

THE UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND
LIBRARIES' ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE AND
CULTURE SURVEY

Assessment conducted by:

Paul J. Hanges, Ph.D.

Lisa M. Leslie, M.A.

&

Kirsten Keller, B.A.

University of Maryland

Industrial/Organizational Psychology Program

FINAL REPORT

January 2005

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Section</u>	<u>Page Number</u>
Executive Summary	4 – 6
Methodology – Focus Groups and Survey	7 – 9
Results and Interpretations – Focus Groups	9 – 11
Survey	
• Respondent Characteristics	11
• Statistical Assessment of the Survey Scales	11 – 12
<u>Survey Results and Interpretations</u>	
• Focus Group Questions	12 – 18
• Climate for Diversity	18 – 21
• Continuous Learning Climate	21 – 22
• Justice/Fairness	22 – 25
• Job Satisfaction	25 – 26
• Organizational Commitment	26
• Managerial Practices	26 – 27
• Work Group Conflict	27 – 28
• Perceptions of Fair Interpersonal Treatment	28 – 29
• Armed Forces Ethnic Experiences Inventory	29
• Organizational Citizenship Behavior	29 – 30
• Team Climate	30 – 33
• Perceived Organizational Support	33 – 34

• Organizational Withdrawal	34
Changes in the Libraries from 2000-2004	34 -36
• Focus Group: Dissemination of Information	36
• Focus Group: Non-Support for Diversity	36 – 37
• Climate for Diversity: Non-Discriminatory Practices	37
• Perceptions of Fair Interpersonal Treatment	37 – 38
• Organizational Withdrawal	38
• Analyses Based on the Complete 2004 Data Set	38 – 40
Summary	40 – 41
Recommendations	41 – 42
References	43 – 45
Tables 1-7	46 – 54
Appendices ****	
• Appendix A: Focus Group Questions	55 – 56
• Appendix B: Survey Questions and Average Scores	57 – 72
• Appendix C: Scale Scores	73 – 74

*****NOTE: For reasons of ownership, confidentiality and potential future re-use, the scales referred to as Appendices of the report are not included.*

THE UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND LIBRARIES'
CLIMATE AND CULTURE SURVEY

Executive Summary

In September 1999, the University of Maryland (UM) Libraries partnered with the Industrial/Organizational Psychology Program to develop an assessment of Library staff. This original Diversity Assessment was designed to provide, through focus group discussions and a large-scale survey, an in-depth look at how Library employees perceived the Libraries' existing Diversity Initiative. The resulting focus groups and Organizational Culture and Diversity Assessment (OCDA) provided insight in the areas of climate and culture, as well as establishing a baseline against which the organization's future progress could be compared and decisions regarding diversity training could be made.

In spring 2004, the Libraries' once again partnered with the Industrial/Organizational Psychology program to provide an updated "snapshot" of where the Libraries are today in achieving the principles of diversity and team development. Similar in methodology to the 2000 survey, the 2004 assessment was designed to measure employees' individual attitudes and beliefs, the Libraries' organizational culture, and current management practices and policies as they relate to diversity. Approximately 19.4 percent of the library staff participated in the focus groups, while 71.1 percent of the staff participated in the survey.

Based on the overall respondent averages, the assessment results indicate that the UM Libraries could be described as:

- Having a positive work environment for diversity.

- Lacking racial barriers (i.e., respondents did not believe, on average, that people were denied opportunities because of their ethnicity).
- A place where information is successfully disseminated.
- A place that values and supports diversity.
- A place that has non-discriminatory practices and that applies these practices and procedures uniformly.
- A place where teamwork is valued, supported, and effective.

Further, based on the overall averages, respondents appear to:

- Be committed to the organization.
- Be somewhat satisfied.
- Perceive fairness in their interpersonal treatment by supervisors.
- Perceive fairness in the amount of information that is shared.
- Go out of their way to help their fellow UM Libraries employees.

While this description is very positive, it is important to note that it is based on the overall average of the sample. There were differences among sub-groups of the UM Libraries respondents in terms of the degree to which they support this average assessment. In particular, there were consistent ethnic group differences and division differences in how the Climate and Culture of the UM Libraries were described.

In addition to reporting results from the 2004 survey, this report contains comparisons of the scale scores of 15 scales held in common between the two surveys. These included measures of organizational commitment, managerial practices, and perceptions of fair interpersonal treatment. These analyses revealed that there were a number of positive changes that occurred over the past four years. Specifically, for those

respondents that completed both the 2000 and 2004 surveys, there were statistically significant improvements in the belief that:

- The UM Libraries support diversity
- Employees are kept well-informed.
- The UM Libraries have non-discriminatory practices.
- Employees are fairly treated.

It should be noted that there was one significant negative change that occurred. Specifically, the frequency with which respondents think about leaving the UM Libraries statistically increased in 2004. Overall, this analysis reveals that the UM Libraries climate and culture has undergone some significant improvements over the past 4 years.

THE UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND LIBRARIES'

CLIMATE AND CULTURE SURVEY

This report reviews the results of a recent assessment conducted for the University of Maryland (UM) Libraries regarding their climate and culture for teamwork and diversity. The project started in February 2004, and the data analyses discussed in this report were completed during September 2004. This assessment was conducted by gathering qualitative information from several focus group discussions as well as analyzing quantitative information obtained from a survey completed by the majority of UM Library employees. Both the focus group discussions and the subsequent survey were designed to assess current perceptions of the UM Libraries' climate for teamwork, diversity, and fairness. Further, the assessment was designed to evaluate whether any change in the fairness and diversity climate of the UM Libraries occurred in the four years since the 2000 UM Libraries' climate and culture assessment was conducted. Changes in culture and climate typically occur very slowly (Schein, 1987) and interventions designed to change organizational culture and climate frequently may not show statistically significant results after four years. However, we used the original 2000 UM Library results as a baseline to assess whether progress over these last four years might be detected.

Methodology – Focus Groups and Surveys

Two methods were used to conduct this climate and culture assessment. First, we conducted 10 faculty and staff focus groups in March 2004. Separate focus groups were conducted for faculty and staff to ensure that inequalities in status would not inhibit

participation and openness in these meetings. Participants were randomly chosen for these sessions, with an average of 5 employees participating in each session. Thus, a total of 50 employees provided input in this phase of the assessment. In addition to these focus sessions, one session with the UM Library executive committee was conducted. Assuming a total of 294 employees are currently working at the UM Libraries, approximately 19.4 percent of these UM Library employees participated in the focus group phase of this assessment.

A total of seven questions were developed to guide discussion during the focus groups. These questions are contained in Appendix A of this report. The focus group questions were designed to gather information about employees' perceptions of the climate at the UM Libraries. The first several questions were designed to be broad questions about employee climate perceptions. These questions were intentionally vague to minimize any biasing of the responses that might result from asking about specific aspects of climate. The purpose of asking these vague questions was to assess the saliency of fairness, diversity, and teamwork issues in the minds of the employees as well as allow for the emergence of any new issues or concerns. The latter questions were specifically focused on the main purpose of the assessment: issues of teamwork and diversity.

The results of the focus groups were then used to develop a survey aimed at obtaining information concerning the climate and culture of the UM Libraries. The survey's questions and scales dealt with topics including organizational commitment, job satisfaction, distributive fairness, ethnic and gender harassment, and perceptions of fair interpersonal treatment.

In order to provide an opportunity for as many employees as possible to participate, the survey was administered on-site during business hours. A total of 209 surveys were completed (approximately 71.1 percent of all UM Library employees). This was an impressive level of participation and provides a strong foundation for making inferences about the climate and culture of the Library on the basis of the survey results.

Results and Interpretations – Focus Groups

Five different themes emerged from the focus group discussions. Specifically, the five issues included (a) Climate for teamwork; (b) Dissemination of organizational information; (c) Interpersonal relations and diversity issues; (d) Climate for continual learning; and (e) Other categories.

