



# **INSPECTORS'** **CENTRAL COMMITTEE**

**Police Federation of England and Wales**

## **Membership Census 2003**

### **Force Supplement Thames Valley**



---

The University of Reading





**INSPECTORS'**  
**CENTRAL COMMITTEE**

## **FORCE SUPPLEMENT**

**This supplement provides specific data and a copy of the two report summaries; it should be read in conjunction with the full data sets in the main report.**

### **Contents**

Introduction

Summary of National Census Findings

Work Life Balance Executive Summary

Force Data



# Section 1 Introduction

## Background

- 1.1 It is now a full ten years since Parliament changed Police Regulations in relation to Chief Inspectors and Inspectors as a result of the Sheehy Inquiry into Police Responsibilities and Rewards. The outcome of this was to make these key members of the police service 'salaried'; it also removed definitions of a working day. The Inquiry also recommended that the Chief Inspector rank was not necessary and should be removed. A last minute reprieve saw the rank remain but without a proper pay spine: Chief Inspectors' pay was bolted on to the top end of the Inspectors' pay spine. The reward for being salaried was an upgrade to pay of £3,500 and £3,000 for Inspectors and Chief Inspectors respectively.
- 1.2 It was the fear and concern of the Inspectors' Central Committee (ICC) at the time that these changes would lead to an abuse of our members in these ranks, and that unscrupulous managers would seek to work them for inordinately long hours to compensate the force for the increased salary.
- 1.3 In 2000 the ICC launched its overstretch campaign, highlighting to Ministers, the Home Office and ACPO that there was no more resilience in the Police Inspector and Chief Inspector ranks and that the decline in numbers must cease.
- 1.4 So as we approach this significant anniversary the ICC felt that the time was appropriate to put the last ten years under the microscope and analyse the impact on our members and the Police Service.

## Police Numbers

- 1.5 In the past ten years the number of Inspectors has reduced from 6,767 in 1993 to 6,282 in 2003, and Chief Inspector from 2,133 to 1,662, this being a reduction of 7.2% for Inspectors and 22.1% for Chief Inspectors. However in 2002, the Chief Inspector numbers fell to 1550, and in 1999 the Inspectors fell to 5936<sup>1</sup>.
- 1.6 This does not reveal the full story as the numbers within the management and supervisory arm of the police ranks have fallen substantially over the last ten years, whilst those in the constable ranks remained relatively constant until the millennium, and have increased significantly over the past 3 years. Table 1 Overleaf shows the extent of this. The loss of such numbers has had a significant impact upon our members.

---

<sup>1</sup> Home Office Statistics excluding seconded officers.

**Table 1: Police Numbers in Forces by Rank - March 1993 to March 2003**

This table excludes all secondments as they were not originally included in 1993 – 1996 figures							
Figures from Home Office Research, Development and Statistics Directorate (Now National Statistics)							
October 2003							
YEAR	C C	A C C	Supt	Ch Insp	Insp	Sgt	Constables
1993	46	176	1,873	2,133	6,767	19,632	95,501
1994	46	158	1,668	1,990	6,652	19,377	95,915
1995	51	155	1,414	1,842	6,559	19,132	96,027
1996	50	145	1,318	1,706	6,272	18,832	96,521
1997	48	145	1,290	1,679	6,164	18,811	96,914
1998	49	143	1,230	1,609	6,050	18,603	97,072
1999	49	151	1,213	1,604	5,936	18,738	96,150
31.03.00	47	149	1,226	1,574	5,941	18,500	94,518
30.09.00	47	145	1,174	1,557	5,892	18,421	94,966
31.03.01	46	149	1,218	1,552	6,012	18,601	95,899
30.09.01	48	147	1,229	1,566	6,035	18,608	97,337
31.03.02	53	151	1,256	1,550	6,196	18,574	99,488
30.09.02	ACPO	191	1,259	1,616	6,228	18,549	102,443
31.03.03	ACPO	195	1258	1662	6282	18,732	104,380
<b>Number change 1993 to 31.03.03 +/-</b>		<b>-27</b>	<b>-615</b>	<b>-471</b>	<b>-485</b>	<b>-900</b>	<b>8,879</b>
<b>% Change +/- *</b>		<b>-12.2%</b>	<b>-32.8%</b>	<b>-22.1%</b>	<b>-7.2%</b>	<b>-4.6%</b>	<b>9.3%</b>
Number change if the same % change as the Inspecting Ranks	ACPO	-19	-200			-2,101	-10,219
<b>Number and % Change Inspecting Ranks</b>				<b>-956 (-10.7%)</b>			

