly valued by their co-workers (see Table 12). Average scores for feeling valued by direct supervisors increased with rank, and ranged from moderately high for Constables to high for the ranks of Sergeant and above. Moreover, Constables and Sergeants reported feeling valued by the force at a moderately low average level, while Inspectors and Chief Inspectors reported moderate levels, Superintendent reported moderately high levels, and Chief Superintendents and above reported a high level. This trend shows the marked difference in police officers' experiences of feeling valued by the force, particularly in lower ranks.

A similar trend was evident for feeling valued by the public. On average, Constables and Sergeants reported a moderately low level of feeling valued by the public, with Inspectors to Superintendents reporting moderate average levels and Chief Superintendents and above reporting a moderately high average level.

Table 12: Average Scores for Sense of Being Valued by Police Officer Rank

Rank	Co-Workers (Average)	Supervisor (Average)	The Force (Average)	The Public (Average)
Constable	7.07	6.60	3.61	3.71
Sergeant	7.40	6.82	4.08	3.97
Inspector	7.49	6.70	4.83	4.58
Chief Inspector	7.48	7.19	5.35	5.33
Superintendent	7.45	7.05	5.60	5.45
Chief Superintendent and above	8.41	7.66	7.11	5.75

Note: Sense of Being Valued is measured on a 0-10 scale.

⁶⁹ Measured on a 1-7 scale.

⁷⁰ Measured on a 1-10 scale.

Support from supervisor was reported at a high average level for Constables, Sergeants, Inspectors, Chief Inspectors, Chief Superintendents and above (3.78, 3.72, 3.66, 3.79, 3.81, respectively). Of note is that Superintendents reported a moderately high average score (3.56). In addition, perceived support from co-workers was reported at a high average level for Constables, Sergeants, Inspectors and Chief Inspectors (3.86, 3.74, 3.72, 3.68, respectively). Superintendents reported a moderately high average level (3.62), while Chief Superintendents and above reported a very high average level (4.13).⁷¹

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 measured individuals' experiences of workplace incivility by someone in their force over the past 12 months. The frequencies of experiencing workplace incivility for police officer ranks are shown in Table 13.

As can be seen from Table 13, 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 26.7%, in comparison with 24.2% for Sergeants, 19.5% for Inspectors, 18.3% for Chief Inspectors, 20.3% for Superintendents, and 14.7% for Chief Superintendents and above.

Generally, individuals reported comparable frequencies for extent to which they had experienced being interrupted and not allowed to finish what they were saying by someone in their force monthly or more frequently in the past 12 months (33.4% for Constables, 36.2% for Sergeants, 31.9% for Inspectors, and 35.5% for Chief Inspectors). Of note is that Superintendents reported slightly higher (40.2%), while Chief Superintendents and above reported lower frequencies for their experience of this incivility behaviour (26.2%).

Moreover, the proportion of police officer respondents who reported experiencing not being listened to when expressing their views or opinions by someone in their force in the past 12 months on a monthly or more frequent basis was generally comparable across all rank levels (37.3% for Constables, 36.8% for Inspectors, 35.6% for Chief Inspectors, 38.4% for Superintendents, and 31.2% for Chief Superintendents and above). Of note is that Sergeants reported slightly higher (43.0%) for their experience of this incivility behaviour.

⁷¹ Support from supervisor and support from co-workers were measured on a 1-5 scale.

Table 13: Frequency of Experienced Workplace Incivility for Police Officer Ranks

Response	Constable		Sergeant		Inspector		Chief Inspector		Superintendent		Chief Superintendent and above	
	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>
Experienced being put down or treated in a condescending manner												
Never	36.3	2,713	39.8	843	41.8	333	46.9	120	46.4	52	49.2	30
Once or twice	37.1	2,767	36.0	764	38.6	308	34.8	89	33.0	37	36.1	22
Monthly or a few times a month	15.9	1,182	14.8	314	12.5	100	14.4	37	14.2	16	11.4	7
Weekly or more frequently	10.8	803	9.4	199	7.0	56	3.9	10	6.3	7	3.3	2
Experienced being interrupted and not allowed to finish what they were saying												
Never	27.7	2,066	22.9	485	21.5	171	19.9	51	14.3	16	26.2	16
Once or twice	38.9	2,902	41.0	870	46.5	370	44.5	114	45.5	51	47.5	29
Monthly or a few times a month	19.4	1,442	20.3	429	20.1	160	21.8	56	21.4	24	14.7	9
Weekly or more frequently	14.0	1,045	15.9	337	11.8	94	13.7	35	18.8	21	11.5	7
Experienced not being listened to when expressing views and opinions												
Never	18.7	1,400	12.6	268	12.8	102	13.3	34	12.5	14	19.7	12
Once or twice	43.9	3,278	44.4	942	50.4	402	51.2	131	49.1	55	49.2	30
Monthly or a few times a month	24.4	1,825	26.6	564	24.1	192	27.0	69	27.7	31	23.0	14
Weekly or more frequently	12.9	966	16.4	348	12.7	101	8.6	22	10.7	12	8.2	5

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

Moderately high average levels of authenticity at work were reported by Constables, Sergeants, Inspectors, Chief Inspectors and Superintendents (4.40, 4.42, 4.49, 4.61 and 4.64, respectively). Chief Superintendents and above reported the highest average levels for authenticity at work (5.11, high).

As shown in Table 14, the three psychological needs of feeling autonomous, competent and related generally increased with rank. The average scores for autonomy range from moderate for Constables to high for Chief Superintendent and above. The average scores for competence range from moderately high for Constables to very high for Chief Superintendent and above. Furthermore, the average scores for relatedness range from moderate for Constables to moderately high for Chief Superintendent and above.

Table 14: Average Scores for Psychological Needs Satisfaction by Police Officer Rank

Rank	Autonomy (Average)	Competence (Average)	Relatedness (Average)
Constable	4.31	4.93	4.10
Sergeant	4.36	5.21	4.11
Inspector	4.55	5.37	4.28
Chief Inspector	4.75	5.32	4.34
Superintendent	4.71	5.34	4.25
Chief Superintendent and above	5.46	5.84	4.88

Note: Psychological Needs Satisfaction is measured on a 1-7 scale.

