

**Modesto Junior College Employee Climate Survey Analysis:  
Spring 2023**

Modesto Junior College  
Office of Planning, Research, Innovation, and Institutional Effectiveness  
August 29, 2023

## Contents

<b>Background</b> .....	3
Purpose.....	4
<b>Method</b> .....	4
Questionnaire Development.....	4
Administration.....	5
<b>Results</b> .....	5
<b>Demographics</b> .....	5
Professional Characteristics.....	6
<b>Organizational Climate</b> .....	6
Leadership.....	7
Managerial Style.....	8
Organizational Citizenship.....	9
Interpersonal Relationships.....	10
Clients, Capacity, & Values.....	10
<b>Climate for Diversity</b> .....	11
Perceptions of Campus Climate.....	11
Space for Diverse Voices.....	12
Diversity Education.....	13
Personal Experiences with Discrimination/Bias.....	13
Discrimination/Bias based on Identity.....	14
<b>Discussion &amp; Recommendations</b> .....	14
<b>References</b> .....	17
<b>Appendix A</b> .....	21

*Please contact the Office of Planning, Research, Innovation, and Institutional Effectiveness at [mjc.edu/general/research/meettheresearchstaff](http://mjc.edu/general/research/meettheresearchstaff) for any questions of comments related to the results of this survey.*

### Modesto Junior College Employee Climate Survey Analysis: Spring 2023

In recent years, there has been a renewed focus on diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) efforts within higher education. While Modesto Junior College frequently uses a DEI lens when assessing students' academic success, the institution has begun to also consider the impacts of workplace climate on overall campus climate and, ultimately, student success.

Because the importance, value, and contribution of diversity is not limited to students, it is important to identify the variety of factors that contribute to creating a positive climate for diversity on campus (Hurtado, Milem, Clayton-Pedersen, and Allen, 1998). A large part of this process for creating a positive campus climate involves providing opportunity for **all** members of the campus community to describe their experiences related to DEI and organizational culture. To be a meaningful assessment of the current campus climate, it is important to ensure that multiple perspectives from the institution are represented as experiences related to DEI and organizational culture may vary greatly between faculty, classified professionals, and administrators and between individuals with different personal or professional characteristics (Mayhew, Grunwald, and Dey, 2006).

Considering that DEI initiatives rely on employees to effectively move the efforts forward, it is necessary to understand how the climate and culture of the institution can influence these efforts in terms of employee retention and belonging. An institution's organizational climate (i.e. the employee's perceptions of the organization in terms of leadership, managerial styles, organizational citizenship, interpersonal relationships, and the institution's capacity and values) has been shown to be negatively correlated with voluntary turnover (i.e. an employee's own estimation of the probability that they will leave the institution within the next year) (Wells and Peachey, 2012; Taplin and Winterton, 2007; Tymon et al., 2011; Maertz, Griffeth, Campbell,

and Allen, 2007; Lam, Chen, and Takeuchi, 2009; Coyne and Ong, 2007; Paille and Grima, 2011; Bertelli, 2006; Regts and Molleman, 2012). This correlation between organizational climate and voluntary turnover is important to note considering institutions are often faced with large disruptions in DEI efforts and/or changes in institutional priorities when employees of any professional role leave the institution (Fulton, 2023).

### **Purpose**

The purpose of this survey was to (1) identify organizational climate factors that may contribute to voluntary employee turnover at Modesto Junior College and (2) evaluate the campus climate for diversity through both overall perceptions and individual employee experiences.

### **Motivation**

The results from this survey will be used to inform decisions surrounding the attainment of Objective B.1 of the 2023-2028 MJC Strategic Plan and to support the work of the Inclusion, Diversity, Equity, Accessibility, and Anti-Racism (IDEAA) committee on campus.

## **Method**

### **Questionnaire Development**

The questionnaire consisted of 21 questions. The items in this survey were chosen after an extensive literature review on employee climate surveys in higher education institutions. This began by looking at employee climate surveys done by other California Community Colleges. Literature pertaining to industrial/organizational psychology (Erasmus, Grobler, & van Niekerk, 2015; Masoga, 2013; Khan, Ismail, Hussain, & Alghazali, 2020), institutional research (Bauer, 1998; Boyer, 1990; Mayhew, Grunwald, & Dey, 2006; Higher Education Research Institute,

2023; National Center on Safe Supportive Learning Environments, 2023; Stork, 2019), and employee engagement/satisfaction (Skelton, Nattress, & Dwyer, 2020; Diamantidis & Chatzoglou, 2019; Arasanmni & Krishna, 2019) was consulted in the creation of these items as well.

The 21 questions were broken into 6 overall sections: Demographics, Professional Characteristics, Organizational Climate, Perceptions of Diversity Climate, Personal Experiences with Discrimination/Bias, and Discrimination based on Identity. See Appendix A for complete questionnaire.

### **Administration**

A list of current Modesto Junior College employees was generated based on employees who were active within the 2022-2023 academic year. This list excluded district employees who are assigned to a Modesto Junior College campus. A total of 853 employees were then sent an anonymous link to the questionnaire via email. The questionnaire link accepted responses for three weeks before data collection closed. Four reminders were spread out over the course of the three weeks to encourage participation. The department with the highest response rate won MJC T-shirts for the entire department. The questionnaire was administered through Qualtrics.

