



**NATIONAL INITIATIVE FOR LEADERSHIP  
& INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS**

North Carolina State University | College of Education

**Yavapai College**  
Prescott, Arizona

**PACE Institutional Structure Subscale Report**  
PACE Climate Survey for Community Colleges

**Lead Researchers**

Greyson Norcross & Dominique Foster

**Conducted**

January 2020



**NATIONAL INITIATIVE FOR LEADERSHIP & INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS**

**Audrey J. Jaeger, Ph.D.**

Executive Director

**Dominique Foster**

Research Associate

**Haruna Suzuki**

Research Associate

**Renee Barger**

Research Associate

**Laura G. Maldonado**

Lead Research

**Daniel West**

Research Associate

**Andrea L. DeSantis**

Assistant Director of Research

**Greyson Norcross**

Research Associate

**Phone**

(919) 515-8567

**Fax**

(919) 515-6305

**Web**

[nilie.ncsu.edu](http://nilie.ncsu.edu)

**Email**

[pace\\_survey@ncsu.edu](mailto:pace_survey@ncsu.edu)

**North Carolina State University**

706 Hillsborough Street

Raleigh, NC 27603

Suggested Citation: National Initiative for Leadership & Institutional Effectiveness, North Carolina State University. PACE Climate Survey for Community Colleges Institutional Structure Subscale Report, by Norcross, G. & Foster, D. Raleigh, NC: 2020.

## Table of Contents

## Page

Institutional Structure Literature Review	1
Table 1. Mission Frequency Distributions	4
Table 2. Leadership Frequency Distributions	5
Table 3. Decision-Making and Influence Frequency Distributions	7
Table 4. Policies and Structural Organization Frequency Distributions	8
Table 5. Teams and Cooperation Frequency Distributions	10
Table 6. Communication and Information Sharing Frequency Distributions	11
Table 7. Mission Item Mean Comparisons	12
Table 8. Leadership Item Mean Comparisons	13
Table 9. Decision-Making and Influence Item Mean Comparisons	14
Table 10. Policies and Structural Organization Item Mean Comparisons	15
Table 11. Teams and Cooperation Item Mean Comparisons	16
Table 12. Communication and Information Sharing Item Mean Comparisons	17
Table 13. Mean Comparisons by Personnel Classification	18
Table 14. Mean Comparisons by Race/Ethnicity	19
Table 15. Mean Comparisons by Employment Status	20
Table 16. Mean Comparisons by Highest Level of Education Earned	21
Table 17. Mean Comparisons by Gender Identity	22
Table 18. Mean Comparisons by Years at this Institution	23
Table 19. Mean Comparisons by Years in Higher Education	24
Table 20. Mean Comparisons by Age	25

## **Institutional Structure Literature Review**

The Institutional Structure climate factor focuses on the mission, leadership, structural organization, decision-making, and communication within the institution. Supervisory Relationship provides insight into the relationship between employee and their supervisors and employees' ability to be creative and express ideas related to their work. Cooperation and effective coordination within work teams is explored within the Teamwork climate factor. The Student Focus climate factor considers the centrality of students to the actions of the institution as well as the extent to which students are prepared for post-institution endeavors. Together, the unique focus of each climate factor provides a comprehensive picture of campus climate at an institution.

As institutions of higher education seek to improve and meet external demands, issues specifically related to the Institutional Structure climate factor often create challenges. Research suggests that organizations function best when they are effectively coordinated, labor and control is appropriately divided, and structural design adapts to current circumstances (Bolman & Deal, 2013). However, PACE survey data consistently reveals that community colleges have relatively negative perceptions of campus climate related to these areas, which are connected to the Institutional Structure climate factor. The Institutional Structure report is designed to provide insight into employee perceptions of institutional structure climate, specifically related to the institution's mission, leadership, decision-making, organization, and communication. Gaining insight into these areas is particularly helpful considering the unique structural organization found in institutions of higher education.

Mintzberg (1979) described the structure of institutions of higher education as a professional bureaucracy, in which a highly specialized workforce conducts decentralized work according to standards often determined by external bodies. Within a professional bureaucracy, two hierarchies often emerge: one democratic, from the bottom up; and one bureaucratic, from the top down (Mintzberg). As a result of the decentralized structure and highly specialized workforce within a professional bureaucracy, institutions of higher education may face problems of coordination between units and staff, difficulty in innovation due to an inflexible structure, slow change processes, and complex relationships, particularly with regard to authority, decision-making, and control of work.

