Summary of Research Findings

Diversity, Equality and Inclusion in Policing

Policing Research Unit

International Centre for Leadership and Followership

Durham University Business School

Durham University

Acknowledgements

Les Graham[1], Sara Gracey[1], Marisa Plater[1], Natalie Brown[1], Nicole Legate[2],
Maya Al-Khouja[3] and Netta Weinstein[4]

[1] Durham University

[2] Illinois Institute of Technology

[3] Cardiff University

[4] University of Reading

January 2021

This 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 research and report.

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

CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

A key goal of increasing diversity is to address societal inequalities. However, recent academic research and extensive practitioner experience in organisations in a range of contexts suggests that increasing workforce diversity alone does not result in the achievement of positive outcomes for organisations or individuals.

Inclusion is increasingly recognised as essential to support and achieve diversity improvement. Working towards achieving inclusion can be considered as doing what is right, just and moral, and will realise practical benefits for organisations, individuals and societies.

An inclusive culture enables all individuals to feel a sense of belonging, whilst being able to be their authentic self, and be fully able to have voice and contribute. For the attainment of an inclusive culture, effective organisational policies and practices need to be achieved and new competencies are required on the part of leaders to achieve inclusion within their teams.

The National Diversity, Equality and Inclusion Survey was designed to examine inclusivity and workplace culture from the perspective of the policing workforce within the forty-three Home Office forces in England and Wales.

The purpose of this research was to support the achievement of the 2018-2025 NPCC Diversity, Equality and Inclusion Strategy through providing an evidence base as to the policing workforce's perceptions of the levels of equality and inclusion they feel in their force. The research also sought to investigate individuals' perspectives as to whether they feel included and valued within their workplace, and to develop a deeper understanding of the frequency of unacceptable behaviour in the workplace and the cost this can have on individuals' wellbeing, with the aim that this information can be used constructively to improve the experiences for all individuals who work in policing and the service they provide to the communities they serve.

Participation in the survey was voluntary, and anonymity and confidentiality for all participants is assured. In total, the online survey received 34,529 responses (16.6% response rate).

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

Force Inclusive Employment Practices

The extent to which respondents felt their force has inclusive employment practices, through for example having fair selection and promotion processes, investing in the development of all its people, demonstrating a commitment to having a diverse workforce, valuing people for who they are, and providing safe ways for people to voice their grievances, was found to be positively associated with individual wellbeing.

When force employment practices were perceived to be more inclusive, this was associated with higher levels of emotional energy, job satisfaction, work effort, and professional commitment, and lower levels of intention to quit.

Overall, police staff reported a higher average score than police officers for the extent to which they perceived that their force's employment practices were inclusive; average levels were moderately high for police staff and moderate for police officers.

Black, Asian and Mixed ethnicity respondents reported lower average levels for this measure than White ethnicity respondents. The average level for Black, Asian and Mixed ethnicity police staff was moderate, while for Black, Asian and Mixed ethnicity police officers it was moderately low.

No material differences were found between the moderate average scores for respondents from different religions/beliefs. A moderate average level was also reported by respondents who identified in the survey as having a different gender identity from that assigned at birth; respondents who identified as gay or lesbian, bisexual, or heterosexual; respondents who identified as having a disability; and respondents who identified as having a neurodiverse condition.

The average scores for force inclusive employment practices were moderately low for respondents who identified as having an autistic spectrum condition.

Perceived Unfair Treatment

Respondents were asked to report how frequently they perceived that they have been unfairly treated at work due to a protected characteristic in the past 12 months.

As predicted, the results of the analyses supported that individuals' perceptions of experiencing unfair treatment due to a protected characteristic were associated with lower levels of individual wellbeing, job satisfaction and professional commitment, and with higher levels of intention to quit.

The proportion of male police officers who reported feeling that they are unfairly treated at work due to their gender was found to be higher than that of female police officers, male police staff and female police staff. For example, 17.2% of male police officers reported strongly agreeing or agreeing that their career promotion opportunities are negatively affected because of their gender, compared with 8.9% of female police officers, 3.8% of male police staff, and 2.5% of female police staff.

17.1% of individuals who identified as having a different gender identity from that assigned at birth[1] reported strongly agreeing or agreeing that their career promotion opportunities are negatively affected because of their gender identity.

21.0% of Black, Asian and Mixed ethnicity police officers[2] and 13.2% of Black, Asian and Mixed ethnicity police staff reported strongly agreeing or agreeing that their career promotion opportunities are negatively affected because of their ethnicity.

21.4% of Muslim police officers reported strongly agreeing or agreeing that their career promotion opportunities are negatively affected because of their religion/beliefs. This is in contrast to the 2.5% of Christian police officer respondents who reported that this was the case. For Muslim police staff the proportion was 11.8%, while for Christian police staff it was 0.5%.

---

[1] Due to the relatively small number of respondents (*n* = 70) who identified in the survey as having a different gender identity from that assigned at birth these findings, while interesting, should be considered as indicative only.

[2] It should be noted that 532 respondents from the total population of approximately 8,329 Black, Asian and Mixed ethnicity police officers provided responses to the survey, which represents only a 6.4% response rate.

When compared with the other protected characteristics considered in this study, the perceived negative impact associated with sexual orientation on career promotion opportunities was reported at a relatively lower level. The proportion of gay or lesbian, or bisexual respondents strongly agreeing or agreeing that their career promotion opportunities are negatively affected because of their sexual orientation was 5.9% for police officers and 2.6% for police staff.

Of those who identified as having a disability, 38.0% of police officers and 19.4% of police staff reported strongly agreeing or agreeing that their career promotion opportunities are negatively affected because of their disability.

Diversity Attitudes

To assess diversity attitudes, we measured respondents' antagonism towards workplace policies designed to help members of minority groups. This is recognised by researchers as a more subtle way of measuring prejudice than asking individuals about their diversity attitudes directly. Low levels of antagonism relate to more positive attitudes towards diversity and equality.

An important finding from the statistical analyses conducted is that individuals' wellbeing was found to be related to their diversity attitudes, such that lower levels of emotional energy were associated with higher levels of antagonism.

On average, police staff reported more positive diversity attitudes than police officers.

Diversity attitudes for both police officers and police staff were found to be more positive for younger respondents. Age was found to be positively related to antagonism towards workplace policies designed to help members of minority groups; that is as age increased, antagonism was found to increase.

Force Communications to Overcome Unconscious Bias and Prejudice

Both police officers and police staff indicated that the clarity of their force's communication of the consequences of discriminating against someone from a minority group was at a very high average level.

The findings from statistical analyses supported that where respondents felt their force adopted a supportive organisational approach to overcoming bias and prejudice, which encourages individuals to internalise and accept the need to work to improve their diversity attitudes, this was associated with more positive diversity attitudes. A pressurising or shaming approach to overcoming bias and prejudice was found to be associated with an increase in antagonism towards workplace policies designed to help members of minority groups.

The average score for the extent to which individuals considered their force's approach to overcoming bias and prejudice as supportive was reported at a moderately high average level for police officers and a high average level for police staff.

Supervisor Listening

Overall, the extent to which respondents viewed their direct supervisors as open, non-judgemental, supportive, and interested in what they have to say was reported at a high average level.

No material differences were found between the high average scores reported by police officer and police staff respondents; by male and female respondents; by respondents from different religions/beliefs; and by gay or lesbian, and bisexual respondents.

Black, Asian and Mixed ethnicity respondents; respondents who identified as having a disability; respondents who identified as neurodiverse; and respondents who identified that their gender identity was different from that assigned at birth reported a moderately high average level for the extent to which respondents viewed their direct supervisors as open, non-judgemental, supportive, and interested in what they have to say.

Supervisor listening was found to be positively related to team inclusivity with a large effect size. This suggests that supervisors play an important role in establishing an inclusive culture within their work teams, which in turn will reduce the occurrence of inappropriate behaviour.

Consistent with this finding, supervisor listening was found to be associated with increased individual wellbeing, job satisfaction, professional commitment and work effort, and reduced intention to quit their jobs.

Team Inclusivity

Team inclusivity, as measured in this survey, encapsulates two factors on the level of inclusivity individuals perceive within their work teams:

Team integration of differences, reflects expectations and norms regarding the openness with which people feel they can be their "true" selves without suffering adverse consequences in their work teams.

Team inclusion in decision making, reflects the extent to which all individuals within teams feel they are genuinely involved in decision making processes, that diverse views are actively sought, and that ideas are judged based on their quality rather than who expresses them.

As predicted, when individuals perceived their work teams as having a climate of inclusivity this was found to be positively associated with wellbeing, in terms of their emotional energy and job satisfaction, and their levels of professional commitment and work effort.

In the total sample of respondents, average scores were high for team integration of differences and moderately high for team inclusion in decision making.

Police officers reported slightly higher average scores compared with police staff for both measures of team inclusivity.

The average levels for both measures of team inclusivity were found not to differ materially by gender for either police officers or police staff.

Gay or lesbian, and bisexual respondents also reported a high average level for team integration of differences and a moderately high average level for team inclusion in decision making.

However, while Black, Asian and Mixed ethnicity respondents; Muslim respondents; respondents who identified as having a disability; respondents who identified that their gender identity was different from that assigned at birth; and respondents who identified as having an autistic spectrum condition also reported a moderately high average level of team inclusion in decision making, the average score for team integration of differences for these respondents was at a moderately high average level.

For Black ethnicity respondents only, the average score for team integration of differences was also moderately high, however, the average level for team inclusion in decision making was lower at a moderate average level.

Workplace Incivility

Workplace incivility can be thought of as a generalised form of low-intensity, subtle, harmful behaviour directed towards others, which can be verbal (being rude or disrespectful) or non-verbal (excluding or ignoring someone). Individuals were asked to report their experiences of workplace incivility by someone in their force over the past 12 months.

As predicted, experiencing incivility at work by someone in their force was found to be detrimental for individual wellbeing, professional commitment, job satisfaction and life satisfaction, and was associated with higher levels of intention to quit.

Police officers reported experiencing higher frequencies of incivility than police staff. 46.7% of police officers and 38.2% of police staff reported that they had experienced not being listened to when expressing their views or opinions by someone in their force monthly or more frequently in the past 12 months.

Furthermore, 39.7% of police officers and 33.1% of police staff reported that 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.

Moreover, 29.1% of police officers and 25.7% of police staff reported they had been put down or treated in a condescending manner by someone in their force monthly or more frequently in the past 12 months.

Male and female police officer respondents reported similar frequencies of experiencing these three forms of incivility behaviour. This was also the case for male and female police staff respondents.

The level of experienced incivility for respondents who identified that their gender identity was different from that assigned at birth was higher than that for the total populations of respondents who identified as male or female. For example, 35.7% of respondents who identified that their gender identity was different from that assigned at birth reported

experiencing being put down or treated in a condescending manner by someone in their force monthly or more frequently, compared with 26.0% of respondents who identified as male and 27.7% who identified as female in the total sample of respondents.

The proportion of individuals who reported experiencing being put down or treated in a condescending manner on a monthly or more frequent basis was slightly higher for Black, Asian and Mixed ethnicity respondents at 33.2%, in comparison with 27.1% for White ethnicity respondents.

The results indicate that there is little difference in the average lived experience of respondents across the four religions or beliefs with the larger sample sizes (Atheist, Christian and Muslim respondents and for those who indicated having no religion or belief) regarding experienced workplace incivility.

35.5% of gay or lesbian, or bisexual respondents reported experiencing being put down or treated in a condescending manner monthly or more frequently. This was higher than the 26.3% reported by heterosexual respondents.

Of the individuals who identified as having a disability, 42.7% of police officers and 40.2% of police staff reported experiencing being put down or treated in a condescending manner monthly or more frequently. Furthermore, 54.0% of police officers and 45.8% of police staff reported experiencing being interrupted and not allowed to finished what they were saying, and 61.7% of police officers and 54.2% of police staff reported experiencing not being listened to when expressing their views and opinions on a monthly or more frequent basis.

For respondents who identified as neurodiverse (such as those with an autistic spectrum condition, dyslexia, dyspraxia, dyscalculia, or ADHD), the proportion of respondents experiencing these three forms of incivility were also at a particularly high level.

Interpersonal Mistreatment Attributed to an Individual's Protected Characteristics

General incivility and specific interpersonal mistreatment due to a protected characteristic are related constructs. These negative behaviours can be regarded as a subtle low-intensity form of aggression with consequences that are often not immediately obvious. This makes it difficult for occurrences to be detected and dealt with. It is often described by perpetrators as

'just banter' or 'joking'. However, prior research outside of policing has shown that both are damaging to those who are subject to it and to organisational performance.

We asked individuals to report the extent to which they had been subject to interpersonal mistreatment in the workplace due to a protected characteristic, by someone in their force over the past 12 months, which they perceived as derogatory and demeaning in nature and which caused them distress, anxiety and humiliation.

As expected, analyses confirmed that experiencing interpersonal mistreatment in the workplace is associated with lower individual wellbeing, professional commitment, job and life satisfaction, and with higher levels of intention to quit.

Female police officers reported experiencing a higher level of interpersonal mistreatment due to their gender than male police officers. This was also the case for female police staff, but to a lesser extent. 27.8% of female police officers reported experiencing derogatory remarks about their gender in the past 12 months. This compares to 13.3% of female police staff, 8.8% of male police officers, and 7.4% of male police staff.

Similarly, the proportion of female police officers who reported experiencing sexist comments from someone in their force in the past 12 months (34.5%) was higher than that for female police staff (21.2%), male police officers (17.9%), and male police staff (17.6%). However, the proportion of respondents experiencing offensive remarks about their appearance, body, or private life from someone in their force in the past 12 months was at a similar level across these four groups, at an average level of 19.2%.

27.4% of Black, Asian and Mixed ethnicity respondents reported that they had experienced derogatory comments about their race or ethnicity from someone in their force in the past 12 months. The proportion of these respondents reporting experiencing racist comments, or hearing jokes or stories about their ethnicity that they felt were offensive were at similar levels.

36.1% of Muslim respondents reported experiencing derogatory remarks about their religion/beliefs in the past 12 months. A similar proportion of these respondents also reported hearing jokes or stories about their religion/beliefs that they felt were offensive. The

proportions were not found to vary materially by reported frequency of attending a place of worship.

While the overall proportion of Christian respondents who reported experiencing derogatory remarks about their religion/beliefs in the past 12 months was lower at an average of 9.2% (*n* = 865), it should be noted that for Christian respondents who reported attending their place of worship weekly or more frequently, the proportion was 42.1% (*n* = 249).

