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The Organizational Climate and Diversity Assessment (ClimateQUAL™: OCDA) survey is a product of a joint venture between the University of Maryland (UM) Libraries, the UM Industrial/ Organizational (I/O) Psychology program and the Association of Research Libraries (ARL). The ClimateQUAL™: OCDA was designed to measure the “healthiness” of an organization. A healthy organization is one that maintains its sensitivity and responsiveness to the environment (Hanges, Aiken, & Chen, 2007). Specifically, healthy organizations have policies, practices, and procedures that empower employees and emphasize the importance of continual learning and innovation. It is one in which employee diversity and fairness are recognized as critical organizational imperatives (Hanges et al., 2007b).

The ClimateQUAL™: OCDA survey measures the following organizational climates:

1. **Climate for Organizational Justice** – the degree to which the organization has policies, practices, and procedures that are perceived as fair/just.

2. **Climate for Leadership** – the degree to which organizational leaders have good working relationships with employees and the extent to which they are trusted by employees. Also, the extent to which organizational leaders are passionate about customer service and seen as authentic.
3. **Climate for Interpersonal Treatment** – the degree to which employees perceive that their treatment within the organization are fair.

4. **Climate for Deep Diversity** – the degree to which an organization has policies, practices, and procedures that encourages diversity of ideas, values, and experiences.

5. **Climate for Demographic Diversity** – the degree to which organizational policies, practices, and procedures encourage diversity among employees in terms of race, gender, rank, and sexual orientation.

6. **Climate for Innovation** – the degree to which new ideas are encouraged and accepted and rewarded.

7. **Climate for Continual Learning** – the degree to which all employees are expected to and supported in the acquiring new knowledge and skills. In addition innovation is emphasized.

8. **Climate for Teamwork** – the degree to which staff perceives that teamwork is valued by the organization and to which they perceive that they are valued as team members. Includes perceptions of team climate for acceptance of diversity in: race, gender, rank, and sexual orientation.

9. **Climate for customer service** – the degree to which employees perceive that the institution values service quality.

The ClimateQUAL™: OCDA survey also measures the following set of organizational attitudes

1. **Job Satisfaction** – the degree to which staff exhibit satisfaction with their work.

2. **Organizational commitment** – the degree to which staff feel valued by the organization.
3. **Organizational citizenship behaviors** – the degree to which staff perceive that ‘professionalism’ is exhibited within the organization.

4. **Organizational withdrawal** – the degree to which employees explore other job opportunities or think about leaving their jobs.

5. **Task engagement** – the degree to which employees perceive their work as important.

6. **Psychological empowerment in the workplace** – the degree to which employees perceive they have influence within their teams.

7. **Work unit conflict** – the degree of disagreement amongst team members.

Table 1 provides the internal consistency reliability for each of the climate measures. Table 2 provides the internal consistency reliability for each of the attitude measures. Internal consistency measures the precision of a scale with respect to inconsistencies caused by wording differences among questions. The measure ranges from 0 (no precision) to 1 (perfect precision) with 0.70 usually considered the minimum level of precision that is acceptable (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994). As can be seen in both of these tables, the ClimateQUAL™: OCDA scales have considerable precision.

**Brief Background: What is the Healthy Organization?**

The ClimateQUAL™: OCDA survey is based on research in the organizational climate research literature. Organizational climate refers to the interpretative frameworks shared by employees regarding the priorities of their organization and it helps them understand what behavior is rewarded, supported, and expected in the organization (Schneider, 1990). Employees develop these
organizational perceptions as a result of their attempts to make “sense” of the policies, practices, and procedures endorsed and enacted in an organization. These perceptions become shared through formal and informal communication networks among employees (Newman, Hanges, Duan, & Ramesh, in press). In general, employees tend to moderate their behavior to be consistent with organizational climate. Stronger climates (i.e., organizational perceptions shared by more employees in an organization) are more effective at moderating employee behavior than weaker climates.

Early climate researchers measured employees’ overall organizational climate impressions. That is, they measured employees’ perceptions regarding various aspects of their work itself, their coworkers, the organizational reward system, and employee motivation (Ashforth, 1985; Newman, 1977). This particular approach to measuring climate turned out not to be useful for understanding employee behavior or organizational outcomes. However, in the 1990s, researchers started to fine-tune their measures of climate so that rather than asking general questions about the organizational climate, researchers started writing their climate surveys focusing on the extent to which organizational policies, practices, and procedures facilitate the attainment of particular organizational imperatives. These imperatives have been things like organizational climates for safety (Lyon, 2007; Zohar, 1980, 2000), innovation (Klein & Sorra, 1996), justice (Naumann & Bennett, 2000), ethics (Victor & Cullen, 1988), and customer service (Schneider & Bowen, 1985), to name a few. Measuring climate in this way proved to be very useful when trying to predict whether employees will exhibit the corresponding behavior. For example, Schneider, White and Paul (1998) found that customers report better service in divisions that have specific policies, practices, and procedures that facilitate customer service. Clearly, organizational climate has to be measured in a way that it is clear what organizational theme, goal, or priority is being rated.
The ClimateQUAL™: OCDA project extends the prior climate literature incorporating the concept of the healthy organization. A healthy organization is one that has a profile where several climate dimensions work synergistically to maintain the organization’s sensitivity and responsiveness to its environment (Hanges, Aiken, & Chen, 2007a, b). Specifically, a healthy organization has policies, practices, and procedures that empower employees and emphasize the importance of continual learning and innovation to meet the demands of an ever changing environment. It is one in which customer service, employee diversity, and organizational justice are all recognized as critical imperatives that will determine the effectiveness of the organization in the long run (Hanges et al., 2007a, b).

More precisely, the healthy organization has policies, practices, and procedures that create climates that send two simultaneous messages to their employees. First, organizations need to send a strong "concerned for employees" message to their employees. This message is sent when organizational policies suggest that things like teamwork, diversity, and justice are valued. Second, organizations also need to send a strong "concern for customers" message to their employees. This message is sent when organizational policies reinforce a climate for customer service (Schneider & Bowen, 1989). Organizations value their customers when they do such things as restructure the work environment to improve customer service and/or offer training and other resources to improve employee customer related skills and knowledge. When organizations have succeeded in developing a climate profile that sends these two messages, resultant employee behavior will be focused on maintaining a mutually beneficial relationship with the organization’s customers. Recent research supported by the joint venture of UM Libraries, the UM I/O Psychology program, and
ARL provides empirical evidence for the connection between these organizational climate concepts and customer satisfaction in a library setting. More information about this joint venture, the ClimateQUAL™: OCDA project, and recent empirical findings can be accessed online at http://www.lib.umd.edu/ocda
Sample

In early 2008, the ClimateQUAL™: OCDA was administered at the Cornell University library system. Of the 426 employees, 337 (79%) started the survey and 307 (72%) completed the survey. Table 3 shows the demographics for this sample. The group with the highest percentage of respondents from the sample came from the PSA: Olin/Kroch/Uris and Annex team and described themselves as female, White, Christian, and heterosexual. The modal age range of the respondents was 50 to 59.