## **Results**

### **Demographics**

Of the 853 employees who received the questionnaire, we received a total of 449 partial or completed responses (52.6% response rate). The demographic make-up of respondents was largely representative of the MJC employee population. The majority of respondents were female ( $n = 300$ ), with 123 male respondents, and less than 10 non-binary respondents. On

average, respondents were in their mid-40s ( $M = 46.71$ ,  $SD = 13.04$ ). Most respondents were White ( $n = 252$ ) or Hispanic/Latino ( $n = 90$ ). The remaining 19.3% of respondents were African-American ( $n = 14$ ), American Indian/Alaska Native ( $n < 10$ ), Asian ( $n = 14$ ), Filipino ( $n < 10$ ), or multiple ethnicities ( $n = 46$ ). Almost half of all respondents indicated that a Master's Degree was their highest level of education ( $n = 204$ ), with the majority having obtained a degree of some kind. Less than 10% of respondents ( $n = 39$ , 8.91%) have not obtained a degree.

**Professional Characteristics.** On average, respondents have been employed at Modesto Junior College for 12 years ( $SD = 9.66$ ). The majority of respondents were faculty members ( $n = 218$ ) and classified professionals ( $n = 186$ ), with 23 mid-level administrators (i.e. Associate/Assistant Dean, Director), and 11 senior administrators (i.e. President, Vice-President, Dean). Faculty and classified respondents primarily consisted of full-time employees ( $n = 138$  and 170, respectively). All areas of the college were represented in this survey.

### **Organizational Climate**

Employees were asked to report the likelihood of leaving their current position and/or Modesto Junior College within the next year. Overall, respondents reported that they were somewhat unlikely to leave their current position ( $M = 2.02$ ,  $SD = 1.31$ ). This trend was consistent across all professional roles at the institution, genders, and ethnicities (see Table 1).

**Table 1. Employee likelihood of leaving the current position (1-Not at all Likely; 5-Extremely Likely)**

Demographic Category	Average Rating ( <i>M</i> )	Standard Deviation ( <i>SD</i> )
<b>Professional Role</b>		
Classified Professional	2.2	1.4
Faculty	1.9	1.2
Mid-Level Administrators	2.1	1.2
Senior Administrators	2.2	1.4
<b>Gender</b>		
Female	1.9	1.2
Male	2.2	1.4
Non-Binary	1	0
<b>Ethnicity</b>		
African-American	1.6	1.2
American Indian/Alaska Native	2.4	1.3
Asian	2.6	1.3
Filipino	2.7	1.5
Hispanic	2.2	1.4
White	1.9	1.2
Multiple Ethnicities	2.1	1.2

Respondents also reported that they were extremely unlikely to leave Modesto Junior College within the next year ( $M = 1.88$ ,  $SD = 1.22$ ), a trend that was also consistent across all professional roles at the institution, genders, and ethnicities (see Table 2).

**Table 2. Employee likelihood of leaving Modesto Junior College (1-Not at all Likely; 5-Extremely Likely)**

Demographic Category	Average Rating ( <i>M</i> )	Standard Deviation ( <i>SD</i> )
<b>Professional Role</b>		
Classified Professional	1.9	1.3
Faculty	1.8	1.2
Mid-Level Administrators	1.9	1.3
Senior Administrators	1.7	1.2
<b>Gender</b>		
Female	1.8	1.1
Male	2.1	1.3
Non-Binary	2.3	1.5
<b>Ethnicity</b>		
African-American	1.6	1.2
American Indian/Alaska Native	2	1.4
Asian	2.4	1.3
Filipino	2	1.4
Hispanic	1.8	1.2
White	1.7	1.1
Multiple Ethnicities	2.3	1.3

A Pearson's  $r$  correlational analysis was used to examine the relationship between an employee's likeliness of leaving their current position and their likeliness of leaving the institution as a whole. Results indicated that there was a significant positive correlation between how likely an employee is to leave their current position within the next year and how likely they are to leave MJC,  $r(397) = .768, p < .001$ .

**Leadership.** Employees were asked 12 items related to their satisfaction with leadership at Modesto Junior College. Overall, respondents are somewhat dissatisfied with leadership at MJC ( $M = 34.28, SD = 12.10$ ). Specifically, respondents feel that MJC's leadership does not: build effective relationships with all employees ( $M = 2.51, SD = 1.24$ ), communicate a clear vision for the institution ( $M = 2.66, SD = 1.23$ ), make effective changes to help the institution be successful ( $M = 2.77, SD = 1.22$ ), know what is going on in the institution ( $M = 2.68, SD = 1.21$ ), or value the many different opinions of its employees ( $M = 2.83, SD = 1.23$ ). Respondents also feel that communication is ineffective both between levels of management ( $M = 2.71, SD = 1.17$ ) and between employees and management ( $M = 2.83, SD = 1.31$ ). When asked about the effectiveness of the current institutional structure, i.e. levels of management, respondents reported that the current structure does not allow them to be effective as an employee ( $M = 2.95, SD = 1.32$ ). This overall dissatisfaction with leadership at MJC was reported within the faculty ( $M = 34.18, SD = 12.13$ ), classified ( $M = 34.12, SD = 12.13$ ), and senior administrator ( $M = 35.60, SD = 13.38$ ) roles on campus. Mid-level administrators reported feeling neither satisfied nor dissatisfied with MJC leadership ( $M = 36.47, SD = 11.84$ ).