Climate for Teamwork: Overall, we received mixed messages regarding teamwork. Some employees felt team structures were useful, but others indicated that it was unnecessary and that teamwork takes away from doing their primary job tasks. These contrary opinions regarding the effectiveness of teamwork were consistent with the confusion we heard regarding the goals/objectives of some teams. For example, some individuals indicated that employees were not recognized for teamwork, and they felt that the tasks of some teams could be better defined. However, it should be noted that this negative evaluation of teamwork was by no means universally expressed. We also heard comments that the recent reorganization helped increase the efficiency of existing teams and that participating on teams helped to build relationships among employees.

Dissemination of organizational information: Several different concerns about organizational information sharing were expressed in the focus group meetings. For

example, there was some concern expressed about the constant pace of change in the organizational system and the resulting confusion regarding to whom employees should report. Concern was also expressed about a lack of recognition and reward for exemplary employee behavior. However, not all the information was negative. Some individuals indicated that while more communication across divisions is needed, the recent remodeling and physical relocation of certain units within the Libraries was helpful.

Interpersonal relations and diversity issues: Overall, we heard mixed reviews about the success of the libraries diversity initiative attempts. Some staff members reported having good supervisor-employee interactions whereas others reported that their supervisors seemed to “play favorites.” It was clear from our discussions that staff has experienced increased tension in their relationship with faculty over the past several years. Further, there was an undercurrent in our conversations regarding differential treatment according to employee status and/or age.

Learning climate: It was clear from our discussion that employees perceived the Libraries as having a learning climate. However, some of the comments indicated that people felt weighted down by the amount they had to learn just to maintain their current job performance. Finally, another frequent comment was related to a desire for additional skills-oriented training.

Other: This category contains some of the additional comments that were expressed during the focus group sessions. We heard several employees indicate that they work hard to maintain customer service as well as employee morale. People also described the library employees as creative and talented. Finally, there was recognition that there are benefits to working in the library that make up for any pay issues.

However, employees did feel overburdened with their workload, and they targeted recent budget cuts as one factor that contributed to these perceptions.

While this qualitative information is helpful in that it identified a few new issues that were not previously assessed, it is important to remember that the majority of the UM Libraries' employees did not participate in these sessions. We therefore followed the focus group sessions with a survey that, in addition to assessing the progress of the Libraries over the past four years based on the previous 2000 survey, captured some of the themes that we heard in the focus groups.

Survey

Respondent Characteristics

A total of 209 UM Library employees completed the UM Libraries' Climate and Culture survey. The age of the respondents ranged from 23 to 71 with an average age of 46 (standard deviation = 12). The majority of the respondents were female (64.4 percent) and full-time UM Library employees (58.2 percent). Tables 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 show the distribution of the respondents with respect to the division that they work, length of employment, job position, ethnicity, and religion, respectively.

Statistical Assessment of the Survey Scales

Averages for each of the questions in the survey are shown in Appendix B. However, since the wording of individual items can distort respondent ratings, we will focus on average scale scores in this report. Scale scores are obtained by averaging the responses to a subset of items that have been determined to measure a single theme. These scale scores provide a more reliable indication of a group's opinion because averaging across multiple items minimizes the influence of "item wording bias."

The adequacy of all scale scores in the UM Libraries' Climate and Culture Survey have been verified by two separate statistical procedures. First, we verified that a sub-set of items measured a single theme by conducting factor analyses. Second, the reliability of our scale scores was assessed by computing the internal consistency of the scale (i.e., Cronbach's coefficient alpha). Scales that have a Cronbach coefficient alpha greater than 0.70 are considered to have an acceptable level of internal consistency (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1993). The results for the scale scores are shown in Appendix C of this report.

Survey Results and Interpretations

Focus Group Questions

Respect and fair treatment: A total of 5 items were averaged to create this scale, and it showed an acceptable level of internal consistency (Cronbach's alpha = 0.79). The average scale score was 3.64, which was in the middle between the "Somewhat False" and "Somewhat True" anchor on the original response scale. Thus, on average, respondents did not report strong levels of agreement for these items.

We explored this scale further by assessing whether groups responded differently to these items. We found that responses to this scale differed statistically depending upon the division ($\eta^2 = 0.12, p < .05$)^{1, 2}, job position ($\eta^2 = 0.10, p < .05$), and ethnicity³ of the respondent ($\eta^2 = 0.09, p < .05$). Specifically:

¹ Eta-squared (η^2) is a statistical estimate of the importance of a finding. η^2 ranges from 0 (completely unimportant) to 1.00 (extremely important). In general, statistical results that have an η^2 of 0.01 are considered small whereas statistical results with an η^2 of 0.09 are considered medium and statistical results that have an η^2 of 0.25 are considered large.

² The reported p -value indicates the probability that group differences could have occurred by chance. In general, group differences associated with p -values less than 0.05 are considered sufficiently rare, and the conclusion that the observed group differences did not occur by chance is justified.

³ Due to the small number of respondents that identified themselves as Native-American (no respondents), Hispanic (four respondents), and Biracial (1 respondent), the average results for these ethnicity's were unstable. We therefore excluded these respondents from analyses exploring scale differences as a function

- *Division.* Respondents from the “Planning and Administrative Services or Dean’s Office” (average= 4.10) and the “Collection Management and Special Collections” division (average = 4.08) were more positive with regard to this scale than were respondents in the “Public Services” (average = 3.60) or “Technical Services” (average = 3.24) divisions.
- *Job Position.* Librarians (average = 3.83) reported greater respect and fair treatment than did Staff (average = 3.51).
- *Ethnicity.* Caucasians (average = 3.75) and Asian-Americans (average = 3.69) reported greater respect and fair treatment than did African-Americans (average = 2.98). Finally, the International respondents (average = 3.38) did not statistically differ in their perception of respect and fair treatment from any of the other ethnic groups⁴.

Concern about diversity: A total of 5 items were averaged to create this scale, and the internal consistency of the scale was 0.81. The average scale score was 3.63, which was in the middle between the “Somewhat False” and “Somewhat True” anchor on the original response scale. Thus, on average, respondents did not report strong levels of agreement for these items.

We found that responses to this scale differed statistically only as a function of respondent ethnicity ($\eta^2 = 0.09, p < .05$). Specifically,

of ethnicity. Further, respondents that classified themselves as Other (10 respondents) were excluded from these analyses because this classification did not identify a single identifiable ethnic group.

⁴ Statistical differences between groups are a function of the size of the difference between averages for these two groups as well as the variability within each group. Two groups may not statistically differ even though they have different averages because the variation within both groups is so large that the differences in the averages may not be reliable. Only those differences that are large enough so that they cannot be attributed to random fluctuation are called “statistically different.”

- *Ethnicity.* Caucasians (average = 3.86) were statistically more likely to report a lack of concern for diversity than were African-Americans (average = 3.18), and International (average = 3.27) respondents. The average score for Asian-Americans (average = 3.51) fell in the middle of these two groups.

Positive work environment for diversity: A total of 4 items were averaged to create this scale, and its' internal consistency was 0.81. The average scale score was 3.95, which corresponds to the "Somewhat True" anchor on the response scale. Thus, on average, respondents indicated that the UM Libraries have a positive environment for diversity.

However, there was a significant difference as a function of ethnicity ($\eta^2 = 0.20, p < .01$) on this scale. Specifically:

- *Ethnicity.* Caucasians (average = 4.18) and Asian-Americans (average = 4.13) were statistically more positive about the climate for diversity than were African-Americans (average = 3.03). While not statistically different from Asian-Americans, International respondents (average = 3.64) were statistically less positive about the climate for diversity than were Caucasians.

Lack of racial barriers. Two items were averaged to create this scale. The internal consistency of this scale was very high (Cronbach's alpha = 0.93). The average scale score was 5.06 indicating that respondents did not perceive that they were denied opportunities because of their ethnicity.

