

ClimateQUAL™: Organizational Climate and Diversity Assessment

Martha Kyrillidou, Charles Lowry, Paul Hanges, Juliet Aiken, and Kristina Justh

Abstract

ClimateQUAL™ is the latest assessment tool in the assessment toolkit development by ARL and accessible through the StatsQUAL® gateway to library assessment tools. The tools available through StatsQUAL® are combining the power of both quantitative and qualitative methods and are integrated into a platform that allows easy data collection, analysis and presentation of the results. The goal is to establish an integrated suite of library assessment tools that tell users' library success stories, emphasize customer-driven libraries and demonstrate responsiveness and engagement in improving customer service. This paper accomplishes three learning outcomes: (1) identifies the elements of a healthy organization in order to improve customer service; (2) identifies the dimensions that are relevant to a healthy organization climate in order to measure them effectively; and (3) helps us understand the relation between organization climate, culture and diversity as measured by the

ClimateQUAL™: Organizational Climate and Diversity Assessment.

Introduction

This paper reports the latest research from a multi-year research project to develop an internal staffing survey measuring organizational climate and diversity. This paper reports on the research, regrouping and refinement of the Organizational Climate and Diversity Assessment (OCDA) survey protocol at the University of Maryland and the establishment of the ClimateQUAL™: OCDA service at the Association of Research Libraries (ARL).

In 2006, Paul Hanges, Associate Chair of the Psychology Department, presented at the Library Assessment Conference in Charlottesville, VA, the plenary speech on "Diversity, Organizational Climate, and Organizational Culture: The Role They Play in Influencing Organizational Effectiveness."¹ The paper discussed (1) the concepts of organizational climate

Martha Kyrillidou is Director, ARL Statistics and Service Quality Programs, Association of Research Libraries, e-mail: martha@arl.org; Charles Lowry is Executive Director, Association of Research Libraries, e-mail: clowry@arl.org; Paul Hanges is Professor, Associate Chair & Graduate Director—Psychology, University of Maryland, e-mail: hanges@psyc.umd.edu; Juliet Aiken is Research Graduate Assistant—Psychology, University of Maryland, e-mail: jaiken@psyc.umd.edu, Kristina Justh, Customer Relations Coordinator, Statistics & Measurement, Association of Research Libraries, e-mail: kristina@arl.org

and culture and the role that they play in effectively managing workforce diversity and (2) how workforce diversity is actually an organizational imperative in our rapidly changing environment. The elements of diversity, organizational climate, and organizational culture can combine to create the 'healthy organization.' The healthy organization can manage and empower its diverse human resources to enable the organization to achieve its goals.

These ideas were first tested in 1999 when the University of Maryland Libraries partnered with the University of Maryland Industrial and Organizational Psychology program to develop an assessment of the climate and culture of the University of Maryland libraries, the Organizational Climate and Diversity Assessment (OCDA). In 2004, the University of Maryland Libraries once again partnered with the Industrial Organizational Psychology program to provide an updated 'snapshot.' The analyses revealed that a number of positive changes had occurred over the four year interval between the two surveys. In summary, this work with the University of Maryland not only identified the dimensions of climate and culture important for a healthy organization in a library setting but also provided proof that feedback from the OCDA survey, when taken seriously, can have practical organizational level benefits.

In 2007, ARL and the University of Maryland Libraries in partnership with the Industrial and Organizational Psychology program attempted to test the generalizability of the OCDA protocol across multiple library organizations. During Phase I, five ARL institutions tested a modified OCDA survey and validated the hypothesis that a healthy organization provides better customer service than do less healthy organizations. In 2008, during Phase II, ten ARL and non-ARL institutions expanded the pilot further refining the protocol. The protocol was transferred to ARL for ongoing operation of a library assessment service, known as ClimateQUAL™: OCDA, and focuses on measuring internal organizational climate and diversity.

ClimateQUAL™ is the latest assessment tool in the assessment toolkit supported by ARL and accessible through the StatsQUAL® gateway to library assessment tools. The tools available through StatsQUAL® are combining the power of both quantitative and qualitative methods and the goal is to integrate the various tools into a platform that allows easy data collection, analysis and presentation of the

results. Ultimately, ARL aspires to offering an integrated suite of library assessment tools that tell users' library success stories, emphasize customer-driven libraries and demonstrate responsiveness and engagement in improving customer service.

The ARL Statistics and Measurement Program's goal is "to describe and measure the performance of libraries and their contribution to research, teaching and learning."² As a member-driven enterprise the program operates within a non-profit environment adhering to objectives of 1) relevance to policy issues, 2) credibility among data users and 3) trust among data providers (influenced by the IMLS articulation of the mission of data driven activities). StatsQUAL® is not simply an infrastructure for conducting surveys but supports services that are necessary to share lessons learned from the data collected as well as deliver training for developing action agendas and implementation plans within an institution and across different groups of institutions. Institutional policies need to be based on sound data, thus StatsQUAL® serves as a platform for supporting sound policies.

Theory

Changes in the composition of the American workforce reflect increasing amounts of diversity within both the working world and in communities at large.³ As reviewed in Hanges, Aiken, and Chen,⁴ the growing diversity of the workplace presents organizations with a number of opportunities, as well as challenges. For instance, diversity has been linked to increased conflict and decreased cohesion.⁵ While diversity may lead to these negative consequences, it may also result in reduced groupthink⁶ and other positive organizational outcomes. Indeed, Schneider asserts in his attraction-selection-attrition (ASA) model that diversity is necessary for organizational survival; specifically, Schneider proposes that organizations' tendencies toward homogeneity make them less responsive to changes in the external environment, which may then lead to organizational death.⁷

Clearly, then, organizations must promote diversity. However, given the aforementioned potential negative consequences of increased diversity, organizations must also learn how to effectively manage diversity.⁸ In sum, it has been argued that an organization which effectively promotes and manages diversity to maintain organizational responsiveness is a "healthy organization."⁹ We briefly review the ASA model and

how it informs our understanding of the development and maintenance of the healthy organization.