25.6% of respondents who identified as gay or lesbian, or as bisexual reported that they had experienced derogatory comments about their sexual orientation from someone in their force in the past 12 months. The proportion was highest for gay or lesbian police officer respondents where 31.5% reported experiencing this form of interpersonal mistreatment. The proportion reporting hearing jokes or stories about their sexual orientation that they felt were offensive was at a similar level.

Of respondents who identified as having a disability, 41.8% of police officers and 31.3% of police staff reported that they had experienced derogatory comments about their disability from someone in their force in the past 12 months. Furthermore, 29.6% of these respondents who were police officers and 21.2% who were police staff reported hearing jokes or stories about their disability that they felt were offensive from someone in their force in the past 12 months.

A higher proportion of Black, Asian and Mixed ethnicity respondents, Muslim respondents, gay or lesbian police officer respondents and respondents who identified as having a disability reported feeling that they had been excluded from a social interaction during or after work because of their protected characteristics compared with respondents from the other protected characteristic groups.

Wellbeing

Police officers who identified as having a disability reported a low average level for emotional energy compared with a moderately low average level for police officers who identified as not having a disability. A similar trend was evident for police staff who identified as having a disability, who also reported a lower average level than those who identified as not having a disability (moderately low and moderate, respectively).

No material differences were found for the average emotional energy scores reported between respondents who identified as male, female and those who identified as having a different gender identity from that assigned at birth; between Black, Asian and Mixed ethnicity and White ethnicity respondents; between respondents from different religions or beliefs; and between respondents who identified as gay or lesbian, bisexual, or heterosexual.

Respondents who identified as neurodiverse (such as those with an autistic spectrum condition, dyslexia, dyspraxia, dyscalculia, or ADHD) reported a moderately low average level of emotional energy.

Further details on overall findings for wellbeing can be found in the National Policing Wellbeing Survey 2019 report.[3]

Job Satisfaction

Overall, job satisfaction was generally reported at a high average level.

No material differences were found between the average scores for female police officers, male police staff, and female police staff; between respondents who identified as having a different gender identity from that assigned at birth and the total populations for male and female respondents; between Black, Asian and Mixed ethnicity and White ethnicity respondents; between respondents across religions or beliefs; and between respondents who identified as gay or lesbian, bisexual, or heterosexual.

Of note is that average scores for sense of being valued by the public were reported at a moderate level for Black, Asian and Mixed ethnicity respondents, while at a moderately low average level for White ethnicity respondents.

Male police officers and police officers who identified as having a disability reported a moderately high average level of job satisfaction. This was also the case for respondents who indicated having an autistic spectrum condition.

---

[3] See https://oscarkilo.org.uk/fatigue-to-be-tackled-following-first-ever-national-police-wellbeing-survey/

Professional Commitment and Work Effort

Professional commitment is a measure of dedication, responsibility and pride that individuals feel towards policing as an occupation.

Respondents who indicated having an autistic spectrum condition and police officers who identified as having a disability reported a moderately high average level of professional commitment. All other respondents, including police staff who identified as having a disability, reported a high average level of professional commitment.

No material differences were found for the very high average levels of effort respondents reported investing into their work, across the protected characteristic groups considered in this study.

1   INTRODUCTION

A key goal of increasing diversity is to address societal inequalities. However, recent academic research and extensive practitioner experience in organisations in a range of contexts suggests that increasing workforce diversity alone does not result in the achievement of positive outcomes for organisations or individuals.

If new people are recruited with the aim of improving diversity but the organisational culture is not inclusive then, no matter how talented they are, they will not succeed and be retained. Furthermore, increasing diversity will not change individuals' day-to-day experiences of encountering unacceptable behaviour in the workplace or being excluded. Moreover, when diversity management practices focus solely on improving the outcomes of historically disadvantaged groups, this may cause resentment and backlash effects from other individuals.

Inclusion is increasingly recognised as essential to support and achieve diversity improvement.

Inclusion can be considered as the way in which organisations, leaders and people enable everyone to feel respected, valued, and treated as equal. An inclusive culture enables all individuals to feel a sense of belonging and connectedness, whilst being able to be their authentic self, and be fully able to have voice and contribute.

An inclusive culture can be considered as being made up of three aspects: inclusive organisational employment practices, integration of people's differences, and inclusion in decision making. Effective organisational policies and practices need to be achieved to encourage and support attainment of an inclusive culture and new competencies are required on the part of leaders to achieve inclusion within their teams.

Inclusive organisations adopt a belief that people's diverse backgrounds act as a source of learning and knowledge that should be utilised to improve organisational functioning. Working towards achieving inclusion can be considered as doing what is right, just and moral, and in doing so realise the achievement of practical benefits for organisations, individuals and societies.

The National Diversity, Equality and Inclusion Survey was designed to examine inclusivity and workplace culture from the perspective of the policing workforce within the forty-three Home

Office forces in England and Wales. The research was conducted by independent researchers from Durham University Business School, Cardiff University, Illinois Institute of Technology and the University of Reading.

The purpose of this research was to support the achievement of the 2018-2025 NPCC Diversity, Equality and Inclusion Strategy through providing an evidence base as to the policing workforce's perceptions of the levels of equality and inclusion they feel in their force. The research also sought to investigate individuals' perspectives as to whether they feel included and valued within their workplace, to develop a deeper understanding of the frequency of unacceptable behaviour in the workplace and the cost this can have on individuals' wellbeing, and to investigate the role of leaders in developing inclusion within their teams.

2   METHODS

As part of the National Wellbeing and Inclusion survey, questions[4] were circulated online to employees from the forty-three Home Office police forces in England and Wales using a secure server and hosted independently by Durham Constabulary.

The study has been 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.

In total, the survey received 34,529 responses (16.6% response rate).[5]

The majority of questions were asked of all respondents and sought to investigate their wellbeing and their views on inclusivity in their workplace. Responses were collected over an eight-week completion period from mid-November 2019.[6]

A further research aim was to evaluate the lived experiences of individuals from minority groups. In order to minimise survey fatigue,[7] and with a desire to be mindful and respectful of the precious time that individuals were giving up to complete the survey, it was considered that a 'one size fits all' approach was not helpful in achieving this research aim. A supplementary section within the survey was therefore designed with skip logic to explore minority group individuals' experiences of harassment and discrimination which they felt were directly due to their protected characteristic(s) and their ability to be open, discuss and disclose their protected characteristic(s).

The 20,355 individuals who indicated they were willing to provide further information regarding their views and experiences at work as relating to their personal backgrounds and identities were asked to indicate their gender, gender identity, ethnicity, religion/beliefs and

---

[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 was 44.7%, while the lowest was 2.6%. The average response rate by force was 18.5%.

[6] The survey was completed before the Covid-19 pandemic was declared.

[7] Survey fatigue has been shown to result in respondents dropping out before submitting their responses and reduce the overall sample achieved.

sexual orientation from a list of broad groupings and/or a free text box to self-describe as preferred.

Respondents were also asked to indicate whether they have a disability and whether they have a neurodiverse condition (such as an autistic spectrum condition, dyslexia, dyspraxia, dyscalculia, or ADHD).

All questions within the survey were completely optional; respondents could choose to leave blank and skip any question they did not wish to answer.

For ease of interpretation and comparison, the average scores reported across the key measures are discussed against a nine-point classification ranging from extremely low to extremely high.[8]

The findings discussed in this report are predominantly restricted to groupings where 100 or more responses were available for analysis. Where sample sizes are small, or it is helpful for interpretation and understanding of findings, the numbers of respondents are reported and commented upon.

---

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

3   FINDINGS

3.1   INTRODUCTION

In the following sections the findings are presented and discussed for the overall sample of respondents, for police officers and police staff, and for the groupings of respondents by protected characteristics.

To assist with development of effective policy and interventions to improve inclusion in the workplace, we also discuss the relationships found between variables[9].

To assist in understanding the findings, the key measures included within this report are defined and discussed in the glossary (see Section 4).

3.2   ALL RESPONDENTS; POLICE OFFICERS AND POLICE STAFF

In total, the survey received 34,529 responses (16.6% response rate). By role, this resulted in a sample of 18,066 police officers (14.7% response rate), 14,526 police staff (22.6% response rate), 1,546 police community support officers (PCSOs) (16.2% response rate), 113 special constables (1.1% response rate) and 59 volunteers (0.8% response rate).[10, 11]

The sample sizes for special constables and volunteers are considered as too low to draw meaningful comparisons regarding the measures discussed in this report. However, the responses from these individuals are included within the overall analyses and discussions and within the non-role-based discussions of differences throughout the report.

The average scores for key measures for all respondents are presented in Table 1. The average scores for police officer and police staff respondents are presented in Table 3.

---

[9] A significance level of *p* < .05 is adopted for all reported results. Whilst in a cross-sectional study it is not possible to establish causality, we adopt an approach of prediction of relationships between variables from theoretical considerations and from prior research. We then test the generated hypotheses using linear regression analyses and PROCESS analysis (Hayes 2014). In regression models, we control for the effects of role, gender, age, and tenure in policing.

[10] Response rates have been calculated based on the workforce headcounts provided in the Home Office (2018) Police Workforce, England and Wales, 30 September 2018 Data Tables.

[11] Due to sample sizes, the PCSO findings are analysed and discussed together with police staff responses in this report.

Table 1: Average Scores for Key Measures for All Respondents

Measure	All Respondents (Average)
Force Inclusive Employment Practices	4.04
Clarity of Consequences for Discriminatory Behaviour	5.83
Supportive Organisational Approach to Overcoming Bias	4.93
Pressurising Organisational Approach to Overcoming Bias	2.50
Antagonism (Minority Groups)	3.60
Supervisor Listening	5.01
Team Integration of Differences	5.23
Team Inclusion in Decision Making	4.93
Emotional Energy	3.61
Job Satisfaction	5.08
Professional Commitment	5.11
Work Effort	6.06

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

Force Inclusive Employment Practices

We asked respondents the extent to which they felt their force has inclusive employment practices, through for example having fair selection and promotion processes, investing in the development of all its people, demonstrating a commitment to having a diverse workforce, and valuing people for who they are.

As shown in Table 2, respondents' perceptions of their force's inclusive employment practices were found to be positively associated with their individual wellbeing. When force employment practices were perceived as more inclusive, this was associated with higher levels of emotional energy, job satisfaction, work effort and professional commitment, and lower levels of intention to quit.

Table 2: The Importance of Workplace Inclusivity

Measure	Force Inclusive Employment Practices	Team Inclusivity
Emotional Energy	++	++
Job Satisfaction	+++	++
Work Effort	+	+
Professional Commitment	++	++
Intention to Quit	- -	- -

Note: + / - denotes whether the impact of the measure is positive or negative, and the strength of this relationship.

As can be seen in Table 3, police officers reported a moderate average level (3.74) for the extent to which they perceived that their force's employment practices were inclusive, while police staff reported a moderately high average level (4.35).

Both police officers and police staff indicated that the clarity of their force's communication of the consequences of discriminating against someone from a minority group was at a very high average level (5.87 and 5.80, respectively).

Communicating about inclusion and non-bias in ways that are autonomy supportive and non-pressuring gives people the opportunity to explore and better understand why non-bias may be important to them.

The results of the analyses of the total sample with all respondents confirmed that where respondents felt their force adopted a supportive organisational approach to overcoming bias, this was associated with more positive diversity attitudes.

In contrast, a pressurising and shaming approach to overcoming bias was found to be associated with an increase in antagonism towards workplace policies designed to help members of minority groups.

Table 3: Average Scores for Key Measures for Police Officers and Police Staff

Measure	Police Officer Respondents (Average)	Police Staff Respondents (Average)
Force Inclusive Employment Practices	3.74	4.35
Clarity of Consequences for Discriminatory Behaviour	5.87	5.80
Supportive Organisational Approach to Overcoming Bias	4.80	5.06
Pressurising Organisational Approach to Overcoming Bias	2.64	2.35
Antagonism (Minority Groups)	3.76	3.43
Supervisor Listening	4.94	5.09
Team Integration of Differences	5.29	5.16
Team Inclusion in Decision Making	4.99	4.85
Emotional Energy	3.30	3.95
Job Satisfaction	4.86	5.32
Professional Commitment	4.91	5.33
Work Effort	5.95	6.20

<u>Note</u>: All of these measures used a 1 to 7 scale.

The average score for the extent to which individuals considered their force's approach to overcoming bias as supportive was reported at a moderately high average level (4.80) for police officers and a high average level (5.06) for police staff. Both police officers and police staff reported a low average level for the extent to which they perceive their force as taking a pressurising and shaming approach to overcoming bias (2.64 and 2.35, respectively).

Perceived Unfair Treatment

Individuals may feel that a protected characteristic results in them not receiving the recognition they deserve, limits them from gaining opportunities for development, and negatively affects their career promotion opportunities. We measured individuals' perceptions of unfair treatment due to disability, ethnicity, gender, gender identity, religion/beliefs, and sexual orientation.

An important finding is that the results of the analyses conducted supported that experiencing unfair treatment is associated with lower levels of individual wellbeing, job satisfaction and professional commitment, and with higher levels of intention to quit.

The extent to which individuals perceive that they have been unfairly treated at work due to a personal protected characteristic is discussed in each of the respective sections below (see Sections 3.3 to 3.9).

Diversity Attitudes

To assess diversity attitudes, we measured respondents' antagonism towards workplace policies designed to help members of minority groups. This is recognised by researchers as a more subtle way of measuring prejudice than asking individuals about their diversity attitudes directly. Low levels of antagonism relate to more positive attitudes towards diversity and equality.

An important finding is that individuals' wellbeing was found to be related to their diversity attitudes, such that lower levels of emotional energy were associated with higher levels of antagonism.

On average, police staff reported more positive diversity attitudes than police officers. The average level for antagonism towards workplace policies designed to help members of minority groups was moderate (3.76) for police officers, while moderately low (3.43) for police staff.

As shown in Table 4 below, diversity attitudes for both police officers and police staff were found to be more positive for younger respondents and to decrease with age. For example, in the age group of 18-25 years, antagonism towards workplace policies designed to help members of minority groups were reported at a moderately low average level for police officers and a low average level for police staff, while for those aged 56 years and above it was at a moderate average level for both groups.

Table 4: Diversity Attitudes by Role and Age

Role	Age Group	Antagonism (Average)
Police Officer	18 - 25 years (*n = 714*)	3.40
	26 - 35 years (*n = 3,570*)	3.62
	36 - 45 years (*n = 7,006*)	3.75
	46 - 55 years (*n = 6,244*)	3.89
	56 years and above (*n = 299*)	3.94
Police Staff	18 - 25 years (*n = 1,227*)	2.93
	26 - 35 years (*n = 2,865*)	3.11
	36 - 45 years (*n = 3,406*)	3.30
	46 - 55 years (*n = 5,035*)	3.56
	56 years and above (*n = 3,220*)	3.83

Supervisor Listening and Team Inclusivity

The extent to which individuals viewed their direct supervisor as open, non-judgemental, supportive, and interested in what they have to say (supervisor listening) was reported at a high average level for the total population of respondents (5.01); no material differences were found between the average scores reported by police officer and police staff respondents. While this is an encouraging finding, it should be noted that 29.8% of respondents scored their supervisor as moderate or lower for this measure.