Results

Table 4 shows the average score for each climate and attitude scale. This table also provides normative data for other libraries. Table 5 provides the standard deviations for each climate and attitude scale. Standard deviations provide an indication of the amount of respondent agreement for each scale. Smaller standard deviations indicate greater agreement around the scale average. Table 6 provides the standard error (SE) for each climate and attitude scale. SEs indicate the margin of error associated with each scale average. Finally, to aid the interpretation of the scale averages, we also provide Table 7 and Appendices A and B. Table 7 shows the percentage of employees agreeing with the statements in each scale. Appendix A contains figures illustrating the organizational climate scale averages for the libraries in the normative sample. Appendix B contains figures illustrating the percentage agreement for the organizational climate scales for the libraries in the normative sample. Appendix C contains information regarding demographic differences in responses to these scales.
Organizational Climate

As indicated previously, organizational climate refers to the interpretative frameworks shared by employees regarding the priorities of their organization and it helps them understand what behavior is rewarded, supported, and expected in the organization (Schneider, 1990). Employees develop these organizational perceptions as a result of their attempts to make “sense” of the policies, practices, and procedures endorsed and enacted in an organization. There are 9 ClimateQUAL™: OCDA organizational climate scales.

1. Organizational Climate for Justice

This construct reflects the degree to which the organization has policies, practices, and procedures that treat employees fairly and justly. Research has shown that Organizational Climate for Justice can be separated into four dimensions. Specifically, Distributive Justice - the degree to which staff perceives that rewards are fairly distributed based upon performance. Procedural Justice - the degree to which staff perceives the procedures that determine the distribution of rewards are uniformly applied. Interpersonal Justice - the degree to which staff perceives there is fairness and respectfulness between employees and supervisors. Informational Justice - the degree to which staff perceives the explanation for distribution of procedures and rewards are provided.

- Distributive Justice. Distributive Justice reflects the employees’ perceptions regarding the extent to which the rewards that they receive (e.g., pay, opportunities to advance, etc.) is adequate given their level of effort and work. A sample question is “do the rewards in your division reflect the effort that division members put into their work”. This measure ranged from
The average for the Cornell University employees was 3.00. Approximately, 35% of the employees agreed that the library had a climate for distributive justice.

- **Procedural Justice.** While Distributive Justice addresses the fairness of outcomes, Procedural Justice addresses the fairness of the procedures used to come to those outcomes (i.e. performance evaluations, amongst others). A sample question is “have the procedures used to determine rewards been applied consistently”. This measure ranged from 1 (low levels) to 5 (high levels). The average for the Cornell University employees was 3.42. Approximately, 52% of the employees agreed that the library had a climate for procedural justice.

- **Interpersonal Justice.** Interpersonal justice refers to the extent to which other people in the workplace, such as supervisors, treat an employee fairly. A sample question is “has the authority figure who determines rewards treated division members in a polite manner”. This measure ranged from 1 (low levels) to 5 (high levels). Employees reported an average score of 4.29. Approximately, 82% of the employees agreed that the library had a climate for interpersonal justice.

- **Informational Justice.** Informational justice refers to whether or not an employee has access to the information he/she needs. This type of justice indicates that transparency—that is, supervisors being honest and open with employees—is imperative to an employee’s sense of justice in the workplace. A sample question is “has the authority figure who determines rewards for your division explained procedures thoroughly”. This scale ranged from 1 (low) to 5 (high). Employees reported an average score of 3.54. Approximately 56% of the employees agreed with these questions.

2. **Climate for Leadership**
This construct assesses the nature of organizational leadership. It assesses whether leaders have good working relationships with employees as well as the extent to which leaders are trusted by employees. Also, it measures the extent to which leaders are seen as authentic and perceived to be truly passionate about customer service. There were four dimensions to this construct. In each of these dimensions, the term “leader” is used to denote employees’ immediate supervisor(s).

- **Trust in Leadership.** Trust in Leadership reflects the extent to which an individual feels he/she can trust his/her leader. A sample question is “If I shared any problems with my immediate supervisor, I know he/she would keep my confidence”. This scale ranged from 1 (low trust) to 5 (high trust). Cornell University library employees reported an average score on this scale of 4.11. Approximately 75% of the Cornell University employees agreed that they trusted their leaders.

- **Leader Member Relationship Quality.** Leader Member Relationship Quality refers to the quality of an individual’s relationship with their immediate supervisor. A sample question is “I can count on my immediate supervisor to support me even when I’m in a tough situation at work”. This scale ranged from 1 (poor relationship) to 7 (excellent relationship). Cornell University employees had an average score of 5.77 with 82% of the employees agreeing that they have a good relationship with their leaders.

- **Manager’s Passion for Service.** When a manager consistently enacts policies, practices, and procedures dedicated to improving service, he/she is said to have a “passion” for service. A sample question is “My immediate supervisor is very
committed to improving the quality of our area’s work and service”. This scale ranged from 1 (lowest level) to 5 (highest level). The average score was 4.08 with 81% of the employees agreeing that their managers have a passion for service.

- **Authentic Transformational Leadership.** An authentic transformational leader is ethical, honest, and inspiring. Employees of authentic transformational leaders report these leaders as being highly transparent—that is, that the transformational leader is consistent in their actions, and that the leader truly believes what he/she claims he believes. A sample question is “My immediate supervisor is convincing when communicating his/her vision”. This measure ranged from 1 (low authenticity) to 5 (high authenticity). The average score was 3.99 with 74% of employees reporting that they thought their leaders were authentic.

3. **Climate for Interpersonal Treatment**

An organization with a Climate for Interpersonal Treatment emphasizes positive treatment of employees, both from the top of the organization down and also amongst employees themselves. This scale was separated into two themes.

- **Team-Level Interpersonal Treatment.** This theme refers to the amount of respect and fair interpersonal treatment amongst team members. A sample question is “Coworkers argue with each other”. This scale ranged from 1 (poor interpersonal treatment among team members) to 5 (good interpersonal treatment among team members). The average score was 3.79. Approximately 68% of the employees agreed that there were good interpersonal treatment among team members.
Managers Interpersonal Treatment of Employees. This theme refers to the amount of respect and fair interpersonal treatment of employees by managers in general throughout the library. That is, the term “manager” does not refer only to respondents’ immediate supervisors, but to managers on average within the library. A sample question is “Employees are treated as children”. It ranged from 1 (poor interpersonal treatment of employees by managers) to 5 (good interpersonal treatment of employees by managers). The Cornell University average was 3.81. Approximately 72% of the employees agreed that managers treated the employees well.

4. Climate for Deep Diversity

Climate for deep diversity refers to the extent that the organization has policies, practices, and procedures that encourage diversity of ideas, values, and experiences. Four dimensions were measured.

- Non-discriminatory Practices, reflects the extent to which the organization participates in non-discriminatory practices. A sample question is “This organization engages in discriminatory hiring practices”. This scale ranged from 1 (least positive climate) to 6 (most positive climate). The average score was 5.21. Approximately 92% of the employees agreed that the library has non-discriminatory practices.

- Standardization of Procedures Across Groups, refers to the consistency of application of procedures across subgroups. A sample question is “Performance reviews are based on objective criteria that minimize personal biases and prejudices”. This scale ranged from 1 (least positive climate) to 6 (most positive climate). The average score was 4.74 with 84% of employees agreeing that organizational procedures are applied equally to everyone.
- **Valuing Diversity**, reflects the extent to which the organization values diversity and diversity-related initiatives. A sample question is “This organization values the different perspectives that employees bring to the workplace”. This scale ranged from 1 (least positive climate) to 6 (most positive climate). The average score was 4.93 with 87% of the employees agreeing that their organization values diversity.