A Pearson's  $r$  correlational analysis was used to examine the relationship between an employee's satisfaction with MJC leadership and their likeliness of voluntary turnover. Results indicated that there was a significant negative correlation between an employee's satisfaction



with MJC leadership and how likely they are to leave their current position,  $r(367) = -.312, p < .001$ , as well as their likeliness of leaving MJC,  $r(366) = -.324, p < .001$ , within the next year.

**Managerial Style.** Employees were asked 15 items related to their satisfaction with their immediate supervisor's managerial style. Overall, respondents are ambivalent about their immediate supervisor's managerial style ( $M = 52.43, SD = 16.33$ ). Specifically, respondents report feeling neither satisfied nor dissatisfied with their manager's accessibility ( $M = 3.82, SD = 1.37$ ), work distribution practice ( $M = 3.29, SD = 1.36$ ), ability to clearly communicate expectations ( $M = 3.83, SD = 1.24$ ), and ability to create an environment of support and trust ( $M = 3.66, SD = 1.44$ ). Respondents also reported feeling ambivalent toward their manager's ability to provide professional development ( $M = 3.26, SD = 1.38$ ) and regular, effective feedback ( $M = 3.38, SD = 1.35$ ). This overall ambivalence with managerial style was reported within the faculty ( $M = 51.84, SD = 15.53$ ), classified ( $M = 52.84, SD = 17.09$ ), mid-level administrator ( $M = 57.88, SD = 14.46$ ) and senior administrator ( $M = 49.50, SD = 19.65$ ) roles on campus.

A Pearson's  $r$  correlational analysis was used to examine the relationship between an employee's satisfaction with their immediate supervisor and their likeliness of voluntary turnover. Results indicated that there was a significant negative correlation between an employee's satisfaction with their immediate supervisor and how likely they are to leave their current position,  $r(347) = -.428, p < .001$ , as well as their likeliness of leaving MJC,  $r(345) = -.390, p < .001$ , within the next year.

**Organizational Citizenship.** Employees were asked four items related to their sense of organizational citizenship (i.e. their sense of belonging, loyalty, and voluntary commitment to the institution). Overall, respondents are somewhat satisfied with their sense of organizational citizenship ( $M = 15.67, SD = 2.98$ ). Specifically, respondents reported that they are committed to

doing their best work at MJC ( $M = 4.70$ ,  $SD = .74$ ) and are willing to go the extra mile when necessary ( $M = 4.54$ ,  $SD = .85$ ). This overall commitment to the institution was reported within the faculty ( $M = 15.64$ ,  $SD = 3.08$ ), classified ( $M = 15.81$ ,  $SD = 2.86$ ), and mid-level administrator ( $M = 15.88$ ,  $SD = 2.26$ ) roles on campus. On the other hand, all respondents are uncertain of whether they clearly understand the college's vision, mission and values ( $M = 3.57$ ,  $SD = 1.23$ ), feel that MJC does not have clear strategic priorities and goals ( $M = 2.86$ ,  $SD = 1.19$ ), and that employee concerns are not considered when making policy ( $M = 2.61$ ,  $SD = 1.20$ ). Senior administrators are ambivalent about the directional impact of their role at MJC ( $M = 13.50$ ,  $SD = 3.89$ ). Additionally, respondents are unsure of whether their contributions are valued by their department ( $M = 3.82$ ,  $SD = 1.26$ ), their direct supervisor ( $M = 3.82$ ,  $SD = 1.42$ ), or senior administrators ( $M = 3.14$ ,  $SD = 1.30$ ). Finally, respondents reported that they are uncertain that they "belong" to this campus ( $M = 3.66$ ,  $SD = 1.26$ ).

A Pearson's  $r$  correlational analysis was used to examine the relationship between an employee's satisfaction with their sense of organizational citizenship and their likeliness of voluntary resignation. Results indicated that there was a significant negative correlation between an employee's satisfaction with their institutional sense of belonging and how likely they are to leave their current position,  $r(354) = -.218$ ,  $p < .001$ , as well as their likeliness of leaving MJC,  $r(353) = -.264$ ,  $p < .001$ , within the next year.

**Interpersonal Relationships.** Employees were asked six items related to their satisfaction with their interpersonal relationships with their coworkers. Overall, respondents are somewhat satisfied with their coworker relationships ( $M = 24.27$ ,  $SD = 5.62$ ). Specifically, respondents reported that they enjoy working with the people in their team ( $M = 4.29$ ,  $SD = .97$ ), feel that the people they work with treat them with respect ( $M = 4.23$ ,  $SD = 1.04$ ), and help each

other when needed ( $M = 4.22$ ,  $SD = .98$ ). This overall satisfaction with interpersonal relationships with coworkers was reported within classified ( $M = 24.64$ ,  $SD = 5.53$ ), mid-level administrator ( $M = 24.88$ ,  $SD = 4.04$ ), and senior administrator ( $M = 24.60$ ,  $SD = 7.04$ ) roles on campus. Faculty members are ambivalent about their relationships with coworkers ( $M = 23.86$ ,  $SD = 5.74$ ).