Psychological detachment from work generally decreased with rank; Constable, Sergeants and Inspectors reported moderate average levels (3.93, 3.79 and 3.77, respectively). Chief Inspectors, Superintendents and Chief Superintendents and above reported moderately low average levels (3.43, 3.62 and 3.51, respectively).⁷²

Table 15 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 from Table 15, disturbed sleep was reported as more frequent at lower rank levels. Though insufficient sleep was also reported as more frequent at lower rank levels, of note is the prevalence of insufficient sleep across police officer ranks is markedly higher when compared with the prevalence of disturbed sleep.

⁷² Measured on a 1-7 scale.

Table 15: Frequencies of Disturbed Sleep and Insufficient Sleep by Police Officer Rank

Rank	Disturbed Sleep <i>(Frequency of "very often" or "all of the time")</i>	Insufficient Sleep <i>(Frequency of "very often" or "all of the time")</i>
Constable	25.1%	40.9%
Sergeant	23.9%	40.6%
Inspector	23.7%	35.6%
Chief Inspector	20.9%	32.0%
Superintendent	16.1%	28.6%
Chief Superintendent and above	13.1%	26.2%

Self-care generally increased with rank; the average scores were moderate for Constables (3.51), moderate for Sergeants (3.65), moderate for Inspectors (3.73), moderate for Chief Inspectors (3.73), moderately high for Superintendents (3.81), and moderately high for Chief Superintendents and above (3.89).⁷³

Prosocial motivation increased with rank; the average scores were high for Constables (5.51), very high for Sergeants (5.71), very high for Inspectors (6.04), very high for Chief Inspectors (6.12), very high for Superintendents (6.26), and extremely high for Chief Superintendents and above (6.57).

Professional commitment increased from the average level of 4.77 (moderately high) for Constables, 4.92 (moderately high) for Sergeants, 5.30 (high) for Inspectors, 5.63 (high) for Chief Inspectors, 5.66 (high) for Superintendents to 5.96 (very high) for Chief Superintendents and above.⁷⁴

Intention to quit was reported at moderately low average levels for Constables and Sergeants (3.36 and 3.27, respectively); while Inspectors, Chief Inspectors and Superintendents reported low levels (2.89, 2.70 and 2.53, respectively). Very low average levels of intention to quit were reported by Chief Superintendents and above (2.01).⁷⁴

Work engagement was found to increase with rank, from Constables reporting a high average score (5.14) to Chief Superintendents and above reporting a very high average score (6.21). Average scores of work effort were reported as very high for all ranks (5.72 for Constables, 5.90 for Sergeants, 5.99 for Inspectors, 6.17 for Chief Inspectors, 6.13 for Superintendents, and 6.33 for Chief Superintendents and above).⁷⁴

⁷³ Measured on a 1-6 scale.

⁷⁴ Measured on a 1-7 scale.

3.5 Police Staff Grades

3.5.1 The Impact of COVID-19 Results

On average, all police staff grades reported being impacted by COVID-19 to a moderately high extent, and the average scores for uncertainty caused by COVID-19 were reported at high average levels by practitioners, supervisory managers and middle managers; senior managers and above reported a moderately high average level (see Table 16).

On average, performance change due to COVID-19 increased with grade, and ranged from moderate for practitioners to moderately high for the grades of supervisory manager and above.

15.8% of police staff practitioners reported feeling their work performance had slightly or strongly declined due to the pandemic. However, a positive finding is that 54.0% indicated they felt their performance was relatively unchanged and at a similar level to before the pandemic, while 30.2% indicated they felt their performance had slightly or strongly improved during this time.

14.6% of supervisory managers reported feeling their work performance had slightly or strongly declined due to the pandemic. However, a positive finding is that 46.6% indicated they felt their performance was relatively unchanged and at a similar level to before the pandemic, while 38.82% indicated they felt their performance had slightly or strongly improved during this time.

16.4% of middle managers reported feeling their work performance had slightly or strongly declined due to the pandemic. However, a positive finding is that 42.4% indicated they felt their performance was relatively unchanged and at a similar level to before the pandemic, while 41.2% indicated they felt their performance had slightly or strongly improved during this time.

10.1% of senior managers and above reported feeling their work performance had slightly or strongly declined due to the pandemic. However, a positive finding is that 42.0% indicated they felt their performance was relatively unchanged and at a similar level to before the pandemic, while 48.0% indicated they felt their performance had slightly or strongly improved during this time.

Perceptions of work effectiveness were reported at high average levels across all staff grades.

Table 16: Average Scores for COVID-19 Measures by Police Staff Grade

Grade	Impact of COVID-19 (Average)	COVID-19 Uncertainty (Average)	Performance Change (Average)	Work Effectiveness (Average)
Practitioner	3.38	5.22	3.20	5.55
Supervisory Manager	3.36	5.09	3.34	5.55
Middle Manager	3.46	5.08	3.34	5.46
Senior Manager and above	3.46	4.93	3.52	5.64

Note: COVID-19 discomfort and work effectiveness are measured on a 1-7 scale; Impact of COVID-19 and Performance Change are measured on a 1-5 scale.

3.5.2 Change Over Time Results

The 2019 and 2020 National Policing Wellbeing Surveys⁷⁵ investigated key wellbeing indicators at each time point, this allows comparisons to be drawn for the differences in average scores reported by the police staff grade populations.

When comparing the wellbeing average scores reported by each police staff grade between the two time points, the results suggest that the pattern of average scores were not materially different across grades from those reported in the 2019 survey.

3.5.3 Descriptive Results

All police staff grades reported a moderate average level of emotional energy.

On average, moderately high levels were reported by all police staff grades for general fatigue (4.57 for practitioners, 4.58 for supervisory managers, 4.57 for middle managers and 4.42 for senior managers and above). Moreover, moderately low average levels of mental fatigue were reported by practitioners, supervisory managers and senior managers and above (3.52, 3.58 and 3.45, respectively). Meanwhile, middle managers reported a moderate average level for mental fatigue (3.68).