## Change

- 1.7 Along with others in the public sector the police service has seen significant change over the past ten years, some legislative but most connected to service delivery. The biggest single drivers for this change have been the insatiable demand to improve performance, the production of performance data, and the devolvement of responsibilities. The Inspecting ranks have been at the forefront of that change as divisions have been replaced by BCU's, and Sub-divisions by Sectors with our members being responsible for performance. Geographical areas previously commanded by a Chief Superintendent or Superintendent are more often than not now the responsibility of Chief Inspectors and Inspectors.
- 1.8 Legislative changes too have had an impact upon our ranks as we have seen responsibilities under PACE being transferred from Superintendent to Inspector.

- 1.9 Operationally we now see Inspectors and Chief Inspectors routinely used as silver commanders for firearms incidents instead of Superintendents and with the proliferation of these types of operations, and as callout becomes the norm, we see Detective Inspectors and Detective Chief Inspectors used more frequently as SIO's.

## The Survey

- 1.10 The ICC had received anecdotal evidence that our members were working excessive hours and that forces were failing to comply with the requirements of Police Regulations and the Working Time Regulations. It was additionally reported that call out regimes were the norm in some forces.
- 1.11 In order to assess our members' views on working time, call out, roles performed etc. we felt that the best way to achieve this would be by way of a membership census. In conjunction with Dr. Peter Moran of The Bolton Institute a methodology was agreed for the census (Section 2), to comprise a questionnaire, one to one interviews and focus groups.
- 1.12 As a result a questionnaire (Appendix A) was sent out via Branch Board Secretaries to our membership at the beginning of November 2003. 178 one to one e-mail interviews and 8 focus group discussions were conducted during January and February 2004.
- 1.13 From a membership base of 8,195 Inspectors and Chief Inspectors, 5034 questionnaires were returned by 31 December 2003 for analysis. This represents a robust return of 61.4%. The full response to the questionnaire is shown in section 3 of this report.

## The Study

- 1.14 In addition to the census, the ICC commissioned a study by Almuth McDowell of The City University, London into 'The Co-relationship between the Inspecting Role, work life balance and illness'. This study, which has been ratified by Professor John Rust, also of the City University London, the country's leading expert in psychometric testing, is presented at section 5 of this report.

## Section 2 Summary of Census Findings

Some of the main findings of the ICC membership census were as follows:

- ❖ 42% of respondents categorised their role as specialist, but 75% said they performed roles other than their main function. In the focus groups our members felt that this was because there were insufficient numbers in the inspecting ranks and in to order get the job done, other roles had to be performed. *(This finding supports the stance of the ICC in its 'Overstretch Campaign'<sup>2</sup> to increase the number of Inspecting Ranks in England and Wales.)*



**The Inspectors' Central Committee lobby of Parliament November 2002**

- ❖ A significant 54.6% of our membership indicated that they were required to be on callout or standby between tours of duty. Additionally 47% of those were required to be on call out on rest days, and even 4% (201 officers) whilst on annual leave.
- ❖ In relation to working hours 4% indicated that they worked 40 hours or less, 41 % worked more than 40 hours but less than 48, and an alarming 56% indicated that they worked in excess of the permitted 48 hours a week maximum as laid down in the Working Time Regulations.
- ❖ We determined through focus groups that only a few roles had been risk assessed.