Supervisor listening was found to be positively related to team inclusivity with a large effect size. This suggests that supervisors play an important role in establishing an inclusive culture within their work teams, which in turn will reduce the occurrence of inappropriate behaviour.

Team inclusivity, as measured in this survey, encapsulates two factors on the level of inclusivity individuals perceive within their work teams: *Team integration of differences*, which reflects expectations and norms regarding the openness with which people can be their "true" selves without suffering adverse consequences in their work teams; and *team inclusion in decision making*, the extent to which all individuals within teams are genuinely involved in

decision making processes, diverse views are actively sought out, and ideas are judged based on their quality rather than who expresses them.

When individuals perceived their work teams as respecting and valuing individual differences such that people can be their "true" selves without suffering adverse consequences, this was associated with higher levels of satisfaction of individuals' fundamental psychological need to feel a sense of relatedness and belonging.

As shown in Table 2, above, where individuals reported feeling that their team had a climate of inclusivity, this was found to be positively associated with their wellbeing, in terms of their emotional energy and job satisfaction, and their levels of professional commitment and work effort.

In the total sample of respondents, average scores were high for team integration of differences (5.23) and moderately high for team inclusion in decision making (4.93). As can be seen in Table 3, police officers reported slightly higher average scores compared with police staff for both these factors of team inclusivity.

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). We measured individuals' experiences of workplace incivility by someone in their force over the past 12 months.

Table 5: The Impact of Experiencing Incivility in the Workplace

Measure	Effect
Emotional Energy	- -
Job Satisfaction	- -
Professional Commitment	-
Intention to Quit	++
Life Satisfaction	- -

Note: + / - denotes whether the impact of the measure is positive or negative, and the strength of this relationship.

As shown in Table 5, above, experiencing incivility at work by someone in their force was found to be detrimental for individuals' wellbeing, professional commitment, job satisfaction and life satisfaction, and was associated with higher levels of intention to quit.

The frequencies of reported experiences of incivility behaviour for police officers and police staff are presented in Table 6, below. As can be seen, on average, police officers reported experiencing slightly higher frequencies of incivility than police staff.

Table 6: Frequency of Experienced Workplace Incivility, by Role

Response	Police Officer Respondents		Police Staff Respondents	
	%	*n*	%	*n*
Experienced being put down or treated in a condescending manner				
Never	33.1	5,955	38.6	6,160
Once or twice	37.9	6,826	35.7	5,702
Monthly or a few times a month	16.3	2,932	14.4	2,302
Weekly or more frequently	12.8	5,237	11.3	1,812
Experienced being interrupted and not allowed to finish what they were saying				
Never	22.2	4,004	29.3	4,680
Once or twice	38.1	6,857	37.6	6,007
Monthly or a few times a month	22.0	3,954	18.4	2,935
Weekly or more frequently	17.7	3,185	14.7	2,355
Experienced not being listened to when expressing views and opinions				
Never	14.1	2,544	21.7	3,478
Once or twice	39.2	7,063	40.0	6,404
Monthly or a few times a month	26.8	4,820	21.9	3,508
Weekly or more frequently	20.0	3,591	16.3	2,606

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

In particular, 46.8% of police officers, compared with 38.2% 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 20.0% of police officers

and 16.3% of police staff who reported experiencing this form of incivility on a weekly of more frequent basis.

Furthermore, 39.7% of police officers, compared with 33.1% of police staff reported they had experienced being interrupted and not allowed to finish what they were saying monthly or more frequently by someone in their force in the past 12 months, including 17.7% of police officers and 14.7% of police staff who reported experiencing this form of incivility on a weekly of more frequent basis.

29.2% of police officers and 25.7% of police staff 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 12.8% of police officers and 11.3% of police staff who reported experiencing this form of incivility on a weekly of more frequently basis.

Professional Commitment and Work Effort

Professional commitment, a measure of dedication, responsibility and pride that individuals feel towards policing as an occupation, was reported at a high average level (5.11). The level of work effort that individuals commit to their work was reported at a very high average level (6.06).

Further detail on overall findings around wellbeing can be found in the separate National Policing Wellbeing Survey 2019 report.[12]

---

[12] See https://oscarkilo.org.uk/fatigue-to-be-tackled-following-first-ever-national-police-wellbeing-survey/

3.3   DISABILITY

2,886 individuals who completed the survey identified as having a disability (including 1,413 police officers and 1,450 police staff). The average scores for key measures for police officers and for police staff who identified as having a disability are presented in Table 7.

Table 7: Average Scores for Key Measures for Police Officers and Police Staff who Identified as Having a Disability

Measure	Police Officer Respondents (Average)	Police Staff Respondents (Average)
Force Inclusive Employment Practices	3.27	3.98
Supervisor Listening	4.68	4.80
Team Integration of Differences	5.00	4.80
Team Inclusion in Decision Making	4.76	4.52
Emotional Energy	2.90	3.49
Job Satisfaction	4.42	5.12
Professional Commitment	4.65	5.23
Work Effort	5.90	6.22

<u>Note</u>: All of these measures used a 1 to 7 scale.

Force Inclusive Employment Practices

Police officers who identified as having a disability reported a moderately low average score (3.27) for force inclusive employment practices, while police staff who identified as having a disability reported a moderate average level (3.98). The average scores reported by respondents who identified as having a disability were lower than that for police officers and police staff who identified as not having a disability (3.90, moderate and 4.53, moderately high, respectively).

Perceived Unfair Treatment Attributed to Disability

38.0% (*n* = 533) of police officers and 19.4% (*n* = 279) of police staff who identified as having a disability reported strongly agreeing or agreeing with feeling that their career promotion opportunities were negatively affected because of their disability.

27.8% (*n* = 391) of police officers and 27.5% (*n* = 398) of police staff were more neutral in their responses, while 34.2% (*n* = 480) of police officers and 53.0% (*n* = 766) of police staff reported strongly disagreeing or disagreeing that this was the case.

Table 8: Respondents' Perceptions of being Unfairly Treated due to their Disability, for Individuals who Identified as Having a Disability

Response	Strongly Disagree or Disagree %	Neutral %	Strongly Agree or Agree %
At work, I feel that my career promotion opportunities are negatively affected because of my disability			
Police Officers	34.2	27.8	38.0
Police Staff	53.0	27.5	19.4
At work, I sometimes feel that people actively try to stop me from gaining opportunities for development because of my disability			
Police Officers	48.0	30.5	21.4
Police Staff	65.3	24.3	10.4
At work, I do not get enough recognition because of my disability			
Police Officers	42.1	35.3	22.7
Police Staff	55.5	30.8	13.6

48.0% (*n* = 675) of police officers and 65.3% (*n* = 939) of police staff who identified as having a disability reported strongly disagreeing or disagreeing with feeling that people at work actively try to stop them from gaining opportunities for development because of their disability. 30.5% (*n* = 429) of police officers and 24.3% (*n* = 350) of police staff were more neutral in their responses, while 21.4% (*n* = 301) of police officers and 10.4% (*n* = 150) of police staff reported strongly agreeing or agreeing that this was the case.

While 22.7% (*n* = 318) of police officers and 13.6% (*n* = 197) of police staff who identified as having a disability reported strongly agreeing or agreeing with feeling that they do not receive enough recognition at work because of their disability, 35.3% (*n* = 496) of police officers and 30.8% (*n* = 445) of police staff were more neutral in their responses, and 42.1% (*n* = 591) of police officers and 55.5% (*n* = 802) of police staff reported strongly disagreeing or disagreeing that this was the case.

Supervisor Listening

Respondents who identified as having a disability reported a moderately high average score (4.75) for the extent to which they felt that their supervisor was open, non-judgemental, supportive and interested in what they have to say, compared with those who identified as not having a disability where the average score was high (5.17).

Team Inclusivity

While still at encouraging levels, respondents who identified as having a disability reported slightly lower average scores for team inclusivity than respondents who identified as not having a disability.

Police officers who identified as having a disability reported a high average score and police staff who identified as having a disability reported a moderately high average score (5.00 and 4.80, respectively) for team integration of differences. While at a slightly lower level than that for police officers and police staff who identified as not having a disability (5.46 and 5.35, respectively), the average scores still reflect that most respondents who identify as having a disability feel that they can express their "true" selves without experiencing adverse consequences in their work teams.

Respondents who identified as having a disability reported high average levels of the extent to which they are open about their disability with their co-workers (7.86 for polices officers and 8.00 for police staff)[13] and their supervisor (8.31 for police officers and 8.48 for police staff).[14] Furthermore, police officers reported a moderately low average score (3.28) and police staff reported a low average score (2.90) for the extent to which they perceived that disclosing or discussing their disability at work would make their co-workers feel uncomfortable.[15]

Police officers and police staff who identified as having a disability reported moderately high average levels of team inclusion in decision making (4.76 and 4.52, respectively). This suggests that, on average, respondents who identified as having a disability perceive that their perspectives are actively and authentically sought and integrated into decision making

---

[13] Measured on a 0-10 scale.
[14] Measured on a 0-10 scale.
[15] Measured on a 1-7 scale.

procedures within their work team. However, these scores were again slightly lower than the average scores for police officers and police staff who identified as not having a disability (5.16 and 5.05, respectively).

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). 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 officers and police staff who identified as having a disability are shown in Table 9, below.

Table 9: Frequency of Experienced Workplace Incivility, for Police Officers and Police Staff who Identified as Having a Disability

Response	Police Officer Respondents		Police Staff Respondents	
	%	*n*	%	*n*
Experienced being put down or treated in a condescending manner				
Never	24.9	351	28.3	409
Once or twice	32.4	456	31.6	457
Monthly or a few times a month	20.3	286	20.9	302
Weekly or more frequently	22.4	315	19.3	279
Experienced being interrupted and not allowed to finish what they were saying				
Never	15.2	214	20.4	295
Once or twice	30.7	431	33.9	491
Monthly or a few times a month	26.2	368	22.4	323
Weekly or more frequently	27.8	391	23.4	339
Experienced not being listened to when expressing views and opinions				
Never	9.5	134	14.6	211
Once or twice	28.8	405	31.2	452
Monthly or a few times a month	30.7	432	28.9	419
Weekly or more frequently	31.0	437	25.3	366

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

Interpersonal Mistreatment Attributed to a Disability

Harassment can be thought of as a form of interpersonal mistreatment of a person based on a personal protected characteristic which is perceived as derogatory and demeaning. We measured individuals' experiences of interpersonal mistreatment attributed to a personal disability by someone in their force over the past 12 months. The frequencies of experiencing interpersonal mistreatment for police officers and police staff identifying as having a disability are reported in Table 10, below.

Table 10: Frequency of Experienced Interpersonal Mistreatment due to Disability, for Police Officers and Police Staff who Identified as Having a Disability

Response	Police Officer Respondents		Police Staff Respondents	
	%	*n*	%	*n*
Experienced derogatory comments about their disability				
Never	58.2	822	68.7	993
Once or Twice	26.2	370	22.5	325
Monthly or more frequently	15.6	220	8.8	127
Heard jokes or stories about their disability that were offensive to them				
Never	70.4	994	78.8	1,137
Once or Twice	19.2	271	14.8	214
Monthly or more frequently	10.4	146	6.5	92
Were excluded from a social interaction during or after work because of their disability				
Never	86.2	1,215	87.7	1,264
Once or Twice	8.7	123	8.3	119
Monthly or more frequently	5.1	71	4.1	59

Note: We measured individuals' experiences of interpersonal mistreatment in their workplace by someone in their force over the past 12 months, which they perceived as related to their disability.

Of the respondents who identified as having a disability, 58.2% of police officers and 68.7% of police staff reported they had not experienced derogatory comments about their disability from someone in their force. However, 26.2% of police officers and 22.5% of police staff

reported experiencing this once or twice in the past 12 months, while 15.6% of police officers and 8.8% of police staff reported a frequency of monthly or above.

Respondents who identified as having a disability were asked to report how frequently people at work made jokes or told stories about their disability that were offensive: 70.4% of police officers and 78.8% of police staff reported not experiencing this form of interpersonal mistreatment. 19.2% of police officers and 14.8% of police staff reported experiencing this once or twice, while 10.4% of police officers and 6.5% of police staff reported a frequency of monthly or above.

Being excluded from a social interaction during or after work because of a disability is an additional form of interpersonal mistreatment; 86.2% of police officers and 87.7% of police staff reported not experiencing social exclusion because of their disability. 8.7% of police officers and 8.3% of police staff reported experiencing this once or twice, while 5.1% of police officers and 4.1% of police staff reported a frequency of monthly or above.

Wellbeing

Police officers who identified as having a disability reported a low average level (2.90) for emotional energy and moderately high average level (4.42) of job satisfaction.

Police staff who identified as having a disability reported a moderately low average level (3.49) for emotional energy and a high average level (5.12) for job satisfaction.

Professional Commitment and Work Effort

Police officers and police staff who identified as having a disability reported very high average levels of work effort (5.90 and 6.22, respectively). In addition, police officers reported a moderately high average score for professional commitment (4.65), while police staff reported a high average score (5.23).

3.4   ETHNICITY

The numbers of responses by ethnicity for police officers and police staff are shown in Table 11. In total, the survey received 453 responses from Asian ethnicity individuals, 133 responses from Black ethnicity individuals, 394 responses from Mixed ethnicity individuals, and 18,849 responses from White ethnicity individuals.[16, 17]

Table 11: Sample Sizes by Role and Ethnicity

Role	Ethnicity	Total Number of Respondents
Police Officer	Asian or Asian British	223
	Black or Black British	62
	Mixed	247
	White (British/Irish/European)	9,577
Police Staff	Asian or Asian British	218
	Black or Black British	67
	Mixed	143
	White (British/Irish/European)	9,050

Conscious of the relatively small sample sizes for some of the groups, the findings in this section are predominantly discussed for the 980 responses received from Black, Asian and Mixed ethnicity individuals collectively (of whom 532 were police officers and 428 police staff) and for the 18,849 responses received from White ethnicity individuals (of whom 9,577 were police officers and 9,050 were police staff). It should also be noted that the response rate of Black, Asian and Mixed ethnicity respondents was lower than that for the total population.[18]

---

[16] 334 individuals indicated that they would *prefer not to say*.