⁷⁵ The 2019 National Policing Wellbeing Survey was conducted before the COVID-19 pandemic was declared, whereas the 2020 National Policing Wellbeing Survey was conducted several months after the declaration of the COVID-19 pandemic.

The frequency of experiencing symptoms of post-traumatic stress decreased by grade; 4.38 for practitioners, 4.11 for supervisory managers, 4.10 for middle managers and 3.70 for senior managers and above.⁷⁶

Senior managers and above reported a moderate average level of symptoms of anxiety, while practitioners, supervisory manager and middle managers reported moderately high average levels (5.59, 6.20, 6.02 and 6.09, respectively).⁷⁷

Moderate average levels of depression symptoms were reported by all staff grades (5.82 for practitioners, 5.71 for supervisory managers, 5.56 for middle managers and 5.03 for senior managers and above).⁷⁷

All staff grades reported moderately high average levels for physical wellbeing.⁷⁸

Job satisfaction increased with grade; the average scores were high for practitioners (5.35), high for supervisory managers (5.44), high for middle managers (5.51), and very high for senior managers and above (5.73).⁷⁹ Life satisfaction was reported at a moderately high average level for practitioners, supervisory managers and middle managers (6.86, 7.10 and 7.10, respectively); senior managers and above reported a high average score (7.48).⁸⁰

The average scores for feeling valued by co-workers were reported as high for practitioners (7.44), high for supervisory managers (7.57), high for middle managers (7.45), and very high for senior managers and above (7.96).⁸⁰ High average scores for feeling valued by direct supervisors were reported by all police staff grades. Feeling valued by the force increased with police staff grade; practitioners and supervisory managers reported at a moderate average level, while middle managers and senior managers and above reported moderately high average levels. Across all police staff grades, moderately low average levels were reported for feeling valued by the public.

Support from supervisors and co-workers were reported at high average levels across all staff grades.

⁷⁶ As previously mentioned, individuals with scores of four or more (indicating people are experiencing PTS symptoms 'a little bit' or more) are considered to screen positive. This is not a diagnosis of PTSD, but it indicates that a more thorough evaluation for PTSD could be beneficial.

⁷⁷ Measured on a 1-10 scale.

⁷⁸ Measured on a 1-5 scale.

⁷⁹ Measured on a 1-7 scale.

⁸⁰ Measured on a 0-10 scale.

Table 17: Average Scores for Sense of Being Valued by Police Staff Grade

Grade	Co-Workers (Average)	Supervisor (Average)	The Force (Average)	The Public (Average)
Practitioner	7.44	7.01	4.94	4.21
Supervisory Manager	7.57	7.22	5.14	4.03
Middle Manager	7.45	7.38	5.61	3.98
Senior Manager and above	7.96	7.71	6.27	4.25

Note: Sense of Being Valued is measured on a 0-10 scale.

As noted previously, 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 measured individuals' experiences of workplace incivility by someone in their force over the past 12 months. The frequencies of experiencing workplace incivility for police staff grades are shown in Table 18.

As can be seen from Table 18, the proportion of police staff 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 slightly higher for middle managers at 22.3%, in comparison with 19.4% for practitioners, 17.6% for supervisory managers, and 18.8% for senior managers and above.

Generally, practitioners and supervisory managers reported comparable frequencies for extent to which they had experienced being interrupted and not allowed to finish what they were saying by someone in their force monthly or more frequently in the past 12 months (24.0% and 26.2%, respectively). Of note is that middle managers and senior managers and above reported slightly higher (32.3% and 31.1%, respectively).

Moreover, the proportion of police staff respondents who reported experiencing not being listened to when expressing their views or opinions by someone in their force in the past 12 months on a monthly or more frequent basis was comparable for practitioners and supervisory managers (28.2% for practitioners, 29.2% for supervisory managers, and 29.6% for senior managers and above). Of note is that middle managers reported slightly higher (34.2%) for their experience of this incivility behaviour.

Table 18: Frequency of Experienced Workplace Incivility for Police Staff Grades

Response	Practitioners		Supervisory Managers		Middle Managers		Senior Managers and above	
	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>
Experienced being put down or treated in a condescending manner								
Never	48.2	3,720	47.8	683	43.7	338	48.6	201
Once or twice	32.4	2,500	34.6	494	33.9	262	32.6	135
Monthly or a few times a month	11.4	884	11.9	170	14.4	112	13.5	56
Weekly or more frequently	8.0	616	5.7	82	7.9	61	5.3	22
Experienced being interrupted and not allowed to finish what they were saying								
Never	40.4	3,115	32.1	458	27.4	212	28.2	117
Once or twice	35.6	2,748	41.7	594	40.2	311	40.7	169
Monthly or a few times a month	14.4	1,112	17.6	251	20.5	159	22.2	92
Weekly or more frequently	9.6	744	8.6	122	11.8	91	8.9	37
Experienced not being listened to when expressing views and opinions								
Never	31.1	2,402	23.1	330	23.0	178	21.6	90
Once or twice	40.6	3,140	47.8	684	42.8	331	48.8	203
Monthly or a few times a month	18.1	1,399	19.1	273	23.2	180	21.9	91
Weekly or more frequently	10.1	784	10.1	144	11.0	85	7.7	32

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

Moderately high average levels of authenticity at work were reported by all police staff grades. As shown in Table 19, moderately high average levels of autonomy were reported by practitioners, supervisory managers and middle managers, whilst senior managers and above reported a high average level. The average scores for competence were reported as high across all police staff grades, and the average scores for relatedness were reported as moderately high across all police staff grades.

Table 19: Average Scores for Psychological Needs Satisfaction by Police Staff Grade

Grade	Autonomy (Average)	Competence (Average)	Relatedness (Average)
Practitioner	4.70	5.26	4.35
Supervisory Manager	4.85	5.33	4.40
Middle Manager	4.93	5.29	4.41
Senior Manager and above	5.22	5.62	4.66

Note: Psychological Needs Satisfaction is measured on a 1-7 scale.

