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In April 2008, Cornell University Library, along with nine other academic libraries (Arizona State, Duke, Emory, Kansas State, NYU, Northwestern, University of Houston, University of Maryland, and University of Massachusetts at Amherst), participated in the Organizational Climate and Diversity Assessment (ClimateQUAL) survey administered by the University of Maryland (UM) Libraries, the UM Industrial/ Organizational Psychology program and the Association of Research Libraries. The survey was anonymous. 337 (79%) CUL employees on the upstate New York campuses chose to participate in the survey; some also provided written comments to various survey questions.

The summary below highlights the key findings about CUL that are described in the approximately 200 pages of reports and statistical tables produced by the Maryland ClimateQUAL Team. Wherever cross-institutional comparisons are made, they refer to the average scores of the other nine participating libraries.

What does ClimateQUAL measure?

ClimateQUAL measures several areas of organizational climate and attitude that have been recognized as the “critical organizational imperatives” indicative of the health of an organization.

What does a healthy organization look like?

A healthy organization is defined as one which has policies, practices, and procedures that empower employees. It emphasizes the importance of continual learning and innovation to meet the demands of an ever changing environment. A healthy organizational climate is one in which customer service, employee diversity, and organizational justice are all recognized as critical in determining the effectiveness of the organization in the long run.

Healthy organizations create workplace climates that send two simultaneous messages to their employees. First, these organizations send a strong message that they care about the wellbeing of their employees through policies that suggest teamwork, diversity, and justice are valued. Second, healthy organizations also send a strong message that they care about customers, in our case the user community. They demonstrate this when they do such things as restructure the work environment to improve customer service and/or offer training and other resources to improve customer-related skills and knowledge. When organizations succeed in developing a climate profile that sends these two messages, employee behaviors will be focused on maintaining a mutually beneficial relationship with the organization’s customers.

\(^1\) 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). A quantitative and a qualitative report plus two supplements were prepared by Paul J. Hanges, Juliet Aiken, & Xiafang Chen of the University of Maryland.
Does Cornell University Library have a “healthy climate”?

Yes! The results revealed a strong and healthy organization. CUL’s average scores were the highest among the 10 participating libraries in 34 out of the 36 aspects measured. CUL employees have indicated that CUL has a healthy climate for Leadership, Diversity, Innovation, Team Work, and Customer Service. For example,

- 84% respondents indicate that they are interested and engaged in CUL’s work
- 84% agree that organizational procedures are applied equally to everyone
- 82% agree that they are treated fairly by supervisors and others in the workplace
- 81% agree that their managers have a passion for service
- 81% agree that CUL has a climate that values teamwork

Indeed fewer people think about leaving CUL, and on average, CUL employees have a more positive perception of our organizational climate and a more positive attitude about working here than do employees at the other nine participating institutions. This does not mean that there isn’t room for improvement.

CUL’s organizational climate was measured in multiple ways. Two, in particular, should be noted. First, a scale is used to measure whether CUL has a poor or strong climate. For example, in the case of Climate for Customer Service, the scale allows the respondents to rate where CUL stands: from 1 (poor climate for customer service) to 5 (strong climate for customer service). Secondly, an agreement index is used to show how many respondents agree or disagree on the rating. Using the Climate for Customer Service as an example again, 86% of the respondents agreed that CUL has a climate for customer service, i.e., they rated the item, on average, a 4 or a 5. The rest of the respondents rated CUL, on average, a 1 or a 2, indicating their disagreement, or a neutral rating of 3, indicating “I do not agree nor disagree”. Appendix I summarizes CUL’s scores and the agreement/disagreement level as indicated by the CUL respondents.

Among all the areas surveyed, the participating CUL employees ranked these six aspects of our climate as “the healthiest:”

1. Climate for Demographic Diversity: 87-95% of CUL participating employees agree that CUL has a climate that values demographic diversity when it comes to race, gender, and sexual-orientation.