[17] 176 individuals self-described with a free text response. The sample sizes for each group were too low to conduct separate reliable analyses; for example, only 7 individuals from Gypsy and Traveller communities provided responses. The majority of the 176 individuals providing a self-described response also selected one of the broader ethnicity response options outlined above (Black, Asian, Mixed or White ethnicities) and are included within the reported results.

[18] 532 respondents from the total population of approximately 8,329 Black, Asian and Mixed ethnicity police officers provided responses to the survey (6.4% response rate).

Any significant indicative findings at a smaller group level are noted in the discussion to provide an indication of the lived experiences and views of the respective populations but are however considered to be unable to support robust conclusions.

The average scores for Black, Asian and Mixed ethnicity respondents and White ethnicity respondents are presented in Table 12.

Table 12: Average Scores for Key Measures, by Ethnicity

Measure	Black, Asian and Mixed ethnicity respondents (Average)	White ethnicity respondents (Average)
Force Inclusive Employment Practices	3.69	4.15
Supervisor Listening	4.84	5.12
Team Integration of Differences	4.91	5.35
Team Inclusion in Decision Making	4.62	5.06
Emotional Energy	3.64	3.67
Job Satisfaction	5.02	5.21
Professional Commitment	5.18	5.24
Work Effort	6.17	6.07

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

Force Inclusive Employment Practices

Average scores for perceptions of force inclusive employment practices were reported at a moderately low level for Black, Asian and Mixed ethnicity police officers (3.47) and at a moderate level for White ethnicity police officers (3.84). Black, Asian and Mixed ethnicity police staff reported a moderate average level (3.95), while White ethnicity police staff reported a moderately high average level (4.47).

Black, Asian and Mixed ethnicity respondents reported a moderately low average level for the extent to which they felt valued by their force[19] (4.09), whereas White ethnicity respondents reported a moderate average level (4.45).

---

[19] Measured on a 0-10 scale.

Perceived Unfair Treatment Attributed to Ethnicity

We asked Black, Asian and Mixed ethnicity individuals and those from other minority ethnicity backgrounds the extent to which they perceived they have been unfairly treated at work due to their ethnicity. The reported perceptions of unfair treatment are presented in Table 13.

While the majority of Black, Asian and Mixed ethnicity police officers reported strongly disagreeing or disagreeing (51.0%, n = 270), or were neutral (28.0%, n = 148), that their career promotion opportunities were adversely affected due to their ethnicity, 21.0% (n = 111) of Black, Asian and Mixed ethnicity police officers reported strongly agreeing or agreeing with feeling that this was the case.

Table 13: Black, Asian and Mixed Ethnicity Respondents' Perceptions of being Unfairly Treated due to their Ethnicity

Response	Strongly Disagree or Disagree %	Neutral %	Strongly Agree or Agree %
At work, I feel that my career promotion opportunities are negatively affected because of my race/ethnicity			
Police Officers	51.0	28.0	21.0
Police Staff	62.4	24.4	13.2
At work, I sometimes feel that people actively try to stop me from gaining opportunities for development because of my race/ethnicity			
Police Officers	57.2	27.3	15.5
Police Staff	65.6	23.6	10.8
At work, I do not get enough recognition because of my race/ethnicity			
Police Officers	52.8	30.4	16.9
Police Staff	60.1	27.7	12.2

For Black, Asian and Mixed ethnicity police staff, 13.2% (n = 56) reported strongly agreeing or agreeing with feeling that their career promotion opportunities were adversely affected due to their ethnicity.

Furthermore, 15.5% (n = 82) of Black, Asian and Mixed ethnicity police officers reported strongly agreeing or agreeing with feeling that people at work actively try to stop them from gaining opportunities for development due to their ethnicity, and 16.9% (n = 89) reported

strongly agreeing or agreeing that they feel they do not get enough recognition at work due to their ethnicity (10.8%, *n* = 46 and 12.2%, *n* = 52, respectively, for police staff).

Supervisor Listening

Supervisor listening, referring to the extent to which individuals view their direct supervisor as open, non-judgemental, supportive, and interested in what they have to say, leads to employees feeling more comfortable when approaching and talking to their supervisor. Black, Asian and Mixed ethnicity respondents reported a moderately high average level (4.84) of supervisor listening, whereas White ethnicity respondents reported a high average level (5.12).

Average scores for the extent to which individuals felt valued by their supervisors[20] were moderately high (6.31) for Black, Asian and Mixed ethnicity respondents and high (6.85) for White ethnicity respondents. For Black ethnicity respondents only (*n* = 133), while still at a moderately high average level, the average score was lower (5.95).

Whilst still at a moderately high average level, the extent to which female Black, Asian and Mixed ethnicity police officers felt their direct supervisor is open, non-judgemental, supportive, and interested in what they have to say was lower than for male Black, Asian and Mixed ethnicity police officers and for male and female White ethnicity police officers. Female Black, Asian and Mixed ethnicity police officers also scored the lowest average scores for the extent to which they felt valued by their supervisor, compared with the other three groups.

Team Inclusivity

Average scores for the extent to which individuals perceived their work teams as inclusive were reported as moderately high for Black, Asian and Mixed ethnicity respondents (4.91 for team integration of differences and 4.62 for team inclusion in decision making) and as high for White ethnicity respondents (5.35 and 5.06, respectively).

Black ethnicity respondents (*n* = 133) in particular reported slightly lower levels of perceived team inclusivity, with average scores at 4.50 for team integration of differences and 4.27 for team inclusion in decision making.

---

[20] Measured on a 0-10 scale.

Black, Asian and Mixed ethnicity and White ethnicity respondents reported high average levels of feeling valued by their co-workers.

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). 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 by ethnicity are presented in Table 14.

Table 14: Frequency of Experienced Workplace Incivility, by Ethnicity

Response	Black, Asian and Mixed ethnicity Respondents		White ethnicity Respondents	
	%	*n*	*%*	*n*
Experienced being put down or treated in a condescending manner				
Never	30.2	295	36.2	6,805
Once or twice	36.6	358	36.7	6,899
Monthly or a few times a month	15.4	150	15.4	2,892
Weekly or more frequently	17.8	174	11.7	2,204
Experienced being interrupted and not allowed to finish what they were saying				
Never	25.6	250	25.7	4,834
Once or twice	35.3	345	38.2	7,172
Monthly or a few times a month	19.6	191	20.3	3,819
Weekly or more frequently	19.5	190	15.8	2,961
Experienced not being listened to when expressing views and opinions				
Never	18.6	182	18.2	3,413
Once or twice	34.8	340	40.1	7,535
Monthly or a few times a month	22.6	221	24.3	4,574
Weekly or more frequently	24.0	235	17.4	3,281

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

The proportion of individuals who reported experiencing being put down or treated in a condescending manner on a weekly or more frequent basis was higher for Black, Asian and Mixed ethnicity respondents at 17.8%, in comparison with 11.7% for White ethnicity respondents. Similarly, 24.0% of Black, Asian and Mixed ethnicity respondents reported experiencing not being listened to on a weekly or more frequent basis, in comparison with 17.4% of White ethnicity respondents. 19.5% of Black, Asian and Mixed ethnicity respondents and 15.8% of White ethnicity respondents reported experiencing being interrupted and not allowed to finish what they were saying on a weekly or more frequent basis.

Interpersonal Mistreatment Attributed to Ethnicity

We asked Black, Asian and Mixed ethnicity individuals to indicate the extent to which they had been subject to interpersonal mistreatment in the workplace due to their ethnicity, by someone in their force over the past 12 months, which they perceived as derogatory and demeaning. The frequencies of reported experiences of interpersonal mistreatment are presented in Table 15, below.

72.6% (*n* = 709) of Black, Asian and Mixed ethnicity respondents reported they had not experienced derogatory comments about their race or ethnicity from someone in their force in the past 12 months. However, 20.4% (*n* = 199) reported experiencing this once or twice in the past 12 months, and 7.1% (*n* = 69) reported a frequency of monthly or above.

Furthermore, 6.4% (*n* = 62) of Black, Asian and Mixed ethnicity respondents reported hearing jokes or stories about their race or ethnicity which they found offensive, and 5.0% (*n* = 49) reported feeling excluded from social interactions by someone in their force, on a monthly or more frequent basis. While 74.4% (*n* = 726) of Black, Asian and Mixed ethnicity respondents reported that they had not experienced someone in their force making racist comments in the past 12 months, 19.9% (*n* = 194) reported experiencing this once or twice, and 5.7% (*n* = 56) reported a frequency of monthly or above.

**Table 15: Frequency of Experienced Interpersonal Mistreatment
in the Workplace due to Ethnicity, for Black, Asian and Mixed ethnicity respondents**

Response	%	*n*
Experienced derogatory comments about their race/ethnicity		
Never	72.6	709
Once or Twice	20.4	199
Monthly or more frequently	7.1	69
Experienced racist comments		
Never	74.4	726
Once or Twice	19.9	194
Monthly or more frequently	5.7	56
Heard jokes or stories about their race/ethnicity that were offensive to them		
Never	73.5	717
Once or Twice	20.2	197
Monthly or more frequently	6.4	62
Were excluded from a social interaction during or after work because of their race/ethnicity		
Never	86.2	840
Once or Twice	8.8	86
Monthly or more frequently	5.0	49

<u>Note</u>: We measured Black, Asian and Mixed ethnicity individuals' experiences of interpersonal mistreatment in their workplace by someone in their force over the past 12 months, which they perceived as related to their ethnicity.

Wellbeing

There were no material differences found between the average emotional energy scores for Black, Asian and Mixed ethnicity respondents and White ethnicity respondents (both reported at a moderately low average level; 3.64 and 3.67, respectively).

Average scores for job satisfaction were high for both Black, Asian and Mixed ethnicity and White ethnicity respondents (5.02 and 5.21, respectively).

Average scores for sense of being valued by the public[21] were at a moderate level for Black, Asian and Mixed ethnicity respondents (4.58), while at a moderately low average level for White ethnicity respondents (4.39).

Professional Commitment and Work Effort

Professional commitment was reported at a high average level and respondents reported investing a very high average level of effort into their work; there were no material differences found for the average professional commitment and work effort scores between Black, Asian and Mixed ethnicity and White ethnicity respondents.

Black, Asian and Mixed ethnicity respondents and White ethnicity respondents, on average, reported feeling a high level of competence at work over the past three months.

---

[21] Measured on a 0-10 scale.

3.5   GENDER

In total, 16,737 responses were received from individuals who identified as male (10,976 police officers and 5,555 police staff) and 16,359 responses from individuals who identified as female (6,243 police officers and 9,943 police staff).[22] The lived experience and views of the 70 respondents who identified in the survey as having a different gender identity from that assigned at birth are discussed in Section 3.6, below.[23]

The average scores by gender for police officer and for police staff respondents are presented in Tables 16 and 17, respectively.

Force Inclusive Employment Practices

No material differences were evident between the average scores for female (4.18) and male (3.97) respondents; both were reported at a moderate average level. As can be seen in Tables 16 and 17, below, this was the case for both police officer and police staff respondents.

Perceived Unfair Treatment Attributed to Gender

Respondents were asked to report how frequently they perceived that they have been unfairly treated at work due their gender in the last 12 months.

As can be seen from Table 18, below, while 58.5% of male police officers reported strongly disagreeing or disagreeing with feeling that their career promotion opportunities were negatively affected because of their gender, 17.2% reported strongly agreeing or agreeing with feeling that this was the case. This proportion of male police officers reporting feeling that their career promotion opportunities were negatively affected due to their gender was found to be higher than that of female police officers (8.9%),[24] male police staff (3.8%) and

---

[22] 944 respondents selected that they would *prefer not to say* their gender.

[23] We use the terms for sex ('male' and 'female') instead of terms for gender ('man' and 'woman') in this section as we used a question assessing respondent 'sex' (i.e. 'female' and 'male', among other categories such as 'intersex' that were too small include in the analyses) to compare levels of gender incivility, harassment, and discrimination. Importantly, this is separate from a different set of questions asked about incivility, discrimination, and harassment related to gender identity, which was answered by those whose gender identity does not match their sex assigned at birth.

[24] While the following finding can only be considered indicative due to the relatively small sample size, it should however be noted that 17.0% of female Black, Asian and Mixed ethnicity police officers, compared with 6.6% of male Black, Asian and Mixed ethnicity police officers reported strongly agreeing or agreeing that their career promotion opportunities were negatively affected because of their gender.

female police staff (2.5%). This finding may indicate a backlash effect on policies and actions designed to improve diversity.

Table 16: Average Scores for Key Measures for <u>Police Officers</u>, by Gender

Measure	Female Respondents (Average)	Male Respondents (Average)
Force Inclusive Employment Practices	3.80	3.76
Supervisor Listening	4.96	4.97
Team Integration of Differences	5.27	5.34
Team Inclusion in Decision Making	4.98	5.04
Emotional Energy	3.80	3.76
Job Satisfaction	5.01	4.80
Professional Commitment	5.05	4.88
Work Effort	6.10	5.87

<u>Note</u>: All of these measures used a 1 to 7 scale.

Table 17: Average Scores for Key Measures for <u>Police Staff</u>, by Gender

Measure	Female Respondents (Average)	Male Respondents (Average)
Force Inclusive Employment Practices	4.40	4.34
Supervisor Listening	5.12	5.11
Team Integration of Differences	5.17	5.22
Team Inclusion in Decision Making	4.85	4.91
Emotional Energy	3.91	4.03
Job Satisfaction	5.37	5.28
Professional Commitment	5.37	5.28
Work Effort	6.28	6.03

<u>Note</u>: All of these measures used a 1 to 7 scale.

Table 18: Respondents' Perceptions of being Unfairly Treated due to their Gender

Response		Strongly Disagree or Disagree %	Neutral %	Strongly Agree or Agree %
At work, I feel that my career promotion opportunities are negatively affected because of my gender				
Police Officers	Female	67.8	23.3	8.9
	Male	58.5	24.3	17.2
Police Staff	Female	81.6	15.9	2.5
	Male	79.9	16.1	3.8
At work, I sometimes feel that people actively try to stop me from gaining opportunities for development because of my gender				
Police Officers	Female	72.7	21.7	5.7
	Male	67.6	20.9	11.5
Police Staff	Female	83.6	14.6	1.8
	Male	82.7	14.8	2.5
At work, I do not get enough recognition because of my gender				
Police Officers	Female	69.6	24.4	6.0
	Male	70.9	20.5	8.6
Police Staff	Female	80.1	17.4	2.5
	Male	81.9	15.8	2.3

Furthermore, while the majority of male police officers (67.6%) reported strongly disagreeing or disagreeing with feeling that people at work actively try to stop them from gaining opportunities for development because of their gender, 11.5% reported strongly agreeing or agreeing with feeling that this was the case. This was again higher than that for female police officers (5.7%), male police staff (2.5%) and female police staff (1.8%).