Practitioners reported a moderately high average level of psychological detachment from work (4.79); supervisory managers, middle managers and senior managers and above reported moderate average levels (4.29, 4.03 and 4.07, respectively).⁸¹

Table 20: 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	18.0%	28.3%
Supervisory Manager	19.6%	29.9%
Middle Manager	18.2%	25.2%
Senior Manager and above	17.5%	24.6%

Table 20 shows the difference in proportions of police staff grades who reported experiencing high frequencies of disturbed and insufficient sleep (*very often* or *all of the time*). Disturbed sleep was reported at comparable levels across staff grades. Though, insufficient sleep was

⁸¹ Measured on a 1-7 scale.

reported as slightly more frequent at lower grade levels, of note is the prevalence of insufficient sleep across staff grades is higher when compared with the prevalence of disturbed sleep.

Self-care generally increased with grade; the average scores were moderate for practitioners (3.65), moderate for supervisory managers (3.76), moderately high for middle managers (3.80) and moderately high for senior managers and above (3.98).⁸²

Very high average levels of prosocial motivation were reported by all police staff grades.

Professional commitment increased from the average level of 5.33 (high) for practitioners, 5.40 (high) for supervisory managers, 5.52 (high) for middle managers to 5.70 (very high) for senior managers and above.⁸³

Intention to quit was reported at moderately low average levels for practitioners and supervisory managers (3.16 and 3.02, respectively); while middle managers and senior managers and above reported low average levels (2.85 and 2.56, respectively).⁸³

Work engagement was found to increase with grade, from practitioners reporting a high average score (5.33) to senior managers and above reporting a very high average score (5.70). Average scores of work effort were reported as very high for practitioners, supervisor managers and middle managers (6.11, 6.13 and 6.18, respectively); while senior managers and above reported an extremely high average level (6.38).⁸³

⁸² Measured on a 1-6 scale.

⁸³ Measured on a 1-7 scale.

3.6 Occupational Job Types

Respondents were asked to indicate what best described their main role at work against a generalised list of occupational job types within policing.^{84, 85}

We used cluster analyses to group different occupational job types, for police officers and police staff separately, based on responses to key wellbeing measures. Cluster analysis refers to a class of statistical techniques which group different objects together into meaningful subgroups based on similarities in the characteristics they possess across a set of variables.⁸⁶ The aim of each analysis is to establish similarity (homogeneity) within each cluster and to maximise the level of difference (heterogeneity) between each of the clusters, in terms of the characteristics of the grouped items. We utilised a hierarchical cluster procedure,⁸⁷ which provides a useful framework for the comparison of sets of cluster solutions to identify how many clusters should be retained.^{88, 89}

The analyses investigated similarities between occupational job types across nine of the core wellbeing measures (emotional energy, general fatigue, mental fatigue, job satisfaction, life satisfaction, symptoms of anxiety and depression, symptoms of post-traumatic stress, and physical wellbeing).⁹⁰ These analyses identified which occupational job types reported similar lived experiences and views in terms of their wellbeing.

⁸⁴ The generalised occupational job types presented closely match those utilised within the 2019 National Wellbeing and Inclusion survey. This list of options was adapted from the Police Workforce England and Wales 2018 data tables on policing functions (Home Office, 2018), and further developed through consultation with key policing personnel in the lead up to the 2019 survey. This procedure was designed to ensure the response options for occupational job types were as concise as possible but remained accurate and inclusive of the complexities of policing.

⁸⁵ For the 2020 National Wellbeing survey, National Policing Initiatives and Counter Terrorism were split into two separate response options, rather than a single combined group, based on further helpful feedback.

⁸⁶ For a more detailed explanation of cluster analysis techniques, please see Hair, Black, Babin, Anderson and Tatham (2007).

⁸⁷ We utilised an agglomerative method of hierarchical analysis; potential solutions were tested initially with Ward's method, using squared Euclidean distance, and then confirmed with a second cluster analysis using an average linkage procedure.

⁸⁸ Hair et al. (2007).

⁸⁹ Occupational job types with fewer than 100 responses were considered not to have a sufficient sample size for inclusion in these analyses.

⁹⁰ The two new measures of general fatigue and mental fatigue have been included into these analyses based on development of the survey design following the findings from the 2019 National Police Wellbeing Survey. The cluster analyses have also been run using only the seven core wellbeing measures from the 2019 survey to check for any substantial differences between the grouping structures identified.

3.6.1 Police Officer Occupational Job Type and Wellbeing

The cluster analyses revealed that five police officer occupational job type groupings should be retained (see Table 21). These groupings are overall very similar to those extracted in the 2019 National Police Wellbeing Survey.

The police officer occupational job types identified as generally having the lowest levels of wellbeing comparatively were in Grouping 5.⁹¹ These seven occupational job types reported moderately low average levels of emotional energy (lower in particular for the three occupational job types of *Response/Incident Management*, *CID/Local Investigations*, and *Custody and Detention*), compared with the moderate average levels reported across most of the other occupational job types included in the analyses. Furthermore, police officers in *Response/Incident Management*, *CID/Local Investigations*, *Custody and Detention*, and *Safeguarding* reported high average levels of general fatigue. Average levels for symptoms of anxiety were moderately high across Grouping 5, with the exception of *Road Policing*, where police officers reported a more positive moderate average level. However, *Road Policing* alongside *Contact Management* reported slightly higher average levels of experiencing post-traumatic stress symptoms. Police officers in *Contact Management* also reported the highest average scores for symptoms of depression (moderately high average level). Average police officer levels of job satisfaction were lowest for *Custody and Detention* (moderate average level). Though at a moderately high average level across the rest of Grouping 5, these were still notably lower than the average levels of job satisfaction for the other occupational job types considered.

The three police officer occupational job types in Grouping 4 reported relatively positive average levels of emotional energy and job satisfaction that were comparable to those reported in Grouping 3. However, symptoms of anxiety, depression, and post-traumatic stress were slightly higher on average and were at similar levels to the occupational job types in Grouping 5. Furthermore, *Support Functions – HR* and *Operational Support – Other Functions* reported higher average scores for mental fatigue; *Support Functions – HR* also reported higher levels of general fatigue.

⁹¹ In the 2019 findings, there was sufficient differentiation between the lowest scoring occupational job types to extract a distinct Grouping 6 for police officer occupational job types; this level of differentiation was not evident to the same significant extent in the 2020 analyses of results.