ASA and the Diversity Imperative

Schneider's ASA model¹⁰ proposes that individuals are attracted to organizations to which they perceive they are similar on values, beliefs, and other relevant characteristics. After these individuals apply, the organization is expected to impose a procedure to select employees whom are perceived to match the organization on certain values, beliefs, and competencies. While this procedure may help organizations and individuals align, it is not without fault. Indeed, over time, individuals may find that they do not match the organization to which they belong. At this point, they are expected to terminate employment, thus starting the ASA cycle again.

Clearly, as time goes on, the departure of non-matching employees from any organization will lead to increased homogeneity. While this homogeneity may lead to positive consequences, Schneider¹¹ proposes that it may also lead to organizational death. As discussed previously, homogenization necessarily causes organizations to become less responsive to changes in the external environment. Without this responsiveness, homogenous organizations cannot survive. Thus, a conclusion that can be drawn from ASA theory is that organizations must make diversity an imperative in order to survive. In making diversity an imperative, organizations should foster a number of different climates to convey this message to employees and consumers. We review these climates next.

Climates as Communicators of the Diversity Imperative

A substantial body of work has discussed the place of organizational climate as a tactic through which organizations can communicate what is rewarded, supported, and expected.¹² In short, climate can be used to convey what the organization values—what its goals and imperatives are.¹³ Clearly, then, if an organization wishes to promote and manage diversity, it must cultivate climates that support diversity. Based largely on initial work on intergroup bias by Allport,¹⁴ we identify nine climates that are expected to contribute to diversity management. Relevant imperatives addressed in five key climates, Climate for Deep and Demographic Diversity, Climate for Innovation and Continual Learning, and Climate for Justice, are discussed next.

Climate Imperatives as Indicators of Cooperation

Allport¹⁵ highlights the role of cooperation in reducing intergroup bias. That is, in situations where cooperation is rewarded, supported, and expected, intergroup bias should be reduced. In organizations with reduced intergroup bias, diverse individuals should feel that they are welcomed and valued. We view climates, then, as indicators that an organization supports cooperation. The following nine climate imperatives are assessed in the ClimateQUALTM measure.

Climate for Deep Diversity

A climate for deep diversity is one in which minority values, ideas, and beliefs, are regarded as highly as those of the majority. In the current instrument, two aspects of deep diversity are measured. The first of these is *Standardization of Procedures*, which refers to the extent to which procedures encouraging the acceptance of minority opinions, ideas, and values are equally expressed and instituted across all levels of an organization. The second is *Valuing Diversity*, which reflects the extent to which organizational policies, practice, procedures, and actions align to clearly express the organization's support for diversity. Clearly, when employees know that their ideas will be valued, regardless of whether or not they represent the majority opinion, they will feel that the organization fosters cooperation. Thus, a climate for deep diversity should aid in diversity management.

Climate for Demographic Diversity

Similar to, but distinct from, deep diversity, a climate for demographic diversity reflects the extent to which demographic minorities are valued relative to demographic majorities. The ClimateQUALTM instrument assesses climate for demographic diversity in four areas: race, gender, rank, and sexual orientation. The more that demographic minorities perceive they are welcomed and valued by the organization, the more employees should also perceive the organization as one that cares about cooperation. Clearly, then, a climate for demographic diversity should contribute to effective diversity management.

Climate for Justice

The current instrument measures a climate for four types of justice. *Distributive Justice* refers to the extent to which employees feel that they are rewarded fairly, based on their efforts. *Procedural Justice* refers to the

extent to which employees feel that procedures for determining rewards are fair, applied consistently across time and people, and that they have feedback, or some degree of influence, in determining what rewards they deserve. *Interpersonal Justice* addresses how fairly individuals feel they were treated during the process of reward determination. Finally, *Informational Justice* assesses how much information employees feel they have about rewards and the procedures used to determine them. It is expected that a just environment is one in which all employees are treated fairly, and all have a say. Thus, climate for justice should enhance perceptions of support for cooperation, and thus also, support for diversity.

Climate for Innovation

Co-worker climate for innovation reflects the extent to which co-workers support each other in determining new ways to accomplish tasks. Since such a climate relies on communication—and thus, cooperation—between work group members, co-worker support for innovation should then be a marker for a cooperative work context. As a marker for a cooperative context, climate for innovation is then expected to convey to employees the message that diversity is important to the organization.

Climate for Continual Learning

Similar to climate for innovation, climate for continual learning reflects the extent to which development of skills is encouraged within the organization. This support is expected to come from both supervisors and coworkers. Thus, like climate for innovation, climate for continual learning hinges on the assumption that coworkers are cooperative, and wish to encourage each other. Consequently, climate for continual learning is also expected to contribute to the effective management of diversity.

Outcomes of Diversity Management

We have argued that climate imperatives serve as indicators for a cooperative work atmosphere, through which diversity can be effectively promoted and managed. How do we know if these climate imperatives are indeed addressing cooperation and diversity promotion? We assert that when diversity is properly managed, employees will experience a number of positive outcomes. Specifically, individual employees are expected to experience such affective benefits as great-

er job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Likewise, we assert that the organization will benefit from increased management of diversity. Next, we discuss the seven employee outcomes that are expected to be affected by effective diversity management. Then, we discuss a relevant organizational outcome expected when organizations correctly manage their diversity: positive perceptions of customer service.

Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction refers to the extent to which individuals assess their job positively overall. Drawing from Allport's¹⁶ distinction between cooperative and competitive contexts, it seems obvious that individuals in cooperative contexts will be more satisfied than those in competitive contexts. Thus, organizations that foster and manage diversity effectively should have more satisfied employees.

Organizational Commitment

An employee with high *organizational commitment* feels positively about their organization, especially relative to other organizations, and intends to stay for some time. This is likely to occur most often in cooperative contexts. Therefore, as with job satisfaction, organizations which effectively manage diversity should have more committed employees.