A Pearson's  $r$  correlational analysis was used to examine the relationship between an employee's satisfaction with their interpersonal relationships with coworkers and their likeliness of voluntary resignation. Results indicated that there was a significant negative correlation between an employee's satisfaction with their interpersonal coworker relationships and how likely they are to leave their current position,  $r(349) = -.258$ ,  $p < .001$ , as well as their likeliness of leaving MJC,  $r(348) = -.326$ ,  $p < .001$ , within the next year.

**Clients, Capacity, and Values.** Employees were asked five items related to their satisfaction with the institution's values and capacity. Overall, respondents are ambivalent about the institution's values and capacity ( $M = 17.79$ ,  $SD = 5.13$ ). Specifically, respondents are uncertain of the extent to which MJC attracts and hires talented employees ( $M = 3.35$ ,  $SD = 1.23$ ), and has the right employees in job roles that fit their experience, skills, and career goals ( $M = 3.38$ ,  $SD = 1.28$ ). Additionally, respondents are uncertain of whether MJC appreciates and understands the aspirations of our students with regard to their education ( $M = 3.59$ ,  $SD = 1.21$ ), and holds meeting the aspirations and expectation of our students as a top priority ( $M = 3.81$ ,  $SD = 1.22$ ). This overall ambivalence with the institution's values and capacity was reported within the faculty ( $M = 17.74$ ,  $SD = 5.07$ ), classified ( $M = 17.79$ ,  $SD = 5.30$ ), mid-level administrator ( $M = 18.07$ ,  $SD = 3.94$ ) and senior administrator ( $M = 18.10$ ,  $SD = 5.70$ ) roles on campus.

A Pearson's  $r$  correlational analysis was used to examine the relationship between an employee's satisfaction with the institution's values and capacity and their likeliness of voluntary turnover. Results indicated that there was a significant negative correlation between an employee's satisfaction with the institution's values and capacity and how likely they are to leave their current position,  $r(339) = -.318, p < .001$ , as well as their likeliness of leaving MJC,  $r(338) = -.341, p < .001$ , within the next year.

### **Climate for Diversity**

**Perceptions of Campus Diversity.** Employees were asked 12 items related to their perception of employee diversity and atmosphere for diversity on campus. Overall, respondents are ambivalent about the *racial/ethnic* diversity of MJC faculty ( $M = 3.29, SD = 1.21$ ), classified professionals ( $M = 3.53, SD = 1.12$ ), and administrators ( $M = 3.24, SD = 1.16$ ). Specifically, African-American respondents reported they are extremely dissatisfied with the racial/ethnic diversity of faculty ( $M = 1.85, SD = 1.21$ ), while Filipino and Hispanic respondents reported they are somewhat dissatisfied ( $M = 2.33, SD = 1.16$  and  $M = 2.95, SD = 1.26$ , respectively). African-American and Filipino respondents are also somewhat dissatisfied with the racial/ethnic diversity of classified professionals ( $M = 2.62, SD = 1.19$  and  $M = 2.67, SD = 1.53$ , respectively). African-American respondents reported also being somewhat dissatisfied with the racial/ethnic diversity of administrators ( $M = 2.15, SD = 1.14$ ). Responses were consistent with the overall average regardless of respondent's gender. When asked about the *gender* diversity of MJC employees, respondents reported mixed feelings toward the gender diversity of faculty ( $M = 3.54, SD = 1.04$ ), classified professionals ( $M = 3.56, SD = 1.02$ ), and administrators ( $M = 3.46, SD = 1.05$ ). Responses were consistent with the overall average regardless of respondent's gender. African-American respondents reported they are somewhat dissatisfied with the gender diversity of

faculty ( $M = 2.54$ ,  $SD = 1.39$ ), classified professionals ( $M = 2.54$ ,  $SD = 1.33$ ), and administrators ( $M = 2.31$ ,  $SD = 1.32$ ).

When asked about atmosphere for diversity on campus, 45.7% of respondents reported that they are satisfied with the campus atmosphere for sexual orientation differences, with 44% reporting that they are neither satisfied nor dissatisfied and 10.2% reporting that they are dissatisfied. When asked about atmosphere for political differences, 33.8% reported that they are satisfied, 38.1% are neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, and 28.1% are dissatisfied. 36.5% of respondents are satisfied with the campus atmosphere for religious differences, with 43.9% reporting that they are neither satisfied nor dissatisfied and 19.5% reporting that they are dissatisfied. When asked about atmosphere for gender differences, 45.7% of respondents reported that they are satisfied, 45.4% are neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, and 8.8% are dissatisfied. 47% of respondents are satisfied with the campus atmosphere for racial/ethnic differences, with 36.7% reporting that they are neither satisfied nor dissatisfied and 16.2% reporting that they are dissatisfied. When asked about atmosphere for individuals with disabilities, 47.9% reported that they are satisfied, 36.3% reported that they are neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, and 15.9% reported that they are dissatisfied. Finally, on average, respondents reported feeling somewhat safe on campus ( $M = 2.30$ ,  $SD = 1.25$ ) (See Table 3).