Climate for Demographic Diversity - Race refers to the extent to which the library supports racial diversity, not necessarily that its staff makeup is racially diverse. 295 employees responded to the question. The scale ranges from 1 (low racial climate) to 5 (high climate for diversity). CUL ranked an average of 4.63, 0.18 points above the averages across the other nine participating libraries. 32 of the 295 respondents (11%) provided comments including:

- As far as I can tell, this is an “ethnic, color, etc.”-blind environment. Since I’m not privy to salary and other assessment decisions, I can’t answer about those issues.
• We don’t seem to have any problems with racial discrimination, but it is also true that we don’t have much diversity in the division where I work.

• Over the years, I have not witnessed any difference in the level of support depending on race, nor have I seen conflict related to race. I don’t know about the rewards process.

Climate of Demographic Diversity - Gender reflects the extent to which the library supports gender diversity. 309 employees responded. The scale ranges from 1 (low gender diversity) to 5 (high gender diversity). Cornell ranked an average of 4.52, 0.12 points above the average across the other nine participating libraries. 21 of the 309 respondents (7%) provided comments. Among the comments were:

• Gender is not considered on any level in my department.
• I do not see any gender-based discrimination. However, the staff in my division is heavily female; of the males, most are in [upper administration] or head managerial positions. For that reason there is something of a difference in how they are treated, how their opinions are evaluated. I think it’s more due to position rather than the gender, but I have to wonder about how gender got them into the position in the first place.
• I do not think discrimination exists in this place.

Climate of Demographic Diversity - Sexual Orientation assesses the extent to which the library has a climate supportive of sexual-orientation diversity. 275 employees responded. The scale ranges from 1 (low) to 5 (high). The average score for Cornell was a 4.60, 0.14 points above the average across the other nine participating libraries. 21 of the 275 respondents (8%) provided comments including:

• I would give our organization good marks in offering a welcoming environment for employees of varying sexual orientations.
• As far as I can tell, sexual orientation is a non-issue. It’s an individual’s matter and no one else’s business.
• In regard to sexual orientation, I don’t have any situations I can refer to to answer the questions. In the Library as a whole, I don’t think that sexual orientation discrimination is an issue.

2. Climate for Deep Diversity - Non-discriminatory Practices: 92% of CUL participating employees agree that the library has a healthy climate for non-discriminatory practices.

Climate for Deep Diversity - Non-discriminatory Practices reflects the extent to which the organization participates in non-discriminatory practices. 308 employees responded. The scale ranges from 1 (least positive climate) to 6 (most positive climate). The average score was 5.21, 0.22 points higher than the average across the other nine participating libraries. 36 of the 308 respondents (12%) provided comments covering the general climate for deep diversity including non-discriminatory practices including:
• General policies and practices are good.
• I only have experience with my own performance evaluations. I feel they've been conducted fairly and without personal bias or prejudice.
• In terms of prejudice against different ethnicities, the library has a good track record. However, if values and ideas about the running of the library are included in "diversity," the library has a problem there.

3. Climate for Psychological Empowerment in the Workplace - Individual Empowerment: 91% of CUL participating employees agree that CUL has a healthy climate in which individuals feel that they are competent and empowered to get their work done.

*Psychological Empowerment in the Workplace - Individual Empowerment* refers to how competent an individual feels regarding his/her ability to complete his/her work. 328 employees responded. The measure ranges from 1 (low empowerment) to 5 (high empowerment). The average score for this measure was 4.42. 57 of the 328 respondents (17%) provided comments covering the overall climate for psychological empowerment in the workplace. They are sampled below.

While one of our healthier aspects, CUL fared below the average of the other participating libraries by 0.07 points. It is one of the two areas (the other is Climate for Demographic Diversity in Rank) where CUL’s average scores are lower than the average of the other nine participating libraries.

The Psychological Empowerment in the Workplace is measured through two dimensions: Individual and Team Empowerment. Interestingly, individual empowerment is one of CUL’s strongest areas while team empowerment is one of Cornell’s weaker areas (see Structural Facilitation of Teamwork below.)

• Over the years I’ve gained more responsibility and consequently feel more confident in some areas and less in others.
• There’s always more to learn, but I have mastered much of what I need right now.
• I like the current dynamic environment of evolving libraries and the new skills we learn – it makes the job interesting.

4. Climate for Teamwork – Benefits of Teams: 90% of CUL participating employees agree that CUL has a climate that values the usefulness and importance of teamwork.