We found that responses to this scale differed statistically depending upon the ethnicity ($\eta^2 = 0.33, p < .01$), division ($\eta^2 = 0.16, p < .05$), and job position of the respondent ($\eta^2 = 0.04, p < .05$). Specifically:

- *Ethnicity.* Caucasians (average = 5.58) were statistically more likely to respond that they were not denied opportunities due to their ethnicity than were International (average = 4.21), Asian-Americans (average = 3.90), or African-Americans (average = 3.75) respondents.
- *Division.* Respondents from the “Collection Management and Special Collections” division (average = 5.64), the “Planning and Administrative Services or Dean’s Office” division (average = 5.48), the “Information Technology” division (average = 5.46), and the “Public Services” division (average = 5.26) were statistically more likely to respond that they were not denied opportunities due to their ethnicity than respondents in the “Technical Services” division (average = 4.50).
- *Job Position.* Librarians (average = 5.40) were statistically more likely to respond that they were not denied opportunities due to their ethnicity than were Staff members (average = 4.88).

Dissemination of information. A total of 6 items were averaged to create this scale. The internal consistency of this scale was quite acceptable (Cronbach’s alpha = 0.82). The average scale score was a 4.45, indicating that respondents, on average, felt that the UM Libraries are successful in keeping people up-to-date about the library and that they have a good understanding of supervisor expectations.

We found that responses to this scale differed statistically depending upon the division of the respondent ($\eta^2 = 0.09, p < .01$). Specifically:

- *Division.* Respondents from the “Collection Management and Special Collections” division (average = 4.93) and the “Planning and Administrative Services or Dean’s Office” division (average= 4.63) were statistically more positive about the dissemination of information than were respondents in the “Public Services” division (average = 4.49), the “Technical Services” division (average = 4.48), and the “Information Technology” division (average = 4.30).

Non-support for diversity. A total of 3 items were averaged to create this scale, and the internal consistency of this scale was 0.69. The scale score was 2.61, indicating that, on average, respondents thought it was generally false that the Libraries do not support diversity.

We found that responses to this scale differed statistically depending upon the division of the respondent ($\eta^2 = 0.08, p < .01$). Specifically:

- *Division.* Respondents from the “Planning and Administrative Services or Dean’s Office” division (average= 2.21), the “Collection Management and Special Collections” division (average = 2.52), the “Public Services” division (average = 2.59), and the “Information Technology” division (average = 2.59) were statistically more likely to perceive the diversity initiative as useful and important than were respondents in the “Technical Services” division (average = 2.92).

Standardization of procedures. Only a single item was used to assess this theme. The score on this item was 4.84, which indicated that, on average, respondents felt that it was generally true that their supervisor treats all employees fairly, regardless of their group identity.

We found that responses to this scale differed statistically depending upon the division of the respondent ($\eta^2 = 0.06, p < .05$). Specifically:

- *Division.* Respondents from the “Collection Management and Special Collections” division (average = 5.35) and the “Public Services” division (average = 5.10) were statistically more likely to indicate that their supervisors treat all employees fairly, regardless of their group identity than were respondents from the “Information Technology” division (average = 4.64) and the “Technical Services” division (average = 4.60). Respondents in the “Planning and Administrative Services or Dean’s Office” division (average= 4.95) did not statistically differ from any of these various groups.

Monetary rewards. A total of 3 items were averaged to create this scale. Unfortunately, the internal consistency of this scale was low (Cronbach’s alpha = 0.55). The average scale score was 3.15, indicating that, on average, respondents felt that their salary was generally not a good reflection of their performance.

Supervisory style. A total of 3 items were averaged to create this scale, and the internal consistency of this scale was 0.71. The scale score was 3.60 indicating that, on average, respondents are in the middle of the scale with regard to their supervisor’s style.

We found that responses to this scale differed statistically depending upon ethnicity ($\eta^2 = 0.11, p < .01$) and division of the respondent ($\eta^2 = 0.08, p < .01$).

Specifically:

- *Ethnicity.* Asian-Americans (average = 4.20), Caucasians (average = 3.66) and International (average = 3.26) respondents were statistically more positive about their supervisor's style than were African-American (average = 2.92) respondents.
- *Division.* Respondents from the "Collection Management and Special Collections" division (average = 3.95), the "Planning and Administrative Services or Dean's Office" division (average= 3.87), the "Information Technology" division (average = 3.83), and the "Public Services" division (average = 3.65) were statistically more positive about their supervisor's style than were respondents in the "Technical Services" division (average = 3.29).

Climate for Diversity

An organization with a "Climate for Diversity" creates, through its practices and policies and through its organizational culture, an environment in which minorities and majorities are valued equally. We included a total of 32 items on the survey to assess the climate for diversity. The Climate for Diversity scale formed by these items was created for use in the 2000 survey (Nishii, Raver, & Dominguez, 2000). Our factor analyses of these items revealed that three unique sub-themes emerge from these items. The first sub-theme was labeled *Climate for diversity: Non-discriminatory practices*. It was measured with 11 items, and it showed an acceptable level of internal consistency

(Cronbach's alpha = 0.89). Its average score was 4.62, indicating that respondents believed that the UM Libraries has non-discriminatory practices. However, there were significant differences on this scale as a function of respondents' ethnicity ($\eta^2 = 0.38, p < .01$), job position ($\eta^2 = 0.12, p < .01$), and division ($\eta^2 = 0.10, p < .01$). Specifically:

- *Ethnicity.* Caucasians (average = 5.04) were statistically more likely to report that the libraries have non-discriminatory practices than were Asian-Americans (average = 4.21). Further, Asian-Americans were statistically more likely to report that the libraries have non-discriminatory practices than were African-Americans (average = 3.41). Finally, while International (average = 3.96) respondents were not statistically different from either Asian-American or African-American respondents, they were statistically less likely to report that the libraries have non-discriminatory practices than Caucasians.
- *Job Position.* Librarians (average = 4.92) were statistically more likely to report that the libraries have non-discriminatory practices than were Staff (average = 4.45).
- *Division.* Respondents from the "Collection Management and Special Collections" division (average = 4.98), the "Planning and Administrative Services or Dean's Office" division (average= 4.94), and the "Public Services" division (average = 4.82) were statistically more likely to report that the libraries have non-discriminatory practices than were respondents in the "Technical Services" division (average = 4.35). Respondents from

the “Information Technology” division (average = 4.74) were not statistically different from any of these other groups,

The second sub-theme was labeled *Climate for diversity: Standardization of procedures*. It was measured with 5 items and exhibited an acceptable level of internal consistency (Cronbach’s alpha = 0.91). The average score on this sub-theme was 3.98, indicating that respondents believed that the procedures of the UM Libraries are applied equally to everyone. However, there were significant differences on this scale as a function of respondents’ ethnicity ($\eta^2 = 0.16, p < .01$). Specifically:

- *Ethnicity*. Caucasians (average = 4.19) and Asian-Americans (average = 4.16) were statistically higher in their agreement that procedures are standardized across groups than were African-Americans (average = 2.97). International (average = 3.69) respondents did not statistically differ from any of the ethnic groups.

The final sub-theme was labeled *Climate for diversity: Valuing diversity*. It was measured by 5 items, and it also had an acceptable level of internal consistency (Cronbach’s alpha = 0.87). The average score for this sub-theme was 4.20, indicating that there is a perception that the UM Libraries value diversity. However, there were significant differences on this scale as a function of respondents’ ethnicity ($\eta^2 = 0.24, p < .01$), job position ($\eta^2 = 0.09, p < .01$), and division. Specifically:

- *Ethnicity*. Caucasians (average = 4.48) and Asian-Americans (average = 4.09) reported that the libraries valued diversity more than African-Americans (average = 3.43). Caucasians were statistically more likely to

report that the libraries valued diversity than were the International (average = 3.78) respondents.

- *Job Position.* Librarians (average = 4.48) statistically reported that the libraries valued diversity more than did Staff (average = 4.11).
- *Division.* Respondents from the “Collection Management and Special Collections” division (average = 4.58) were statistically more likely to report that the libraries valued diversity than were respondents in the “Information Technology” division (average = 4.08) and the “Technical Services” division (average = 4.05). Respondents from the “Planning and Administrative Services or Dean’s Office” division (average= 4.37) and the “Public Services” division (average = 4.33) were not statistically different from any of these other groups,

Continuous Learning Climate

A “continuous learning climate” refers to an organizational environment in which (a) all employees are expected to continuously acquire new knowledge and skills; (b) the organizational structures and policies support the acquisition of new knowledge and skills; and (c) the organization emphasizes innovation, both within and outside of the immediate work context. Our scale consisted of 19 items, and it showed an acceptable level of internal consistency (Cronbach’s alpha = 0.89; Tracey, Tannenbaum, & Kavanagh, 1995). A 5-point response scale was used ranging from 1= “Strongly Disagree” to 5= “Strongly Agree.” The average score on this scale was 3.36, indicating a moderate level of agreement that the UM Libraries have a continuous learning climate.