While male and female police officers reported similar levels of feeling that they did not get enough recognition at work due to their gender (8.6% and 6.0%, respectively), this was higher than that reported by male and female police staff (2.3% and 2.5%, respectively).

Supervisor Listening

As can be seen in Tables 16 and 17, above, supervisor listening was found to be at a high average level, with no material differences found between the average scores for female respondents and male respondents.

Team Inclusivity

Respondents, on average, reported experiencing high levels of inclusion in decision making in their work teams. A further positive finding is that the average level of inclusion in decision making is consistently high across roles and genders.

Similarly, respondents reported experiencing high average levels of integration of differences within their work teams, which is also consistently high across roles and genders.

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). We measured individuals' experiences of workplace incivility by someone in their force over the past 12 months.

As can be seen in Table 19 below, the frequencies of experiencing incivility reported by male police officers is very similar to that of female police officers. This is also the case for male and female police staff.

For example, 47.3% of male police officers and 43.8% of female police officers reported experiencing not being listened to when expressing views and opinions by someone in the force in the past 12 months on a monthly or more frequent basis, including 20.6% of male police officers and 17.5% of female police officers who reported experiencing this form of incivility weekly or more frequently.

The proportions for male and female police staff experiencing this form of incivility monthly or more frequently were 38.9% and 36.9%, respectively, including 17.0% of male police staff and 15.3% of female police staff who reported experiencing this form of incivility weekly or more frequently.

Table 19: Frequency of Experienced Workplace Incivility, by Role and Gender

Response	Female Police Officers %	Male Police Officers %	Female Police Staff %	Male Police Staff %
Experienced being put down or treated in a condescending manner				
Never	29.4	35.6	35.6	45.2
Once or Twice	40.6	36.7	37.9	31.7
Monthly or a few times a month	17.6	15.2	14.7	13.3
Weekly or more frequently	12.4	12.4	11.8	9.9
Experienced being interrupted and not allowed to finish what they were saying				
Never	22.1	22.5	29.5	29.8
Once or Twice	39.5	37.8	37.9	37.3
Monthly or a few times a month	22.0	21.9	18.1	18.4
Weekly or more frequently	16.4	17.8	14.4	14.4
Experienced not being listened to when expressing views and opinions				
Never	14.5	14.2	22.4	21.6
Once or Twice	41.7	38.4	40.7	39.6
Monthly or a few times a month	26.3	26.7	21.6	21.9
Weekly or more frequently	17.5	20.6	15.3	17.0

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

27.6% of male police officers and 30.0% of female police officers reported experiencing being put down or treated in a condescending manner by someone in the force in the past 12 months on a monthly or more frequent basis, including 12.4% of both male and female police officers who reported experiencing this form of incivility weekly or more frequently.

The proportions for male and female police staff experiencing this form of incivility monthly or more frequently were 23.2% and 26.5%, respectively, including 9.9% of male police staff and 11.8% of female police staff who reported experiencing this form of incivility weekly or more frequently.

Interpersonal Mistreatment Attributed to Gender

We asked individuals to report the extent to which they had been subject to interpersonal mistreatment in the workplace due to their gender by someone in their force over the past 12 months, which they perceived as derogatory and demeaning. The frequencies of reported experiences of interpersonal mistreatment attributed to gender are presented in Table 20, below.

72.2% of female police officers reported they had not experienced derogatory comments about their gender from someone in their force in the past 12 months. However, 19.1% reported experiencing this once or twice in the past 12 months, while 8.7% reported experiencing derogatory comments monthly or more frequently.

Male police officers reported experiencing a lower level of derogatory comments about their gender than female police officers, with 91.2% reporting never in the past 12 months, 6.3% once or twice in the past 12 months, and 2.6% monthly or more frequently.

For police staff, the frequencies of female and male respondents who reported experiencing derogatory comments about their gender were 86.7% and 92.6% for never in the past 12 months, 10.3% and 5.3% for once or twice in the past 12 months, and 3.0% and 2.1% for monthly or more frequently, respectively.

65.6% of female police officers reported they had not experienced sexist comments from someone in their force in the past 12 months. However, 23.7% of female police officers reported experiencing this once or twice in the past 12 months, while 10.7% reported a frequency of monthly or more frequently.

Male police officers reported a lower level of experiencing sexist comments than female police officers, with 82.1% reporting never, 12.1% once or twice in the past 12 months, and 5.8% monthly or more frequently.

For police staff, the frequencies of female and male respondents who reported experiencing sexist comments over the past 12 months from someone in the force were 78.8% and 82.4% for never in the past 12 months, 16.3% and 11.9% for once or twice in the past 12 months, and 4.9% and 5.6% for monthly or more frequently, respectively.

**Table 20: Frequency of Experienced Interpersonal Mistreatment
in the Workplace due to Gender, by Role and Gender**

Response	Female Police Officers %	Male Police Officers %	Female Police Staff %	Male Police Staff %
Experienced derogatory comments about their gender				
Never	72.2	91.2	86.7	92.6
Once or Twice	19.1	6.3	10.3	5.3
Monthly or more frequently	8.7	2.6	3.0	2.1
Experienced sexist comments				
Never	65.6	82.1	78.8	82.4
Once or Twice	23.7	12.1	16.3	11.9
Monthly or more frequently	10.7	5.8	4.9	5.6
Heard jokes or stories about their gender that were offensive to them				
Never	81.7	94.5	88.7	95.0
Once or Twice	12.7	3.9	8.9	3.6
Monthly or more frequently	5.5	1.6	2.4	1.3
Experienced offensive remarks about their appearance, body, or private life				
Never	79.0	76.7	84.9	82.5
Once or Twice	14.9	14.8	12.0	12.5
Monthly or more frequently	6.1	8.5	3.1	5.0
Were excluded from a social interaction during or after work because of their gender				
Never	89.9	95.7	96.5	96.6
Once or Twice	7.2	2.9	2.5	2.4
Monthly or more frequently	2.9	1.3	1.0	1.0

Note: We measured individuals' experiences of interpersonal mistreatment in their workplace by someone in their force over the past 12 months, which they perceived as related to their gender.

Respondents were also asked to report how frequently they heard people make jokes or tell stories about their gender that were offensive to them. 94.5% of male police officers and

95.0% of male police staff reported not having experienced this form of interpersonal mistreatment.

While 81.7% of female police officers reported not having experienced this form of interpersonal mistreatment in the past 12 months, 12.7% of female police officers reported experiencing this once or twice, and 5.5% reported monthly or more frequently.

For female police staff, 88.7% reported not having experienced individuals making jokes or telling stories about their gender that were offensive to them in the past 12 months, 8.9% reported experiencing this once or twice in the past 12 months, and 2.4% monthly or more frequently.

Although the frequency of respondents experiencing offensive remarks about their appearance, body or private life once or twice in the past 12 months was similar across female police officers (14.9%) and male police officers (14.8%), and female police staff (12.0%) and male police staff (12.5%), the frequency of experiencing this form of interpersonal mistreatment weekly or more frequently was slightly higher for male police officers (8.5%) when compared with female police officers (6.1%), male police staff (5.0%) and female police staff (3.1%).

For experiencing being excluded from a social interaction during or after work because of gender, the proportions of respondents who reported not having experienced this form of interpersonal mistreatment in the past 12 months were similar for male police officers (95.7%), female police staff (96.5%) and male police staff (96.6%), and slightly lower for female police officers (89.9%)

Wellbeing

No material differences in wellbeing scores were found between respondents by gender; emotional energy was reported at a moderate average level for both male and female respondents (3.56 and 3.68, respectively).

Professional Commitment and Work Effort

As can be seen in Tables 16 and 17, above, male police officers (5.05), female police staff (5.37), and male police staff (5.28) reported a high average level for professional commitment. Male police officers reported a moderately high average level of professional commitment (4.88).

On average, respondents reported very high levels of work effort, with no material differences found between respondents by role and gender (6.10 for female police officers, 5.87 for male police officers, 6.28 for female police staff and 6.03 for male police staff).

3.6   GENDER IDENTITY

The results presented in this section provide an indication of the lived experiences and views of the 70 respondents who identified in the survey as having a different gender identity from that assigned at birth.[25] As the sample size is relatively small, the findings should be considered as indicative only and treated with some caution for measures which report proportions of respondents' views rather than overall sample average scores. The average scores are presented in Table 21, below.

Table 21: Average Scores for Key Measures for Individuals who Identified as Having a Different Gender Identity from that Assigned at Birth

Measure	Average Score
Force Inclusive Employment Practices	3.87
Supervisor Listening	4.88
Team Integration of Differences	4.91
Team Inclusion in Decision Making	4.85
Emotional Energy	3.35
Job Satisfaction	5.20
Professional Commitment	5.09
Work Effort	5.95

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

Force Inclusive Employment Practices

Similar to the total populations of respondents who identified as male or female, individuals who identified as having a different gender identity from that assigned at birth reported a moderate average level for perceived inclusivity of force employment practices.

Perceived Unfair Treatment Attributed to Gender Identity

17.1% (*n* = 12) of individuals who identified as having a different gender identity from that assigned at birth reported strongly agreeing or agreeing with feeling that their career

---

[25] This includes respondent who identified in the survey as trans male, trans female, non-binary, and individuals who preferred to self-describe.

promotion opportunities were negatively affected because of their gender identity; 21.4% (*n* = 15) were more neutral in their responses, while 61.4% (*n* = 43) reported strongly disagreeing or disagreeing. As can be seen above in Section 3.5, this is at a similar average level to that reported by the total population of male police officers, and higher than that reported by the total populations of female police officers or male and female police staff.

11.4% (*n* = 8) of individuals who identified as having a different gender identity from that assigned at birth reported strongly agreeing or agreeing with feeling that people at work actively try to stop them from gaining opportunities for development due to their gender identity; 22.8% (*n* = 16) were more neutral in their responses, while 65.7% (*n* = 46) reported strongly disagreeing or disagreeing.

11.4% (*n* = 8) of individuals who identified as having a different gender identity from that assigned at birth reported strongly agreeing or agreeing that they feel they do not get enough recognition at work due to their gender identity; 31.4% (*n* = 22) were more neutral in their responses, while 57.1% (*n* = 40) reported strongly disagreeing or disagreeing.

Supervisor Listening

Respondents who identified that their gender identity was different from that assigned at birth reported a moderately high average level (4.88) for the extent to which they felt their supervisor was open, non-judgemental and supportive towards them. This is lower than that reported by the total populations of respondents who identified as male or female (high average levels; 5.02 and 5.06, respectively).

Team Inclusivity

Similarly, moderately high average levels were reported for team integration of differences and team inclusion in decision making (4.91 and 4.85, respectively). The team integration of differences average score is slightly lower than that for the total populations of respondents who identified as male or female (high average levels; 5.30 and 5.21, respectively). The average level for team inclusion in decision making was found to be at a similar moderately high level to that for the total populations of respondents who identified as male or female (5.00 and 4.90, respectively).

Workplace Incivility

Respondents who identified that their gender identity was different from that assigned at birth reported higher levels of experienced incivility than the total populations of respondents who identified as male or female. For example, 35.7% (n = 25) of respondents who identified that their gender identity was different from that assigned at birth reported experiencing being put down or treated in a condescending manner by someone in their force monthly or more frequently; 44.3% (n = 31) reported experiencing being interrupted by someone in their force monthly or more frequently; and 44.3% (n = 31) reported not being listened to by someone in their force monthly or more frequently.

Interpersonal Mistreatment Attributed to Gender Identity

59.4% (n = 41) of individuals reported they had not experienced derogatory comments about their gender identity from someone in their force in the past 12 months. However, 26.1% (n = 18) reported experiencing this once or twice in the past 12 months, while 14.5% (n = 10) reported a frequency of monthly or above.

Similarly, 53.6% (n = 37) of individuals reported they had not heard people in their force tell jokes or stories about their gender identity that were offensive to them in the past 12 months. However, 29.0% (n = 20) reported experiencing this once or twice in the past 12 months, while 17.4% (n = 12) reported a frequency of monthly or above.

87.0% (n = 60) of individuals reported they had not experienced having been excluded from a social interaction during or after work because of their gender identity by someone in their force in the past 12 months. However, 8.7% (n = 6) reported experiencing this once or twice in the past 12 months, while 4.3% (n = 3) reported a frequency of monthly or above.

Wellbeing

Emotional energy was reported at a moderately low average level; no material differences were found between the average emotional energy scores reported by respondents who identified as having a different gender identity from that assigned at birth and the total populations of respondents who identified as male or female.

Job satisfaction was reported at a high average level (5.20) for respondents who identified as having a different gender identity from that assigned at birth (no material differences were found compared with the remaining population, where the average level was 5.11).

Professional Commitment and Work Effort

No material differences were found between the average levels of professional commitment and work effort between respondents who identified in the survey that their gender identity was different from that assigned at birth and the remaining population.

Professional commitment was reported at a high average level (5.09, compared with 5.14, respectively).

Work effort was reported at a very high average level (5.95, compared with 6.07, respectively).

These results indicate that respondents who identified that their gender identity was different from that assigned at birth are committed to policing and invest very high levels of effort into their work.

3.7 NEURODIVERSITY

Respondents who indicated they were willing to provide further information regarding their views and experiences at work as relating to their personal backgrounds and identities were asked to indicate whether they have a neurodiverse condition and whether they were self-diagnosed or professionally diagnosed in relation to their neurodiversity.

Cognisant of the relatively small sample sizes, and as there were only limited differences in scores between self-diagnosed and professionally diagnosed respondents, for the purposes of this report the findings are discussed for these respondents collectively.

Table 22: Sample Sizes by Role and Neurodiversity

Role	Neurodiversity	Total Number of Respondents
Police Officer	Autistic Spectrum Condition (ASC) only	169
	Neurodiverse Condition such as Dyslexia, Dyspraxia, Dyscalculia or ADHD (NDC) only	742
Police Staff	Autistic Spectrum Condition (ASC) only	132
	Neurodiverse Condition such as Dyslexia, Dyspraxia, Dyscalculia or ADHD (NDC) only	580

The distribution of responses by neurodiversity for police officers and police staff is shown in Table 22. In total, the survey received 1,863 responses from neurodiverse individuals (comprising 306 responses from individuals with an Autistic Spectrum Condition (ASC); 1,343 responses from individuals with a neurodiverse condition such as Dyslexia, Dyspraxia, Dyscalculia or ADHD (NDC); and 214 responses from individuals with both an Autistic Spectrum Condition and a further neurodiverse condition).