*Climate for Teamwork – Benefits of Teams* concerns employees’ opinions of the usefulness and importance of teamwork. 310 employees responded. This scale ranges from 1 (weakest employee belief in benefit of teamwork) to 7 (strong employee belief in benefit of teamwork). The average was 5.81, 0.33 points higher than the average across the other nine
participating libraries. 47 of the 310 respondents (15%) provided comments covering the overall climate for teamwork including:

- I think the way teamwork is promoted is already very effective at making this library a better place.
- Teams work for some jobs, individuals for others. I hope the organization can continue to be flexible and balance work between these two approaches, rather than forcing everything into one mold of thinking. Communication is what I believe matters; whether we are working as individuals or teams, we need to communicate between divisions and organizations.
- Some teams have worked well, others haven't. Having a clear purpose, and the authority/ability to make changes, helps immensely.

5. Climate for Teamwork - Informational Facilitation of Teamwork: 86% of CUL participating employees agree that the CUL has a climate for teamwork and team supervisors provide employees with the information they need to complete their work.

Climate for Teamwork - Informational Facilitation of Teamwork assesses the extent to which teamwork and team supervisors provide employees with the information needed to complete their work. 310 employees responded. This scale ranges from 1 (weakest informational facilitation of teamwork) to 7 (strongest informational facilitation of teamwork). The CUL average was 5.74, 0.40 points higher than the average of the other nine participating libraries. 47 of the 310 respondents (15%) provided comments as sampled below:

- My unit naturally functions as a team in many respects. It is hard to say what the Library as a whole is doing.
- The problem isn’t too little information; it’s too much information. Teamwork is valuable but it’s time consuming.
- There is a great deal of information about library activities, but not always in a centralized or organized fashion.

It is worth noting the difference of the scores of the two dimensions contributing to the assessment of the Climate of Teamwork: while Information Facilitation of Teamwork is one of the strongest area of CUL, Structural Facilitation of Teamwork is one of the weakest (discussed below.)

6. Climate for Customer Service: 86% of CUL participating employees agree that the CUL enacts policies, practices, and procedures that clearly indicate the importance and value of customer service.
Climate for Customer Service measures the degree to which employees perceive the institution values customer service. 307 employees answered the questions. The scale ranges from 1 (poor climate for customer service) to 5 (strong climate for customer service). The average score for Cornell was a 4.21, 0.42 points higher than the average across the other nine participating libraries. 33 of the 307 respondents (11%) provided comments including:

- Resources for new projects seem to weigh far more heavily than core services.
- We have a great deal of knowledge and skill in the library in certain areas but I think we need more development in others. We also spend a great deal of effort in collecting data but sometimes its not clear what the benefit is. More communication to both staff and patrons would be useful and even better tools to provide core services are needed.
- The Library emphasizes service. The Library needs to prioritize better, though. The Library keeps adding services [that] stretch staff thinner and thinner, and only infrequently drops a service, even if underutilized or overly expensive to maintain.

But where are we not so healthy?

As noted, CUL’s average scores were the highest among the 10 participating libraries in 34 out of the 36 aspects measured. The Maryland ClimateQUAL Team recommended several strategies for interpreting the results and identifying topics for future interventions: “…One way …is to compare your library’s average score for each dimension to the normative sample. …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.” We did both.

Using the 50% agreement rate as a threshold, there are only two measures in which CUL falls below this threshold (Distributive Justice and Psychological Empowerment in the Workplace - Team-level).

We decided to set CUL’s bar higher and identified the aspects that are ranked by more than 30% of CUL respondents with either a neutral rating (“I do not agree nor disagree that CUL has a climate of…”) or a disagreement rating (“I do not agree that CUL has a climate of…”). Here are the eight aspects.

1. **Distributive Justice**: 35% of CUL participating employees (compared to an average of 23% across the other nine participating libraries) perceive the rewards they receive (pay, opportunities to advance, rewards, and recognition) is adequate given their level of effort and work. The other 65% respondents are either neutral or they disagree with this perception.