Table 21: Police Officer Cluster Analysis of Occupational Job Types

Occupational Job Type	<i>n</i>
<i>Grouping 1</i>	
Force Command (Chief Officers, Civilian Chief Officers, Staff Officers and Command Team Support)	100
<i>Grouping 2</i>	
Operational Support - Firearms and Public Order	412
<i>Grouping 3</i>	
Counter Terrorism	374
Specialist Investigations (e.g., Major Investigation Units, Cyber Crime, Economic Crime, Serious & Organised Crime)	968
<i>Grouping 4</i>	
Intelligence	290
Operational Support - Other Functions (e.g., Dogs Section, Mounted Police, Airports and Ports, Air Operations)	215
Support Functions - Human Resources, Training, Occupational Health, Performance Review and Corporate Development	318
<i>Grouping 5</i>	
Road Policing	375
Neighbourhood Policing and Community Liaison	1,214
Safeguarding / Public Protection / Protecting Vulnerable People	941
Response / Incident Management	2,751
Criminal Investigation Department (CID) / Local Investigations	1,597
Contact Management / Central Communications Units	182
Custody and Detention	259

Note:

Seven occupational job types could not be included within these analyses due to their low sample size. These were Support Functions – Professional Standards ($n = 94$); Investigative Support and Forensic Services ($n = 82$); Support Functions – Information Technology, Data/Information Management, Digital Policing ($n = 47$); Criminal Justice ($n = 38$); National Policing Initiatives ($n = 26$); Support Functions – Finance, Legal, Press and Media, Other Administrative Support ($n = 10$); and Support Functions – Fleet Services, Estates and Buildings ($n = 4$). While the samples were relatively low, it should still be noted that both Investigative Support & Forensic Services and Criminal Justice had noticeably low average scores across all nine key wellbeing measures and were at a similar level to the occupational job types within Grouping 5.

The police officer occupational job types identified as generally having the highest levels of wellbeing comparatively were *Force Command* (Grouping 1), *Operational Support - Firearms and Public Order* (Grouping 2), *Counter Terrorism* (Grouping 3) and *Specialist Investigations* (Grouping 3). In particular, the average scores for *Force Command* (Grouping 1) were generally more positive than the other police officer occupational job types across all nine wellbeing measures (emotional energy, general fatigue, mental fatigue, job satisfaction, life satisfaction, symptoms of anxiety, symptoms of depression, post-traumatic stress symptoms, and physical wellbeing). *Operational Support - Firearms and Public Order* (Grouping 2) also reported higher average levels of physical wellbeing and lower average levels of mental fatigue, symptoms of anxiety, symptoms of depression, and post-traumatic stress symptoms. However, respondents working within this occupational job type reported lower levels of job satisfaction on average. Average scores for mental fatigue were slightly higher within *Specialist Investigations* (Grouping 3).

Average levels of emotional energy were found to be highest in *Force Command* (Grouping 1) and *Counter Terrorism* (Grouping 3), whilst lowest in *Response/Incident Management*, *CID/Local Investigations*, *Custody and Detention* (Grouping 5). *Force Command* (Grouping 1) and *Counter Terrorism* (Grouping 3) also reported the lowest average scores for general fatigue; average scores for this measure were highest in *Response/Incident Management*, *CID/Local Investigations*, *Custody and Detention*, and *Safeguarding* (Grouping 5). Furthermore, police officer respondents within *CID/Local Investigations* (Grouping 5), alongside *Support Functions – HR* (Grouping 4), reported higher average levels of mental fatigue. The most positive average scores for mental fatigue were reported in *Force Command* (Grouping 1), *Operational Support - Firearms and Public Order* (Grouping 2), and *Counter Terrorism* (Grouping 3).

The lowest average levels of anxiety symptoms and depression symptoms were found to be in *Operational Support - Firearms and Public Order* (Grouping 2) and *Force Command* (Grouping 1). Police officer respondents within *Safeguarding* (Grouping 5) and *CID/Local Investigations* (Grouping 5) reported the highest levels of anxiety symptoms, on average, whilst average scores for depression symptoms were relatively high for police officer respondents within *Contact Management* (Grouping 5). Symptoms of post-traumatic stress were found to be lowest in *Force Command* (Grouping 1), *Operational Support - Firearms and Public Order* (Grouping 2), and *Counter Terrorism* (Grouping 3). Though at a moderately low

average level, *Road Policing* (Grouping 5) and *Contact Management* (Grouping 5) reported higher average frequencies of experiencing post-traumatic stress symptoms than the other police officer occupational job types.

Similarly, the two occupational job types in Groupings 1 and 2 reported the highest average levels of physical wellbeing. Police officer respondents in *Road Policing* (Grouping 5) reported slightly lower average scores for physical wellbeing compared with the other occupational job types.

Force Command (Grouping 1) reported particularly high average levels of job satisfaction compared with that reported by the other occupational job types. Average levels of job satisfaction were also high across the occupational job types within Groupings 3 and 4. Of note, the average level of job satisfaction reported by *Operational Support - Firearms and Public Order* (Grouping 2), though still at a moderately high level, was noticeably lower than expected considering the positive results across the other eight wellbeing measures and was more similar in score to the job satisfaction averages seen within Grouping 5. *Custody and Detention* reported the lowest average score for job satisfaction, at a moderate average level, of all of the police officer occupational job types.

Life satisfaction was reported at a high average level within *Force Command* (Grouping 1) and was at a relatively similar moderately high average level across all the other police officer occupational job types.

3.6.2 Police Staff Occupational Job Type and Wellbeing

For police staff, the cluster analyses revealed five groupings (see Table 22).

The police staff groupings with the lowest levels of wellbeing comprised *Custody and Detention* (Grouping 5) and *Contact Management, Investigative Support and Forensic Services, Criminal Justice, and Response/Incident Management* (Grouping 4). *Custody and Detention* in particular reported the lowest average levels of wellbeing across all nine wellbeing measures when compared with the other police staff occupational job types.