5. **Climate for Demographic Diversity**

The Climate for Demographic Diversity reflects the extent to which the library has policies, practices and procedures that support diversity among minority and majority employees. Four dimensions were assessed.

- **Climate for Demographic Diversity: Race**, refers to the extent to which the library supports racial diversity. A sample question is “The race of a team/work unit member does **NOT** affect how they are valued on this team/work unit”. The scale ranged from 1 (low racial climate) to 5 (high climate for diversity). The Cornell University average was 4.63 with 95% of the employees agreeing that the Cornell University library system has a climate supportive of racial diversity.

- **Climate for Demographic Diversity: Gender**, reflects the extent to which an individual team supports diversity of genders. A sample question is “The gender of a team/work unit member does **NOT** affect how they are valued on this team/work unit”. The scale ranged from 1 (low gender diversity) to 5 (high gender diversity). The average score was 4.52 with 90% of the employees indicating that Cornell University has a climate for gender diversity.

- **Climate for Demographic Diversity: Rank**, reflects whether the library has a climate that supports diversity among employees of different rank. A sample question is “The rank of a team/work unit member does **NOT** affect how they are
valued on this team/work unit”. This scale ranged from 1 (low rank diversity) to 5 (high rank diversity). The average score was 3.66 with 62% of the employees agreeing that the library has a climate for rank diversity.

- **Climate for Demographic Diversity: Sexual Orientation**, assesses the extent to which the library has a climate supportive of sexual-orientation related diversity. A sample question is “The sexual orientation of a team/work unit member does NOT affect how they are valued on this team/work unit”. This scale ranged from 1 (low sexual orientation diversity) to 5 (high sexual orientation diversity). The average score was 4.60 with 95% of the employees agreeing that the library has a climate for sexual orientation diversity.

6. **Climate for Innovation**

A Climate for Innovation refers to the degree to which an organization encourages independent, creative thinking on the part of its employees. Two dimensions were measured for this construct.

- **Climate for Innovation: Supervisory**, refers to the actions that supervisors engage in, including assigning jobs, that reflect a concern for innovation. A sample question is “independent and innovative thinking are encouraged by supervisors”. The scale ranged from 1 (least positive climate for innovation from supervisor) to 5 (strongest climate for innovation from supervisor). The average score was 3.57 with 62% of the employees agreeing that their supervisors encourage innovation.

- **Climate for Innovation: Co-Workers**, refers to the extent to which co-workers encourage each other to share and come up with innovative solutions. A sample question is “coworkers tell each other about other new information that can be used to increase job performance”. The scale ranged from 1 (least positive climate for innovation from co-workers) to 5
(strongest climate for innovation from co-workers). The average was 3.82 with 76% of the employees agreeing that co-workers encourage innovation in the library.

7. Climate for Continual Learning

An organization with a Climate for Continual Learning has policies, practices, and procedures that emphasize continued employee education. A sample question is “there is excellent on-the-job training”. This scale ranged from 1 (poor continual learning climate) to 5 (strong continual learning climate). The average was 3.82 with 75% percent of the employees agreeing that Cornell University has a climate for continual learning.

8. Climate for Teamwork

An organization with a Climate for Teamwork enacts policies, practices, and procedures that emphasize the importance and usefulness of teamwork. Four dimensions were measured regarding this climate.

- **Employee Belief in Benefits of Teamwork**, concerns employees’ opinions of the usefulness and importance of teamwork. A sample question is “Teamwork is important to completing work in this organization”. This scale ranged from 1 (weakest employee belief in benefit of teamwork) to 7 (strong employee belief in benefit of teamwork). The average was 5.81 with 90% of the employees agreeing that teamwork is beneficial.

- **Organizational Value of Teamwork** reflects how much the organization as a whole values and appreciates teamwork. A sample question is “This organization values teamwork”. This scale ranged from 1 (weakest organizational value of
teamwork) to 7 (strongest organizational value of teamwork). The average was 5.51 with 81% of the employees agreeing that the organization values teamwork.

- *Structural Facilitation of Teamwork*, refers to the degree to which the organization’s structure and policies facilitate and encourage teamwork. A sample question is “The structure of this organization helps facilitate teamwork”. This scale ranged from 1 (weakest structural facilitation of teamwork) to 7 (strongest structural facilitation of teamwork). The average was 4.70 with 61% of the employees agreeing that the organization’s structure and policies facilitate and encourage teamwork.

- *Informational Facilitation of Teamwork*, assesses the extent to which teamwork and team supervisors provide employees with the information needed to complete their work. A sample question is “I have a clear idea of who needs to approve projects and proposals”. This scale ranged from 1 (weakest informational facilitation of teamwork) to 7 (strongest informational facilitation of teamwork). The average was 5.74 with 86% of the employees agreeing that the organization provided sufficient information to complete their teamwork.

9. *Climate for Customer Service*

An organization with a Climate for Customer Service enacts policies, practices, and procedures that clearly indicate the importance and value of customer service. Seven items were used to measure this concept. A sample question is “Library employees have the job knowledge and skills required to deliver superior quality work and service”. This scale ranged from 1 (poor climate for customer service) to 5 (strong climate for customer service). The average was 4.21 with 86% of the employees agreeing that the library has a climate for customer service.
10. Climate for Psychological Safety

A Climate for Psychological Safety refers to the degree to which an organization or teams therein encourage employees to freely share opinions with each other and with management. Two dimensions were measured for this construct.

- **Climate for Psychological Safety: Team-level**, refers to how safe employees feel, on the whole, expressing their views to their team members and immediate supervisor. A sample question is “As an employee in my division one is able to bring up problems and tough issues”. The scale ranged from 1 (least positive climate for psychological safety on the team level) to 5 (strongest climate for psychological safety on the team level). The average score was 3.94 with 78% of the employees agreeing that their team encourages opinion-sharing.

- **Climate for Psychological Safety: Library-level**, refers to the extent to which the library as a whole has a safe environment for self-expression. A sample question is “As an employee in this library one is able to bring up problems and tough issues”. The scale ranged from 1 (least positive climate for psychological safety in the library) to 5 (strongest climate for psychological safety in the library). The average was 3.82 with 73% of the employees agreeing that the library has a psychologically safe climate.
Organizational Attitudes

The information summarized in this section measures employee attitude on a number of different topics, such as their commitment to the organization, their satisfaction with their work, the extent to which they feel empowered. The organizational attitude measures included in the ClimateQUAL™: OCDA are therefore different reflections of the current workforce’s morale. In other words, these measures can be thought of as an assessment of the current health of the employed workforce.

1. **Job Satisfaction**

   Our measure of job satisfaction uses one question to assess how satisfied an individual is with their job. This measure, which instructs employees to indicate their satisfaction using a face scale, has been shown to be as accurate as multi-item measures of job satisfaction. Job satisfaction was measured with a 5 point scale (1=least satisfied; 5=most satisfied). The average job satisfaction at Cornell University was 3.90. Approximately 73% of the employees indicated that they were satisfied on their job.