Organizational Citizenship Behaviors

Organizational Citizenship Behaviors (OCBs) reflect activities in which employees engage that are not part of their job description, yet help the organization function. In cooperative contexts, employees should feel more willing to give of their time and energy. Consequently, diversity management should result in employees participating in more OCBs.

Organizational Withdrawal

When an employee undergoes *organizational withdrawal*, they desire to leave the organization and attain employment elsewhere. Organizational withdrawal is more likely when employees are dissatisfied—which is likely a more common outcome of competitive, relative to cooperative, contexts. Thus, effective management of diversity should lead to employees experiencing less desire to withdrawal from the organization.

Task Engagement

When an employee experiences *task engagement*, they

truly care about and are invested in their work tasks. This should happen when employees are encouraged to learn, enhance their skills sets, and pursue interesting work opportunities. These practices are more likely to be encouraged in cooperative versus competitive environments. Thus, the cooperative context induced through diversity management should contribute to greater feelings of task engagement.

Team Psychological Empowerment

Team psychological empowerment results when employees feel that their work contributes greatly to a team task. This kind of empowerment is likely most imperative, and most fostered, in cooperative contexts. Thus, management of diversity should lead to greater perceptions of team psychological empowerment.

Work Unit Conflict

Two types of conflict are assessed in the current instrument. *Task conflict* results when employees disagree over how to complete a given task. Alternatively, *interpersonal conflict* comes about as a result of personal, or affective, disagreements amongst team members. Conflict can be seen as a hallmark of a competitive organization—correspondingly, conflict should be much lower in cooperative organizations wherein which diversity is well-managed.

Customer Service

Employees are not the only ones who are expected to benefit from diversity management. Indeed, the organization as a whole should reap rewards when employees are treated fairly, and a cooperative context is encouraged. To draw this connection, we refer again to work by Schneider and his colleagues in the customer service literature. Schneider and his colleagues¹⁷ propose that organizational climate specifically and greatly impacts customer service. They argue that, in customer service industries, the increased contact between consumer and employees means that consumers are more likely to pick up on what employees are feeling. Indeed, Parkington and Schneider¹⁸ discovered that customer service is negatively affected when employees' values do not match organizational values. Likewise, employee ratings of managerial endorsement of policies practices, and procedures were found to relate positively to customer service.¹⁹ Clearly, then, organizations must make it an imperative to create a cooperative context through the strategic use of cli-

mate. In doing so, they will enhance their employees' affect and behavior, and consumers will have greater perceptions of service quality.

In sum, employees and organizations are expected to experience a number of positive affective and task-related outcomes in cooperative contexts. All of these outcomes can be directly linked to effective promotion and management of diversity. Clearly, the proposed model of the Healthy Organization stands to provide a much-needed framework through which to view diversity management. Unfortunately, this model has of yet not been completely tested. While the entire model has not been addressed, one ClimateQUAL™: OCDA study does address the link between climate imperatives and customer service.²⁰ These findings are reviewed in the section 'Support for the Healthy Organization Hypotheses.'

Support for the Healthy Organization Hypotheses

Current findings indicate strong support for the notion that effectively managed diversity results in greater organizational outcomes. Hanges et al.²¹ ran a study assessing the extent to which certain climate imperatives contribute to relevant organizational outcomes. Specifically, Hanges et al.²² analyzed the effects of Climate for Demographic Diversity, Climate for Deep Diversity, Climate for Innovation, Climate for Continual Learning, and Climate for Justice on customer service perceptions. Results of this analysis show support for the healthy organization hypotheses. That is, all five of these climate imperatives were found to significantly and positively impact consumer ratings of service quality. These results lend support to Schneider's²³ assertion that organizations must maintain and encourage diversity in order to remain responsive to external changes. Clearly, then, management of diversity is essential in maintaining organizational contact and responsiveness to the outside environment.

Survey Mechanics

ClimateQUAL™ has been established in the tradition of the ARL New Measures Initiatives adhering to the need to provide data to the leadership of the library organization for making fact-based decisions. It is one of the tools that belong to the StatsQUAL® family of assessment tools which includes LibQUAL+® for measuring service quality, MINES for Libraries®

for measuring the impact of networked electronic resources, DigiQUAL® for measuring the quality of digital libraries, and ARL Statistics™ for annual library statistics.

ClimateQUAL™ is an online Web based survey administered online using SurveyMonkey.com, a well-known survey software that offers a variety of customization and data analysis options. The survey period is 3 weeks. ClimateQUAL™ consists of approximately 200 questions representing the nine climate dimensions, seven organizational attitude scales, and additional demographic questions. There is also one free-text comments box at the end of the survey. The 2009 implementation of the survey uses 7-point scales consistently across dimensions and questions have been refined over time to eliminate any deficiencies and to ensure high reliability and validity coefficients. ClimateQUAL™: OCDA takes more than half an hour to complete and library leadership support is essential in making this protocol happen—neither staff nor leadership would like to waste staff time if the results are not used effectively.

Respondent confidentiality is of paramount concern, given the sensitive nature of the questions and responses. Results are reported back to individual institutions in a way that will not compromise respondent identity. A standard overview report is provided to all participants but only libraries with large enough sample sizes can receive additional analysis for specific subgroups within the organization.

This means that in certain instances, an institution may be able to obtain deeper data from a certain scale than is available to another institution; the former institution's demographic breakdown allows this analysis because it will not reveal any individual identifiers. Detailed analysis is prepared and thoroughly reviewed by the researchers to ensure confidentiality is not compromised and further drilling into the data is only performed by the researchers at the University of Maryland and ARL Statistics and Measurement Program staff. As a result, the protocol is not easily scalable and requires commitment of resources to ensure that both the needs of the organization are met and that the needs of the individual respondents are respected. ARL serves as a trusted third party that provides in depth independent analysis services.