**Table 3. Employee Satisfaction with Campus Atmosphere for Diversity**

Campus Atmosphere Category	Satisfied	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied
Atmosphere for Sexual Orientation Differences	45.7%	44%	10.2%
Atmosphere for Political Differences	33.8%	38.1%	28.1%
Atmosphere for Religious Differences	36.5%	43.9%	19.5%
Atmosphere for Gender Differences	45.7%	45.4%	8.8%
Atmosphere for Racial/Ethnic Differences	47%	36.7%	16.2%
Atmosphere for Individuals with Disabilities	47.9%	36.3%	15.9%

**Space for Diverse Voices.** Employees were asked seven questions related to the extent to which MJC welcomes and provides a space for diverse voices of students and employees. Overall, respondents feel that there is not a lot of racial tension on campus ( $M = 2.51$ ,  $SD = 1.15$ ). The majority of respondents agree that the institution promotes the appreciation of cultural differences (56.92%) and encourages students to have a public voice and share their ideas openly (55.46%). Less than half of respondents felt the institution encourages employees to have a public voice and share their ideas openly (43.68%). 44.51% of respondents believe that MJC provides the campus community with opportunities to share feeling about issues of concern and 37.99% believe that MJC has effective practices and policies that increase employee diversity. Finally, 48.69% of employees agree that MJC has campus administrators who regularly speak about the value of diversity.

**Diversity Education.** Employees were asked four questions related to their individual efforts to increase their education related to diversity. The majority of respondents have participated in some form of diversity education, with 86.92% of respondents educating themselves about individuals who are different than them on at least an occasional basis. 62.10% of respondents attend programs focused on diversity on an occasional-to-frequent basis, with 21% of respondents having never attended a program on this topic. Finally, 47.81% of respondents have participated in a coalition of different groups to address social justice issues, with 33.24% of respondents having never participated in this form of coalition.

**Personal Experiences with Discrimination/Bias.** Employees were asked nine questions related to their personal experiences with discrimination and bias on campus. 45.64% of respondents have never challenged others on issues of discrimination. When asked if they have ever assisted someone with a problem about discrimination, respondents, on average, reported

that they have never assisted another employee ( $M = 1.95$ ,  $SD = 1.26$ ) and have seldom assisted a student ( $M = 2.25$ ,  $SD = 1.30$ ). Additionally, 41.23% of respondents have never witnessed discrimination on campus. When asked how often they have heard insensitive or disparaging remarks about race/ethnicity or gender, 59.06% reported they have never heard these kinds of remarks from faculty, 64.81% have never heard these remarks from classified professionals, 68.13% have never heard these kinds of remarks from mid-level administrators, and 70% have never heard these remarks from senior administrators.

**Discrimination/Bias based on Identity.** Employees were asked to identify how often they have been discriminated against or excluded from activities on campus across twelve different categories. 7.85% of respondents have experienced discrimination/exclusion at MJC based their ability/disability status, 17.82% based on their age, 3.01% based on their citizenship status, 13.19% based on their gender/gender identity, 29.48% based on job classification, 17.12% based on level of education, 23.62% based on political beliefs, 17.25% based on race/ethnicity, 17.07% based on religious/spiritual beliefs, 8.21% based on sexual orientation, 9.57% based on socioeconomic status, and 8.89% based on parent/guardian status.

A Pearson's  $r$  correlational analysis was used to examine the relationship between the frequency of which an employee experiences discrimination/bias and their likeliness of voluntary resignation. Results indicated that there was a significant positive correlation between the frequency of which an employee experiences discrimination/bias and how likely they are to leave their current position for employee's experiencing discrimination/bias based on ability/disability status ( $r(327) = .218$ ,  $p < .001$ ), age ( $r(327) = .197$ ,  $p < .001$ ), citizenship status ( $r(326) = .221$ ,  $p < .001$ ), gender/gender identity ( $r(327) = .138$ ,  $p = .012$ ), job classification ( $r(328) = .235$ ,  $p < .001$ ), level of education ( $r(326) = .176$ ,  $p = .001$ ), race/ethnicity ( $r(325) =$

.205,  $p < .001$ ), religious/spiritual beliefs ( $r(326) = .126, p = .022$ ), sexual orientation ( $r(325) = .220, p < .001$ ), socioeconomic status ( $r(324) = .239, p < .001$ ), and parent/guardian status ( $r(325) = .209, p < .001$ ). There was also a significant positive correlation between the frequency of which an employee experiences discrimination/bias and how likely they are to leave Modesto Junior College for employee's experiencing discrimination/bias based on ability/disability status ( $r(328) = .210, p < .001$ ), age ( $r(328) = .274, p < .001$ ), citizenship status ( $r(327) = .240, p < .001$ ), gender/gender identity ( $r(328) = .207, p = .012$ ), job classification ( $r(329) = .239, p < .001$ ), level of education ( $r(327) = .163, p = .003$ ), race/ethnicity ( $r(327) = .288, p < .001$ ), political beliefs ( $r(327) = .159, p = .004$ ), religious/spiritual beliefs ( $r(327) = .189, p < .001$ ), sexual orientation ( $r(326) = .219, p < .001$ ), socioeconomic status ( $r(325) = .255, p < .001$ ), and parent/guardian status ( $r(326) = .182, p < .001$ ).

## Discussion and Recommendations

The purpose of this survey was to (1) identify organizational climate factors that may contribute to voluntary employee turnover at Modesto Junior College and (2) evaluate the campus climate for diversity through both overall perceptions and individual employee experiences. The results from this survey can be used to inform decisions surrounding the attainment of Objective B.1 of the 2023-2028 MJC Strategic Plan and to support the work of the Inclusion, Diversity, Equity, Accessibility, and Anti-Racism (IDEAA) committee on campus.