2. **Organizational Commitment**

   Organizational Commitment refers to the extent to which an individual employee is dedicated to staying with, and feels positively about, this organization. A sample question is “I am willing to put in a great deal of effort beyond that normally expected in order to help this organization be successful”. This measure ranged from 1 (low levels of organizational commitment) to 7 (high levels of organizational commitment). The average organizational commitment for Cornell University was 5.28 with 78% of the employees being committed to the library.
3. Organizational Citizenship Behaviors

An Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) is an activity not included in an employee’s job description that they nonetheless conduct to improve the organization. While not a formal part of anyone’s job, most organizations cannot work as efficiently as they do without employees doing some OCBs. A sample question is “Give up time to help others who have work or non-work problems”. This measure ranged from 1 (low levels of OCB) to 7 (high levels of OCB). The average was 5.11 with 77% of the employees indicating that OCBs occur at the library.

4. Organizational Withdrawal

Organizational Withdrawal refers to the actions that an employee may engage in that distance themselves from the organization and reflect intentions to leave the organization. A sample question is “How often do you explore other job opportunities by checking job listings or want ads”. The measure ranged from a 1 (weak desire to leave the organization) to 8 (strong desire to leave organization). The average score was 3.12 with 22% of the employees wanting to leave the organization.

5. Psychological Empowerment in the Workplace

Psychological empowerment in the workplace refers to the extent to which an individual feels they can contribute to their team. There were two aspects of psychological empowerment measured by this scale.

- Individual Empowerment refers to how competent an individual feels regarding his/her ability to complete his/her work. A sample question is “I am confident about my ability to do my job”. The measure ranged from a 1 (low empowerment) to 5 (high empowerment). The average score was 4.42 with 91% of the employees agreeing that they are empowered.
6. **Team Empowerment** reflects the extent to which an individual feels they can contribute to their team. A sample question is “My impact on what happens in my team/work unit is large”. The measure ranged from a 1 (low empowerment) to 5 (high empowerment). The average score was 3.45 with 50% of the employees agreeing that they can contribute to their team.

6. **Task Engagement**

Task engagement refers to the extent to which an employee is interested in and engaged in his/her work. A sample question is “The work I do is very important to me”. The measure ranged from 1 (weak task engagement) to 5 (strong task engagement). The average was 4.27 with 84% of the employees indicating that they were engaged in their tasks.

7. **Work Unit Conflict**

Conflict in a work unit reflects the amount of disagreements within team members. Two dimensions of work unit conflict were measured.

- **Interpersonal Conflict**, refers to the amount of personal or emotional conflict amongst a work unit. A sample question is “How much jealousy or rivalry is there among members of your unit”. The measure ranges from 1 (low levels of interpersonal conflict) to 5 (high levels of interpersonal conflict). The average score was 2.32 with 16% of the employees agreeing that there was interpersonal conflict.

- **Task Conflict**, refers to the disagreements coworkers have over how to complete their tasks. A sample question is “How often do the members of your unit disagree about which procedure should be used to do your work”. The measure ranges
from 1 (low levels of task conflict) to 5 (high levels of task conflict). The average score was 2.59 with 14% of the employees reporting task conflict.

**Interpreting Organizational Climate Results and Identifying Topics for Future Interventions**

The best way to use the information in this report is to review the results to identify a subset of organizational climate themes that need attention. One way to identify this subset of themes is to compare your library’s average score for each dimension to the normative sample. For example, if your library has a substantially lower average than the normative sample for a particular organizational climate theme, then this theme might be problematic and should be explored in future intervention efforts. Another way to identify a theme is to examine the percentage of employees that agree with each scale. For example, if an organizational climate theme has fewer than 50% of the employees agreeing with that scale, then that theme should be examined further in future intervention efforts. Clearly, themes that are substantially below the normative average and have fewer than 50% of the employees agreeing with them, need further attention.

Of course, it is important not to just focus on the negative aspects of this report. Organizational climate averages that are higher than the normative sample or that have more than 50% of the employees agreeing are also informative about your library. This positive information needs to be considered along with the more negative information.
Table 1: Reliabilities of Climate Measures

Internal consistency measures the precision of a scale with respect to inconsistencies caused by differences among questions measuring a construct. The measure ranges from 0 (no precision) to 1 (perfect precision) with 0.70 usually considered the minimum level of precision that is acceptable (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Climate Constructs</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Climate for Organizational Justice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributive Justice</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedural Justice</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Justice</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informational Justice</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Leadership Climate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust in Leader</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader-Member Relationship Quality</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager’s Passion for Service</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authentic Transformational Leadership</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Climate for Interpersonal Treatment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team-Level Interpersonal Treatment</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers Interpersonal Treatment of Employees</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Climate for Deep Diversity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-discriminatory practices</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standardized Procedures</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valuing diversity</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Climate for Demographic Diversity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Orientation</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Climate for Innovation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-workers</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Climate for Continual Learning</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Climate for Teamwork

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefit</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benefits of Teams</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational value of teamwork</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural facilitation of teamwork</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informational Facilitation of Teamwork</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Climate for Customer Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Type</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Team-level</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library-level</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Climate for Psychological Safety

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Team-level</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library-level</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2: Reliabilities of Outcome Measures

Internal consistency measures the precision of a scale with respect to inconsistencies caused by differences among questions measuring a construct. The measure ranges from 0 (no precision) to 1 (perfect precision) with 0.70 usually considered the minimum level of precision that is acceptable (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome Measures</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Job Satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Organizational Commitment</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Organizational Citizenship Behaviors</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Organizational Withdrawal</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Task Engagement</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Psychological Empowerment in the Workplace</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual empowerment</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team empowerment</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Work Unit Conflict</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Omitted
Table 4: Scale Averages

The superscripts in the table indicate the number of points on each scale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizational Climate</th>
<th>Cornell University</th>
<th>Phase I</th>
<th>Phase II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Climate for Organizational Justice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributive Justice$^5$</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>2.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedural Justice$^5$</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>3.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Justice$^5$</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>4.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informational Justice$^5$</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>3.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Climate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust in Leader$^5$</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>4.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader-Membership Relationship Quality$^7$</td>
<td>5.77</td>
<td>5.46</td>
<td>5.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager's Passion for Service$^5$</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>3.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authentic Transformational Leadership$^5$</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>3.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate for Interpersonal Treatment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team-level Interpersonal Treatment$^5$</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>3.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers Interpersonal Treatment of Employees$^5$</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>3.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate for Deep Diversity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-discriminatory Practice$^6$</td>
<td>5.21</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>4.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standardized Procedures$^6$</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>4.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valuing Diversity$^6$</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>4.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate for Demographic Diversity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race$^5$</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>4.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender$^5$</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>4.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank$^5$</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>3.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Orientation$^5$</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>4.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate for Innovation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory$^5$</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>3.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>3.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-workers(^5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate for Continual Learning(^5)</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>3.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate for Teamwork</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits of Teams(^7)</td>
<td>5.81</td>
<td>5.39</td>
<td>5.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational value of teamwork(^7)</td>
<td>5.51</td>
<td>5.19</td>
<td>5.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural facilitation of teamwork(^7)</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>4.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informational Facilitation of Teamwork(^7)</td>
<td>5.74</td>
<td>5.36</td>
<td>5.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate for Customer Service(^5)</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>3.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate for Psychological Safety: Team-level(^5)</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate for Psychological Safety: Library-Level(^5)</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4: Scale Averages (Continued)