One of the ways ClimateQUAL™ differs from other surveys in the StatsQUAL® platform, for example the LibQUAL+® survey, is that the entire data

set is proprietary. All data is owned by the University of Maryland Industrial/Organizational Psychology program and the Association of Research Libraries. Participating institutions receive prepared analysis of their results from the program's researchers—including limited raw data when confidentiality can be maintained. In addition to receiving their own institutional analysis, institutions receive reports on all respondents so they can compare their report to the normative data compiled from all participating libraries.

While each participating institution is free to use its own results and does not need permission from the researchers with regard to use or publication of its own reports, participants do not have direct access to the results of other libraries. Again, the sensitive nature of the results and the potential issues raised by these results requires these additional quality control steps. Comparisons across institutions are performed only against the aggregated data.

The protocol also collects extensive qualitative data in the form of comments. These comments have been shared in a variety of ways with participants during the first two years of the protocol's implementation. The first year only summative descriptions were shared for each dimension with a few samples drawn from the words of actual respondents. The second year a complete report of all the comments was provided after reviewing and editing the data for confidentiality purposes. There is not an easy way to scale the qualitative analysis and interpretation of the comments across multiple institutions, so comments will be disclosed as provided in future years starting in 2009. The qualitative comments will be provided in their entirety to the library participants and the respondents will be explicitly reminded that all their comments will be shared with their organization's leadership. The underlying philosophy of disclosing comments ensures that they are meaningful and practically useful to the organization in ways that direct action may be taken by the leadership of the organization based on the comments provided.

Value to the Administrator—The Leadership Context

Thirty five years ago Arthur M. McAnnally and Robert B. Downs published a paper that stimulated much discussion if not controversy. In "Changing Roles of Directors of University Libraries," they established (at

least for ARL members) the conditions that made it so difficult for library directors at the beginning of the 1970s and made recommendations for improving the situation. In particular, they asserted that to succeed library administrators should abandon hierarchical structures and move to participative management.²⁴ Within three years, Maurice Marchant's landmark work *Participative Management in Academic Libraries* appeared signaling a major shift in management perspective.²⁵

By 1990, William Birdsall was calling on library managers to evince the skills of charismatic leaders, therapeutic managers, enablers of their work force, and other goals of the "human side" management theory that some would call "ambiguous."²⁶ There is considerable evidence in the operation of libraries and the managerial styles of directors that academic libraries evolved in this direction.

Rooks, in her 1994 review of the McAnnally-Downs article, enumerated the additional new set of skills that had come to reflect the life of the university library administrator, including: management skills, technical skills, communication skills, human relations skills, fund-raising skills, and legal skills.²⁷ More recently, Hernon, Powell, and Young also started with the McAnnally-Downs article to develop an analysis of expectations. They relied on a variety of data collection techniques to define "Key Attributes" that would be needed including thirty-one "abilities," sixteen "skills," sixty-two "individual traits," and twelve specific "areas of knowledge."²⁸ Any objective reader might want to cry "foul" since this may seem like piling on. Yet, for those of us who have held these positions, reading these lists elicits two responses that may seem contradictory—on the one hand, the "lists sound about right," while on the other, one thinks "why would anyone want to do this job?"

Over these three and a half decades, the dominant themes that have emerged are emphasis on the human side of management, teamwork, fact-based decision making, and assessment all grounded in the need for leadership. Are these expectations reasonable and achievable and more importantly are they a guide to effective leadership for libraries? An important element to understanding how to employ these ideas is the concept of "continuous organizational development" grounded in teamwork, learning, leadership, and measurement.²⁹ Charles Lowry has articulated that:

The management literature to which we so often look for guidance fundamentally emphasizes the role of managers and leadership. As important as I think these are, I also believe the external challenges to academic libraries are so great that to achieve great success in meeting them means the intelligence, energy and commitment of all staff must be mobilized to find our way. In effect, every staff member must, in some measure, become a manager and a leader—and the organization must treat them as though they have a brain in their head. I am not suggesting a lock-step mentality or a monolithic organizational vision is desirable—or, for that matter, achievable. I am suggesting that there is afoot in academic libraries what may be called an 'organizational development movement' that has as its goal the creation of the 'learning organization.' In my view, this is an encouraging sign that we have recognized the only way to be successful in the current environment.³⁰

In many ways, ClimateQUALTM provides the ultimate management tool for effective organizational adaptation that uses deep assessment of a library's staff to plumb the dimensions of climate and organizational culture important for a healthy organization in a library setting. This provides feedback from the survey that is grounded in a baseline from the libraries that have already participated. Using normative scales and institutional results effectively, significant improvements can be achieved. The most effective techniques for remediation are not top-down, but those that engage the entire staff. The University of Maryland (UM) Libraries are a good test case with three snapshots of the staff using ClimateQUALTM—2000, 2004, and 2008.

There are two perspectives on the UM experience that provide a sense of how the results of the ClimateQUALTM survey protocol can be of use for creating change:

- The scalar data provided by the survey and an understanding of how to interpret it; and
- Some "interventions" (or "improvement strategies") that help address the issues arising from the survey.