Force Inclusive Employment Practices

As can be seen in Table 23, below, average scores for force inclusive employment practices were moderately low (3.60) for respondents who identified as having an autistic spectrum condition and moderate (3.92) for respondents who identified with a neurodiverse condition.

Table 23: Average Scores for Key Measures, by Neurodiversity

Measure	ASC Respondents (Average)	NDC Respondents (Average)
Force Inclusive Employment Practices	3.60	3.92
Supervisor Listening	4.69	4.93
Team Integration of Differences	4.88	5.13
Team Inclusion in Decision Making	4.56	4.76
Emotional Energy	3.21	3.41
Job Satisfaction	4.66	4.96
Professional Commitment	4.86	5.13
Work Effort	5.97	6.04

Notes:

1. All of these measures used a 1 to 7 scale.
2. Average scores are presented for respondents who indicated having an Autistic Spectrum Condition (ASC), respondents with a neurodiverse condition such as Dyslexia, Dyspraxia, Dyscalculia or ADHD (NDC) and respondents with both an Autistic Spectrum Condition and a further neurodiverse condition.

Respondents who identified as neurodiverse (such as those with an autistic spectrum condition, dyslexia, dyspraxia, dyscalculia, or ADHD) reported a moderately low average score (3.89) for the extent to which they perceive their force as promoting awareness of autism and other neurological conditions in diversity training.

Respondents who identified as having an autistic spectrum condition reported a low average score (3.12) for the extent to which they perceived their force as offering resources and support for neurodiverse individuals, while respondents who identified as having a neurodiverse condition such as Dyslexia, Dyspraxia, Dyscalculia or ADHD reported a moderately low average score (4.31).

Supervisor Listening

The average score for the extent to which respondents who identified as neurodiverse (both ASC and NDC) viewed their direct supervisor as open, non-judgemental, supportive and interested in what they have to say was at a moderately high level (4.85).

Team Inclusivity

The average scores for team integration of differences, the extent to which individuals perceive that differences between individuals are appreciated, respected and valued within their work team, were at a high level for respondents who identified as having a neurodiverse condition (NDC) such as dyslexia, dyspraxia, dyscalculia, or ADHD. Respondents who identified as having an autistic spectrum condition (ASC) reported a moderately high average score. This compares to a high average level for those who identified as not having a neurodiverse condition.

The team inclusion in decision making measure reflects the extent to which individuals perceive that thoughts and suggestions are actively and authentically sought from everyone within their work team and that ideas are judged based on their quality rather than who expresses them. Average scores for team inclusion in decision making for both ASC and NDC respondents were at a moderately high average level, similar to that of the main population.

Respondents who identified as neurodiverse (ASC and NDC respondents) reported high average scores for the extent to which they feel valued by their co-workers.

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). 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 are presented in Table 24.

22.5% of respondents who identified as neurodiverse reported experiencing being put down or treated in a condescending manner on a weekly or more frequent basis. Similarly, 27.9% of respondents who identified as neurodiverse reported experiencing not being listened to on a weekly or more frequent basis and 25.3% reported experiencing being interrupted and not allowed to finish what they were saying on a weekly or more frequent basis.

Table 24: Frequency of Experienced Workplace Incivility for Neurodiverse Respondents[1]

Response	Neurodiverse Respondents[2]		Respondents with no known Neurodiverse Condition	
	%	*n*	%	*n*
Experienced being put down or treated in a condescending manner				
Never	24.6	457	36.8	6,746
Once or twice	32.7	609	37.0	6,782
Monthly or a few times a month	20.2	376	14.9	2,738
Weekly or more frequently	22.5	418	11.2	2,060
Experienced being interrupted and not allowed to finish what they were saying				
Never	19.4	360	26.3	4,812
Once or twice	30.8	572	38.5	7,060
Monthly or a few times a month	24.4	453	19.9	3,648
Weekly or more frequently	25.3	470	15.3	2,797
Experienced not being listened to when expressing views and opinions				
Never	12.7	236	18.6	3,401
Once or twice	30.1	560	40.5	7,430
Monthly or a few times a month	29.2	543	23.8	4,367
Weekly or more frequently	27.9	519	17.1	3,135

Notes:

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

2. Neurodiverse respondents includes both ASC and NDC respondents.

Wellbeing

Respondents who identified as neurodiverse (such as those with an autistic spectrum condition, dyslexia, dyspraxia, dyscalculia, or ADHD) reported a moderately low average level of emotional energy.

Average scores for job satisfaction were at a moderately high level for respondents who identified as neurodiverse.

Professional Commitment and Work Effort

Average scores for the extent to which individuals feel committed to policing as a profession were reported at a moderately high level for respondents who indicated having an autistic spectrum condition and at a high level for respondents who indicated having a neurodiverse condition such as dyslexia, dyspraxia, dyscalculia, or ADHD.

No material differences were found across the very high average levels of effort respondents reported investing into their work.

3.8 RELIGIONS/BELIEFS

The distribution of police officer and police staff responses by their reported religion/beliefs is shown in Table 25.[26]

Table 25: Sample Sizes by Role and Religion/Beliefs

Religion/Beliefs	Police Officer Respondents	Police Staff Respondents
Agnosticism	58	75
Atheism	1,138	1,115
Buddhism	85	46
Christianity (all denominations)	4,854	4,499
Hinduism	24	42
Humanism	44	44
Islam	155	128
Judaism	20	19
Paganism	59	67
Sikhism	40	41
No religion or belief	3,463	3,195

Due to the sample sizes of the different religions or beliefs, the findings in this section are predominantly discussed for the groups which received a higher response rate. Where sample sizes are small, or it is helpful for interpretation and understanding of findings, the numbers of respondents are reported.

As the sample sizes for respondents who identified as Agnostic, Buddhist, Hindu, Humanist, Jewish, Pagan and Sikh are small, findings for these religions/beliefs need to be interpreted with some caution and should be considered as indicative results only which are provided for information.

---

[26] In addition, 669 individuals indicated that they would *prefer not to say*.

Force Inclusive Employment Practices

No material differences were found for the average scores for respondents from different religions/beliefs. Respondents who identified as Atheist, Christian, Muslim and those who indicated having no religion or belief all reported a moderate average level for the extent to which they perceived their force's employment practices as inclusive. While they can only be considered as indicative, the findings suggest this was also the case for Agnostic, Buddhist, Hindu, Humanist, Jewish, Pagan and Sikh respondents.

Perceived Unfair Treatment Attributed to Religion/Beliefs

We asked individuals the extent to which they perceived they have been unfairly treated at work due their religion/beliefs. Due to the respondent sample sizes for the different religions or beliefs, we compare Muslim and Christian police officers and police staff perceptions of unfair treatment in Table 26, below. Commentary on the other religions or beliefs is also provided, but at a total population level for police officers and police staff combined.

As can be seen in Table 26, below, 50.0% (n = 77) of Muslim police officer respondents reported strongly disagreeing or disagreeing with feeling that their career promotion opportunities were negatively affected because of their religion/beliefs. 28.5% felt more neutral (n = 44), while 21.4% (n = 33) strongly agreed or agreed this was the case. This is in contrast to the small proportion (2.5%) of Christian police officer respondents (n = 121) who strongly agreed or agreed. 81.0%, (n = 3,915) of Christian police officer respondents strongly disagreed or disagreed this was the case, while 16.5%, (n = 798) were neutral in their response.

For Muslim police staff, the proportion who reported strongly agreeing or agreeing with feeling that their career promotion opportunities were negatively affected because of their religion/beliefs was 11.8% (n = 15), which was again higher than that for Christian police staff which was 0.5% (n = 22).

Similar trends were evident for the other two questions asked for perceptions of unfair treatment at work due to an individuals' religion/beliefs. A higher proportion of Muslim police officers felt they were prevented from gaining opportunities for development because of their religion/beliefs (20.1%, n = 31) and that they didn't get enough recognition due to their

religion/beliefs (23.4%, *n* = 36) than their Christian counterparts. This was also the case, but to a lesser extent, for Muslim police staff when compared with Christian police staff.

Table 26: Respondents' Perceptions of being Unfairly Treated due to their Religion/Beliefs

	Strongly Disagree or Disagree % (*n*)	Neutral % (*n*)	Strongly Agree or Agree % (*n*)
At work, I feel that my career promotion opportunities are negatively affected because of my religion/beliefs			
Christian Police Officers	81.0 (3,915)	16.5 (798)	2.5 (121)
Christian Police Staff	88.5 (3,967)	11.0 (492)	0.5 (22)
Muslim Police Officers	50.0 (77)	28.5 (44)	21.4 (33)
Muslim Police Staff	56.7 (72)	31.4 (40)	11.8 (15)
At work, I sometimes feel that people actively try to stop me from gaining opportunities for development because of my religion/beliefs			
Christian Police Officers	83.3 (4,030)	15.4 (745)	1.2 (61)
Christian Police Staff	88.7 (3,975)	11.0 (490)	0.4 (14)
Muslim Police Officers	50.6 (78)	29.2 (45)	20.1 (31)
Muslim Police Staff	63.2 (79)	25.6 (32)	11.2 (14)
At work, I do not get enough recognition because of my religion/beliefs			
Christian Police Officers	76.9 (3,717)	21.1 (1,022)	2.0 (97)
Christian Police Staff	84.2 (3,771)	15.2 (683)	0.6 (26)
Muslim Police Officers	46.8 (72)	29.8 (46)	23.4 (36)
Muslim Police Staff	59.1 (75)	28.4 (36)	12.6 (16)

<u>Note</u>: We measured individuals' experiences of interpersonal mistreatment in their workplace by someone in their force over the past 12 months, which they perceived as related to their religion/beliefs.

As the sample sizes[27] for respondents from the other religions/beliefs considered in this survey are relatively small, commentary is provided at the total population level. The profiles of scores for Buddhist, Humanist, Jewish, and Pagan respondents were at similar levels. The proportions of respondents from these religions or beliefs strongly disagreeing or disagreeing

---

[27] Due to the low sample sizes across the three response groupings of strongly disagree and disagree; neutral; and strongly agree and agree, these findings need to be interpreted with caution and considered as indicative only.

with feeling that their career promotion opportunities were negatively affected because of their religion/beliefs was 84.1% (*n* = 111) for Buddhist respondents, 80.2% (*n* = 73) for Humanist respondents, 78.0% (*n* = 32) for Jewish respondents, and 76.4% (*n* = 97) for Pagan respondents.

The proportion of respondents strongly agreeing or agreeing with feeling that their career promotion opportunities were negatively affected because of their religion/beliefs was 0.8% (*n* = 1) for Buddhist respondents, 3.3% (*n* = 3) for Humanist respondents, 4.9% (*n* = 2) for Jewish respondents, and 2.4% (*n* = 3) for Pagan respondents.

The proportions for Hindu and Sikh respondents strongly disagreeing or disagreeing with feeling their career promotion opportunities were negatively affected because of their religion/beliefs were lower than the above proportions. The proportions were 67.6% (*n* = 46) for Hindu respondents and 60.5% (*n* = 49) for Sikh respondents.

The proportions for Hindu and Sikh respondents strongly agreeing or agreeing with feeling their career promotion opportunities were negatively affected because of their religion/beliefs were 5.9% (*n* = 4) for Hindu respondents and 12.3% (*n* = 10) for Sikh respondents.

Supervisor Listening

Supervisor listening, referring to the extent to which individuals view their direct supervisor as open, non-judgemental, supportive, and interested in what they have to say, leads to employees feeling more comfortable when approaching and talking to their supervisor. No material differences were found for the average scores for respondents from the different religions/beliefs with a large sample size, all of whom generally reported a high average level.

However, Muslim female respondents reported a lower average level of being valued by their supervisor compared with that of Muslim male respondents. The average level for Muslim female respondents was moderately high, while for Muslim male respondents it was high.[28]

---

[28] This difference was not found for the other religions/belief groups with sufficient respondents to conduct these analyses.

Team Inclusivity

Team integration of differences, referring to people's perceptions of the extent to which all individuals are appreciated, respected and valued within their work teams. Agnostic, Atheist, Christian, Hindu, Humanist, Jewish and Pagan respondents, and respondents with no religion or belief reported a high average level. Buddhist, Muslim and Sikh respondents reported a moderately high average level.

Team inclusion in decision making reflects the extent to which individuals perceive that thoughts and suggestions are actively and authentically sought from everyone within their work team and that ideas are judged based on their quality rather than who expresses them. Average scores for team inclusion in decision making were at a high average level for Christian respondents and those who indicated having no religion or belief, and at a moderately high average level for Atheist and Muslim respondents.

The average scores for team inclusion in decision making were also at a high average level for Agnostic and Pagan respondents, while at a moderately high average level for Buddhist, Hindu, Humanist, Jewish and Sikh respondents.

There were no material differences found between religions or beliefs for the extent to which individuals felt valued by their co-workers; average scores were high for all groups of respondents.

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). We measured individuals' experiences of workplace incivility by someone in their force over the past 12 months.

The results indicate that there is little difference in the average lived experience of respondents across the four religions or beliefs with the larger sample sizes (Atheist, Christian and Muslim respondents and for those who indicated having no religion or belief) regarding experienced workplace incivility.

The proportion of individuals who reported experiencing being put down or treated in a condescending manner on a monthly or more frequent basis was at similar level for Atheist, Christian and Muslim respondents and for those who indicated having no religion or belief (29.4%, *n* = 668, for Atheist respondents; 26.4%, *n* = 2490, for Christian respondents; 32.3%, *n* = 93, for Muslim respondents; and 27.0%, *n* = 1814, for those who indicated having no religion or belief).

Furthermore, the proportion of Atheist, Christian and Muslim respondents and those of no religion or belief who reported experiencing being interrupted and not allowed to finish what they were saying on a monthly or more frequent basis was also at a similar level (37.6%, *n* = 853, for Atheist respondents; 35.7%, *n* = 3,372, for Christian respondents; 35.9%, *n* = 103, for Muslim respondents; and 35.6%, *n* = 2,396, for those who indicated having no religion or belief).

This was also the case for the experiencing on a monthly or more frequent basis of not being listened to (43.9%, *n* = 999, for Atheist respondents; 41.3%, *n* = 3,894, for Christian respondents; 40.3%, *n* = 116, for Muslim respondents; and 41.5%, *n* = 2,795, for those who indicated having no religion or belief).