Overall, it was found that employee satisfaction with leadership, management, organizational citizenship, interpersonal relationships, and the institution's capacity and values are all significantly correlated with the employee's intention to leave their current position and/or the institution as a whole. It was also shown that employees who reported that they are likely to



leave their current position are also likely to leave the institution within the next year. These potential relationships map onto findings in previous literature related to organizational climate and voluntary turnover (Wells and Peachey, 2012; Taplin and Winterton, 2007; Tymon et al., 2011; Maertz, Griffeth, Campbell, and Allen, 2007; Lam, Chen, and Takeuchi, 2009; Coyne and Ong, 2007; Paille and Grima, 2011; Bertelli, 2006; Regts and Molleman, 2012), highlighting the importance of examining these factors to identify opportunities for decreasing voluntary employee turnover at the institution. As the results of this current study indicate, MJC employees are mostly satisfied with their immediate supervisor's managerial style and their interpersonal relationships with their coworkers. On the other hand, all employees, including faculty, classified professionals, and administrators, tend to be dissatisfied with the institution's leadership and ambivalent about their individual sense of organizational citizenship as well as the institution's capacity and values. This suggests that although MJC employees feel supported and respected by their managers and coworkers, they are unsure of the directional impact of their role at MJC and whether the institution, as a whole, holds student aspirations and goals at the center of its priorities, policies, and practices. Future research should be done to further examine these attitudes and identify potential avenues for increasing employees' sense of purpose and prioritizing student-centered policies and practices on campus.

The institutional climate for diversity seems to be viewed with a similar theme of ambivalence. Overall, employees had mixed feelings regarding both the racial/ethnic and gender diversity of employees on campus. African-American, Filipino and Hispanic employees, specifically, were dissatisfied with the racial/ethnic diversity of employees. African-American employees were also dissatisfied with the gender diversity among faculty, classified professionals, and administrators. Although over half of survey respondents felt that the

institution does promote the appreciation of cultural differences, most respondents believe the institution does not provide the campus community with opportunities to share feelings about issues of concern, does not encourage employees to have a public voice and share their ideas openly, and does not have effective practices and policies that increase employee diversity. There is also a perception among employees that MJC campus administrators do not regularly speak about the value of diversity. When asked about their personal experiences with discrimination/bias, 59% of survey respondents indicated they have witnessed discrimination at least once on campus, with 17% having personally experienced some form of discrimination/bias based on race/ethnicity, 13% based on gender, 18% based on age, and 29% based on job classification. The combination of these results suggests that although the college may promote an appreciation of diversity, the institution falls short in terms of actually embracing employee diversity, discussing the value of a diverse workplace, and fostering a positive work climate for diversity on campus.

### References

- Arasanmni, C.N. & Krishna, A. (2019). Employer branding: Perceived organizational support and employee retention – the mediating role of organizational commitment. *Industrial and Commercial Training*, 51(3), 174-183.
- Bauer, K. (1998). Campus climate: Understanding the critical components of today's colleges and universities. *New Directions for Institutional Research*, 98.
- Bertelli, A.M. (2006). Determinants of bureaucratic turnover intention: Evidence from the Department of Treasury. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 17, 235-258.
- Boyer, E. (1990). *Campus life: In search of community*. Princeton, NJ: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
- Coyne, I. & Ong, T. (2007). Organizational citizenship behavior and turnover intention: A cross-cultural study. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 18(6), 1085-1097.
- Diamantidis, A. D. & Chatzoglou, P. (2019). Factors affecting employee performance: An empirical approach. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, 68(1), 171-193.
- Erasmus, B. J., Grobler, A., & van Niekerk, M. (2015). Employee retention in a higher education institution: An organizational development perspective. *Progressio*, 37(2), 33-63.

Fulton, A. (2023). *Sustaining diversity, equity, and inclusion requires shared leadership*.

Retrieved from: <https://www.insidehighered.com/opinion/career-advice/diversity/2023/04/27/everyones-work>

Higher Education Research Institute (2023). *Staff Climate Survey*, Retrieved from:

<https://heri.ucla.edu/staff-climate-survey/>

Hurtado, S., Milem, J.F., Clayton-Pedersen, A.R., & Allen, W. (1998). Enhancing campus climates for racial/ethnic diversity: Educational policy and practice. *The Review of Higher Education*, 21(3), 279-302.

Khan, M. A., Ismail, F B., Hussain, A. & Alghazali, B. (2020). The interplay of leadership styles, innovative work behavior, organizational culture, and organizational citizenship behavior. *SAGE Open*, 1-16.

Lam, W., Chen, Z., & Takeuchi, N. (2009). Perceived human resource management practices and intention to leave of employees: The mediating role of organizational citizenship behavior in a Sino-Japanese joint venture. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 20(11), 2250-2270.

Maertz, C.P., Griffeth, R.W., Campbell, N.S., & Allen, D.G. (2007). The effects of perceived organizational support and perceived supervisor support on employee turnover. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 28, 1059-1075.

Masoga, L. (2013). *The role of personality and organizational climate in employee turnover* (Doctoral dissertation).