| TABLE 1* ClimateQUAL™ 2008: Scale Averages | | | | | |
|--|------------------------|-------------|------------|-------------|-------------|
| Organizational Climate | University of Maryland | UMD 2004 | UMD 2000 | Phase I | Phase II |
| Climate for Organizational Justice | | | | | |
| Distributive Justice ⁵ | 2.65 | 2.58 | N/A | 2.88 | 2.65 |
| Procedural Justice ⁵ | 3.18 | 2.81 | N/A | 3.01 | 3.08 |
| Interpersonal Justice ⁵ | 4.15 | 3.58 | N/A | 4.15 | 4.11 |
| Informational Justice ⁵ | 3.52 | 3.55 | N/A | 3.59 | 3.47 |
| Leadership Climate | | | | | |
| Trust in Leader ⁵ | 4.08 | N/A | N/A | 3.90 | 4.01 |
| Leader-Membership Relationship Quality ⁷ | 5.60 | 5.33 | N/A | 5.46 | 5.57 |
| Manager's Passion for Service ⁵ | 4.01 | 3.56 | 3.58 | 3.85 | 3.99 |
| Authentic Transformational Leadership⁵ | 3.88 | 3.21 | N/A | 3.47 | 3.87 |
| Climate for Interpersonal Treatment | | | | | |
| Team-level Interpersonal Treatment ⁵ | 3.71 | 3.71 | 4.24 | 3.92 | 3.67 |
| Managers Interpersonal Treatment of Employees ⁵ | 3.57 | 3.45 | 3.91 | 3.90 | 3.52 |
| Climate for Deep Diversity | | | | | |
| Non-discriminatory Practice ⁶ | 4.87 | 4.76 | 3.92 | 4.78 | 4.99 |
| Standardized Procedures ⁶ | 4.36 | 3.97 | 4.07 | 4.10 | 4.34 |
| Valuing Diversity ⁶ | 4.80 | 4.18 | 4.15 | 4.54 | 4.64 |
| Climate for Demographic Diversity | | | | | |
| Race ⁵ | 4.35 | 4.31 | N/A | 4.46 | 4.44 |
| Gender ⁵ | 4.40 | 4.31 | N/A | 4.39 | 4.40 |
| Rank ⁵ | 3.82 | 3.94 | N/A | 3.76 | 3.68 |
| Sexual Orientation ⁵ | 4.40 | N/A | N/A | 4.40 | 4.49 |
| Climate for Innovation | | | | | |
| Supervisory ⁵ | 3.43 | 3.27 | 3.09 | 3.22 | 3.41 |
| Co-workers ⁵ | 3.83 | 3.76 | 3.55 | 3.57 | 3.77 |
| Climate for Continual Learning ⁵ | 3.67 | 3.43 | 3.31 | 3.41 | 3.57 |
| Climate for Teamwork | | | | | |
| Benefits of Teams ⁷ | 5.25 | 4.82 | N/A | 5.39 | 5.48 |
| Organizational value of teamwork ⁷ | 5.31 | 5.23 | N/A | 5.19 | 5.12 |
| Structural facilitation of teamwork ⁷ | 4.33 | 4.10 | N/A | 4.26 | 4.33 |
| Informational Facilitation of Teamwork ⁷ | 5.52 | 5.57 | N/A | 5.36 | 5.34 |
| Climate for Customer Service ⁵ | 3.83 | N/A | N/A | 3.81 | 3.79 |
| Climate for Psychological Safety: Team-level ⁵ | 3.88 | N/A | N/A | N/A | 3.88 |
| Climate for Psychological Safety: Library-Level ⁵ | 3.64 | N/A | N/A | N/A | 3.62 |
| Job Satisfaction ⁵ | 3.66 | 3.56 | N/A | 3.59 | 3.70 |
| Organizational Commitment ⁷ | 4.71 | 4.69 | 4.58 | 4.88 | 4.91 |
| Organizational Citizenship Behaviors ⁷ | 4.91 | 4.88 | N/A | 5.16 | 5.01 |
| Organizational Withdrawal ⁸ | 3.42 | 2.63 | 2.01 | 3.33 | 3.27 |

| Organizational Climate | University of Maryland | UMD 2004 | UMD 2000 | Phase I | Phase II |
|--|------------------------|----------|----------|---------|----------|
| Psychological Empowerment in the Workplace | | | | | |
| Individual empowerment ⁵ | 4.43 | 4.33 | N/A | 4.44 | 4.49 |
| Team empowerment ⁵ | 3.30 | 3.57 | N/A | 3.49 | 3.41 |
| Task Engagement ⁵ | 4.15 | 4.19 | N/A | 4.30 | 4.24 |
| Work Unit Conflict | | | | | |
| Interpersonal ⁵ | 2.34 | 2.10 | 2.15 | 2.44 | 2.29 |
| Task ⁵ | 2.75 | 2.42 | 2.47 | 2.67 | 2.59 |

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

ClimateQUAL™ Themes

Table 1 is a synopsis of the scale averages for each of the three survey administrations at UM over the last eight years.

Note that the Likert scales have varied in a 5–7 range. To improve interpretation and understanding, we will be moving these to a seven-point range for all of the protocol scales and normalizing them for libraries that have already participate for multi-year consistency. Each of the Climate Scales in the Table shows UM's multi-year range of responses and the averages for the Phase I and Phase II partners. The pivotal role of leadership has already been highlighted in this paper, thus the six point Leadership Climate scales provide an appropriate good point

of departure for this discussion. Note that on each of the scale elements there is marked improvement from 2004 to 2008. Similarly, if the averages for the partner libraries is a measure—again UM Libraries demonstrate an acceptable pattern. It should be concluded that work in this area has resulted in a healthy climate.

Another way to look at the issue is the number of employees who responded positively to this portion of the survey. Table 2 provides the percentages for the same climate themes.

