Assessing Organizational Climate

Part II:
What did we Find?
What are the Next Steps?
Three thousand three hundred and sixty-nine (n= 3,369) usable surveys were returned representing ten organizations from seven states.

Response rates varied from a low of 17 percent to a high of 94 percent.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Surveys Completed</th>
<th>Response Rate (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Arizona</td>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell University</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>843</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado State University</td>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado Agricultural Experimental Station</td>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Missouri</td>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>N/A(^1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln University</td>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina State University</td>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>521</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina A&amp;T</td>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Georgia</td>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota State University</td>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>3369</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Missouri used a web based tool; all others used paper and pencil. The total number of surveys distributed for Missouri was not provided therefore response rate could not be calculated.
Survey Respondents (n)

- Field/faculty agent: 1006
- Support Staff: 944
- Campus faculty/specialist: 542
- Paraprofessional/technician: 464
- Administrator: 245
- Missing: 168
Survey Respondents
Gender

- Male (33.9%)
- Female (66.0%)
- Declined to respond
Survey Respondents
Race/Ethnicity

- Middle Eastern
- Asian/Pacific Islander
- Other
- African American/Black
- Chicano(a)/Latino(a)/Hispanic
- American Indian/Alaskan Native/Hawaiian Native
- White/Caucasian

32 60 81 203 180 246 2667
Survey Respondents
Age

- 22 and under: 15
- 23 to 32: 461
- 33 to 42: 736
- 43 to 52: 1259
- 53 and over: 788
- Missing: 110
## Survey Respondents
### Sexual Identity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sexual Identity</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>(n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bisexual</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gay</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesbian</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterosexual</td>
<td>95.0</td>
<td>2599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uncertain</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Survey Respondents

Environment

- Large Farm: 889
- Small Farm: 631
- Rural, non-farm: 455
- Rural, non-farm: 437
- Suburban: 407
- Urban: 288
- Urban: 79
- Combination: 26
- International: Other
## Family Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family status</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>(n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>72.0</td>
<td>2340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In a committed relationship</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated, divorced, widowed</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Survey Respondents
On or Off Campus

- On Campus: 989
- Off-Campus: 2268
Annual Income

- Below $10,000: 34
- $10,000-$19,999: 359
- $20,000-$29,999: 686
- $30,000 - $39,000: 587
- $40,000-$49,000: 452
- $50,000-$59,000: 652
- Above $75,000: 351
Other Demographic Information

- 116 identified themselves as being disabled
- 176 identified themselves as being veterans
- 3074 people are U.S. citizens.
Aggregate Findings

- Caution must be taken when attempting to generalize these results, as each organization has its own unique context based on organizational size, location, and demographic make-up.
Good News!!

✓ 81 percent of respondents had not heard any employees make insensitive or disparaging remarks about various populations.

✓ Few respondents reported observing discriminatory hiring (less than 9%), firing (less than 2%), or promotion (less than 9%) based on any of the characteristics presented.
More Good News!!

✓ The majority of respondents indicated that they would feel comfortable being a close friend of, sharing an office with, and being supervised by people “different” than themselves.

✓ 71% of respondents felt that their organizational leadership visibly fostered diversity.
Even More Good News!!

✓ Three-quarters of the respondents believed that management within their work units demonstrated a commitment to diversity.

✓ Sixty-one percent felt that programming within the state organization represented the contributions of people from underrepresented groups.

✓ Seventy-five percent of respondents indicated that the overall climate was accepting of most of the groups listed.
Challenges and Opportunities
20% (n=691) of respondents personally experienced conduct that had interfered unreasonably with their ability to work or learn in the organization.
Experienced Conduct

Gender

Male: 24.5
Female: 74.9
Voices

- “I criticized my supervisor’s decision on a personal matter. He told me that my criticism hurt his feelings. When the conversation was over, he asked me to give him a hug. I felt disgusted.”

- “White males are now the minority...”

- “We with children at home are snubbed somewhat because work is not our life...I work to support my family.”
Voices

• “The overall work environment is hostile. There is very little contact/interaction among and between staff. Mistrust is rampant.”

• “...staff support vs. exempt staff. Only the exempt staff is considered to be ‘professional’. It is a CRAPPY work environment – too hierarchical.”

• “…that will be the reason I leave this job. It is a situation where support staff are told they are valued but the...admin/profs keep them in their place.”
Experienced Conduct Race/Ethnicity

- African/American/Black: 31.3%
- Asian/Pacific Islander: 29.3%
- American Indian/Alaskan Native/Hawaiian Native: 29.3%
- Middle Eastern: 28.1%
- Chicano(a)/Latino(a)/Hispanic: 27.6%
- White/Caucasian: 19.6%
Voices

- “...I would like to educate people about my culture but fear angry post 9/11 attacks. I live alone and cannot face this risk.”
- “I heard continuous references made by a support staff to ‘that f&%$#ng Nazi.’ A man of German heritage.”
- “I have seen American prospects for technical positions passed over in favor of Chinese candidates because ‘Chinese technicians work harder.’...”
Voices

- “We want to hire African Americans, Latinos, and others but only if they can walk and talk like a white middle class person…”

- “Unfortunately, there is till an ‘old boys’ network in our organization that values a very homogenous ‘administration’…”
Experienced Conduct Sexual Identity

- 26.1 % Sexual Minorities
- 20.6 % Heterosexual
Experienced Conduct Based on my:

- Other: 39.8
- Gender: 39.5
- Age: 24.5
- Race/Ethnicity: 18.5
- Socioeconomic Class: 15.1
Voices

• “I was asked by a faculty member, ‘have you always been this anal or only since you reached menopause?’”