Although *Response/Incident Management* also scored comparatively lower average levels across key wellbeing measures, the scores for mental fatigue and symptoms of depression were reported at a relatively positive average level in comparison with the other occupational job types. However, average scores for symptoms of anxiety and post-traumatic stress were at higher levels for police staff in this occupational job type.

The police staff occupational job types within Grouping 3 generally reported high average levels of job satisfaction, moderately high levels of physical wellbeing, and moderate levels for emotional energy. However, average scores for mental fatigue and symptoms of anxiety across these occupational job types were at a similar level to those in Groupings 4 and 5.

The grouping identified as generally having the highest levels of wellbeing (Grouping 1) comprises *Operational Support - Other Functions (e.g., Dogs Section)* and *Fleet Services, Estates and Buildings*. In particular, individuals within *Operational Support - Other Functions (e.g., Dogs Section)* reported the highest average levels of wellbeing across almost all of the key measures in these analyses.

On average, emotional energy was found to be highest in *Operational Support - Other Functions (e.g., Dogs Section)* (Grouping 1) and *Professional Standards* (Grouping 3), whilst lowest for *Custody and Detention* (Grouping 5), *Contact Management* (Grouping 4), and *Response/Incident Management* (Grouping 4). These latter three occupational job types also reported the highest average scores for general fatigue.

Police staff in *Fleet Services, Estates and Buildings* (Grouping 1), *Specialist Investigations* (Grouping 2) and *Professional Standards* (Grouping 3) reported the highest average levels of physical wellbeing.

Table 22: Police Staff Cluster Analysis of Occupational Job Types

Occupational Job Type	<i>n</i>
<i>Grouping 1</i>	
Operational Support - Other Functions (e.g., Dogs Section, Mounted Police, Airports and Ports, Air Operations)	117
Support Functions - Fleet Services, Estates and Buildings	363
<i>Grouping 2</i>	
Counter Terrorism	284
Neighbourhood Policing and Community Liaison	173
Force Command (Chief Officers, Civilian Chief Officers, Staff Officers and Command Team Support)	141
Specialist Investigations (e.g., Major Investigation Units, Cyber Crime, Economic Crime, Serious & Organised Crime)	615
Road Policing	126
Safeguarding / Public Protection / Protecting Vulnerable People	555
<i>Grouping 3</i>	
Support Functions - Professional Standards	236
Support Functions - Finance, Legal, Press and Media, Other Administrative Support	980
Criminal Investigation Department (CID) / Local Investigations	216
Support Functions - Information Technology, Data/Information Management, Digital Policing	882
Support Functions - Human Resources, Training, Occupational Health, Performance Review and Corporate Development	1,460
Intelligence	607
<i>Grouping 4</i>	
Response / Incident Management	139
Criminal Justice (e.g., Crown Court Liaison, Police National Computer, Disclosure and Barring Service, Coroner Assistance)	737
Investigative Support and Forensic Services	662
Contact Management / Central Communications Units	1,017
<i>Grouping 5</i>	
Custody and Detention	234

Notes:

- Two occupational job types could not be included within these analyses due to their low sample size. These were Operational Support – Firearms and Public Order ($n = 45$) and National Policing Initiatives ($n = 15$).
- When included within the cluster analyses of police staff wellbeing, PCSOs ($n = 1,069$) clustered within Grouping 4. Positively, PCSOs reported relatively low average levels of general fatigue, mental fatigue, and symptoms of depression. However, their average score for job satisfaction was lower than the majority of other occupational job types.

Mental fatigue was reported at the highest average levels for police staff in *Investigative Support and Forensic Services* (Grouping 4), *Support Functions - e.g., Human Resources* (Grouping 3), and *Support Functions – e.g., Information Technology* (Grouping 3). Police staff in *Operational Support – Other Functions (e.g., Dogs Section)* (Grouping 1), *Road Policing* (Grouping 2), and *Response/Incident Management* (Grouping 4) reported the lowest average scores for this measure.

The highest average scores for symptoms of anxiety were found to be in *Custody and Detention* (Grouping 5), *Response/Incident Management* (Grouping 4) and *Intelligence* (Grouping 3). *Custody and Detention* (Grouping 5), alongside *Criminal Justice* (Grouping 4), also reported the highest average scores for symptoms of depression. Frequencies of experiencing post-traumatic stress symptoms were highest within *Custody and Detention* (Grouping 5), reported at a moderately low average level. Though at a low average level across the other police staff occupational job types, average scores for post-traumatic stress symptoms were also slightly higher on average for police staff within *Contact Management* (Grouping 4), *Response/Incident Management* (Grouping 4), and *CID/Local Investigations* (Grouping 3).

The average scores for symptoms of post-traumatic stress, anxiety and depression were lowest across the two occupational job types within Grouping 1; average scores for symptoms of anxiety were also low for *Neighbourhood Policing* (Grouping 2) whilst *Counter Terrorism* (Grouping 2) scored low average levels for symptoms of depression and post-traumatic stress.

Average scores for job satisfaction were highest in *Operational Support – Other Functions (e.g., Dogs Section)* (Grouping 1) and *Professional Standards* (Grouping 3). *Operational Support – Other Functions (e.g., Dogs Section)* (Grouping 1) and *Force Command* (Grouping 2) reported the highest average levels of life satisfaction.

Police staff within *Custody and Detention* (Grouping 5) reported lower levels of job satisfaction, at a moderately high average level, than the high average scores across the other occupational job types. Job satisfaction scores were also slightly lower for police staff within *Contact Management* (Grouping 4). Average scores for life satisfaction were also generally slightly lower within these two police staff occupational job types.

3.7 Police Officer Tenure

3.7.1 Change Over Time Results

When comparing the wellbeing average scores reported by each police officer tenure grouping between the two time points, the results suggest the average scores were comparable to those reported in the 2019 survey;⁹² this indicates the trends in average scores have generally maintained the same, with no differences identified.

3.7.2 Descriptive Results

On average, moderate levels of emotional energy were reported by police officer respondents with less than one years' service; police officer respondents with over one years' service, on average, reported moderately low levels.

On average, the lowest level of general fatigue was reported by police officer respondents with less than one years' service (moderate average level). Moderately high average levels of general fatigue were reported by police officers who reported a tenure of between 1-5 years and over 20 years. Police officers with 6-20 years reported high average levels for general fatigue.