Due to the low sample sizes for the other religion/beliefs, the results need to be interpreted with some caution when comparing the proportions across the different religions and beliefs and are included for illustration and information only:

27.8% (*n* = 37) of Agnostic respondents, 40.9% (*n* = 54) of Buddhist respondents, 35.3% (*n* = 24) of Hindu respondents, 33.0% (*n* = 30) of Humanist respondents, 24.4% (*n* = 10) of Jewish respondents, 38.3% (*n* = 49) of Pagan respondents and 34.1% (*n* = 28) of Sikh respondents reported experiencing being put down or treated in a condescending manner on a monthly or more frequent basis.

Experiencing being interrupted and not allowed to finish what they were saying on monthly or more frequently was found to be highest for Pagan (51.6%), Humanist (47.3%) and Buddhist (46.2%) respondents. The proportions of respondents for the remaining religions or beliefs considered in this study experiencing this form of incivility, monthly or more frequently, were at a similar lower level (36.8% for Agnostic respondents, 36.8% for Hindu respondents, 36.6% for Jewish respondents, and 39.0% for Sikh respondents).

The proportion of individuals who reported experiencing not being listened to on a monthly or more frequent basis was at similar level for Buddhist, Humanist, Jewish, Pagan and Sikh respondents (52.3% for Buddhist respondents; 52.7% for Humanist respondents; 56.1% for Jewish respondents; 53.9% for Pagan respondents; and 51.2% for Sikh respondents). For Agnostic and Hindu respondents, the corresponding proportions were slightly lower (38.3% for Agnostic respondents and 44.1% for Hindu respondents).

Interpersonal Mistreatment Attributed to Religion/Beliefs

We asked individuals the extent to which they had been subject to interpersonal mistreatment in the workplace due to their religion or beliefs, by someone in their force over the past 12 months, which they perceived as derogatory and demeaning.

On average, Muslim respondents reported experiencing higher levels of interpersonal mistreatment due to their religion/beliefs than Christian respondents. Muslim respondents reported higher levels of experiencing derogatory comments and jokes or stories about their religion/beliefs, that they felt were offensive, and reported feeling excluded from social interactions during or after work because of their region or beliefs more frequently than Christian respondents. However, for Christian respondents who reported attending their place of worship weekly or more frequently, the proportions experiencing interpersonal mistreatment due to their religion/beliefs were more similar to that of Muslim respondents, rather than that for the total Christian population of respondents.[29]

For example, 63.9% (*n* = 184) of Muslim respondents, compared with 90.9% (*n* = 8,590) of all Christian respondents reported they had not experienced derogatory comments about their religion/beliefs from someone in their force in the past 12 months. However, for Christian respondents who reported attending their place of worship weekly or more frequently the proportion was 57.9% (*n* = 342).

27.1% (*n* = 78) of Muslim respondents compared with 7.3% (*n* = 691) of all Christian respondents reported experiencing this form of mistreatment once or twice in the past 12

---

[29] For Muslim respondents, the frequency of attendance at their place of worship did not materially affect the frequency of their experience of interpersonal mistreatment due to their religion/beliefs.

months. For Christian respondents who reported attended their place of worship weekly or more frequently the proportion was 28.4% (*n* = 168).

Moreover, 9.0% (*n* = 26) of Muslim respondents, compared with 1.8% (*n* = 174) for all Christian respondents, reported experiencing this at a frequency of monthly or above. For Christian respondents who attended their place of worship weekly or more frequently the proportion was 13.7% (*n* = 81).

The frequency of Muslim respondents experiencing hearing jokes or stories about their religion/beliefs that they perceived as offensive were very similar to that of experiencing derogatory comments. This was also the case for the total Christian population, and for those reporting attending their place of worship weekly or more frequently.

While the majority of Christian respondents (98.9%, *n* = 9,343) reported they had not felt excluded from social interactions during or after work because of their region or beliefs, the proportion for Muslim respondents reporting not feeling excluded from social interactions was lower (74.7%, *n* = 215). 9.4% (*n* = 27) of Muslim respondents reported feeling excluded from social interactions due to their religion/beliefs on a monthly or more frequently basis.

The findings indicate that Hindu, Jewish, Pagan and Sikh respondents experience higher levels of interpersonal mistreatment at work than Buddhist and Humanist respondents. For example, 90.2% (*n* = 119) of Buddhist and 90.1% (*n* = 82) of Humanist respondents reported that they had not experienced derogatory comments about their religion/beliefs in the past 12 months from someone in the force. The proportions for Hindu respondents (82.4%, *n* = 56), Jewish respondents (80.5%, *n* = 33), Pagan respondents (74.8%, *n* = 95) and for Sikh respondents (75.6%, *n* = 62) were lower than that for Buddhist and Humanist respondents.

The proportion of Buddhist respondents (87.1%, *n* = 115) and Humanist respondents (91.2%, *n* = 83) who reported not experiencing hearing jokes or stories that they found offensive were also similar, and again higher, than the proportions reporting not experiencing this form of interpersonal mistreatment for respondents from the other religions or beliefs (80.9%, *n* = 55, for Hindu respondents; 80.5%, *n* = 33, for Jewish respondents; 79.5%, *n* = 101, for Pagan respondents; and 79.3%, *n* = 65, for Sikh respondents).

In terms of not feeling excluded from social interactions during work or after work due to their religion of beliefs in the past 12 months, the proportion of Buddhist respondents (97.7%, *n* = 129), Humanist respondents (95.6%, *n* = 87), Jewish respondents (92.7%, *n* = 38) and Pagan respondents (96.9%, *n* = 123) were at a relatively high level. The level for Hindu respondents (89.6%, *n* = 60) and Sikh respondents (88.9%, *n* = 72) were reported at a lower level.

Wellbeing

There were no material differences found between the average emotional energy scores across individuals of different religions or beliefs. Average scores for job satisfaction were high across all religions or beliefs.

Professional Commitment and Work Effort

Professional commitment was reported at a high average level and respondents reported investing a very high average level of effort into their work; there were no material differences found for the average professional commitment and work effort scores across respondents of different religions or beliefs.

3.9   SEXUAL ORIENTATION

The distribution of responses by sexual orientation for police officers and police staff are shown in Table 27. In total, the survey received 17,818 responses from heterosexual individuals, 971 responses from gay or lesbian individuals, and 648 responses from bisexual individuals. It should be noted when considering the findings in this section that respondents who identified as bisexual reported lower average levels of the extent to which they are open about their sexual orientation compared with gay or lesbian respondents. This may have affected their experiences for some of the measures reported below.

Table 27: Sample Sizes by Role and Sexual Orientation

Role	Sexual Orientation	Total Number of Respondents
Police Officer	Gay or Lesbian	570
	Bisexual	321
	Heterosexual	9,017
Police Staff	Gay or Lesbian	384
	Bisexual	312
	Heterosexual	8,597

Table 28, below, presents the average scores for police officer respondents who identified as gay or lesbian, bisexual or heterosexual. Similarly, Table 29 presents the average scores for police staff respondents.

Force Inclusive Employment Practices

For both police officers and police staff, force inclusive employment practices were reported at slightly lower average levels for respondents who indicated they were bisexual compared with respondents who identified as gay or lesbian, or as heterosexual.

Police officers who identified as gay or lesbian or as heterosexual reported moderate average levels of force inclusive employment practices (3.77 and 3.84, respectively), while police officers who identified as bisexual reported a moderately low average level (3.58). A similar trend was evident for police staff. Police staff who identified as gay or lesbian or as

heterosexual reported moderately high average levels of inclusive employment practices (4.40 and 4.47, respectively); those who identified as bisexual reported a moderate average level (4.20).

Table 28: Average Scores for Key Measures for <u>Police Officers</u>, by Sexual Orientation

Measure	Gay or Lesbian Respondents (Average)	Bisexual Respondents (Average)	Heterosexual Respondents (Average)
Force Inclusive Employment Practices	3.77	3.58	3.84
Supervisor Listening	4.99	4.74	5.05
Team Integration of Differences	5.32	5.05	5.42
Team Inclusion in Decision Making	4.99	4.74	5.14
Emotional Energy	3.27	3.04	3.37
Job Satisfaction	4.97	4.69	4.99
Professional Commitment	5.16	5.03	5.05
Work Effort	6.04	5.89	5.97

<u>Note</u>: All of these measures used a 1 to 7 scale.

Table 29: Average Scores for Key Measures for <u>Police Staff</u>, by Sexual Orientation

Measure	Gay or Lesbian Respondents (Average)	Bisexual Respondents (Average)	Heterosexual Respondents (Average)
Force Inclusive Employment Practices	4.40	4.20	4.47
Supervisor Listening	5.23	4.99	5.21
Team Integration of Differences	5.20	4.99	5.28
Team Inclusion in Decision Making	4.75	4.68	5.00
Emotional Energy	3.91	3.74	4.01
Job Satisfaction	5.33	5.31	5.44
Professional Commitment	5.40	5.43	5.43
Work Effort	6.13	5.98	6.20

<u>Note</u>: All of these measures used a 1 to 7 scale.

Perceived Unfair Treatment Attributed to Sexual Orientation

As can be seen in Table 30, below, of the respondents who identified as gay or lesbian, 8.1% (*n* = 46) of police officers and 3.4% (*n* = 13) of police staff reported strongly agreeing or agreeing their career promotion opportunities have been negatively affected due to their sexual orientation. 22.2% (*n* = 126) of police officers and 17.0% (*n* = 65) of police staff were more neutral in their responses, and 69.7% (*n* = 396) of police officers and 79.7% (*n* = 305) of police staff reported strongly disagreeing or disagreeing this was the case. In support of these findings, the average scores for perceptions of fear that disclosing or discussing their sexual orientation at work would negatively affect their career prospects for gay or lesbian respondents were low for male police officers (2.78), very low for female police officers (1.96), very low for male police staff (2.29) and very low for female police staff (1.83).[30]

Moreover, the proportion of gay or lesbian respondents who felt that they were stopped from gaining opportunities for development, or that they did not get enough recognition due to their sexual orientation, were at a similarly relatively low average level.

Table 30: <u>Gay or Lesbian Respondents'</u> Perceptions of being Unfairly Treated due to their Sexual Orientation

Response	Strongly Disagree or Disagree %	Neutral %	Strongly Agree or Agree %
At work, I feel that my career promotion opportunities are negatively affected because of my sexual orientation			
Police Officers	69.7	22.2	8.1
Police Staff	79.7	17.0	3.4
At work, I sometimes feel that people actively try to stop me from gaining opportunities for development because of my sexual orientation			
Police Officers	71.9	22.7	5.2
Police Staff	80.8	16.6	2.6
At work, I do not get enough recognition because of my sexual orientation			
Police Officers	68.5	26.8	4.8
Police Staff	74.5	23.1	2.4

---

[30] Measured on a 1-7 scale.

As can be seen in Table 31, below, the proportion of bisexual respondents who felt that they had been unfairly treated at work due to their sexual orientation was lower than the proportion of gay or lesbian respondents feeling this way (see Table 30, above).

Table 31: <u>Bisexual Respondents'</u> Perceptions of being Unfairly Treated due to their Sexual Orientation

Response	Strongly Disagree or Disagree %	Neutral %	Strongly Agree or Agree %
At work, I feel that my career promotion opportunities are negatively affected because of my sexual orientation			
Police Officers	79.6	18.6	1.9
Police Staff	80.9	17.4	1.6
At work, I sometimes feel that people actively try to stop me from gaining opportunities for development because of my sexual orientation			
Police Officers	80.5	18.5	0.9
Police Staff	67.6	18.1	0.9
At work, I do not get enough recognition because of my sexual orientation			
Police Officers	76.8	21.3	1.8
Police Staff	77.4	21.4	1.2

Supervisor Listening

Police officer respondents who identified as gay or lesbian or as heterosexual reported similar average levels for the extent to which they feel that their direct supervisors were open, non-judgemental and supportive (4.99 and 5.05, respectively). Bisexual police officer respondents reported a slightly lower average level (4.74, moderately high). Police staff respondents who identified as gay or lesbian, bisexual, or as heterosexual reported high average levels of supervisor listening (5.23, 4.99 and 5.21, respectively).

Team Inclusivity

Police officer and police staff respondents who identified as gay or lesbian, or bisexual, or heterosexual reported high average levels for team integration of differences. These results imply that, on average, individuals perceive that their differences are integrated, respected and valued within their work teams to a high extent.

Consistent with these findings, police officer and police staff respondents who identified as gay or lesbian reported very high average levels for the extent to which they are open about their sexual orientation with their co-workers (8.68 and 8.35, respectively) and supervisors (8.25 and 7.89, respectively).[31] These results imply that, on average, respondents who identified as gay or lesbian feel highly comfortable being open about their sexual orientation when at work.

In contrast, police officer and police staff respondents who identified as bisexual reported moderately low average levels of the extent to which they are open about their sexual orientation with their co-workers (3.43 and 3.69, respectively) and low average levels for openness with their supervisors (2.70 and 2.91, respectively).[31] Of note is that male respondents who identified as bisexual reported a very low average level of openness with their direct supervisor about their sexual orientation when at work (1.99). [31]

Police officers and police staff who identified as gay or lesbian reported low average scores for the extent to which they perceive that disclosing or discussing their sexual orientation at work would make their co-workers feel uncomfortable (2.46 and 2.59, respectively).[32] Bisexual respondents reported that disclosing or discussing their sexual orientation at work would make their co-workers feel uncomfortable to a moderately low extent (3.35 for police officers and 3.17 for police staff).[32] Male respondents who identified as bisexual (n = 210) reported perceiving that discussing their sexual orientation would lead to their co-workers feeling uncomfortable to a moderate degree (3.81).[32]

Police officers who identified as gay or lesbian, or as bisexual reported moderately high average levels of team inclusion in decision making (4.99 and 4.74, respectively). Similarly, police staff who identified as gay or lesbian, or as bisexual also reported moderately high average levels of team inclusion in decision making (4.75 and 4.68, respectively).

Police officers and police staff who identified as heterosexual reported high average levels of team inclusion in decision making (5.14 and 5.00, respectively).

---

[31] Measured on a 0-10 scale.
[32] Measured on a 1-7 scale.

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). We measured individuals' experiences of workplace incivility by someone in their force over the past 12 months. Table 32 presents the frequencies of experienced workplace incivility behaviours by sexual orientation.