---

<sup>2</sup> Overstretch campaign commenced Oct 2002, calling upon Home Office and Chief Officers to reverse decline in Inspecting numbers. Since campaign commenced numbers have grown by a total of 496.

- ❖ 64% of respondents' working hours were recorded, normally by the member him/herself, but 56% stated that their working hours were never monitored.
- ❖ Many respondents said they frequently worked extended hours at short notice, 40 % on most working days.
- ❖ 62% and 43% of respondents were unable to take their full rest day or leave entitlement respectively. 58% reported that they had difficulty in taking days off that were owed, and 72% admitted to taking work home with them.
- ❖ 35,031 rest days, and 15,065 leave days were not taken. *(If you were to enable the respondents to take all the days owing to them you would need to appoint a further 223 Inspecting posts, and this is just what we know about.)*
- ❖ 31% of the respondents indicated that they took annual instead of sick leave, in order to avoid a sickness record, which they felt would damage their career prospects or prevent them from being awarded/keeping their CRTP.
- ❖ 55% of respondents stated that they worked excessive hours on days, which incorporated pre-planned events, of which 40 % reported that this prevented them from having a rest day for between 8 and 15 days.
- ❖ 34% of respondents said that they had to work between 8 and 15 days before a rest day owing to a spontaneous event, with 2% stating that they had to work between 15 and 20 days before a rest day.
- ❖ Three out of four respondents, 74%, said that they were expected to attend meetings outside of working hours.
- ❖ 38 % reported that they suffered some form of illness owing to the excessive demands placed upon them.

# Work Life Balance

## Executive Summary

### Key findings

➔ **'Work/work balance':** Inspectors work long and irregular hours without much control over the hours worked, this has a negative impact on their work/life balance, affecting their private life outside work

➔ Inspectors report that their workload has increased over the last five years, resulting in inspectors doing extra work outside hours and from home, juggling multiple roles and a perception of increased stress

➔ Inspectors report that their health has suffered as a result of work

### Brief

It was our brief to provide the ICC with consultation on their ICC census instrument and to analyze the findings with a focus on the work/life balance and work stress indices to determine the sources of work/life balance problems and job-related stress.

### Summary of background research

The working conditions of Police inspectors are different from other occupations, as a number of different stressors interact and may impact on the work/life balance:

- 1) **Long working hours:** Both acute (how many hours during the day) and cumulative (the number of hours over weeks/months) hours can be problematic. Existing research says that long hours have a negative affect on the work/life balance and on health
- 2) **On-call duty:** On-call duty is stressful (since no real rest is possible), the longer on-call duty continues, the more stressful it is. As their work patterns are irregular, inspectors are effectively doing shift-work. Extensive research shows that this impacts on physical and mental health
- 3) **Control:** Employees need to have control over their work (e.g. design of shifts and number of hours worked) otherwise their mental and physical well-being can be affected

- 4) **Organizational factors:** This includes the prevailing culture, the necessity to fulfill multiple roles and an absence of managerial support, the basic design of the role of inspectors
- 5) **Demographic variables:** Research has shown that those who have children and/or adults to look after find it harder to juggle work and private life

## Summary of findings

The following is a brief overview of our main findings, beginning with a description of what we mean when we refer to “Work/life Balance”.

### Work/life balance

Work/life balance is about people’s ability to juggle their work and private life, without one having a detrimental impact on the other. Ideally, a good work/life balance should mean that work and activities outside work enhance each other. We looked at people’s home life, social life and leisure time both separately and as a combined index. We found that all respondents reported a negative impact on their work life balance. We also found that certain groups of inspectors and chief inspectors report to a greater extent than others that work interferes with their private life. The key findings are listed below:

### Hours worked

#### **Control over working hours:**

60% of those who feel that they don’t have control over the hours they work report an adverse effect on their work-life balance (for home/social life and leisure time), compared to 23% of those who do have control.