There were significant differences on this scale as a function of respondent ethnicity ($\eta^2 = 0.12, p < .01$). Specifically:

- *Ethnicity*. Asian-Americans (average = 3.67) and Caucasians (average = 3.42) reported statistically greater levels of continuous learning climate than did African-Americans (average = 2.96). The International (average = 3.18) respondents statistically differed from only the Asian-American group.

Justice/Fairness

Recent research (Colquitt, 2001; Colquitt, Gonion, Wesson, Porter, & Ng, 2001) has found that justice perceptions can be separated into four distinct sub-themes. The first sub-theme is called *Distributive Justice* and refers to the degree to which respondents believe that outcomes (e.g., rewards) are distributed in a fashion commensurate with the level of a person's input to the job (e.g., performance, talent). The *Distributive Justice* scale was measured by 4 items using a 5 point response scale (i.e., 1= To no extent; 2= To a limited extent; 3= To some extent; 4= To a considerable extent; 5 = To a great extent). The internal consistency of this scale was acceptable (Cronbach's alpha = 0.93). The average *Distributive Justice* score was 2.59 reflecting that respondents indicated a moderate belief in the fair and equal distribution of outcomes.

The second sub-theme is called *Procedural Justice* and refers to perceptions among respondents that the procedures used to determine the distribution of rewards have been consistently and uniformly applied to all individuals in the organization.

Procedural Justice was measured by 7 items using the same 5 point response scale. The

internal consistency of this scale was quite good (Cronbach's alpha = 0.89). The average scale score was 2.71 indicating that respondents held a moderate belief in the consistency of the application of organizational procedures and processes in allocating rewards. There was a significant difference by respondent ethnicity, however ($\eta^2 = 0.12, p < .01$).

Specifically:

- *Ethnicity*. Caucasians (average = 2.89) and Asian-Americans (average = 2.80) reported a greater degree of procedural justice than did African-Americans (average = 2.08). The International (average = 2.49) respondents did not statistically differ from any of the ethnic groups.

The third sub-theme is called *Interpersonal Justice* and it focuses on the fairness and respectfulness of the interactions between employees and their supervisors. We measured this sub-theme using 4 items (Cronbach's alpha = 0.92). The average score on this scale was 4.15 indicating that respondents were extremely positive about the level of interpersonal justice. There were, however, significant differences on this scale as a function of respondents' ethnicity ($\eta^2 = 0.10, p < .01$), division ($\eta^2 = 0.07, p < .05$), and gender ($\eta^2 = 0.03, p < .05$). Specifically:

- *Ethnicity*. Caucasians (average = 4.35) reported statistically more interpersonal justice than did either African-Americans (average = 3.81), Asian-Americans (average = 3.70), or the International (average = 3.37) respondents.
- *Division*. Respondents from the "Collection Management and Special Collections" division (average = 4.51) and the "Public Services" division (average = 4.39) reported statistically more interpersonal justice than did

respondents in the “Technical Services” division (average = 3.87). Respondents from the “Planning and Administrative Services or Dean’s Office” division (average= 4.36) and the “Information Technology” division (average = 4.10) were not statistically different from any of these other groups.

- *Gender.* Females (average = 4.31) reported statistically more interpersonal justice than did males (average = 3.97).

The final sub-theme is called *Informational Justice*. It refers to respondents’ beliefs regarding the extent to which explanations for the procedures and reward distribution decisions are provided. We measured this sub-theme using 5 items, and its level of internal consistency was good (Cronbach’s alpha = 0.94). The average score on this scale was 3.56, indicating that respondents were fairly positive about the level of information sharing. However, there were significant differences on this scale as a function of respondent division ($\eta^2 = 0.08, p < .01$) and ethnicity ($\eta^2 = 0.07, p < .01$). Specifically:

- *Division.* Respondents from the “Collection Management and Special Collections” division (average = 3.93) reported statistically more informational justice than did respondents in the “Technical Services” division (average = 3.36) and the “Information Technology” division (average = 3.21). Respondents from the “Public Services” division (average = 3.87) and the “Planning and Administrative Services or Dean’s

Office” division (average= 3.73) were not statistically different from any of these other groups.

- *Ethnicity.* Asian-Americans (average = 3.71) and Caucasians (average = 3.70) reported statistically higher levels of informational justice than did African-Americans (average = 2.98). International (average = 3.12) respondents did not statistically differ from any of the ethnic groups.

Job Satisfaction

We used the single item “faces” scale to measure job satisfaction (Kunin, 1998). Prior studies have shown that this single item does as good a job in measuring this attitude as do multi-item measures. The item asked respondents to pick one out of 5 faces that best reflects their level of satisfaction with the job. When scoring the item, we associated the extremely happy face with a score of 5, the moderately happy face with a score of 4, the non-descript face with a score of 3, the moderately sad face with a score of 2, and the extremely sad face with a score of 1. The average score was 3.56, indicating that respondents were somewhat satisfied with their job. However, we also found significant differences on this scale as a function of respondent division ($\eta^2 = 0.06, p < .05$). Specifically:

- *Division.* Respondents from the “Collection Management and Special Collections” division (average = 4.00) reported statistically more job satisfaction than did respondents in the “Technical Services” division (average = 3.30). Respondents from the “Planning and Administrative Services or Dean’s Office” division (average= 3.81), the “Public Services” division (average = 3.59), and the “Information Technology” division

(average = 3.57) were not statistically different from any of the other divisions.

Organizational Commitment

Employees who are highly committed to an organization often indicate that they identify strongly with organizational values and that they care about the fate of the organization. Therefore, high levels of organizational commitment would be rewarding and beneficial for both the Libraries and their employees. We measured this scale with 15 items (Cronbach's alpha = 0.89; Mowday, Porter, & Steers, 1982) using a 7-point response scale. The average score was 4.69 reflecting a tendency for respondents to be more rather than less committed to the organization. There were, however, significant differences on this scale as a function of respondent ethnicity ($\eta^2 = 0.09, p < .01$).

Specifically:

- *Ethnicity.* International (average = 4.88) respondents and Caucasians (average = 4.87) reported statistically more organizational commitment than did African-Americans (average = 4.07). Asian-Americans (average = 4.79) were not statistically different from any of these ethnic groups.

Managerial Practices

The Managerial Practices scale assesses the extent to which employees believe that their managers strive to improve the quality of work and service in their areas (Schneider, White, & Paul, 1998). Four items were used to measure this scale (Cronbach's alpha = 0.91). Respondents used a 5-point response scale ranging from 1= "To no extent" to 5= "To a great extent." The average score for this scale was 3.56, indicating that most respondents believed that their managers are effectively helping

improve the quality of work and service in their area. There were, however, significant differences due to respondent ethnicity ($\eta^2 = 0.07, p < .01$). Specifically:

- *Ethnicity*. Asian-Americans (average = 4.05) and Caucasians (average = 3.64) rated their managers as more helpful than did African-Americans (average = 2.89). Asian-Americans rated their managers as more helpful than did International (average = 3.04) respondents. Caucasians and International respondents did not statistically differ on this scale.

Work Group Conflict

Work group conflict refers to two types of conflict that may exist within an individual's work unit. The first is *task conflict*, which refers to conflict based on the substance of the task that the group is performing. The second type of conflict, *relationship conflict*, refers to conflict based on the unit's interpersonal relations. We measured these two aspects of work group conflict with 4 items each (Jehn, 1995). However, factor analyses revealed that there really were not two separate sub-themes in this scale. Therefore, we combined our items to a single work group conflict scale. Respondents rated the 8 items using a 5-point response scale that ranged from 1="To no extent" to 5 = "To a great extent." The internal consistency of this scale was acceptable (Cronbach's alpha = 0.90). The average for this scale was 2.31, indicated a "limited" to "some" level of work group conflict.