If an organizational climate theme has fewer than 50% of the employees agreeing with that scale, then that theme should be examined further in future intervention efforts. Clearly, themes that

| Organizational Climate | University of Maryland | UMD 2004 | UMD 2000 | Phase I | Phase II |
|---|------------------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| Climate for Organizational Justice | | | | | |
| Distributive Justice | 20% | 22% | N/A | 29% | 23% |
| Procedural Justice | 39% | 28% | N/A | 33% | 40% |
| Interpersonal Justice | 78% | 59% | N/A | 78% | 77% |
| Informational Justice | 53% | 59% | N/A | 57% | 54% |
| Leadership Climate | | | | | |
| Trust in Leader | 75% | N/A | N/A | 69% | 74% |
| Leader-Membership Relationship Quality | 81% | 74% | N/A | 77% | 79% |
| Manager's Passion for Service | 78% | 60% | 61% | 72% | 77% |
| Authentic Transformational Leadership | 70% | 45% | N/A | 49% | 70% |
| Climate for Interpersonal Treatment | | | | | |
| Team-level Interpersonal Treatment | 61% | 69% | 75% | 71% | 59% |
| Managers Interpersonal Treatment of Employees | 57% | 62% | 69% | 65% | 63% |

| Organizational Climate | University of Maryland | UMD 2004 | UMD 2000 | Phase I | Phase II |
|---|------------------------|----------|----------|---------|----------|
| Climate for Deep Diversity | | | | | |
| Non-discriminatory Practice | 83% | 82% | 52% | 87% | 87% |
| Standardized Procedures | 71% | 59% | 59% | 62% | 73% |
| Valuing Diversity | 88% | 69% | 63% | 75% | 83% |
| Climate for Demographic Diversity | | | | | |
| Race | 82% | 85% | N/A | 91% | 88% |
| Gender | 87% | 87% | N/A | 90% | 86% |
| Rank | 59% | 72% | N/A | 65% | 61% |
| Sexual Orientation | 84% | N/A | N/A | 90% | 91% |
| Climate for Innovation | | | | | |
| Supervisory | 52% | 51% | 35% | 37% | 54% |
| Co-workers | 77% | 77% | 64% | 66% | 76% |
| Climate for Continual Learning | 68% | 56% | 47% | 72% | 64% |
| Climate for Teamwork | | | | | |
| Benefits of Teams | 78% | 68% | N/A | 77% | 83% |
| Organizational value of teamwork | 77% | 81% | N/A | 74% | 74% |
| Structural facilitation of teamwork | 52% | 46% | N/A | 46% | 51% |
| Informational Facilitation of Teamwork | 79% | 90% | N/A | 79% | 78% |
| Climate for Customer Service | 71% | N/A | N/A | 70% | 67% |
| Climate for Psychological Safety: Team-level | 74% | N/A | N/A | N/A | 75% |
| Climate for Psychological Safety: Library-Level | 63% | N/A | N/A | N/A | 63% |
| Job Satisfaction | 62% | 60% | N/A | 60% | 66% |
| Organizational Commitment | 62% | 60% | 53% | 63% | 67% |
| Organizational Citizenship Behaviors | 64% | 62% | N/A | 76% | 72% |
| Organizational Withdrawal | 24% | 19% | 11% | 24% | 23% |
| Psychological Empowerment in the Workplace | | | | | |
| Individual empowerment | 91% | 92% | N/A | 93% | 92% |
| Team empowerment | 44% | 53% | N/A | 53% | 49% |
| Task Engagement | 77% | 85% | N/A | 86% | 83% |
| Work Unit Conflict | | | | | |
| Interpersonal | 15% | 11% | 12% | 19% | 14% |
| Task | 17% | 11% | 14% | 14% | 13% |

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

are substantially below the normative average and have fewer than 50% of the employees agreeing with them, need further attention. Of course, it is important not to just focus on the negative aspects of this report. Organizational climate averages that

are higher than the normative sample or that have more than 50% of the employees agreeing are also informative. This positive information needs to be considered along with the more negative information.

Interventions—What Did UM Do?

With respect to the leadership climate, there are good signs in the UM report and positive trend lines over eight years. It is worth noting here that this is a long period and major efforts were made in the area of organizational development to achieve improvement in most of the climate themes not just those pertaining to leadership. The full report grids of UM's efforts (what we styled "interventions" and more recently "improvement strategies") have been shared with partner libraries. Frankly, looking at them can be daunting, but UM felt strongly that the first action to be taken is sharing the results fully and openly with all library staff. Nothing could be more critical to making the point that the effort of taking the survey was worth the time spent. Among the interventions undertaken after the initial 2000 survey administration are the following:

- Established a monthly all staff meeting to enhance information sharing.
- Developed the Learning Curriculum, a comprehensive learning and education plan of over 150 content hours that was launched in May 2001. (<http://www.lib.umd.edu/groups/learning/curriculum.html>)
- Created the position of Coordinator of Personnel Programs to develop the areas of recruitment, orientation, performance review, tele-working, and mentoring.
- Created the position of Assistant Dean for Organizational Development.
- Held "Town Hall" meetings to discuss perceived barriers to creating an open climate of communication.
- Services Task Force led to the creation of the first "teams" in public services.
- Team based decision making expanded to the whole library system.
- Created a statement of support for participation in development activities for all library staff. (<http://www.lib.umd.edu/PASD/LPO/AdminMemos/memo40.html>)
- Held a luncheon each October to welcome new library staff.
- Conducted workshops specifically designed for supervisors including these examples (see the Learning Curriculum):
 - Rewards in Tough Times (dealing with morale and motivation issues)

- Do You Supervise Students? (focusing on best practices for student supervisors)
- Dealing with Differences (dealing with working in a multi-cultural climate)
- Giving and Receiving Feedback (focusing on the "do's and don'ts of feedback")
- Time Management (how to best organize and manage one's time)
 - Presentations to demystify how merit pools and cost-of-living increases were established and distributed.
 - Ongoing use of the "Individual-Team-Organization Survey" to measure progress of team-based work.
 - Facilitators' team established to assist units in problem solving and decision making.
 - Implemented Organizational Citizenship Expectations—OCE's required as part of the individual work plans.
 - The Leadership Practices Inventory—LPI adopted for identifying the strengths and areas for improvement in an individual's leadership skills.