The superscripts in the table indicate the number of points on each scale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizational Attitude Measures</th>
<th>Cornell University</th>
<th>Phase I</th>
<th>Phase II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction(^5)</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>3.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Commitment(^7)</td>
<td>5.28</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>4.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Citizenship Behaviors(^5)</td>
<td>5.11</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td>5.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Withdrawal(^8)</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Empowerment in the Workplace</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual empowerment(^5)</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>4.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team empowerment(^5)</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>3.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Engagement(^5)</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>4.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Unit Conflict</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal(^9)</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>2.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task(^5)</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>2.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5: Standard Deviations between Libraries

Standard deviations provide an indication of the amount of respondent agreement for each scale. Smaller standard deviations indicate greater agreement around the scale average.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizational Climate</th>
<th>Cornell University</th>
<th>Phase I</th>
<th>Phase II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Climate for Organizational Justice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributive Justice</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedural Justice</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Justice</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informational Justice</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Climate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust in Leader</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader-Membership Relationship Quality</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager’s Passion for Service</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authentic Transformational Leadership</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate for Interpersonal Treatment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team-level Interpersonal Treatment</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers Interpersonal Treatment of Employees</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate for Deep Diversity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-discriminatory Practice</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standardized Procedures</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valuing Diversity</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate for Demographic Diversity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Orientation</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate for Innovation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5: Standard Deviation between Libraries (Continued)

Standard deviations provide an indication of the amount of respondent agreement for each scale. Smaller standard deviations indicate greater agreement around the scale average.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cornell University</th>
<th>Phase I</th>
<th>Phase II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizational Attitude Measures</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job Satisfaction</strong></td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizational Commitment</strong></td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizational Citizenship Behaviors</strong></td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizational Withdrawal</strong></td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Psychological Empowerment in the Workplace</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual empowerment</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team empowerment</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Task Engagement</strong></td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Work Unit Conflict</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Conflict</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Conflict</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6: Standard Errors for the ClimateQUAL™: OCDA Scales

Standard errors (SE) indicate the margin of error associated with the averages reported in Table 4. For further explanation, please see the note at the bottom of the table on the next page.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizational Climate</th>
<th>Cornell University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Climate for Organizational Justice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributive Justice</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedural Justice</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Justice</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informational Justice</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Climate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust in Leader</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader-Membership Relationship Quality</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager’s Passion for Service</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authentic Transformational Leadership</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate for Interpersonal Treatment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team-level Interpersonal Treatment</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers Interpersonal Treatment of Employees</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate for Deep Diversity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-discriminatory Practice</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standardized Procedures</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valuing Diversity</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate for Demographic Diversity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Orientation</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate for Innovation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-workers</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate for Continual Learning</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate for Teamwork</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits of Teams</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Value of Teamwork</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural Facilitation of Teamwork</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informational Facilitation of Teamwork</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate for Customer Service</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate for Psychological Safety: Team-level</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate for Psychological Safety: Library-Level</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: Standard Errors for the ClimateQUAL™: OCDA Scales (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizational Attitude Measures</th>
<th>Cornell University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Commitment</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Citizenship Behaviors</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Withdrawal</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Empowerment in the Workplace</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual empowerment</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team empowerment</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Engagement</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Unit Conflict</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Conflict</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Conflict</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Note: Standard errors (SE) indicate the margin of error associated with the averages reported in Table 4. The best estimate of each library’s average is obtained by forming an interval which ranges from $2(SE) - \text{Scale Average}$ to $2(SE) + \text{Scale Average}$. This range is called a 95% confidence interval.

For example, the distributive justice average for the normative overall score is 2.86 (Table 4). The SE associated with that mean is 0.04 (Table 6). The 95% confidence interval for the overall distributive justice score for the normative sample is:

$$2.78 \Leftrightarrow 2.94$$

The SEs reported in this table were computed using the following formula for finite populations:

$$SE = \frac{S}{\sqrt{n}} \sqrt{\frac{N - n}{N - 1}}$$

In this formula, $S$ represents a scale’s standard deviation, $n$ represents the number of ClimateQUAL™: OCDA respondents for a particular library, and $N$ represents the total number of employees in that library.
Table 7: Percentage Agreement between Libraries

These percentages reflect the number of employees who positively respond to the questions in each scale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizational Climate</th>
<th>Cornell University</th>
<th>Phase I</th>
<th>Phase II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Climate for Organizational Justice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributive Justice</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedural Justice</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Justice</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informational Justice</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Climate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust in Leader</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader-Membership Relationship Quality</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager's Passion for Service</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authentic Transformational Leadership</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate for Interpersonal Treatment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team-level Interpersonal Treatment</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers Interpersonal Treatment of Employees</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate for Deep Diversity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-discriminatory Practice</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standardized Procedures</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valuing Diversity</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate for Demographic Diversity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Orientation</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate for Innovation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-workers</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate for Continual Learning</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate for Teamwork</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits of Teams</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational value of teamwork</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural facilitation of teamwork</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informational Facilitation of Teamwork</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate for Customer Service</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate for Psychological Safety: Team-level</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate for Psychological Safety: Library-Level</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7: Percentage Agreement between Libraries (Continued).

These percentages reflect the number of employees who positively respond to the questions in each scale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizational Attitude Measures</th>
<th>Cornell University</th>
<th>Phase I</th>
<th>Phase II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Commitment</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Citizenship Behaviors</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Withdrawal</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Empowerment in the Workplace</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual empowerment</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team empowerment</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Engagement</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Unit Conflict</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Appendix A

Graphs for ClimateQUAL™: OCDA

Organizational Climate Scales
1. Climate for Organizational Justice

Means of Climate for Organizational Justice: Distributive Justice

Distributive Justice

Means:
- Cornell: 3.00
- Phase I: 2.88
- Phase II: 2.65
Means of Climate for Organizational Justice:
Procedural Justice

Cornell University ClimateQUAL™: OCDA Report, 44
Means of Climate for Organizational Justice: Interpersonal Justice

Interpersonal Justice

Cornell
Phase I
Phase II

4.29
4.15
4.11
Means of Climate for Organizational Justice:
Informational Justice

Informational Justice

Cornell
Phase I
Phase II

3.54
3.57
3.47
2. Leadership Climate

Means of Leadership Climate: Trust in Leadership

- Cornell: 4.11
- Phase I: 3.90
- Phase II: 4.01

Legend:
- Cornell
- Phase I
- Phase II
Means of Leadership Climate: Leader-Member Relationship Quality

Leader-Member Relationship Quality

Cornell
Phase I
Phase II

5.77
5.46
5.57
Means of Leadership Climate: Leaders' Passion for Service

Leaders' Passion for Service

Cornell University ClimateQUAL™: OCDA Report
Means of Leadership Climate: Authentic Transformational Leadership

- Authentic Transformational Leadership Mean Scores:
  - Cornell: 3.99
  - Phase I: 2.98
  - Phase II: 3.87
3. Climate for Interpersonal Treatment