We found significant differences on this scale as a function of respondent division ($\eta^2 = 0.06, p < .05$). Specifically:

- *Division.* Respondents from the “Planning and Administrative Services or Dean’s Office” division (average= 2.02) and the “Collection Management and Special Collections” division (average = 2.03) reported statistically less work group conflict than did respondents in the “Technical Services” division (average = 2.59). Respondents from the “Information Technology” division (average = 2.25) and the “Public Services” division (average = 2.32) were not statistically different from any of these groups.

Perceptions of Fair Interpersonal Treatment (PFIT)

This scale assessed the extent to which respondents felt that supervisors and co-workers in the organization treated each other with fairness and respect (Donovan, Drawgow, & Munson, 1998). It was measured by combining 18 items that were measured with a 3-point response scale (1= Yes, 2=Can’t decide; 3=No). The internal consistency of this scale was acceptable (Cronbach’s alpha = 0.93). The average score on this scale was 1.43, indicating that perceptions of fair interpersonal treatment in the Libraries were fairly high. There were, however, significant differences on this scale as a function of respondents’ ethnicity ($\eta^2 = 0.10, p < .01$) and division ($\eta^2 = 0.10, p < .01$). Specifically:

- *Ethnicity.* Caucasians (average = 1.34) and Asian-Americans (average = 1.32) had statistically greater perceptions of fair interpersonal treatment than either African-Americans (average = 1.72) and International (average = 1.72) respondents.
- *Division.* Respondents from the “Collection Management and Special Collections” division (average = 1.21), the “Planning and Administrative

Services or Dean's Office" division (average= 1.30), the "Information Technology" division (average = 1.32), and the "Public Services" division (average = 1.37) reported statistically greater perceptions of fair interpersonal treatment than did respondents in the "Technical Services" division (average = 1.56).

The Armed Forces Ethnic Experiences Inventory (AFEI)

This scale assessed the extent to which employees attributed negative experiences to their race/ethnicity (Schneider, Hitlan, & Radhakrishnan, 2000). Respondents were asked to indicate whether they have experienced any of fourteen negative race- or ethnicity-driven scenarios. The internal consistency of this scale was 0.79. The average percentage of respondents that identified a particular negative experience as occurring was 2.8 percent. In summary, there is no evidence of ethnic harassment in the Libraries.

Organizational Citizenship Behavior

Organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) refers to discretionary prosocial behavior that promotes the efficient and effective functioning of an organization. Specifically, our measure assessed two different OCB sub-themes (Lee & Allen, 2002). The first sub-theme, *individual focused OCB*, examined on the extent to which respondents were prosocial toward their fellow employees. This sub-theme was measured with 8 items on a 7-point response scale. The internal consistency of this scale was quite acceptable (Cronbach's alpha = 0.89). The average for this scale was 5.13, which is slightly above "often" on the response scale. In other words, respondents frequently help their fellow UM Libraries' employees.

The second sub-theme, *organizational focused OCB*, assessed the extent to which respondents were prosocial to help the organization. This second sub-theme was also measured with 8 items and the internal consistency of the scale was acceptable (Cronbach's alpha = 0.91). The average for this scale was 4.71 which is between "sometimes" and "often" on the response scale. In other words, respondents exhibited OCBs directed toward the organization fairly frequently. However, there were statistical differences on this scale as a function of respondents' job position ($\eta^2 = 0.09, p < .01$). Specifically:

- *Job Position.* Librarians (average = 5.10) reported statistically more organizational focused OCBs than did Staff (average = 4.50).

Team Climate

This scale was designed specifically for the UM Libraries Climate and Culture survey. A total of 26 items were written to assess the extent to which respondents believed that the UM Libraries had a climate for teamwork. A factor analysis revealed that only 14 items were needed to measure three different sub-themes. The first theme, which we called *Climate for teamwork*, measures the perception that the policies, practices, and procedures of the UM Libraries encourages teamwork. The scale consisted of 5 items and it had an acceptable level of internal consistency (Cronbach's alpha = 0.87). The overall average was 4.06, indicating that respondents were non-committal with regard to this scale. There were statistical differences on this scale as a function of respondent's division ($\eta^2 = 0.11, p < .01$), ethnicity ($\eta^2 = 0.09, p < .01$), job position ($\eta^2 = 0.07, p < .01$), and gender ($\eta^2 = 0.03, p < .05$). Specifically:

- *Division.* Respondents from the “Planning and Administrative Services or Dean’s Office” division (average= 5.11) reported statistically more climate for teamwork than did the “Information Technology” division (average = 4.24), the “Public Services” division (average = 4.03) and the “Technical Services” division (average = 3.70). While not statistically different from the “Planning and Administrative Services or Dean’s Office” respondents, the “Collection Management and Special Collections” division (average = 4.37) reported statistically more climate for teamwork than did the “Technical Services” division.
- *Ethnicity.* Asian-Americans (average = 4.94) reported statistically more climate for teamwork than did Caucasians (average = 4.14). Both Asian-Americans and Caucasians reported statistically more climate for teamwork than did African-Americans (average = 3.42). International (average= 4.05) respondents did not statistically differ from any of these groups.
- *Job Position.* Staff (average = 4.51) reported statistically more climate for teamwork than did Librarians (average = 3.73).
- *Gender.* Males (average = 4.52) were statistically higher on this scale than were females (average = 3.99). However, it should be noted that neither males nor females could be characterized as strongly supporting this scale.

The second theme, which we called *Teamwork effectiveness*, measures the extent to which respondents believe that teamwork results in a number of positive outcomes (e.g., improving work quality, building relationships, facilitating task completion). The

scale consisted of 5 items and it had an acceptable level of internal consistency (Cronbach's alpha = 0.86). The overall average was 4.61, indicating that respondents were slightly agreed that teamwork had positive consequences. There were statistical differences on this scale as a function of respondent's ethnicity ($\eta^2 = 0.08, p < .01$) and gender ($\eta^2 = 0.02, p < .05$). Specifically:

- *Ethnicity.* Asian-Americans (average = 5.39) reported statistically more positive consequences for teamwork than did Caucasians (average = 4.56) or African-Americans (average = 4.12). International (average = 4.50) respondents did not statistically differ from any of these groups.
- *Gender.* Males (average = 4.95) reported statistically more positive consequences for teamwork than did females (average = 4.55).

The third sub-theme, which we called *Teamwork culture*, measures the extent to which respondents believe that teamwork is valued at the UM Libraries. The scale consisted of 5 items and it had an acceptable level of internal consistency (Cronbach's alpha = 0.84). The overall average was 5.25, indicating that respondents tend to moderately agree that the UM Libraries value teamwork. There were statistical differences on this scale as a function of respondent's division ($\eta^2 = 0.09, p < .01$).

Specifically:

- *Division.* Respondents from the "Planning and Administrative Services or Dean's Office" division (average= 5.91), the "Collection Management and Special Collections" division (average = 5.53), the "Public Services" division (average = 5.44), the "Information Technology" division (average = 5.34) statistically were more likely to perceive the UM Libraries as

having a culture for teamwork than did respondents from the “Technical Services” division (average = 4.86).

Perceived Organizational Support

This 8 item-scale measured the extent to which respondents perceive the organization as supporting and valuing respondent’s inputs and efforts at the library (Eisenberger, Cummings, & Armeli, 1997). The internal consistency of this scale exceeded professional standards (Cronbach’s alpha = 0.93). The average scale score was 4.53, indicating that people tended to slightly agree that the UM Libraries supported and valued them. We did find, however, statistical differences as a function of respondents’ ethnicity ($\eta^2 = 0.07$, $p < .05$), division ($\eta^2 = 0.06$, $p < .05$), and gender ($\eta^2 = 0.04$, $p < .05$). Specifically:

- *Ethnicity*. Asian-Americans (average = 4.79) and Caucasians (average = 4.72) reported statistically greater amounts of organizational support than did African-Americans (average = 3.71). International (average = 4.45) respondents did not statistically differ from any of these groups.
- *Division*. Respondents from the “Collection Management and Special Collections” division (average = 5.05) and the “Planning and Administrative Services or Dean’s Office” division (average = 5.05) reported statistically greater perceptions of organizational support than did respondents from the “Technical Services” division (average = 4.07). Respondents from the “Public Services” division (average = 4.56) and the “Information Technology” division (average = 4.52) did not significantly differ from any of these groups.