#### **Long working hours:**

There is a clear trend here in that the more hours employees work per week, the more of an impact they experience on their work-life balance (from 21% of those working less than 40 hours saying that home/social life and leisure time are all affected, to 100% for those who work more than 80 hours). Being allocated extra duties also has an adverse effect on work/life balance, with nearly 50% of those affected reporting problems.

#### **Working outside hours:**

Holding meetings outside working hours impacts negatively on work/life balance, as 49% of those who say that this occurs regularly say that both home/social life and leisure time are affected. Taking work home also has a negative effect, with nearly 50% of those who take work home reporting an adverse effect on their work/life balance.

#### **On call duty:**

Being required on call (between tours of duty) has negative implications for work/life balance. Over 50% of those who are on-call say that home and social life have been affected by their work. Being on call during rest days seems to have a more pronounced effect on work/life balance, as over half who say that they are on call during rest days report that both home/ social life and leisure time are affected. Being

on call during holidays has the highest impact, as nearly 70% of those who are on call during those times say that home/social life and leisure time have all been affected by their work.

## Elements of the job

### **Job roles:**

There is a difference between job roles. CID officers experience the greatest impact on their home/social life and leisure time. 58% of these officers reported this as a problem.

### **Staff supervision:**

The more staff an inspector supervises, the more of an impact they experience on their work-life balance

### **Workload:**

Workload is adversely related to work/life balance. 46% of those who feel their workload has increased say that home/social life and leisure time have been affected, whereas only 20% of those who think that it decreased say that this has been affected.

### **Seniority:**

Chief inspectors reported a larger impact on their home/social life and leisure time than inspectors.

### **Fulfilling multiple roles:**

Having to perform extra roles appears to have an effect on the work/life balance index, as nearly 50% of those who have extra roles to juggle report that home/social life and leisure time are all affected (compared to 35% in the 'no extra roles' group).

## Time off

### **Allocation of compensatory extra hours:**

The allocation of such hours ameliorates any effect on work/life balance, as those who get compensatory hours report less of an impact on home/social life and leisure time than those who do not.

### **Ability to take rest days:**

The ability to take rest days appears to improve work/life balance, as results on the work/life indicators are poorer for those who can't take rest days.

### **Taking time off to avoid sickness leave:**

Using annual leave allowance to avoid reporting sick leave has more of a negative effect on work/life balance than reporting sick leave accurately. Those who take time off for these reasons report bigger percentages on home/social life and leisure time affected (51% compared to 41%).

## Work-stress in the force

It appears from the results that Inspectors experience a number of stressors (factors that facilitate the experience of stress) as part of their everyday activities, and these can be summarised as follows:

- A high volume of work, necessitating long hours.
- A lack of control over the hours they work, especially on-call periods and major incidents.
- A lack of support while on leave / on rest days.
- A long hours culture and perceived lack of support from senior managers.

There is also a clear link between stress-related symptoms and the work/life balance, such that those who report that stress has increased also report a bigger impact on their work/life balance (nearly 50% of those who say that stress has increased also report a negative impact on home/social life and leisure time).

There is also a link between interpreting an illness as work-related and reporting a negative impact on work/life balance where those who believe that an illness was made worse by their job also report higher frequencies (nearly 55%) for the home/social life and leisure time all being affected by work. More specifically, with regard to the illnesses reported, there was a relationship between self-reported anxiety/depression and eye strain/headaches and negative work/life balance.

Essentially, the role of Inspector suffers from poor job design, requiring too much of the post holder on a regular basis, and providing no contingency (in the form of back-up) when required on an emergency basis.

## Private life

### Dependents:

Inspectors who have both adults and children dependents report the greatest impact on their work-life balance as 46% say that both home/social life and leisure time are affected. Those who have children report the greatest impact on their home life, whereas inspectors who don't have dependents say that their social life and leisure time suffers.

### Marital status:

The home life is much more affected for those who have a partner (19% vs 10% who don't have one), whereas social life and leisure time are more affected for those who are single.