Means of Climate for Interpersonal Treatment: Team-level Interpersonal Treatment

Team-level Interpersonal Treatment

- Cornell: 3.79
- Phase I: 3.92
- Phase II: 3.67
Means of Climate for Interpersonal Treatment: Managers’ Interpersonal Treatment of Employees

Managerial Interpersonal Treatment

Cornell
Phase I
Phase II

3.6
3.9
3.52
4. Climate for Deep Diversity

Means of Climate for Deep Diversity: Non-Discriminatory Practices

Cornell University ClimateQUAL™: OCDA Report, 53
Means of Climate for Deep Diversity: Standardization of Procedures

Cornell
Phase I
Phase II

Standardization of Procedures

Cornell: 4.74
Phase I: 4.10
Phase II: 4.34
Means of Climate for Deep Diversity: Valuing Diversity

Cornell University ClimateQUAL™: OCDA Report, 55
5. Climate for Demographic Diversity

Means of Climate for Demographic Diversity: Race

Team Climate for Racial Diversity

Cornell Phase I Phase II
Means of Climate for Demographic Diversity: Gender

Team Climate for Gender Diversity:

- Cornell: 4.52
- Phase I: 4.30
- Phase II: 4.46
Means of Team Climate for Demographic Diversity: Rank

Team Climate for Diversity of Ranks

Cornell: 3.66
Phase I: 3.76
Phase II: 3.88
Means of Climate for Demographic Diversity:
Sexual Orientation

Team Climate for Sexual Orientation Diversity

Cornell
Phase I
Phase II

4.60
4.40
4.48
6. Climate for Innovation

Means of Climate for Innovation: Supervisory Support

Supervisory Support for Innovation

Cornell | Phase I | Phase II

3.57 | 3.22 | 3.41
Means of Climate for Innovation: Co-worker Support

Support for Innovation from Co-Workers

- Cornell: 3.82
- Phase I: 3.57
- Phase II: 3.77
7. Climate for Continual Learning

Means of Climate for Continual Learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Turk</th>
<th>Phase I</th>
<th>Phase II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>3.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. Climate for Teamwork

Means of Climate for Teamwork: Employee Beliefs in Benefits of Teamwork

Benefits of Teams

Cornell Phase I Phase II
Means of Climate for Teamwork: Organizational Value of Teamwork

Organizational Value of Teamwork

Cornell
Phase I
Phase II

5.51
4.19
5.12
Means of Climate for Teamwork: Structural Facilitation of Teamwork

Structural Facilitation of Teamwork

- Cornell: 4.70
- Phase I: 4.26
- Phase II: 4.33
Means of Climate for Teamwork: Informational Facilitation of Teamwork

Cornell
Phase I
Phase II

Informational Facilitation of Teamwork
9. Climate for Customer Service

Climate for Customer Service Means

Cornell  Phase I  Phase II
4.2  3.81  3.79
10. Climate for Psychological Safety: Team Level

Means of Climate for Psychological Safety:
Team Level

Team Level Climate for Psychological Safety

- Cornell: 3.94
- Phase II: 3.88
11. Climate for Psychological Safety: Library Level

Means of Climate for Psychological Safety: Library Level

- Cornell: 3.82
- Phase II: 3.62
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Graphs for Percentage Agreement for

ClimateQUAL™: OCDA  Organizational Climate Scales
1. Climate for Organizational Justice

Agreement Ratings of Climate for Organizational Justice: Distributive Justice
Agreement Ratings of Climate for Organizational Justice: Procedural Justice
Agreement Ratings of Climate for Organizational Justice: Interpersonal Justice

- Cornell: 82%
- Phase I: 78%
- Phase II: 77%
Agreement Ratings of Climate for Organizational Justice: Informational Justice

Percent Agreement

Cornell University ClimateQUAL™: OCDA Report, 75
2. Leadership Climate

Agreement Ratings of Leadership Climate:
Trust in Leadership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent Agreement</th>
<th>Cornell</th>
<th>Phase I</th>
<th>Phase II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Agreement Ratings of Leadership Climate:
Leader-Member Relationship Quality

Percent Agreement

Cornell
Phase I
Phase II

82%
77%
79%
Agreement Ratings of Leadership Climate:
Leaders' Passion for Service

Percent Agreement

Cornell University ClimateQUAL™: OCDA Report, 78
Agreement Ratings of Leadership Climate: Authentic Transformational Leadership

Cornell University ClimateQUAL™: OCDA Report, 79
3. Climate for Interpersonal Treatment

Agreement Ratings of Climate for Interpersonal Treatment: Team-level Interpersonal Treatment

Percent Agreement

- Cornell
- Phase I
- Phase II
Agreement Ratings of Climate for Interpersonal Treatment: Managers' Interpersonal Treatment of Employees

- Cornell: 72%
- Phase I: 65%
- Phase II: 59%
4. Climate for Deep Diversity

Agreement Ratings of Climate for Deep Diversity: Non-Discriminatory Practices
Agreement Ratings of Climate for Deep Diversity: Standardization of Procedures

- Cornell: 84%
- Phase I: 62%
- Phase II: 73%
Agreement Ratings of Climate for Deep Diversity: Valuing Diversity

Percent Agreement

Cornell Phase I Phase II
5. Climate for Demographic Diversity

Agreement Ratings of Climate for Demographic Diversity: Race

Percent Agreement

- Cornell
- Phase I
- Phase II
Agreement Ratings of Climate for Demographic Diversity: Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent Agreement</th>
<th>Cornell</th>
<th>Phase I</th>
<th>Phase II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Agreement Ratings of Team Climate for Demographic Diversity: Rank

- Cornell
- Phase I
- Phase II
Agreement Ratings of Climate for Demographic Diversity: Sexual Orientation

Percent Agreement

- 95%
- 90%
- 91%

Cornell Phase I Phase II

Percent Agreement
6. Climate for Innovation

Agreement Ratings of Climate for Innovation:
Supervisory Support

- Cornell: 62%
- Phase I: 37%
- Phase II: 54%
Agreement Ratings of Climate for Innovation:
Co-worker Support

Percent Agreement

Cornell Phase I Phase II
7. Climate for Continual Learning

Agreement Ratings of Climate for Continual Learning

Percent Agreement

- Cornell
- Phase I
- Phase II

75% 72% 64%
8. Climate for Teamwork

Agreement Ratings of Climate for Teamwork: Employee Beliefs in Benefits of Teamwork

Percent Agreement

- Cornell: 90%
- Phase I: 77%
- Phase II: 83%
Agreement Ratings of Climate for Teamwork:
Organizational Value of Teamwork

- Cornell: 81% agreement
- Phase I: 74% agreement
- Phase II: 74% agreement

Percent Agreement
Agreement Ratings of Climate for Teamwork:
Structural Facilitation of Teamwork

Percent Agreement

- Cornell
- Phase I
- Phase II
Agreement Ratings of Climate for Teamwork: Informational Facilitation of Teamwork

- Cornell: 86%
- Phase I: 79%
- Phase II: 78%
9. Climate for Customer Service

Agreement Ratings Climate for Customer Service

- Cornell: 86%
- Phase I: 70%
- Phase II: 67%
10. Climate for Psychological Safety: Team Level

Agreement Ratings of Climate for Psychological Safety: Team Level

Cornell
Phase II
11. Climate for Psychological Safety: Library Level

Agreement Ratings of Climate for Psychological Safety: Library Level

- 73% Agreement Rating for Cornell
- 63% Agreement Rating for Phase II
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Executive Summary

Between 17 and 118 employees provided detailed comments on the nine organizational climate and seven organizational attitude scales on the Organizational Climate and Diversity assessment. Table 1.1 at the end of this report provides detailed information on how many employees provided qualitative responses for each scale. In this report, all relevant and non-identifying employee comments on the organizational climate and organizational attitude scales are included.