- *Gender.* Males (average = 5.04) rated perceived organizational support statistically higher than did females (average = 4.45).

Organizational Withdrawal

Organizational withdrawal refers to the frequency that employees' think about leaving the organization or looking for other work opportunities. This scale was composed of two items with a seven point response scale (Hanisch & Hulin, 1990). The internal consistency of this scale was acceptable (Cronbach's alpha = 0.80). The average scale score was 2.63, reflecting that respondents think about quitting between 2 to 6 times per year.

Changes in the Libraries from 2000 to 2004

In this section of the report, we examine whether there were statistically significant changes in the UM Libraries since the last climate and culture assessment in 2000. More specifically, the goal of this comparison was to determine if the changes implemented in the Libraries over the last four years have been effective. Therefore, we conducted analyses that compared scale scores from the 2000 survey with scale scores from the 2004 survey. In conducting these analyses, we used the responses of all individuals who completed the survey in 2000, which consisted of a total of two hundred sixty employees equal to an 82% participation rate of those individuals employed by the Libraries. We compared the average of these responses to the responses of only those individuals who completed the 2004 survey and indicated that they completed the 2000 survey as well. Out of the 209 employees (71.1% of all employees) who completed the 2004 survey, 111 employees (53.1% of 2004 respondents, 37.8% of all 2004 employees)

reported that they also completed the 2000 survey. We excluded 2004 participants who did not participate in 2000 to rule out the possibility that results indicating changes in the Libraries' climate were due to the hiring of new employees and not perceptions of actual changes as experienced by individuals employed during this time period. Ideally, we would have liked to exclude individuals who participated in 2000 but not in 2004 from the 2000 responses, but it was impossible to identify these individuals.

In assessing the changes in the Libraries between 2000 and 2004, we were only able to compare the scale scores of constructs included in both the 2000 and 2004 surveys. Therefore, we were able to assess changes in a total of 15 scales between 2000 and 2004. These scales included:

- Focus Group Theme: Respect and Fair Treatment
- Focus Group Theme: Lack of Concern about Diversity
- Focus Group Theme: Positive Work Environment for Diversity
- Focus Group Theme: Lack of Racial Barriers
- Focus Group Theme: Dissemination of Information
- Focus Group Theme: Non-support for Diversity
- Climate for Diversity: Non-discriminatory Practices
- Climate for Diversity: Standardization of Procedures
- Climate for Diversity: Valuing Diversity
- Continuous Learning Climate
- Organizational Commitment
- Managerial Practices
- Workgroup Conflict
- Perceptions of Fair Interpersonal Treatment
- Organizational Withdrawal

We compared the average values of each of these scales in the 2000 and 2004 data. Table 6 shows the averages for these 15 scales for the UM Library. Table 7 shows the same information but it provides separate tables for each UM Library division.

Our analyses indicated that only five of these scales exhibited a significant change over time. The results for these five scales are described below. The scales listed above

but not discussed below did not exhibit statistically significant levels of change between 2000 and 2004.

Focus Group: Dissemination of Information

The comparison revealed that since 2000, the Library has made a small improvement in the ability to disseminate information to employees and keep them well-informed ($t = 1.845, p = .07$)⁵. Responses were measured on a 6-point scale ranging from 1= “always false or almost always false” to 6= “always true or almost always true.” The average value of the dissemination of information scale in 2000 was 4.81, and the average value in 2004 was 5.00. This change reflects the notion that employees were more likely to agree that they are kept well-informed in 2004 as compared to 2000. It should be noted that although six items were used to measure Dissemination of Information in the 2004 survey, only two of those items were included in the 2000 survey. Therefore, this comparison reflects the average value of those two items (items numbered 17 and 18 on page 2 of the 2004 survey).

Focus Group: Non-support for Diversity

The comparison revealed that since 2000, the Library has also made significant improvements in the extent to which diversity related policies and practices are supported in the library ($t=13.24, p = .00$). Again, responses were measured on a 6-point scale ranging from 1= “always false or almost always false” to 6= “always true or almost always true.” The average value of the scale reflecting a lack of support for diversity was 4.31 in 2000 and was 2.61 in 2004. This indicates that employees thought it was generally true that the Libraries did not support diversity in 2000, but in 2004 they

⁵ The t statistic is an index that is used to determine whether or not two average values are statistically different. Generally, t values are considered significant if they reach the absolute value of 1.96. Values greater than 1.65 are generally considered marginally significant.

thought that it was generally false that the Libraries do not support diversity. It should be noted that although seven items were used to measure Dissemination of Information in the 2000 survey, only three of those items were included in the 2004 survey. Therefore, this comparison reflects the average value of those 3 items (items numbered 25, 26, and 27 on pages 2-3 of the 2004 survey).

Climate for Diversity: Non-Discriminatory Practices

The comparison revealed that since 2000, the Library has made improvements in the extent to which the climate of the Library is characterized by non-discriminatory practices ($t = 2.175, p = .03$). Responses were measured on a 6-point scale ranging from 1= “always false or almost always false” to 6= “always true or almost always true.” The average value of the Non-discriminatory Practices facet of Climate for Diversity in 2000 was 4.35, and the average value in 2004 was 4.61. This change reflects the notion that employees were more likely to agree that the climate of the Library fosters non-discriminatory practices in 2004, as compared to 2000.

Perceptions of Fair Interpersonal Treatment

This comparison revealed that since 2000, the Library has made large improvements in the perceptions of fair interpersonal treatment among Library employees ($t = 18.179, p = .00$). The average value of the perceptions of fair interpersonal treatment scale in 2000 was 2.48, and the average value in 2004 was 1.45 on a scale for which higher scores indicated that employees do not receive positive interpersonal treatment. The scale asked respondents to indicate whether they had experienced the described events. This was measured with a 3-point response scale (1= Yes, 2=Can't decide; 3=No). Therefore, this change indicates that individuals agreed that

employees are treated well in 2004, but did not agree that employees are treated well in 2000.

Organizational Withdrawal

The significant change in Organizational Withdrawal is the only finding that does not offer positive news for the Libraries about changes since 2000 ($t = 3.170, p = .00$). Organization withdrawal was measured on a 7-point scale in which respondents were asked how often they perform or think about the following behaviors (0= “never” to 7= “more than once a week”). The average amount of organizational withdrawal in 2000 was 2.02, and the average amount in 2004 was 2.72. This change indicates that individuals in the Library are more likely to think about quitting or explore other options now than they were in 2000⁶. At the same time, the average value in 2004 indicates that on the average employees think about withdrawing from the organization less than every other month.

Analyses Based on the Complete 2004 Data Set

As mentioned, the results reported above reflect approximately half of the 2004 survey respondents (i.e., only those 2004 respondents who also completed the survey in 2000). Using this criterion for inclusion greatly reduced the number of responses that were used in the comparison analyses. The data set including 209 respondents was reduced to only 111 respondents. This reduction in the size of the sample used greatly reduces the ability of the analyses to detect changes between the two time periods. Therefore, we also conducted the 2000 to 2004 comparison analyses using all of the respondents that completed the survey in 2004. In this second analysis, the changes

⁶ One hypothesis for this increase in organizational withdrawal over the four year period is that respondents are now older and are starting to think about retirement. We tested this alternative explanation by statistically controlling for the age of the respondent. The difference across the two time periods was still statistically different after controlling for age. Thus, this “retirement hypothesis” does not account for the increase in organizational withdrawal from 2000 to 2004.

reported above for the five scales remained the same. That is, the changes were all significant and in the same direction. Additionally, we found significant changes from 2000 to 2004 in two other scales. These results, however, should be interpreted cautiously.