• “...Older workers are replaced by younger workers and denied opportunities...”

• “I have experienced instances of support staff harassing me because the fact that I am younger than them...”
In what form was this conduct?

- Derogatory comments: 419
- Excluded: 308
- Ignored: 287
- Other: 258
- Target of Physical Violence: 9
Where did this conduct occur?

- Local Office: 64.0%
- Campus Office: 25.5%
- On campus event: 15.1%
- Off campus event: 8.7%
- Non-organizational event: 5.4%
- Other: 13.6%
Who was the source of this conduct?

- Field/Faculty agent: 32.4
- Administrator: 30.4
- Supervisor: 27.2
- Support Staff: 24.3
- Specialist/campus faculty: 18.4
What did you do in response to this conduct?

- Embarrassed 56%
- Ignored it 45%
- Avoided the harasser 38%
- Left the situation immediately 37%
- Considered changing my job 34%
- Confronted the harasser at the time 24%
- Made a complaint to appropriate official 17%
Organizational Comfort by Race

Figure 6
Organizational Comfort Level by Race

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>People of Color</th>
<th>White People</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Comfortable/Comfortable</td>
<td>70.3</td>
<td>82.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncomfortable/Uncomfortable</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Work Unit Comfort by Race

Figure 7
Work Unit Comfort Level by Gender

- Very Comfortable/Comfortable
  - People of Color: 77.2%
  - White People: 85.4%

- Very Uncomfortable/Uncomfortable
  - People of Color: 11.1%
  - White People: 7.1%

- Very Uncomfortable/Uncomfortable
  - People of Color: 11.4%
  - White People: 7.3%
Organizational Comfort by Gender

Figure 8
Organizational Comfort Level by Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Uncomfortable/Uncomfortable</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comfortable/Very Comfortable</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The chart shows the percentage of individuals who feel very comfortable or comfortable by gender.
Work Unit Comfort by Gender

Figure 9
Work Unit Comfort Level by Gender

Very Comfortable/Comfortable

Women: 82.2%
Men: 86.6%

Very Uncomfortable/Uncomfortable

Women: 8.9%
Men: 6.4%

Women: 8.8%
Men: 6.8%
Observed Harassment

23% (n=756) of respondents personally experienced conduct that had interfered unreasonably with their ability to work or learn in the organization.
Observed Conduct
Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>24.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>74.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Observed Conduct Position

- Support Staff: 30.1
- Field/faculty agent: 28.9
- Campus faculty/specialist: 16.6
- Paraprofessional/technician: 15.7
- Administrator: 8.7
Observed Conduct Race/Ethnicity

- **African/American/Black**: 34.9
- **Chicano(a)/Latino(a)/Hispanic**: 30.7
- **Asian/Pacific Islander**: 28.8
- **Middle Eastern**: 28.1
- **American Indian/Alaskan Native/Hawaiian Native**: 26.7
- **White/Caucasian**: 22.6
Observed Conduct Sexual Identity

- Sexual Minorities: 33.6
- Heterosexual: 22.8

Sexual Minorities  Heterosexual
Observed Conduct Based on:

38.6
34.1
25.3
16.4
14.9
14.3
13.9

Gender
Other
Race/Ethnicity
Age
Physical Characteristics
Ethnicity
Socioeconomic Class
In what form was this conduct?

- Derogatory comments: 76.9%
- Ignored: 31.2%
- Excluded: 29.2%
- Other: 26.7%
Where did this conduct occur?

- Local Office: 59.5%
- Campus Office: 26.5%
- Other: 14.3%
- Off campus event: 13.4%
Who was the source of this conduct?

- Field/Faculty agent: 34.1%
- Support Staff: 28.2%
- Administrator: 26.2%
- Specialist/campus faculty: 21.0%
- Supervisor: 19.2%
- Technician/para-professional: 13.8%
What did you do in response to this conduct?

- Embarrassed 40%
- Ignored it 21%
- Made a complaint to appropriate official 21%
- Considered changing my job 16%
- Confronted the harasser at the time 11%
CASD Employees’ Perceptions of the Climate

- Friendly: 85.9% (2765)
- Welcoming: 79.6% (2556)
- Respectful: 77.5% (2504)
- Cooperative: 75.6% (2438)
- Improving: 67.8% (2167)
CASD Perceptions of Climate “ism’s”

- Racist?
  - People of color (12%)
  - White respondents (4%)

- Sexist?
  - Women (13%)
  - Men (10%)
Organization Addresses
Issues of:

- Race
- Ethnicity
- Disabilities
- Gender
- Age
- Socioeconomic Class
- Non-Native English speaker
- Sexual Orientation
Next Steps…
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