278 employees responded to the question. The measure ranges on a scale of 1 (low levels of distributive justice) to 5 (high levels of distributive justice). Cornell averaged 3.00, 0.35 points above the average of other participating libraries. 63 of the 278 respondents (23%)
provided comments as sampled below. Reports of distributive justice in the comments are not high. Some feel that while there are no rewards, 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."

- *Workspace for professional staff is limited. Distribution of "rewards" within the department is equitable, I think.*
- *I have no clue as to any awards ever given out to any co-workers including myself. And if there are any awards given, which I don't think there are any at all, they are not talked about between co-workers. My understanding is that there are none. How SAD!*
- *People work hard and conscientiously; no one is paid what they're worth.*

It is important to note that Distributive Justice is one of the four dimensions: Distributive, Procedural, Interpersonal, and Informational Justices, that contribute to the overall assessment of CUL’s Climate for Organizational Justice. While two other dimensions are relatively weak, by “CUL standards,” the Interpersonal Justice is very strong (82%).

### 2. Psychological Empowerment in the Workplace - Team-level

50% of CUL participating employees (compared to an average of 49% across the other nine participating libraries) feel that they can contribute to their team. The other 50% respondents are either neutral or they disagree with this perception.

328 employees responded. The measure ranges from 1 (low empowerment) to 5 (high empowerment). Cornell averaged 3.45, 0.04 points higher than the average of the other nine libraries. 57 of the 328 respondents (17%) provided comments as sampled below. 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.

- *More impact/ control over my team, which is within a division. Much less impact/ control over my (much larger) division.*
- *There is not enough collegiality and no real management in my division.*
- *No one seems to have a lot of control - even the University Librarian. There are far too many stakeholders to satisfy for anyone to have too much control.*

A second dimension, Individual Empowerment also contributes to the overall measure of the Psychological Empowerment in the Workplace. This particular dimension is ranked extremely high by CUL staff (91%).
3. **Procedural Justice**: 52% of CUL participating employees (compared to an average of 40% across the other nine participating libraries) perceive that the CUL procedures used to determine rewards and recognition (performance evaluations, for example) are applied uniformly. The other 48% respondents are either neutral or they disagree with this perception.

Procedural justice addresses the fairness of the procedures that were used to determine rewards and recognition. 226 employees responded. This scale ranges from 1 (low) to 5 (high). Cornell’s average was 3.42, 0.34 points above the overall average of the other libraries. 51 of the 226 respondents (23%) commented as sampled below. 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 used to determine rewards. Those who feel there are procedures indicate that rewards are biased and are distributed according to favoritism and elitism.

- *We don't really receive much in the way of rewards other than our salaries.*
- *Favoritism, elitism, and rigidity do describe some of the ways procedures have been applied in this division.*
- *It is felt in our office that hard work and taking on challenges is not valued. It seems like the staff that have less challenging roles, or have been in their positions for long periods (ie. "coasting") are more highly valued than staff that "stretch" themselves by taking on more responsibility or attempting to grow in their careers.*

4. **Informational Justice**: 56% of CUL participating employees (compared to an average of 54% across the other nine participating libraries) feel CUL has transparency of policies and practices that impact an employee, that they have access to the information they need. The other 44% respondents are either neutral or they disagree with this perception.

Informational justice refers to whether or not an employee has access to the information he/she needs. This type of justice indicates transparency—supervisors’ being honest with employees—is imperative to an employee’s sense of justice in the workplace. 226 employees responded. The scale ranges from 1 (low) to 5 (high), with Cornell receiving an average of 3.54, 0.07 points higher than the averages of the other libraries. 34 of the 226 respondents (12%) commented as sampled below. In general, employees voice the concern that communication is particularly poor. Because of this, some employees feel disassociated from management and the library.

- *Explaining and communicating procedures has improved in the last year. Because many of the employees (until recently) were very long term, it was taken for granted that everyone knew the procedures.*
- *Haven't really asked for explanations/ communication of rewards' procedures. Not sure how much impact [...] this supervisor has.*
- *Serious communication problems exist.*
Structural Facilitation of Teamwork refers to the degree to which the organization’s structure and policies facilitate and encourage teamwork and falls under the Climate for Teamwork construct. The scale ranges from 1 (weak) to 7 (strong). 207 employees responded. Cornell ranked an average of 4.70, 0.37 points above the average across the other nine participating libraries. 47 of the 207 respondents (15%) provided comments as sampled below. 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.