After the 2004 administration of the survey a number of positive changes were reported since the 2000 survey including a positive work environment, the Libraries' support for diversity, employees are kept well-informed, they feel fairly treated, and teamwork has had positive consequences. It was noted, however, that there were differences in the results by Division. In addition, it was recommended that more assessment concerning ethnic differences be conducted. Among the interventions undertaken after the initial 2004 survey administration are the following:

- Held focus groups with library staff within the Technical Services Division and Information Technology Division to help them address specific issues identified in the report.
- Charged each Division to develop 2-3 strategies for addressing the results of the OCDA. Some examples include:
 - Created a Special Collections Orientation and Training Team to facilitate outreach, orientation and information sharing regarding the work of Special Collections.
 - Hired a consultant to evaluate the structure of the Information Technology Division and make recommendations to improve workflows and facilitate communication.
 - Created a marketing plan for the Learning

- Curriculum to identify more effective means of publicizing activities.
- o Appointed a Government and Geographic Information Services Task Force to create a new model for service as a Regional Depository.
 - o Established a blog for instructions, information sharing, meeting agendas and discussion topics.
 - Charged teams to review their meeting management practices to ensure that teams were using meeting time efficiently.
 - Developed a system to recognize staff achievements and contributions beyond the Libraries' Staff Awards Program (http://www.lib.umd.edu/PUB/AWARDS/desc_awards.html).
 - Reorganized the Human Resources and Budget Office into separate entities to more effectively address needs of the organization and library staff.
 - Revised the Organizational Citizenship Expectations and each library staff now applies these to their yearly work plans (<http://www.lib.umd.edu/groups/learning/citizenship.html>).
 - Evaluated and streamlined recruitment and hiring processes.
 - Formalized financial support for development activities for library staff: non-exempt staff, \$250; exempt staff, \$500; graduate assistants, \$250; library faculty with permanent status, \$1100; and library faculty without permanent status, \$1400.
 - Piloted a leadership assessment tool to help supervisors understand their strengths and areas for improvement.
 - Creating supervisory core competencies, which will support training, performance review, and other development activities. (to be completed by February 2008)
 - Send one to two library staff to the campus Leadership Development Institute each semester.
 - Developed Guidelines for Teams, a resource for ongoing team development (<http://www.lib.umd.edu/groups/facteam/GuidelinesFinal050928.pdf>).
 - Documented policy and procedures for merit and other HR processes such as acting capacity, administrative stipends, salary buyouts, and overload to provide all library staff with more information.
 - Hold brown bag lunches and forums on diversity topics such as "Rethinking Diversity" and "LGBT Forum."

As a means for tracking how the results were addressed, a table was created to map each of the survey concepts to the various interventions identified. In some cases, a specific intervention addressed multiple concepts. See examples in Table 3.

It is important to remember that the data tables reflect aggregate numbers. The full ClimateQUAL™ reports are far richer. They provide data based on the demographics—library unit, gender, race and ethnicity, religion, age, length of service, and sexual orientation. Thus, differences between the staff groups who were present for different years of the survey can be assessed. Similarly, looking at race and ethnicity can give deeper understanding of differences. UM learned that the climate for diversity was good, and that all groups perceived improvement between 2000 and 2008. But UM also learned that there was a consistent gap in perceptions of majority and minority employees in each of the survey results. This serves as a reminder that there are larger social forces always at play. About these UM may be able to do very little, but within the library organization we can do quite a lot to change the diversity climate landscape. In the end, we should tackle the problems in climate that are within our reach and unapologetically ignore those that are not.

Community-Building

As with any survey results, institutions use ClimateQUAL™ analyses in myriad ways, varying from cursory to deep interpretation. The unique organizational make-up of each library staff contributes to (if not creates outright) individual feelings or experiences specific to each institution, or in other words, a library's culture and climate.

There is no one-size-fits-all method of interpreting the results, nor is there a standardized method of determining and implementing changes necessary to improve the library's organizational health. In order to address identified issues or concerns in their entirety, the unique library climate must be understood by those attempting bring about change. The participants have come together and have shared improvement strategies that they have developed partly in response to ClimateQUAL™ and partly in response to the rest of the organizational pressures they are experiencing.

One of the participants was engaged in focusing on the organizational development aspects of the findings and engaged into detailed follow up with focus group and consulting activities with staff members to

| TABLE 3 University of Maryland Survey Concepts and Interventions Map | | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|---|--|
| Assessment Areas / Scales | Results of Scales | What Has Been Completed | What Is Currently Being Done | What Needs To Be Done | Next Steps |
| Survey Results | | | | | |
| Respect and Fair Treatment | In the middle | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hearing held to discuss revised Organizational Citizenship Expectations (OCE's) – (12/05). • Staff notified prior to mid-year review if documentation lacked OCE's (2006). | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applying revised Organizational Citizenship Expectations library wide. • Informing staff if PRD's lack OCE's (ongoing). | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue encouraging use of OCE's in PRD's and workplans. • Evaluate the effectiveness of the application of OCE's. |
| Dissemination of Information | People up to date but it differs by division | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recruitment and hiring processes evaluated by Planning and Administrative Services Division (PASD) in order to streamline and improve them (2005-6; preliminary reports at 12/06 All-Staff Sessions). | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applying revised Organizational Citizenship Expectations library wide. • Continuing to streamline processes and incorporate campus requirements. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Emphasize LAG's role in communicating with staff. • After hire of new Head of HR Office, review all strategies (2007). | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluate the effectiveness of the application of OCE's. • Continue to adjust strategies, emphasizing efficiency, responsiveness to candidates, competitiveness, and appeal of UMD as an employer. |

understand the specific issues surfaced. In this setting there was also a driver for a five year review process of the leadership of the organization and a strategic planning process that started to unfold in full soon after the ClimateQUAL™ survey took place. Another participant engaged in follow up focus groups with only those departments where issues seemed to emerge. A third institution followed up with staff dissemination of the results and engagement of all the participants in defining intervention strategies. Our understanding of the improvement strategies developed by participants and their effect on service quality issues is unfolding as the diversity of the participating libraries is increasing.