The frequency of experiencing symptoms of post-traumatic stress increased in an almost linear fashion between the tenure groupings of less than one year to over 20 years' service; a noteworthy finding is that the average scores reported by police officers with one year and above qualify for a positive screening.⁹³

On average, the lowest average levels of symptoms of anxiety and depression were reported by police officers with less than one years' service.

Police officers with up to five years' service reported moderately high average levels for physical wellbeing. Similarly, police officers with over 20 years' service reported a moderately high average level. Moderate average levels of physical wellbeing were reported by police officers with 6-20 years' service.

⁹² Prior to the declaration of the COVID-19 pandemic.

⁹³ As previously mentioned, individuals with scores of four or more (indicating people are experiencing PTS symptoms 'a little bit' or more) are considered to screen positive. This is not a diagnosis of PTSD, but it indicates that a more thorough evaluation for PTSD could be beneficial.

Police officers with up to two years' service reported high average levels for job satisfaction. Moreover, police officers with over three years' service reported a moderately high average level.

A very low level of intention to quit was reported by police officer respondents with less than one years' service and a low level was reported by police officer respondents with 1-2 years' service. Moderately low levels of intention to quit were reported by police officers who reported a tenure of three years and above.

On average, all police officer tenure groupings reported feeling highly valued by their co-workers. In contrast, low average levels of feeling valued by the force and by the public were reported by police officers with 3-5 years' service. Police officers with less than one year's service reported moderate average levels for feeling valued by the force and by the public.

On average, disturbed sleep was found to increase with tenure; a moderate level of disturbed sleep was reported by police officer respondents with less than one years' service, while police officer respondents with over one years' service reported moderately high levels of sleep disturbance.

Very high average levels of prosocial motivation were reported by police officers with up to two years' service. Police officers with three years' service and above reported a high average level.

Professional commitment generally decreased from a high average level for police officers with up to two years' service, while moderately high average levels were reported by police officers with three years' service and above. Average scores of work effort were reported as very high for all police officer tenure groupings.

3.8 Police Staff Tenure

3.8.1 Change Over Time Results

When comparing the wellbeing average scores reported by each police staff tenure grouping between the two time points, the results suggest the average scores were comparable to those reported in the 2019 survey;⁹⁴ this indicates the trends in average scores have generally maintained the same, with no differences identified.

3.8.2 Descriptive Results

On average, moderately high levels of emotional energy were reported by police staff respondents with less than one years' service; police staff respondents with over one years' service reported moderate levels.

The lowest levels of general fatigue were reported by police staff respondents with less than one years' service and over 20 years' service (moderate average levels, respectively). Moderately high average levels of general fatigue were reported by police staff with 1-20 years in service.

On average, low levels of symptoms of post-traumatic stress were reported by all police staff tenure groupings. A finding of concern is that the average scores reported by all police staff qualify for a positive screening of post-traumatic stress symptoms.⁹⁵

Moderate average levels of anxiety symptoms were reported by police staff respondents with less than one years' service and over 20 years' service. Moderately high average levels of anxiety symptoms were reported by police staff with 1-20 years in service. On average, moderate levels of depression symptoms were reported by all police staff tenure groupings.

Moderately high average levels for physical wellbeing were reported by all police staff tenure groupings.

On average, police staff with less than one years' service reported a very high level for job satisfaction; police staff with over one years' service reported a high level.

⁹⁴ Prior to the declaration of the COVID-19 pandemic.

⁹⁵ As previously mentioned, individuals with scores of four or more (indicating people are experiencing PTS symptoms 'a little bit' or more) are considered to screen positive. This is not a diagnosis of PTSD, but it indicates that a more thorough evaluation for PTSD could be beneficial.

A low level of intention to quit was reported by police staff respondents with less than one years' service and by those with over 20 years' service. Moderately low levels of intention to quit were reported by police staff respondents with between one and 20 years' service.

On average, all police staff tenure groupings reported feeling highly valued by their co-workers. Moreover, moderately high average levels of feeling valued by the force were reported by police staff with up to two years' service. Police staff with over three years' service reported moderate average levels for feeling valued by the force.

Police staff respondents with less than one years' service reported feeling valued by the public to a moderate extent; police staff respondents with over one years' service reported moderately low levels.

Disturbed sleep was found to generally increase with tenure. A moderate average level of disturbed sleep was reported by police staff respondents with up to two years' service, while police staff respondents with three years' service and above reported moderately high levels of sleep disturbance.

Prosocial motivation and work effort were reported at very high average levels by all police staff tenure groupings. On average, all police staff tenure groupings reported a high level of professional commitment.

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.

Authenticity at Work

Being able to openly express personal identities and act in a way that feels authentic and true to one's self has important implications for individual wellbeing. When individuals feel the need to only put the interests of others first, repress genuine emotions and needs, hide their true feelings and outwardly present themselves as being socially compliant in order to minimise conflict and disagreements at work, they expend additional energy to self-regulate and are at risk of losing their sense of self, which in turn can result in negative outcomes such as depression.

Covid-19 Impact

We asked respondents specifically about the impact of Covid-19, with a few questions on how significantly the pandemic has affected their lives, whether they feel their performance has changed during this period and how effective they feel at work at the moment. In addition, we asked respondents how unsettled and uncertain they feel due to the pandemic, and to indicate what specific personal concerns they may have in relation to the impact of Covid-19.

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. Experiencing work stressors not only has a direct negative impact on emotional energy and wellbeing, but also reduces individuals' ability to recover through negative effects on sleep quality and quantity. A lack of recovery

can have serious impacts on individuals' health, wellbeing and performance. 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.

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. General fatigue and mental fatigue arise from different conditions and are associated with different outcomes for individuals. While fatigue is 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. 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, reduced communication skills, 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.

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.

Post-Traumatic Stress Symptoms

Experiencing post-traumatic stress symptoms refers to the psychological reaction to an event that is threatening and/or stressful. This reaction can result in flashbacks, anxiety, depression, hypervigilance, and mental health concerns. A lower score on this measure is more desirable.