- There's too much email and undifferentiated email--items requiring immediate action get lost in chatty information email.
- Lots of info about activities, not always time to absorb.
- We have a culture that pays lip service to teams. We don't have training on how to perform on a team, or lead a team. My value to teams is not part of my performance review or my SIP. We should have a system that requires members of teams to review each other. 360 reviews are never conducted on a team by team basis, and why not? We don't reward those who perform really well on teams -- instead we give them more work.

Climate for Innovation- Supervisory: 62% of CUL participating employees (compared to an average of 54% across the other nine participating libraries) perceive that actions that supervisors engage in, including assigning jobs, reflect a concern for innovation. The other 38% respondents are either neutral or they disagree with this perception.

A climate for innovation refers to the degree to which an organization encourages independent, creative thinking on the part of its employees. The supervisory aspect refers to the actions supervisors engage in, including assigning jobs that reflect concern for innovation. 311 employees responded. The scale ranges from 1 (least positive climate for innovation) to 5 (highest climate for innovation). The average score Cornell received was 3.57, 0.16 points higher than the average of the other nine participating libraries. 30 of the 311 respondents (10%) commented as sampled below. Employees note that support for innovation varies by department, but either way, a large majority of the comments indicates 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).

- Need to acquire new technical knowledge but often not enough time to keep up with this.
• CUL does not encourage risk-taking. I have many examples of projects and peers who have tried new things and failed, and yet those failures are hidden rather than used as examples to learn from.
• The Library does encourage new ideas, but often is so embedded in existing technology, that progress is difficult. Existing systems (e.g. Voyager, WebFeat, etc.) can't accommodate new modules, but limited resources prohibit a complete overhaul.

A second dimension, Climate for Innovation - Co-workers, also contributes to the overall measure for Climate of Innovation. This particular dimension is ranked higher by CUL staff (76% of the respondents agree that co-workers encourage innovation in the library.)

| 7. Climate for Demographic Diversity in Rank: 62% of CUL participating employees (compared to an average of 61% across the other nine participating libraries) agree that CUL has a climate that supports diversity among employees of different rank. The other 38% respondents are either neutral or they disagree with this perception. |

There are four dimensions contributing to the climate for demographic diversity: gender, race, rank, and sexual orientation. Of all the organizational climate measures, CUL ranked the highest in Climate for Demographic Diversity in gender, race and sexual orientation. Climate for demographic diversity in rank, however, did not receive as positive of a rating. 308 employees responded to this question. The scale ranges from 1 (low diversity) to 5 (high diversity). CUL’s average score was 3.66, 0.02 points lower than the average of the other nine participating libraries. In fact, it is one of the only two areas where CUL does not fare as well as the average of the other nine participating libraries.

47 of the 308 respondents (15%) provided comments. Many expressed 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 hand, some employees speak very highly of the interactions between persons of different ranks.

• Any bias that I have observed appears to be unconscious on the individual's part. The issue seems to be a lack of awareness of how others may view particular actions when the standards and criteria for decision making are not shared. It leaves me - and others - to speculate on why one person received an opportunity - an award - over another. When there is a void, it will be filled - sometimes with not the best of assumptions and beliefs about the intent of the actions of the other.
• There are no rank problems within immediate group, but the low rank of the group can be a difficulty in getting timely responses on issues from senior librarians/decision-makers.
• Not all members of this team are treated as equals. Those at the top of the structure are treated differently--with respect and kid gloves; while those lower on the chart are treated with disdain.
313 employees responded. This scale ranges from 1 (poor interpersonal treatment among team members) to 5 (good interpersonal treatment among team members). The average score was 3.79, 0.12 points above the average of the other participating libraries. 36 of the 313 respondents (12%) provided comments as sampled below. 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.

- I feel slightly less positive about the library as a whole as compared to my own division.
- There are always going to be arguments and personality clashes in an organization of this size. I don't believe the personal disagreements get in the way of respecting each other and working together.
- I'm starting to see that I greatly admire the Library's values, but feel that some of my co-workers aren't properly aligned with them. Some are. Coworkers in my division don't argue or put each other down frequently in a public manner, but it comes out in subtle ways. That's only some coworkers though. Others are respectful and supportive.