Summaries of respondent comments and concerns are organized by scale. Several sub-scales are combined (e.g. Climate for Teamwork: Organizational Value of Teamwork and Climate for Teamwork: Benefits of Teams). This occurred as these separate scales were presented as one individual scale on the survey, and thus there was only one comment box provided for two scales.

Please also note that sometimes the number of comments you see does not match the number of comments we identify per scale. This happens for two reasons. First, personally identifying comments are identified as a "response" in the tally, but are deleted to preserve confidentiality and privacy. Second, sometimes an individual would discuss several different points per scale. In these instances, comments were broken up to separate ideas/different thoughts.

Our research team identified several themes in both the scale responses and the qualitative comments for your library. One theme is the expressed opinion that the structure of the current library system, especially with regard to the administration, seems disorganized and out of touch with employees. Another theme that emerges across scales is that there are communication problems from the top down. Finally, a prevalent theme throughout survey responses, perhaps related to these first two was that procedures, practices, visions, and other goal-oriented information are confusing at best, and often not explicated at all.
Qualitative Results

Organizational Climate Scales

Organizational Climate for Justice:

Distributive Justice:
Sixty-three employees out of the 278 (23%) responded to this scale with comments. Reports of distributive justice are not high. Some feel that while there are no rewards, that salaries are equitable. Most respondents report disparities in salaries. Some feel that incoming hires are paid more by default, while others feel that salary reflects longevity, not performance. Several believe there is "salary compression".

Procedural Justice:
Fifty-one employees out of the 226 (23%) responded to this scale with comments. Employees feel that procedural justice varies by unit, based on two things: the immediate supervisor of that unit/division and how close it is to the central library system. Many employees don't know what procedures are undergone to determine rewards. Those who feel there are procedures indicate that rewards are biased and are distributed according to favoritism and elitism.

Interpersonal Justice:
Thirty-one employees out of the 285 (11%) responded to this scale with comments. Several employees still indicate that there are no rewards, or that they don't know who determines them. As for interpersonal treatment from supervisors in general, employees report mixed impressions. Some feel that their supervisors treat them very respectfully, while others have manipulative and abusive supervisors.

Informational Justice:
Thirty-four employees out of the 275 (12%) responded to this scale with comments. In general, employees voice the concern that communication is particularly poor. Because of this, some employees feel disassociated from management and the library.
CLIMATE FOR LEADERSHIP:

Leader’s Passion for Service:
Thirty-nine out of 323 (12%) employees responded to this scale with comments. Numerous themes emerged in employee responses. First, employees feel that their hard work is expected, but not appreciated or recognized. Second, many employees feel that their supervisor/the library prizes quantity over quality. Third, employees express the opinion that there are no clear standards for service in many divisions and the library overall, and where there are standards, they are unequally applied. Finally, some employees feel that while their supervisor does their best to remove obstacles, that many come from too high up to be easily dealt with, or stem from the supervisor themselves.

Authentic Transformational Leadership:
Thirty-one out of 323 (10%) employees responded to this scale with comments. Employees report both positive and negative perceptions of their supervisors' authentic leadership. Those who feel negatively about their leaders' authenticity feel that their supervisors have poor communication styles, care only about themselves. The most prevalent negative feedback is that employees feel that their supervisors lack vision. When employees feel positively about their supervisors' authentic leadership, they characterize these leaders as supportive and action-oriented. Supervisors with high authentic leadership are reported to solicit, and then act upon feedback. One mitigating comment that several employees voiced was that despite supervisory authenticity, employees feel their supervisors do not have the ability to make decisions or make a large impact on the broader library.

Leader-Member Relationship Quality:
Fifty-two out of 323 (12%) employees responded to this scale with comments. As often happens with this scale, there is great variety in employees' relationships with their supervisors. When these relationships are bad, employees cite reasons being a lack of feedback, feeling ignored, a lack of understanding on the supervisor's part of their employees' jobs, and supervisors being more concerned about how they look to their supervisors than how their employees feel. When these relationships are good, employees feel that their supervisors are caring, listen, are respectful of their employees' work loads, are genuinely nice people, easy to talk to, and care about their employees' professional development.

Trust in Leadership:
Twenty-eight out of 321 (9%) employees responded to this scale with comments. Trust in leadership seems to vary widely. Some feel that their supervisors are trustworthy, sincere, and honest. Some indicate that while they respect their supervisors, they may not trust them. Finally, numerous employees do not trust their supervisors, stating that they only seem to care about themselves, are concerned for their position, or are unpredictable.
CLIMATE FOR INTERPERSONAL TREATMENT:

Thirty-six out of 313 (12%) employees responded to this scale with comments. Employees in general seem to feel that interpersonal treatment varies between different coworkers/supervisors. One employee opined that the Library as a whole has less positive interpersonal treatment than their division. One central issue brought up by a number of employees is the extent to which they feel ignored, insulted, and treated poorly due to poor communication from the top down.

CLIMATE FOR DEEP DIVERSITY:

Thirty-six out of 308 (12%) employees responded to this scale with comments. Employees feel that the library says it is committed to diversity, and has goals stated to that effect, but that the behavior and actions of employees do not follow this goal. Further, employees indicate that there is education-based and age discrimination. Finally, employees would like better performance reviews that more accurately reflect work done and provide critical feedback.

CLIMATE FOR DEMOGRAPHIC DIVERSITY:

Race:
Thirty-two out of 295 (11%) employees responded to this scale with comments. In large majority, respondents say there is no racial diversity in their division, and thus, this is a moot point. The other respondents say that there is no racial discrimination, while a few feel there is some favoritism of minority races.

Gender:
Twenty-one out of 309 (7%) employees responded to this scale with comments. Employees feel that there is gender discrimination in the library as a whole. Specifically, while there are fewer male employees, they are disproportionately represented at administrative levels compared to women.

Rank:
Forty-seven out of 308 (15%) employees responded to this scale with comments. An overwhelming majority express the idea that there is discrimination based on rank. Some feel that this is unconscious, while others feel it is not a problem (for instance, saying that certain types of information SHOULD be restricted access). Several employees say that people work well together in their units, but that rank issues are a problem library-wide. When there is rank-based discrimination, employees cite issues of unequal information and meeting access, dismissal of ideas from those of lower rank, and lower salaries. On the other side, some employees speak very highly of the interactions between persons of different ranks.

Sexual Orientation:
Twenty-one out of 275 (8%) employees responded to this scale with comments. Sexual orientation discrimination does not seem to be a problem within the library system as a whole. Only two individuals discussed sexual orientation-based discrimination at all, and one attributed it specifically to one staff member as opposed to a general climate.
CLIMATE FOR CONTINUAL LEARNING:

Thirty out of 314 (10%) employees responded to this scale with comments. Climate for continuous learning varies by department. Some feel very encouraged, while others do not. One employee mentions that while there are opportunities for continuous learning offered, there is no big push toward that end. For those who feel that continuous learning is not supported, they cite lack of feedback, ideas being ignored, and lack of resources and support.