- Mayhew, M. J., Grunwald, H. E., & Dey, E. L. (2006). Breaking the silence: Achieving a positive campus climate for diversity from the staff perspective. *Research in Higher Education, 47*(1), 63-88.
- National Center on Safe Supportive Learning Environments (2023). *Assessing Climate*, Retrieved from: <https://safesupportivelearning.ed.gov/training-technical-assistance/education-level/higher-education/assessment/assessing-climate>
- Paille, P. & Grima, F. (2011). Citizenship and withdrawal from the workplace: Relationship between organizational citizenship behavior, intention to leave current job and intention to leave the organization. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 151*(4), 478-493.
- Regts, G. & Molleman, E. (2012) To leave or not to leave: When receiving interpersonal citizenship behavior influences an employee's turnover intention. *Human Relations, 66*(2), 193-218.
- Skelton, A. R., Nattress, D., & Dwyer, R. J. (2020). Predicting manufacturing employee turnover intentions. *Journal of Economics, Finance, and Administrative Science, 25*(49), 101-117.
- Stork, E. (2019). Multiple diversity dimensions and organizational climate: Faculty and staff perceptions about agency, resistance, marginalization, and university leadership. *The International Journal of Organizational Diversity, 19*, 29-44.
- Taplin, I.M. & Winterton, J. (2007). The importance of management style in labor retention. *International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy, 27*(1/2), 5-18.
- Tymon W.G., Stumpf, S.A., & Smith, R.R. (2011). Manager support predicts turnover of professionals in India. *Career Development International, 16*(3), 293-312.

Wells, J.E., & Peachey, J.W. (2010). Turnover intentions: Do leadership behaviors and satisfaction with the leader matter? *Team Performance Management*, 17(1/2), 23-40.

**Appendix A. Spring 2023 MJC Employee Climate Survey Items**

1. In which area do you primarily work at Modesto Junior College?
  - a. School of Agriculture
  - b. School of Art, Performance, & the Humanities
  - c. School of Behavioral and Social Sciences
  - d. School of Business & Computing
  - e. School of Fitness & Health Professions
  - f. School of Industry & Trades
  - g. School of Language Arts & Education
  - h. School of Public Safety
  - i. School of Science, Engineering, & Mathematics
  - j. Library & Learning Center
  - k. Academic Counseling, Admissions & Records, Financial Aid
  - l. Career Services, Campus Life, Dining Services, Health/Psychological Services, Special Programs
  - m. External Affairs (e.g. Access & Outreach, Public Relations, Foundation, Community Engagement/Partnerships, Workforce Development)
  - n. Administration (e.g. Instruction Office, College Administrative Services, President's Office, Vice President of Student Services Office)
2. Please indicate your gender.
  - a. Male
  - b. Female
  - c. Non-Binary
3. Please indicate your age.

- a. (sliding scale from 0-100)
4. Please indicate your ethnicity.
  - a. African-American
  - b. American Indian/Alaskan Native
  - c. Asian
  - d. Filipino
  - e. Hispanic
  - f. Two or more
  - g. Pacific Islander
  - h. White
5. Please indicate your highest level of education.
  - a. Did not complete high school
  - b. High school diploma or GED
  - c. Some college, but no degree
  - d. Associate's Degree
  - e. Bachelor's Degree
  - f. Some graduate work, but no graduate degree
  - g. Master's Degree
  - h. Doctorate or Professional Degree
6. How long have you been employed at Modesto Junior College?
  - a. (Sliding scale from 0-50 years)
7. What is your professional role at Modesto Junior College?
  - a. Senior Administrator (i.e. President, Vice-President, Dean)



- b. Mid-Level Administrator (i.e. Associate/Assistant Dean, Director)
  - c. Classified Professional
    - i. (if selected): I am a:
      - 1. Full-Time Classified Professional
      - 2. Part-Time Classified Professional
      - 3. Temporary/Contract Classified Professional
  - d. Faculty Member
    - i. (if selected): I am:
      - 1. Full-Time Faculty
      - 2. Part-Time Faculty
8. Within the next year, how likely are you to leave: (1-Extremely Unlikely, 5-Extremely Likely)
- a. Your Current Position
  - b. Modesto Junior College
9. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements related to leadership at MJC. (1- Strongly Disagree, 5- Strongly Agree)
- a. In general, policies are applied fairly and consistently.
  - b. MJC is constantly seeking new and better ways of doing things.
  - c. The current structure (levels of management) allows me to be effective as an employee.
  - d. MJC values and promotes creativity and innovation.
  - e. Communication between employees and management is effective.
  - f. Communication between levels of management is effective.

- g. MJC cares about its employees.
  - h. MJC values the many different opinions of its employees.
  - i. MJC's leadership knows what is going on in the institution.
  - j. MJC's leadership is making effective changes to help the institution be successful.
  - k. MJC's leadership communicates a clear vision for the institution.
  - l. MJC's leadership builds effective relationships with all employees.
10. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements related to your manager at MJC. (1- Strongly Disagree, 5- Strongly Agree)
- a. I am satisfied with my opportunities for growth and development at MJC.
  - b. I am encouraged to come up with new ideas and suggestions for improving our work.
  - c. I am consulted on important matters that affect my job.
  - d. My manager expects a high quality of work from everyone.
  - e. My performance is assessed against clear and measurable objectives.
  - f. I receive regular training to do my job to the best of my ability.
  - g. I can speak openly without fear of victimization.
  - h. I clearly understand what my manager expects of me in my job.
  - i. My manager distributes work evenly among our team.
  - j. My manager is easily available/accessible to me.
  - k. My manager listens to me and is responsive to my concerns.
  - l. My manager creates an environment of support and trust.
  - m. My manager regularly recognizes me for doing a good job.
  - n. My manager gives me regular feedback on how I am doing.