Focus Group-Respect and Fair Treatment: Comparison analyses using all respondents in the 2004 data set indicated that library employees reported statistically higher levels of respect and fair treatment ($t = 3.292$, $p = .00$) in 2004 (average = 3.63) than they did in 2000 (average = 3.37). Responses were measured on a 6-point scale ranging from 1= “always false or almost always false” to 6= “always true or almost always true.” The direction of the difference was the same in the data using only those 2004 respondents who also completed the 2000 survey, but the difference was not statistically significant (average 2000 = 3.37, average 2004 = 3.50). It is worth noting that the average value of this scale in the 2004 data using only those respondents who completed the survey in 2000 is higher than the average value of this scale in the 2004 data including all participants. As discussed previously, the reason why the difference is not significant in the reduced analysis is because reductions in sample size decrease the chances that differences will be significant.

Continuous Learning Climate: When all 2004 respondents were included in the analysis, there was also a significant change in continuous learning ($t = 2.480$, $p = .01$). Continuous learning climate was measured on a 5-point scale ranging from 1= “strongly disagree” to 5= “strongly agree.” In 2004 Library employees reported a greater emphasis on continuous learning (average = 3.36) than they did in 2000 (average = 3.22). The direction of the difference was the same in the data using only those 2004 respondents

who also completed the 2000 survey, but the difference was not statistically significant (average 2000 = 3.22, average 2004 = 3.31). As is evident, the average value of this scale in the 2004 data using only those respondents who completed the survey in 2000 is only slightly lower than the average value of this scale in the 2004 data including all participants.

Summary

Based on the average survey response, our assessment produces the following description of the UM Libraries: It can be described as:

- Having a positive work environment for diversity.
- Lacking racial barriers (i.e., respondents did not believe, on average, that people were denied opportunities because of their ethnicity).
- A place where information is successfully disseminated.
- A place that valued and supported diversity.
- A place that had non-discriminatory practices and that applied these practices and procedures uniformly.
- A place where teamwork is valued, supported, and effective.

Further, based on the overall averages, respondents appear to:

- Be committed to the organization.
- Be somewhat satisfied.
- Perceive fairness in their interpersonal treatment by supervisors.
- Perceive fairness in the amount of information that is shared.
- Go out of their way to help their fellow UM Libraries employees.

While these findings provide an extremely positive impression of the UM Libraries culture in 2004, we also noted that there were several statistically significant differences among various UM Libraries respondent sub-groups. In particular, there were statistical differences as a function of division, ethnicity, job position, and gender depending upon the particular variable being assessed. These findings indicate that there is a splintering of opinion regarding aspects of the UM Libraries' Climate and Culture. By far, the largest and most frequent differences were a function of ethnicity differences and division differences.

Finally, we also assessed whether there were statistical significant changes in the UM Libraries Climate and Culture from 2000 to 2004. Our analyses revealed that a number of statistically significant changes over the past four years. Specifically, for those respondents that completed both the 2000 and 2004 surveys, there were statistically significant improvements in the belief that:

- The UM Libraries support diversity
- Employees are kept well-informed.
- The UM Libraries have non-discriminatory practices.
- Employees are fairly treated.

It should be noted that the only statistically significant negative change over this four year period is that the frequency with which respondents think about leaving the UM Libraries statistically increased.

Recommendations

Our analyses revealed many positive changes in the climate and culture of the UM Libraries. However, progress can still be made in many of these areas. In particular,

the splintering in opinions regarding the UM Libraries is particularly worrisome. The most frequently occurring and largest differences in opinions were found to be a function of division and ethnicity. Therefore, a critical question for the UM Libraries to resolve is why are there systematic differences in the climate and culture perceptions for different divisions and different ethnicities. These findings could serve as an early warning of future problems regarding diversity issues. For example, why are there systematic differences across divisions? Can some organizational level intervention be implemented to reduce division differences in the future?

In addition to the division differences, the source of the wide spread ethnicity differences in the perception of the UM Libraries and the increase in organizational withdrawal should be examined. Organizational committees designed to address diversity issues in the UM Libraries have already been formed. One task that these committees should undertake is to orchestrate a discussion to take among the diverse employees of the UM Libraries regarding what can be done to further improve the climate for diversity and teamwork at the libraries.

Clearly, it is important for the UM Libraries to continue to work on issues of diversity, fairness, teamwork, and learning climate. Efforts made by the Libraries in the last four years have lead to many positive changes. Looking toward the future, it is important for that the systematic differences that appear to be splintering some of the divisions and ethnic groups within the Libraries be assessed and reduced so that the UM Libraries can maintain its progress.

References

- Bishop, J. W. & Scott, K. D. (2000). An examination of organization and team commitment in a self-directed team environment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 83, 439-450.
- Colquitt, J. A. (2001). "On the dimensionality of organizational justice: A construct validation of a measure." *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 8, 386-400.
- Colquitt, J. A., Gonion, D. E., Wesson, M. J., Porter, C. O., & Ng, K. Y. (2001). 'Justice at the millennium: A meta-analytic review of 25 years of organizational justice research', *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86, 425-445.
- Donovan, M. A., Drasgow, F., & Munson, L. J. (1998). The perceptions of fair interpersonal treatment scale: Development and validation of a measure of interpersonal treatment in the workplace. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 83, 683-692.
- Eisenberger, R. Cummings, J., & Armeli, S. (1997). Perceived organizational support, discretionary treatment, and job satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82, 812-820
- Hanisch, K. A., & Hulin, C. L. (1990). Job attitudes and organizational withdrawal: An examination of retirement and other voluntary withdrawal behavior. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 37, 60-78.
- Jehn, K. A. (1995). A multimethod examination of the benefits and detriments of intragroup conflict, *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 40, 256-282,
- Kunin, T. (1998). The construction of a new type of attitude measure. *Personnel Psychology*, 51(4), 823-824.

- Lee, K., & Allen, N.J. (2002). Organizational citizenship behavior and workplace deviance: The role of affect and cognitions. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*(1), 131-142.
- Luhtanen R. & Crocker J. (1992). A collective self-esteem scale: Self-evaluation of one's social identity. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 18*, 302-318.
- Mowday, R. T., Porter, L. W. & Steers, R. M. (1982). Employee-organizational linkages: The psychology of commitment, absenteeism, and turnover. New York: Academic Press.
- Nishii, L. H., Raver, J. L., & Dominguez, A. (2000). Organizational culture and diversity assessment. *University of Maryland Libraries*.
- Nunnally, J.C., and I. H. Bernstein. (1994). *Psychometric Theory*. 3rd ed. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Phinney, J. (1992). The multigroup ethnic identity measure: A new scale for use with adolescents and young adults from diverse groups. *Journal of Adolescent Research, 7*, 156-176.
- Scandura, T. A., & Graen, G. B. (1984). Moderating effects of initial Leader-Member Exchange status on the effects of a leadership intervention. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 69*, 428 – 436.
- Schein, E.H. (1987). *Organizational culture and leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Schneider, K. T., Hitlan, R. T., & Radhakrishnan, P. (2000). An examination of the nature and correlates of ethnic harassment experiences in multiple contexts. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 85*, 3-12.

Schneider, B., White, S., & Paul, M. C. (1998). Linking service climate and customer perceptions of service quality: Test of a causal model. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 83*, 150-162.

Spreitzer, G. M. (1995). Psychological empowerment in the workplace: Dimensions, measurement, and validation. *Academy of Management Journal, 38*, 1442-1465.

Tracey, J. B., Tannenbaum, S. I., & Kavanagh, M. J. (1995). Applying trained skills on the job: The importance of the work environment. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 80*, 239-252.

Table 1.

Current Division	Number	Percentage of total respondents
Collection Management and Special Collections	26	12.4
Planning and Administrative Services or Dean's Office	21	10.0
Information Technology	23	11.0
Public Services	59	28.2
Technical Services	49	23.4
Membership in more than one division	16	7.7
Missing	15	7.2

Table 2.

Length of Employment	Number	Percentage of total respondents
Less than 1 year	8	3.8
1-4 years	47	22.5
5-10 years	51	24.4
more than 10 years	89	42.6
Missing	14	6.7

Table 3.