One benefit of ClimateQUAL™ is the intimate community created by participating institutions. Through participation, these institutions are demonstrating the value of the staff as distinct individuals and committing to better understand and engage their organizations as a whole. This growing community of

participants uses in-person events, an online shared workspace, and conversations to share strategies used in further understanding issues raised by the survey results and actions taken to address these issues. This sharing of insights adds great value to the ClimateQUAL™ protocol, and is considered an integral part of its success. Sustaining continued commitment by the community is critical for the success of any new measures initiative and for ClimateQUAL™: OCDA as well. A major challenge lies ahead of us in the area of supporting these institutions in developing and implementing improvement strategies as appropriate for their setting by emphasizing the right mix on diversity, leadership, organizational development, justice (distributive, procedural, interpersonal) and innovation and climate for learning aspects.

As organizational systems and procedures are adjusted properly to effect a 'healthier' organizational climate, we expect to see higher job satisfaction, less work conflict, greater organization commitment, en-

agement, empowerment and ultimately improved customer service. Understanding the linkages between the elements of the organizational climate and improvements in customer service is what makes the ClimateQUAL™ beat engaging.

Notes

1. P.J. Hanges, J. Aiken, and X. Chen, "Diversity, Organizational Climate, and Organizational Culture: The Role They Play in Influencing Organizational Effectiveness," in *Proceedings of the Library Assessment Conference Building Effective, Sustainable, Practical Assessment, September 25–27, 2006, Charlottesville, VA*, ed. Francine DeFranco et al. (Washington, DC: Association of Research Libraries, 2007) 359-368.
2. ARL Statistics and Measurement Program, www.arl.org/stats.
3. R.E. Ployhart, "Staffing in the 21st Century: New Challenges and Strategic Opportunities," *Journal of Management* 32 (2006): 868-897.
4. P.J. Hanges et al., "Diversity, Organizational Climate, and Organizational Culture"; P.J. Hanges, J.R. Aiken, and X. Chen, "Climate and Customer Service: The Healthy Organization," *in preparation*.
5. D.A. Harrison, K.H. Price and M.P. Bell, "Beyond Relational Demography: Time and the Effects of Surface and Deep-level Diversity on Work Group Cohesion," *Academy of Management Journal* 41 (1998): 96–107; S. Mohammed and L.C. Angell, "Surface- and Deep-level Diversity in Workgroups: Examining the Moderating Effects of Team Orientation and Team Process on Relationship Conflict," *Journal of Organizational Behavior* 25 (2004): 1015-1039.
6. C.K.W. De Dreu and M. A. West, "Minority Dissent and Team Innovation: The Importance of Participation in Decision Making," *Journal of Applied Psychology* 86 (2001): 1191-1201.
7. B. Schneider, "The People Make the Place," *Personnel Psychology* 40 (1987): 437-453.
8. Hanges et al., "Climate and Customer Service: The Healthy Organization."
9. Hanges et al., "Diversity, Organizational Climate, and Organizational Culture"; Hanges et al., "Climate and Customer Service."
10. Schneider, "The People Make the Place."
11. Ibid.
12. C. Ostroff, A.J. Kinicki, and M.M. Tamkins, "Organizational Culture and Climate," in *Comprehensive Handbook of Psychology, Volume 12: I/O Psychology*, eds. W.C. Bor-
- man, D.R. Ilgen, & R.J. Klimoski (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 2003), 565-594; B. Schneider, ed., *Organizational Climate and Culture* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1990); B. Schneider, S.K. Gunnarson, and K. Niles-Jolly, "Creating the Climate and Culture of Success," *Organizational Dynamics* 23 (1994): 17-29.
13. A.E. Reichers and B. Schneider, "Climate and Culture: An Evolution of Constructs," in *Organizational Climate and Culture*, ed. B. Schneider (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1990), 5–39.
14. G.W. Allport, *The Nature of Prejudice* (Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley, 1954).
15. Ibid.
16. Ibid.
17. J.J. Parkington and B. Schneider, "Some Correlates of Experienced Job Stress: A Boundary Role Study," *Academy of Management Journal* 22, no. 2 (1979): 270–281; B. Schneider, J.J. Parkington, and V.M. Buxton, "Employee and Customer Perceptions of Service in Banks," *Administrative Science Quarterly* 25 (1980): 252-267.
18. Parkington and Schneider, "Some Correlates of Experienced Job Stress."
19. Schneider et al., "Employee and Customer Perceptions of Service in Banks."
20. Hanges et al., "Climate and Customer Service."
20. Ibid.
22. Ibid.
23. Schneider, "The People Make the Place."
24. Arthur M. McAnnally and Robert B. Downs, "Changing Roles of Directors of University Libraries," *College and Research Libraries* 50 (1989): 307-327, reprinted from Arthur M. McAnnally and Robert B. Downs, "The Changing Role of Directors of University Libraries," *College & Research Libraries* 34 (1973): 103-25.
25. Maurice P. Marchant, *Participative Management in Academic Libraries* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press: 1976).
26. William F. Birdsall, "The Library Manager as Therapist," *The Journal of Academic Librarianship* 16 (1990): 209-12.
27. Dana C. Rooks, "Terms for Academic Library Directors," *Library Trends* 43 (1994): 47-61.
28. Peter Hernon, Ronald R. Powell, and Arthur P. Young, "University Library Directors in the Association of Research Libraries: The Next Generation, Part One," *College and Research Libraries* 62, no.2 (2001): 121, 127, and 133.
29. Charles B. Lowry, "Continuous Organizational Development—Teamwork, Learning, Leadership, and

Measurement,” *portal: Libraries and the Academy* 5, no. 1 (2005): 1–6; Kyrillidou, Martha and Colleen Cook. 2008. The evolution of measurement and evaluation of libraries: A perspective from the Association of Research Libraries. *Library Trends* 56, no. 4: 888–909; Russell, Keith. 2008. Evidence-based practice and organizational development in libraries. *Library Trends* 56, no. 4: 910–930.

30. Charles B. Lowry, “The More Things Change...” *portal: Libraries and the Academy* 1, no. 4 (2001): iix.