CLIMATE FOR INNOVATION:

Thirty out of 311 (10%) employees responded to this scale with comments. Employees note that support for innovation varies by department, but either way, a large majority indicate that there is no time to explore innovative solutions. Some employees attribute this to outdated or existing resources or a lack of control (e.g. not being able to load plug-ins themselves).

CLIMATE FOR TEAMWORK:

Forty-seven out of 310 (15%) employees responded to this scale with comments. Employees, first and foremost, feel that too much information is distributed, such that it's hard for them to know what is important. Several employees feel that there are too many teams, while several feel that teams are being constructed just because they are trendy. Finally, some employees say that their "team work" is simply individual work toward a team goal.

CLIMATE FOR CUSTOMER SERVICE:

Thirty-three out of 307 (11%) employees responded to this scale with comments. Employees feel that the effort for service is there, but the results are not as desired. Some of the reasons employees feel this way is that there are too many jobs and not enough people to do them, limited training, little technology and other resource support, and poor communication with patrons.

CLIMATE FOR PSYCHOLOGICAL SAFETY:

Team Level:

Twenty-six out of 314 (8%) employees responded to this scale with comments. Responses to degree of psychological safety vary. Some employees feel that they are safer to speak up and be themselves in their smaller team, not the larger division. Some feel psychologically safe in their teams, while others do not. When people report low feelings of psychological safety, they say that ideas are not listened to, mistakes are not tolerated, and complainers as well as those who make mistakes receive backlash.
Library Level:

Seventeen out of 306 (6%) employees responded to this scale with comments. In large majority, respondents feel it is not safe to speak out in the library as a whole, citing backlash for complaints. Employees feel they need to "fly under the radar" in the overall library system.

ORGANIZATIONAL ATTITUDE SCALES:

Job Satisfaction:

One hundred eighteen out of 337 (35%) employees responded to this scale with comments. A number of factors contributing to job satisfaction are listed, such as colleagues, chances for continuous learning, lack of transparency in practices, pay issues, and supervisory concerns. One of the most frequently mentioned issues concerns relationships with supervisors. When these relationships are good, people are likely to have high job satisfaction. However, when these relationships are poor, they impact job satisfaction highly. Another issue concerns the administration. In general, employees report a sense that the administration is disorganized and out of touch, often making decisions that affect lower-level staff without understanding the issues underlying these decisions. A third theme is that employees enjoy opportunities to learn more and expand their skill sets. This is provided as a reason for job satisfaction when satisfaction is high, and a lack of these opportunities is provided as a reason for low satisfaction. Finally, employees cite having too much work and no opportunities to advance as contributors to lower satisfaction.

Organizational Commitment:

Sixty-eight out of 328 (21%) employees responded to this scale with comments. Many reporters seem to feel strong loyalty and commitment to the library. However, there are several key themes that emerge in terms of lowered commitment. Mostly, they revolve around the structure of the library and administration. Specifically, one issue is that the complexity of the system and the constantly changing nature of library work makes it difficult to make a contribution to the library as a whole. Further, confusing staffing procedures and other procedures make CUL look inconsistent and subjective in hiring, promoting, and rewarding practices. This can result, as employees indicate, in feelings that there is favoritism. Other issues concern perceptions of limited communication from the top-down and low pay. Finally, employees report lower commitment due to a lack of options for upward mobility.

Organizational Citizenship Behaviors:

Fifty-one out of 322 (15%) employees responded to this scale with comments. A large majority indicate extremely strong positive feelings about the library and the library's image, indicating that they don't NEED to defend the library, as people in and out of the library, in general, have high opinions of it. The main complaint that employees' voice is that administration does not seem open to ideas for improvement, and indeed, rejects them out-of-hand, making employees hesitant to offer these ideas in the future.
Organizational Withdrawal:

Ninety-one out of 328 (28%) employees responded to this scale with comments. People who report low withdrawal at attached to the Ithaca area. Those who wish to withdrawal usually experience this desire because of conflicts with other individuals, largely supervisors. Others think about retiring. Some express a concern that they are overworked and underpaid and several say that they wish to leave, but that there are no other job opportunities in the area.

Task Engagement:

Forty-eight out of 327 (15%) employees responded to this scale with comments. When employees do not find their work to have meaning, this perception is attributed to how intellectually stimulating (or boring) the work is as well as to “politics” and “bureaucracy”. Some employees feel that their work is meaningful—but only to themselves. They do not feel appreciated by the library at large, or otherwise do not know if their work is meaningful outside of themselves. One employee, however, feels the opposite: their work is meaningful to the library, but not to themselves.

Psychological Empowerment in the Workplace:

Fifty-seven out of 328 (17%) employees responded to this scale with comments. In terms of personal empowerment, employees discuss the constantly changing nature of their jobs. Some are excited by these changes, some would like additional training, and some feel they simply can’t keep up. For those employees who do feel empowered in contributing to their team, they feel they contribute more to their immediate team than to their division, and the library as a whole. Employees also feel that their impact is lessened because their ideas are ignored, communication is poor, and decisions are always made top-down, without consulting those who are affected by them.

Work Unit Conflict:

Fifty-two out of 317 (16%) employees responded to this scale with comments. There is enormous variation in perceived levels, sources, and types of conflict reported by employees. Some employees report great amounts of conflict. Sources of great conflict seem to come from personality clashes within units as well as an us versus them mentality that certain divisions have adopted, causing them to form factions. Another type of conflict source is external. Employees report conflict coming from time pressures, unclear priorities, and upper level decisions that affect their division. Further, some employees feel there is favoritism, which they cite as a cause of conflict. Positive responses to this scale include several people who express that their divisions have been striving towards having less unproductive conflict. Another positive response is that while many employees experience little conflict, what conflict is present reflects productive discussion that helps improve work efficiency and quality.
Table 1.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Climate Scales</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Percentage of Total*</th>
<th>Number of Scale Respondents**</th>
<th>Percentage of Respondents***</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizational Climate for Justice</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributive Justice</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedural Justice</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Justice</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informational Justice</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Climate for Leadership</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaders' Passion for Service</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authentic Transformational Leadership</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader-Member Relationship Quality</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust in Leadership</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Climate for Interpersonal Treatment</strong></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Climate for Deep Diversity</strong></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Climate for Demographic Diversity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Orientation</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Climate for Continual Learning</strong></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Climate for Innovation</strong></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Climate for Teamwork</strong></td>
<td>47</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Climate for Service</strong></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Climate for Psychological Safety: Team Level</strong></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Climate for Psychological Safety: Library Level</strong></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizational Attitude Scales</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Percentage of Total*</th>
<th>Number of Scale Respondents**</th>
<th>Percentage of Respondents***</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Commitment</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Citizenship Behaviors</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Withdrawal</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Engagement</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Empowerment in the Workplace</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work-Unit Conflict</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*out of total respondents to survey (337)

**number of people who filled out the quantitative scale aspect of each construct

***out of number of people who filled out the quantitative scale relating to each construct