Job Position	Number	Percentage of Total Respondents
Librarian	54	25.8
Administrative Support Services	9	4.3
Graduate Assistant	11	5.3
Library Technician	55	26.3
Supervisor	7	3.3
Other	13	6.2
Technical Support	10	4.8
Manager	9	4.3
More than one	28	13.4
Missing	13	6.2

Table 4.

Ethnicity	Number	Percentage of Total Respondents
African American	19	9.1
Asian American	15	7.2
Caucasian	129	61.7
Hispanic	4	1.9
Native-American	0	0.0
International	13	6.2
Biracial	1	0.5
Other	10	4.8
Missing	18	8.6

Table 5.

Religion	Number	Percentage of Total Respondents
Christian	89	42.6
Jewish	3	1.4
Buddhist	4	1.9
Islamic	3	1.4
Hindu	6	2.9
Agnostic	12	5.7
Atheist	13	6.2
Spiritual but not religious	33	15.8
Other	19	9.1
Checked more than one	2	1.0
Missing	25	12.0

Table 6.

Averages for the 15 common organizational scales

Overall			
Scale	Averages		
	2000	2004 (only 2000 respondents)	2004 (All)
Focus Group Theme: Respect and Fair Treatment	3.37	3.50	3.63
Focus Group Theme: Concern about Diversity	3.55	3.70	3.63
Focus Group Theme: Positive Work Environment for Diversity	3.87	3.91	3.95
Focus Group Theme: Lack of Racial Barriers	4.99	4.99	5.05
Focus Group Theme: Dissemination of Information	4.81	4.99	4.97
Focus Group Theme: Non-support for Diversity*	4.31	2.61	2.60
Climate for Diversity: Non-discriminatory Practices	4.35	4.61	4.61
Climate for Diversity: Standardization of Procedures	3.87	3.91	3.98
Climate for Diversity: Valuing Diversity	4.11	4.20	4.19
Continuous Learning Climate	3.22	3.32	3.36
Organizational Commitment	4.58	4.76	4.70
Managerial Practices	3.58	3.51	3.56
Workgroup Conflict	2.34	2.34	2.31
Perceptions of Fair Interpersonal Treatment	2.48	1.45	1.43
Organizational Withdrawal*	2.02	2.72	2.62

Note: A * identifies scales in which lower values reflect more desirable outcomes.

Table 7.

Averages for the 15 common scales separated by UM Library division.

Planning and Administrative Services or Dean's Office			
Scale	Averages		
	2000	2004 (only 2000 respondents)	2004 (All)
Focus Group Theme: Respect and Fair Treatment	3.44	4.31	4.10
Focus Group Theme: Concern about Diversity	3.51	3.90	3.67
Focus Group Theme: Positive Work Environment for Diversity	3.87	4.29	4.15
Focus Group Theme: Lack of Racial Barriers	5.07	5.69	5.48
Focus Group Theme: Dissemination of Information	4.73	4.96	4.86
Focus Group Theme: Non-support for Diversity	4.62	2.10	2.21
Climate for Diversity: Non-discriminatory Practices	4.24	4.98	4.94
Climate for Diversity: Standardization of Procedures	3.79	4.32	4.25
Climate for Diversity: Valuing Diversity	4.13	4.62	4.37
Continuous Learning Climate	3.23	3.38	3.35
Organizational Commitment	4.45	5.37	5.11
Managerial Practices	3.78	4.08	3.93
Workgroup Conflict	1.95	1.80	2.02
Perceptions of Fair Interpersonal Treatment	2.43	1.14	1.30
Organizational Withdrawal	2.18	3.08	2.62

Information Technology			
Scale	Averages		
	2000	2004 (only 2000 respondents)	2004 (All)
Focus Group Theme: Respect and Fair Treatment	3.69	3.68	3.68
Focus Group Theme: Concern about Diversity	3.66	3.38	3.44
Focus Group Theme: Positive Work Environment for Diversity	3.98	3.88	3.93
Focus Group Theme: Lack of Racial Barriers	5.39	5.28	5.46
Focus Group Theme: Dissemination of Information	4.50	5.00	5.13
Focus Group Theme: Non-support for Diversity	4.41	3.00	2.59
Climate for Diversity: Non-discriminatory Practices	4.58	4.65	4.74
Climate for Diversity: Standardization of Procedures	4.06	4.04	4.00
Climate for Diversity: Valuing Diversity	4.28	3.96	4.08
Continuous Learning Climate	3.25	3.39	3.36
Organizational Commitment	4.50	4.83	4.79

Managerial Practices	3.17	3.53	3.35
Workgroup Conflict	2.81	2.22	2.25
Perceptions of Fair Interpersonal Treatment	2.43	1.31	1.32
Organizational Withdrawal	2.08	2.17	2.78

Collection Management and Special Collections			
Scale	Averages		
	2000.00	2004 (only 2000 respondents)	2004 (All)
Focus Group Theme: Respect and Fair Treatment	3.37	4.00	4.08
Focus Group Theme: Concern about Diversity	3.52	4.18	4.14
Focus Group Theme: Positive Work Environment for Diversity	3.95	3.95	3.91
Focus Group Theme: Lack of Racial Barriers	5.07	5.79	5.64
Focus Group Theme: Dissemination of Information	4.85	5.32	5.25
Focus Group Theme: Non-support for Diversity	4.38	2.43	2.52
Climate for Diversity: Non-discriminatory Practices	4.38	5.08	4.98
Climate for Diversity: Standardization of Procedures	3.82	4.09	4.11
Climate for Diversity: Valuing Diversity	4.02	4.69	4.58
Continuous Learning Climate	3.25	3.52	3.54
Organizational Commitment	4.76	4.98	5.03
Managerial Practices	3.64	3.98	3.89
Workgroup Conflict	2.38	1.93	2.03
Perceptions of Fair Interpersonal Treatment	2.56	1.18	1.21
Organizational Withdrawal	1.95	2.30	2.17

Public Services			
Scale	Averages		
	2000.00	2004 (only 2000 respondents)	2004 (All)
Focus Group Theme: Respect and Fair Treatment	3.44	3.38	3.60
Focus Group Theme: Concern about Diversity	3.52	3.66	3.66
Focus Group Theme: Positive Work Environment for Diversity	3.87	4.03	4.15
Focus Group Theme: Lack of Racial Barriers	5.04	5.34	5.26
Focus Group Theme: Dissemination of Information	4.93	5.05	5.10
Focus Group Theme: Non-support for Diversity	4.24	2.65	2.59
Climate for Diversity: Non-discriminatory Practices	4.42	4.80	4.82
Climate for Diversity: Standardization of Procedures	3.99	4.03	4.16
Climate for Diversity: Valuing Diversity	4.25	4.23	4.33
Continuous Learning Climate	3.25	3.31	3.42

Organizational Commitment	4.69	4.68	4.78
Managerial Practices	3.76	3.44	3.65
Workgroup Conflict	2.25	2.32	2.32
Perceptions of Fair Interpersonal Treatment	2.56	1.41	1.37
Organizational Withdrawal	1.74	2.69	2.32

Technical Services			
Scale	Averages		
	2000.00	2004 (only 2000 respondents)	2004 (All)
Focus Group Theme: Respect and Fair Treatment	3.13	3.10	3.24
Focus Group Theme: Concern about Diversity	3.61	3.55	3.57
Focus Group Theme: Positive Work Environment for Diversity	3.76	3.73	3.79
Focus Group Theme: Lack of Racial Barriers	4.70	4.29	4.50
Focus Group Theme: Dissemination of Information	4.84	4.84	4.84
Focus Group Theme: Non-support for Diversity	4.16	3.00	2.92
Climate for Diversity: Non-discriminatory Practices	4.25	4.21	4.35
Climate for Diversity: Standardization of Procedures	3.78	3.65	3.87
Climate for Diversity: Valuing Diversity	4.02	3.94	4.05
Continuous Learning Climate	3.19	3.19	3.29
Organizational Commitment	4.42	4.40	4.39
Managerial Practices	3.38	3.16	3.37
Workgroup Conflict	2.43	2.65	2.59
Perceptions of Fair Interpersonal Treatment	2.35	1.73	1.56
Organizational Withdrawal	2.35	2.89	2.81