Professional Commitment

Professional commitment can be thought of as a mind-set that binds an individual to a particular line of work. This emotional form of commitment occurs when an individual has a dedication to their particular occupation and feel a sense of responsibility to contribute to its success.

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 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.

Self-Care

While people are often kind and compassionate to others when they face difficult times, they are often harsher towards themselves and do not recognise the need to take care of themselves. Through the adoption of an attitude involving increased self-kindness and through working to reduce feelings of isolation and over-identification with problems individuals become more able to understand and deal with difficult situations they face. A growing body of research suggests that self-compassion is associated with psychological health such as reduced anxiety and depression and increased optimism and positive emotional states.

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.

Social Support (from Supervisor and Co-Workers)

The perceived quality of workplace social support has been identified as an important factor that is related to a variety of work outcomes, including burnout, job satisfaction and performance. This research examines supervisor social support and co-worker social support; we investigate the extent to which individuals believe their supervisors and co-workers are approachable and supportive when facing work difficulties, and the extent to which they can be relied upon when facing tough moments at work.

Work Effort

Work effort represents an individual's time commitment and the intensity of the work they undertake, constituting the essence of working hard within an individual's job role.

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.

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). It can include not being listened to, being treated in a condescending manner, and being interrupted while speaking. Individuals were asked how frequently they had experienced these behaviours by someone in their force while at work over the past 12 months. Lower reported frequencies are more desirable.

5 REFERENCES

- Barnes, C. M., Guarana, C. L., Nauman, S. & Kong, D. T. (2016). Too tired to inspire or be inspired: Sleep deprivation and charismatic leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 101(8), 1191.
- Beurskens, A. J., Bültmann, U., Kant, I., Vercoulen, J. H., Bleijenberg, G. & Swaen, G. M. (2000). Fatigue among working people: validity of a questionnaire measure. *Occupational and Environmental Medicine*, 57(5), 353-357.
- 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>).
- Caldwell, J. A., Caldwell, J. L., Thompson, L. A. & Lieberman, H. R. (2019). Fatigue and its management in the workplace. *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews*, 96, 272-289.
- Cho, K., Barnes, C. M. & Guanara, C. L. (2016). Sleepy punishers are harsh punishers: Daylight saving time and legal sentences. *Psychological Science*, 1-6.
- 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.
- Fekedulegn, D., Burchfiel, C. M., Ma, C. C., Andrew, M. E., Hartley, T. A., Charles, L. E., Gu, J. K. & Violanti, J. M., (2017). Fatigue and on-duty injury among police officers: The BCOPS study. *Journal of Safety Research*, 60, 43-51.
- 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://oscarkilo.org.uk/fatigue-to-be-tackled-following-first-ever-national-police-wellbeing-survey/>
- Graham, L., Gracey, S., Plater, M., Brown, N., Legate, N., Al-Khouya, M. & Weinstein, N. (2021). *Summary of Research Findings Diversity, Equality and Inclusion in Policing*. Durham University, January 2021. Available on the National Police Chiefs' Council web site: <https://news.npcc.police.uk/releases/action-to-address-findings-of-first-employee-led-assessment-of-workplace-culture>

- Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., Anderson, R. E. & Tatham, R. L. (2007). *Multivariate Data Analysis*. (6th ed.). New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Hayes, A. F. (2018). *An Introduction to Mediation, Moderation, and Conditional Process Analysis*. New York: The Guilford Press.
- Hesketh, I., Cooper, C. L., & Ivy, J. (2017). Wellbeing and engagement in policing: the key to unlocking discretionary effort? *Policing: A Journal of Policy and Practice*, 11(1), 62-73.
- Hesketh, I., Tehrani, N., Harrison, J., Brewin, C. & Miller, J. (2018). *Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD) and Policing – Short Guidance Document*. College of Policing Ltd. Available at <https://oscarkilo.org.uk/3886-2/>
- Home Office (2018). *Police Workforce, England and Wales, 30 September 2018: Data Tables*. Available at <https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/police-workforce-england-and-wales-30-september-2018>.
- Lockey, S., Graham, L., Zheng, Y., Hesketh, I., Plater, M. & Gracey, S. (2021). The impact of workplace stressors on exhaustion and work engagement in policing. *The Police Journal*, 0032258X211016532.
- Neff, K. D., Kirkpatrick, K. L. & Rude, S. S. (2007). Self-compassion and adaptive psychological functioning. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 41(1), 139-154.
- Pallant, J. (2020). *SPSS Survival Manual. A Step by Step Analysis Using SPSS*. Open University.
- Penson, A., van Deuren, S., Worm-Smeitink, M., Bronkhorst, E., van den Hoogen, F.H., van Engelen, B.G., Peters, M., Bleijenberg, G., Vercoulen, J.H., Blijlevens, N. & Van Dulmen-den Broeder, E. (2020). Short fatigue questionnaire: Screening for severe fatigue. *Journal of Psychosomatic Research*, 137 (110229).
- 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.
- Riedy, S. M., Dawson, D. & Vila, B. (2019). US police rosters: Fatigue and public complaints. *Sleep*, 42(3), 1-10.
- 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.
- Söderström, M., Jeding, K., Ekstedt, M., Perski, A. & Åkerstedt, T. (2012). Insufficient sleep predicts clinical burnout. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 17, 175-183.
- 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.

- Van den Bosch, R. & Taris, T. W. (2014). The authentic worker's well-being and performance: The relationship between authenticity at work, well-being, and work outcomes. *The Journal of Psychology, 148*(6), 659-681.
- Weinstein, N. & DeHaan, C. (2014). On the Mutuality of Human Motivation and Relationships. In N. Weinstein, Ed. *Human Motivation and Interpersonal Relationships* (3-25). Springer: Dordrecht.
- 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.
- Zheng, Y., Wu, C. H. & Graham, L. (2020). Work-to-non-work spillover: the impact of public service motivation and meaningfulness on outcomes in work and personal life domains. *Public Management Review, 22*(4), 578-60.
- Zohar, D., Tzischinsky, O., Epstein, R. & Lavie, P. (2005). The effects of sleep loss on medical residents' emotional reactions to work events: a cognitive-energy model. *Sleep, 28*(1), 47-54.