A second dimension, Manager Interpersonal Treatment of Employees also contributes to the overall measure of Climate for Interpersonal Treatment. This particular dimension is ranked higher by CUL staff (72% of the CUL participants agree that managers treat employees well).

It is worth noting that among the eight CUL weaker aspects, three relate to teamwork: Climate for Interpersonal Treatment at Team-level, Structural Facilitation of Teamwork, and Psychological Safety at Team-level. It is worthwhile for CUL to examine its team culture and functions.

**How accurate is this data?**

The Maryland ClimateQUAL team applied tests to evaluate the consistency of responses among the various questions measuring a particular aspect. The consistency of all CUL responses is high, except in one aspect: Climate for Deep Diversity- Non-discriminatory Practices.

According to the summary report, on a scale of 1(low) - 6 (high), CU average 5.21, with 92% (282 employees) agreeing that the library has non-discriminatory practices. In the comments provided by 36 out of the 282 respondents (12%), they 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. The responses were considered below the minimum threshold of the consistency test. This is an area deserving further investigation.
## Appendix I. CUL Average Scores and Percentage of Positive Responses by Measure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizational Climates</th>
<th>CUL Average Scores</th>
<th>Average Score of the Nine Other Libs</th>
<th>Difference btw CUL and the Nine Other Libs</th>
<th>% of CUL Positive Responses (See note 1)</th>
<th>Average % of the Nine Other Libs</th>
<th>Difference btw CUL and the Nine Other Libs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Climate for Organizational Justice (See note 2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributive Justice (See note 3)</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedural Justice</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Justice</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informational Justice</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Climate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust in Leader</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager’s Passion for Service</td>
<td>5.77</td>
<td>5.57</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authentic Transformational Leadership</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate for Interpersonal Treatment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team-level Interpersonal Treatment</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers Interpersonal Treatment of employees</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate for Deep Diversity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-discriminatory Practice</td>
<td>5.21</td>
<td>4.99</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standardized Procedures</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valuing Diversity</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate for Demographic Diversity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Orientation</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate for Innovation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-workers</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate for Continual Learning</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate for Teamwork</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits of Teams</td>
<td>5.81</td>
<td>5.48</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational value of teamwork</td>
<td>5.51</td>
<td>5.12</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural facilitation of teamwork</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informational Facilitation of Teamwork</td>
<td>5.74</td>
<td>5.34</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate for Customer Service</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Attitudes</td>
<td>CUL Average Scores</td>
<td>Average Score of Nine Other Libs</td>
<td>CUL compared to Nine Other Libs</td>
<td>% of CUL positive responses</td>
<td>Average % of positive responses of the Nine Other Libs*</td>
<td>CUL compared to Nine Other Libs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction(^5)</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Commitment(^7)</td>
<td>5.28</td>
<td>4.91</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Citizenship Behaviors(^7)</td>
<td>5.11</td>
<td>5.01</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Withdrawal(^8) (See note 4)</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Empowerment in the Workplace</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual empowerment(^5)</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team empowerment(^5)</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Engagement(^5)</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Unit Conflict(^3) (See note 3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal(^5)</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task(^5)</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes

(1) The percentage of CUL ClimateQUAL respondents who chose a rating that states, "I agree that my organization has a climate supportive of xxx."

(2) In some cases, multiple dimensions contribute to the assessment of a particular climate, for example, four dimensions: Distributive, Procedural, Interpersonal, and Informational Justices, contribute to the Climate for Organizational Justice.

(3) The superscripts in the first column indicate the scale of a measured aspect, for example, Distributive Justice has a 5-point scale, from 1 (lowest) to 5 (highest). Note not all are 5-point scales. Comparison of multiple climates/attitude can only be made when all points are normalized.

(4) These measure how many employees are thinking about leaving the organization and how much conflict there is in the work unit. The lower the score the better it is, in other words, the lower the score the fewer people are thinking about leaving the organization and fewer conflicts exist in the work unit.