Table 32: Frequency of Experienced Workplace Incivility, by Sexual Orientation

Response	Gay or Lesbian Respondents		Bisexual Respondents		Heterosexual Respondents	
	%	*n*	*%*	*n*	*%*	*n*
Experienced being put down or treated in a condescending manner						
Never	30.8	298	26.3	170	36.8	6,538
Once or twice	37.0	358	33.1	214	36.9	6,562
Monthly or a few times a month	18.4	178	20.9	135	14.9	2,650
Weekly or more frequently	13.8	133	19.7	127	11.4	2,023
Experienced being interrupted and not allowed to finish what they were saying						
Never	20.9	202	18.4	119	26.4	4,692
Once or twice	37.5	363	34.1	220	38.3	6,809
Monthly or a few times a month	22.3	216	23.5	152	20.0	3,546
Weekly or more frequently	19.3	187	24.0	155	15.3	2,712
Experienced not being listened to when expressing views and opinions						
Never	14.5	140	15.8	102	18.6	3,306
Once or twice	38.0	368	31.9	206	40.4	7,178
Monthly or a few times a month	27.2	263	28.9	187	23.8	4,232
Weekly or more frequently	20.4	197	23.4	151	17.2	3,061

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

The proportion of individuals who reported they had experienced being put down or treated in a condescending manner by someone in their force on a monthly or more frequent basis was 32.2% for respondents who identified as gay or lesbian, 40.6% for respondents who

identified as bisexual and 26.3% for respondents who identified as heterosexual. Included within these figures, 13.8% of gay or lesbian respondents, 19.7% of bisexual respondents and 11.4% of heterosexual respondents reported experiencing this form of incivility weekly or more frequently.

Moreover, the proportion of individuals who reported experiencing being interrupted and not allowed to finish what they were saying by someone in their force on a monthly or more frequent basis was 41.6% for gay or lesbian respondents, 47.5% for bisexual respondents and 35.3% for heterosexual respondents (including 19.3% for gay or lesbian respondents, 24.0% for bisexual respondents and 15.3% for heterosexual respondents who experienced this weekly or more frequently).

The proportion of individuals who reported they had experienced not being listened to when expressing their views or opinions by someone in their force on a monthly or more frequent basis was 47.6% for gay or lesbian respondents, 52.3% for bisexual respondents and 41.0% for heterosexual respondents; this includes 20.4% of gay or lesbian respondents, 23.4% of bisexual respondents and 17.2% of heterosexual respondents who experienced this form of incivility weekly or more frequently.

Interpersonal Mistreatment Attributed to Sexual Orientation

The frequencies of experienced interpersonal mistreatment due to sexual orientation as reported by respondents who identified as gay or lesbian, or as bisexual are presented in Tables 33 and 34, respectively.

Of the respondents who identified as gay or lesbian, 68.5% of police officers and 74.2% of police staff reported they had not experienced derogatory comments about their sexual orientation from someone in their force in the past 12 months. However, 22.9% of police officers and 19.3% of police staff who identified as gay or lesbian reported they had experienced derogatory comments about their sexual orientation once or twice in the past 12 months, and 8.7% of police officers and 6.4% of police staff who identified as gay or lesbian reported a frequency of monthly or above.

**Table 33: Frequency of Experienced Interpersonal Mistreatment
due to Sexual Orientation, for <u>Gay or Lesbian Respondents</u>**

Response	Police Officer Respondents		Police Staff Respondents	
	%	*n*	%	*n*
Experienced derogatory comments about their sexual orientation				
Never	68.5	389	74.2	285
Once or Twice	22.9	130	19.3	74
Monthly or more frequently	8.7	49	6.4	25
Heard jokes or stories about their sexual orientation that were offensive to them				
Never	72.1	410	73.4	282
Once or Twice	19.9	113	19.5	75
Monthly or more frequently	8.1	46	7.0	27
Were excluded from a social interaction during or after work because of their sexual orientation				
Never	88.2	502	93.8	360
Once or Twice	7.7	44	3.9	15
Monthly or more frequently	4.1	23	2.3	9

<u>Note</u>: We measured individuals' experiences of interpersonal mistreatment in their workplace by someone in their force over the past 12 months, which they perceived as related to their sexual orientation.

Of the respondents who identified as bisexual, see Table 34, below, 77.9% of police officers and 81.0% of police staff reported they had not experienced derogatory comments about their sexual orientation from someone in their force in the past 12 months. However, 15.9% of police officers and 15.1% of police staff who identified as bisexual reported that they had experienced derogatory comments about their sexual orientation once or twice in the past 12 months, and 6.3% of police officers and 3.8% of police staff who identified as bisexual reported a frequency of monthly or above.

Respondents who identified as gay or lesbian also reported how frequently they had heard people at work make jokes or tell stories about their sexual orientation that they felt were offensive; 72.1% of police officers and 73.4% of police staff who identified as gay or lesbian

reported not experiencing this form of interpersonal mistreatment. However, 19.9% of police officers and 19.5% of police staff who identified as gay or lesbian reported experiencing this once or twice in the past 12 months, and 8.1% of police officers and 7.0% of police staff who identified as gay or lesbian reported a frequency of monthly or above.

**Table 34: Frequency of Experienced Interpersonal Mistreatment
due to Sexual Orientation, for <u>Bisexual Respondents</u>**

Response	Police Officer Respondents		Police Staff Respondents	
	%	*n*	%	*n*
Experienced derogatory comments about their sexual orientation				
Never	77.9	250	81.0	252
Once or Twice	15.9	51	15.1	47
Monthly or more frequently	6.3	20	3.8	12
Heard jokes or stories about their sexual orientation that were offensive to them				
Never	81.9	263	80.4	251
Once or Twice	13.7	44	15.1	47
Monthly or more frequently	4.4	14	4.4	14
Were excluded from a social interaction during or after work because of their sexual orientation				
Never	96.9	311	96.8	299
Once or Twice	2.2	7	2.6	8
Monthly or more frequently	0.9	3	0.6	2

<u>Note</u>: We measured individuals' experiences of interpersonal mistreatment in their workplace by someone in their force over the past 12 months, which they perceived as related to their sexual orientation.

81.9% of police officers and 80.4% of police staff who identified as bisexual reported not experiencing people at work making offensive jokes or telling stories about their sexual orientation. However, 13.7% of police officers and 15.1% of police staff who identified as bisexual reported experiencing this once or twice in the past 12 months, and 4.4% of police officers and 4.4% of police staff who identified as bisexual reported a frequency of monthly or above.

88.2% of police officers and 93.8% of police staff who identified as gay or lesbian reported not experiencing social exclusion during or after work by someone in their force because of their sexual orientation in the past 12 months. 7.7% of police officers and 3.9% of police staff who identified as gay or lesbian reported experiencing this once or twice in the past 12 months, and 4.1% of police officers and 2.3% of police staff who identified as gay or lesbian reported a frequency of monthly or above.

96.9% of police officers and 96.8% of police staff who identified as bisexual reported not experiencing social exclusion during or after work by someone in their force because of their sexual orientation in the past 12 months. However, 2.2% of police officers and 2.6% of police staff who identified as bisexual reported experiencing this once or twice in the past 12 months, and 0.9% of police officers and 0.6% of police staff who identified as bisexual reported a frequency of monthly or above.

Wellbeing

No material differences were found for the average emotional energy scores reported between respondents who identified as gay or lesbian and respondents who identified as heterosexual.

Bisexual police officer respondents reported, on average, lower levels of emotional energy and job satisfaction. Bisexual police staff respondents also reported a lower level of emotional energy; however, their job satisfaction was reported at a similar average level to gay or lesbian and heterosexual respondents.

Professional Commitment and Work Effort

Professional commitment was reported at a high average level with no material differences between respondents who identified as gay or lesbian, bisexual, or heterosexual. There were no material differences found between the very high work effort average scores reported by police officer and police staff respondents who identified as gay or lesbian, bisexual, or heterosexual. These results suggest that, on average, respondents are dedicated to policing and invest very high levels of effort into their work.

4 GLOSSARY OF KEY MEASURES

Antagonism (Minority Groups) - This measure looks at antagonism towards workplace policies designed to help members of minority groups and promote inclusion, and is a more subtle way of measuring prejudice. Lower levels of antagonism relate to more positive attitudes towards diversity, equality and inclusion. As such, a lower average score is more desirable for this measure as it indicates lower levels of prejudice.

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. A higher score on this measure reflects a high level of wellbeing.

Experienced Interpersonal Mistreatment - We measured interpersonal mistreatment based on disability, ethnicity, gender, gender identity, religion/beliefs, and sexual orientation. Individuals were asked how frequently they had experienced interpersonal mistreatment from someone in their force while at work over the past 12 months which they perceived as derogatory and demeaning.

Experienced Unfair Treatment - Individuals may feel that a protected characteristic has resulted in them not receiving the recognition they deserve, has limited them from gaining opportunities for development, and has negatively affected their career promotion opportunities. We measured individuals' perceptions of unfair treatment due to disability, ethnicity, gender, gender identity, religion/beliefs, and sexual orientation.

Force Inclusive Employment Practices - We asked respondents to what extent they feel their force values people for who they are as people and not just for the jobs they fill, has fair processes for job selection and promotion, invests in the development of all its people,

provides safe ways for them to voice their grievances, and is committed to having a diverse workforce. A higher score on this measure reflects a more positive perception of inclusivity.

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. A higher score on this measure is more positive as it indicates that individuals are more satisfied in their work.

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 the individual has a dedication to that particular occupation, and that they feel a sense of responsibility to contribute to its success. A higher score on this measure is more desirable as it reflects a higher level of an individual's professional commitment.

Supervisor Listening - Supervisor listening signals to individuals that their supervisor is open, interested and supportive, leading to employees feeling more comfortable when approaching and talking to their supervisor. A higher score on this measure is more desirable.

Supportive Organisational Approach to Overcoming Bias (Minority Groups) - As workplaces are increasingly becoming more inclusive and sensitive to issues of diversity, they communicate these values to employees in ways that are more or less pressuring. Communicating about inclusion and non-bias in ways that are autonomy supportive, or non-pressuring, gives people the opportunity to explore and better understand why non-bias may be important to them. This autonomy supportive organisational approach is made up of providing individuals with *choice* (finding own way), *rationale* (needs and reasons for changes are communicated), *perspective taking* (individuals' views are considered), *supportive structure* (helping to accomplish new changes) and *introjection* (not pressurising or shaming).

Team Inclusive Climate - *Team integration of differences* reflects expectations and norms regarding the openness with which people can be their *"true"* selves without suffering adverse consequences in their work teams. Integration of differences within work teams ensures the differences between individuals are appreciated, respected and valued, and that team members feel it is important to resolve misunderstandings or personal conflicts that occur.

Inclusive organisations adopt a belief that people's diverse backgrounds act as a source of learning and knowledge that should be utilised to improve organisational functioning. *Team inclusion in decision making* refers to the extent to which an individual feels that perspectives from diverse groups are actively and authentically sought and integrated into decision making procedures within their work team, and whether they feel ideas are judged based on their quality rather than who expresses them. In inclusive climates, perspectives that might upset the status quo are not viewed as a threat, but rather as a valuable source of information.

Higher scores on these measures are desirable as they reflect a culture of inclusivity within the individual's team.

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.

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.

5   REFERENCES

Abrams, D., Swift, H., and Houston, D. (2018). *Developing a national barometer of prejudice and discrimination in Britain*. Equality and Human Rights Commission Research, Report 119.

Al-Khouja, M., Graham, L., Weinstein, N., and Zheng, Y. (2020). How autonomy support and ethical value alignment influences attitudes towards diversity in English police. *Journal of Moral Education*, 1-16.

Brown, J., Gouseti, I., and Fife-Schaw, C. (2018). Sexual harassment experienced by police staff serving in England, Wales and Scotland: A descriptive exploration of incidence, antecedents and harm. *The Police Journal*, 91(4), 356-374.

Ferdman, B. M. (2014). *The practice of inclusion in diverse organizations: Toward a systemic and inclusive framework.* In B. M. Ferdman & B. R. Deane (Eds.), *The professional practice series. Diversity at work: The practice of inclusion* (p. 3-54). Jossey-Bass/Wiley.

Ferdman, B. M., and Sagiv, L. (2012). Diversity in organizations and cross-cultural work psychology: What if they were more connected? *Industrial and Organizational Psychology: Perspectives on Science and Practice*, 5, 323-345.

Fiol, C. M., Pratt, M. G., and O'Connor, E. J. (2009). Managing intractable identity conflicts. *Academy of Management Review, 34*(1), 32-55.

Graham, L., and Gracey, S. (2019). Diversity, Equality and Inclusion in Policing: Achieving Inclusive Climates through Front-line Supervisors. *5th Policing Conference 2019*.

Hayes, A. F. (2017). *Introduction to mediation, moderation, and conditional process analysis: A regression-based approach*. Guilford publications.

Holdaway, S., and O'Neill, M. (2007). Where has all the racism gone? Views of racism within constabularies after Macpherson. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 30(3), 397-415.

Jones, K. P., Peddie, C. I., Gilrane, V. L., King, E. B., and Gray, A. L. (2016). Not so subtle: A meta-analytic investigation of the correlates of subtle and overt discrimination. *Journal of Management*, 42(6), 1588-1613.

Kelley, N., Khan, O., and Sharrock, S. (2017). Racial prejudice in Britain today. *London: NatCen Social Research and Runnymede Trust*.

Kobrynowicz, D., and Branscombe, N. R. (1997). Who considers themselves victims of discrimination? Individual difference predictors of perceived gender discrimination in women and men. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 21(3), 347-363.

Lloyd, K. J., Boer, D., Keller, J. W., and Voelpel, S. (2015). Is my boss really listening to me? The impact of perceived supervisor listening on emotional exhaustion, turnover intention, and organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *130*(3), 509-524.

Miller, F., and Katz, J. (2002)*. Inclusion breakthrough: Unleashing the real power of diversity.* Berrett-Koehler Publishers.

Nishii, L. H. (2013). The benefits of climate for inclusion for gender-diverse groups. *Academy of Management Journal*, *56*(6), 1754-1774.

Nishii, L. H., and Mayer, D. M. (2009). Do inclusive leaders help to reduce turnover in diverse groups? The moderating role of leader–member exchange in the diversity to turnover relationship. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *94*(6), 1412.

Nishii, L. H., & Rich, R. E. (2014). Creating inclusive climates in diverse organizations. In B.M. Ferdman & B.R. Deane (Eds.), *Diversity at work: The practice of inclusion* (330–363). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Randel, A. E., Galvin, B. M., Shore, L. M., Ehrhart, K. H., Chung, B. G., Dean, M. A., and Kedharnath, U. (2018). Inclusive leadership: Realizing positive outcomes through belongingness and being valued for uniqueness. *Human Resource Management Review*, *28*(2), 190-203.

Raver, J. L., & Nishii, L. H. (2010). Once, twice, or three times as harmful? Ethnic harassment, gender harassment, and generalized workplace harassment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *95*(2), 236.

Zurbrügg, L., and Miner, K. N. (2016). Gender, sexual orientation, and workplace incivility: Who is most targeted and who is most harmed?. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *7*, 565.