- o. My manager helps me develop my skills and abilities.

11. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements. (1- Strongly Disagree, 5- Strongly Agree)

- a. MJC has clear strategic priorities and goals.
- b. I am willing to go the extra mile when necessary.
- c. Overall, I am committed to doing my best work at MJC.
- d. I clearly understand the college's vision, mission, and values.

12. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements. (1- Strongly Disagree, 5- Strongly Agree)

- a. I feel supported by other employees even in the face of challenging situations.
- b. Communication amongst members of my department is effective.
- c. I enjoy working with the people in my team.
- d. The people I work with treat me with respect.
- e. People within my department collaborate with each other and work as a team.
- f. The people I work with help each other when needed.

13. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements. (1- Strongly Disagree, 5- Strongly Agree)

- a. We have the right employees in job roles that fit their experience, skills, and career goals.
- b. We attract and hire talented employees at MJC.
- c. Meeting the aspirations and expectations of our students is a top priority at MJC.
- d. MJC appreciates and understands the aspirations of our students with regard to their education.

- e. MJC maintains very high standards of quality education.

14. Please rate your satisfaction with Modesto Junior College in the following areas. (1-

Extremely dissatisfied, 5- Extremely satisfied)

- a. Racial/Ethnic diversity of FACULTY
- b. Racial/Ethnic diversity of CLASSIFIED PROFESSIONALS
- c. Racial/Ethnic diversity of ADMINISTRATORS
- d. Gender diversity of FACULTY
- e. Gender diversity of CLASSIFIED PROFESSIONALS
- f. Gender diversity of ADMINISTRATORS
- g. Atmosphere for sexual orientation differences
- h. Atmosphere for political differences
- i. Atmosphere for religious differences
- j. Atmosphere for gender differences
- k. Atmosphere for racial/ethnic differences
- l. Atmosphere for individuals with disabilities

15. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements. (1- Strongly disagree, 5- Strongly agree)

- a. Employee concerns are considered when making policy.
- b. I feel respected by other employees in my professional role (faculty, classified professional, administrator)
- c. I feel respected by senior administrators.

16. This institution: (1- Strongly disagree, 5- Strongly agree)

- a. Encourages employees to have a public voice and share their ideas openly.

- b. Encourages students to have a public voice and share their ideas openly.
  - c. Has campus administrators who regularly speak about the value of diversity.
  - d. Promotes the appreciation of cultural differences.
  - e. Provides the campus community with opportunities to share feelings about issues of concern.
  - f. Has effective practices and policies that increase employee diversity.
  - g. Has a lot of racial tension.
17. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements. (1- Strongly disagree, 5- Strongly agree)
- a. I feel unsafe on campus.
  - b. I feel my contributions are valued by my department.
  - c. I feel my contributions are valued by my direct supervisor.
  - d. I feel my contributions are valued by my senior administrators.
  - e. I feel my contributions are valued by students.
  - f. My professional skills are effectively put to use in this position.
  - g. My job duties are clearly defined.
  - h. My workload is manageable given the hours I am scheduled to work.
  - i. I achieve a healthy balance between my personal and professional life.
  - j. I have at least one professional mentor I can turn to for guidance.
  - k. I feel a sense of belonging to this campus.
18. How often in the past year at Modesto Junior College have you: (1- Never, 5- Very Often)
- a. Challenged others on issues of discrimination.

- b. Educated yourself about individuals who are different from you.
  - c. Participated in a coalition of different groups to address social justice issues.
  - d. Attended programs focused on diversity (e.g. presentations, performances, etc.)
19. Please indicate how often at Modesto Junior College you have: (1- Never, 5- Very Often; 6- Decline to state)
- a. Assisted a student with a problem about discrimination.
  - b. Assisted another employee with a problem about discrimination.
  - c. Witnessed discrimination.
  - d. Reported an incident of discrimination to a campus authority.
  - e. Been sexually harassed.
  - f. Reported an incident of sexual harassment to a campus authority.
  - g. Felt my ideas were dismissed by my colleagues.
  - h. Felt I did not receive due credit for my ideas or work.
20. How often have you heard insensitive or disparaging remarks about race/ethnicity or gender from: (1- Never, 5- Very Often; 6- Decline to state)
- a. Faculty
  - b. Classified Professionals
  - c. Students
  - d. Mid-Level Administrators
  - e. Senior Administrators
21. At Modesto Junior College, how often have you been discriminated against or excluded from activities because of your: (1- Never, 5- Very Often; 6- Decline to state)
- a. Ability/Disability Status

- b. Age
- c. Citizenship Status
- d. Gender/Gender Identity
- e. Job Classification
- f. Level of Education
- g. Political Beliefs
- h. Race/Ethnicity
- i. Religious/Spiritual Beliefs
- j. Sexual Orientation
- k. Socioeconomic Status
- l. Parent/Guardian Status