## Summary of qualitative analyses

We further conducted an extensive analysis of inspectors' written comments. These were the key themes, all of which directly complement the quantitative results. Direct quotes are reported in italics:

### Impact on Personal Life:

Childcare is difficult to arrange and family relationships suffer: [...my child said] *"My Dad is a Policeman, I don't see him much"*. Relationships are put under great strain, especially if both partners work for the force. It is difficult to plan social events and maintain involvement in sports and hobbies. Rather than achieving a work/life balance, one officer called the current status quo a *'work/work balance'*.

**Hours and Workload:**

Inspectors regularly work excessive hours, often without adequate rest, and report little support from management or other support functions, for instance being told “*I [the inspector] should manage my time better*”. Rest days and annual leave are often cancelled due to staff shortages, and officers are also frustrated that they have to attend training or other events on days off duty. Many officers report excessive travelling time, adding to an already demanding schedule. Work is regularly taken home and the time spent on it is not officially recorded.

**On-Call Duty:**

Officers are frustrated by the restrictions imposed on them by on-call duty, including travel restrictions, the requirement to remain contactable and carry job-related equipment, while also being unable to consume alcohol. There is also an ‘informal on-call culture where officers are contacted 24/7 to give advice.

**Well-Being:**

Several officers indicated that they are currently off work with stress/anxiety/depression as a result of work. A range of additional physical problems were also identified, including cancer, strokes, recurrent infections and colitis (stress-related bowel condition). Others reported a difficulty in “switching off” after work, getting adequate sleep and having to use days off to catch up on rest. Many officers reported low morale and an intention to leave the force.

**Pay:**

The level of pay does not reflect the level of responsibility, according to the respondents; other complaints included not receiving pay for work at home, travelling time, and receiving take home pay less than more junior ranks.

**Managerial Support:**

There is a reliance on inspectors’ ‘goodwill’ to ensure that work is completed. The organizational support is not in place, despite the efforts of (some) individual line managers. An officer described it as ‘*battlefield management*’.

# Thames Valley


Sample Size:	117
--------------	-----

Inspectors:	97
Chief Inspectors:	20


Males:	98
Females:	19

Full Time	97
Part Time	5


## Current role




## Call/Standby between tours of duty




## Required to perform additional roles




## Restrictions placed while on call




## Required on call during rest days and leave




## Restrictions place while on call




### Average weekly hours





### Hours recorded by force




### Role covered during absence




### Ability to take leave entitlement




### Leave entitlement used to cover illness




### Reasons for using leave to cover illness




### Days worked without rest day due to spontaneous events




### Expected to hold meetings outside of normal hours




### Time in meetings recorded by force as working hours




### Time allocated to compensate extra hours



### Work taken home




### Workload over last 5 years




■ Increased ■ Hasn't Changed ■ Decreased

### Stress over last 5 years




■ Increased ■ Hasn't Changed ■ Decreased

### Support by managers over last 5 years




■ Increased ■ Hasn't Changed ■ Decreased

### Morale over last 5 years




■ Increased ■ Hasn't Changed ■ Decreased

### Sense of being valued over last 5 years




■ Increased ■ Hasn't Changed ■ Decreased


### Long hours at short notice since April '03




### Line manager's monitoring of working hours



### Work suspected of causing illness



## Illness types suffered



- Lung related
- Skin related
- Stress related
- Head related
- Heart related
- Infectious illness
- Other illness types

© Copyright Inspectors' Central Committee 2004.  
No part of this report may be reproduced in any format  
without the written consent of the Inspectors' Central Committee



**INSPECTORS'**  
**CENTRAL COMMITTEE**

Inspectors' Central Committee  
Police Federation of England and Wales  
15 – 17 Langley Road  
Surbiton, Surrey, KT6 6LP

Telephone 020 8339 9750  
E-Mail [icc@polfed.org](mailto:icc@polfed.org)