Institutions of higher education have also been described as loosely coupled organizations (Weick, 1976), where functions and units might be momentarily attached and responsive to one another, but each retains its own identity and is often minimally interdependent. While loosely coupled organizations have benefits such as a lower probability that every environmental change will necessitate a response or greater ability to sense necessary adaptations (Weick), they are not without problems. Institutions of higher education that are loosely coupled may experience difficulty in diffusing new policies or procedures, improving weak or problematic functions, and in streamlining processes so that each autonomous unit is not duplicating the work of other units.

Understanding the climate around institutional structure within a community college is more important now than ever. Over the last decade, community colleges have faced a challenging environment defined by resource constraints, greater demands for services and unprecedented enrollment pressure (Boggs, 2004). Hill and Jones (2001) suggest that organizational renewal and better understanding of an institution's mission and mode of operation might assist community colleges in surviving and overcoming these challenges. Furthermore, Ayers (2002) identified organizational structure, empowerment, interdependence/communication, and shared vision—all components of the Institutional Structure climate factor—as variables which might provide community college leaders with an understanding of how to foster positive campus climate and effectively respond to internal and external challenges.

The National Initiative for Leadership and Institutional Effectiveness recognizes the need to understand more about institutional structure and provides a tool that institutional leaders can use to gain insight into climate around institutional structure at their campus. The collected data will be analyzed using a six-factor framework derived from the current Institutional Structure climate factor and higher education organizational structure literature. The Institutional Structure subscale six-factor framework includes:

- Mission
- Leadership
- Decision-Making and Influence
- Policies and Structural Organization
- Teams and Cooperation
- Communication and Information Sharing.

## References

- Ayers, D. F. (2002). Developing climates for renewal in the community college: A case study of dissipative self-organization. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice* , 26(2), 165-185.
- Boggs, G. R. (2004). Community colleges in a perfect storm. *Change*, 36(6), 6-11.
- Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (2013). *Reframing organizations: Artistry, choice, and leadership* (5th ed.). San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Hill, C. W. L., & Jones, G. R. (2001). *Strategic management: An integrated approach* (5th ed.). New York: Houghton Mifflin.
- Mintzberg, H. (1979). The professional bureaucracy. In *The Structuring of Organizations* (p. 348-379). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Weick, K. E. (1976). Educational organizations as loosely coupled systems. *Administrative Science Quarterly* , 21(1), 1-19.

**Table 1. Mission Frequency Distributions**

Mission		<i>YC compared with:</i>							
		YC		NILIE Normbase		Medium 2-year		West	
Response Option	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	
<i>The extent to which...</i>									
<b>1</b> employees in this institution share a common definition of its mission	Strongly disagree	19	4%	606	5%	169	4%	180	6%
	Disagree somewhat	57	13%	1149	10%	363	9%	334	11%
	Neither	117	26%	2804	23%	837	22%	783	27%
	Agree somewhat	201	44%	5122	43%	1746	45%	1147	39%
	Strongly agree	62	14%	2311	19%	769	20%	509	17%
<b>Total</b>	<b>456</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>11992</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>3884</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>2953</b>	<b>100%</b>	
<b>2</b> employees are supportive of the mission of this institution	Strongly disagree	5	1%	279	2%	65	2%	94	3%
	Disagree somewhat	10	2%	560	5%	145	4%	166	6%
	Neither	103	23%	2377	20%	728	19%	691	24%
	Agree somewhat	246	54%	5934	50%	1976	51%	1355	46%
	Strongly agree	90	20%	2829	24%	974	25%	629	21%
<b>Total</b>	<b>454</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>11979</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>3888</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>2935</b>	<b>100%</b>	
<b>3</b> employees take action to fulfill the mission of this institution	Strongly disagree	5	1%	253	2%	65	2%	92	3%
	Disagree somewhat	12	3%	509	4%	126	3%	155	5%
	Neither	98	22%	2495	21%	743	19%	707	24%
	Agree somewhat	244	54%	5904	49%	1977	51%	1347	46%
	Strongly agree	96	21%	2792	23%	965	25%	621	21%
<b>Total</b>	<b>455</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>11953</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>3876</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>2922</b>	<b>100%</b>	
<b>4</b> there is consensus among employees about the goals of the institution	Strongly disagree	24	5%	774	6%	232	6%	217	7%
	Disagree somewhat	74	16%	1588	13%	525	13%	422	14%
	Neither	144	31%	3314	28%	1028	26%	831	28%
	Agree somewhat	164	36%	4470	37%	1511	39%	1033	35%
	Strongly agree	55	12%	1849	15%	598	15%	440	15%
<b>Total</b>	<b>461</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>11995</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>3894</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>2943</b>	<b>100%</b>	

**Table 2. Leadership Frequency Distributions**

Leadership		<i>YC compared with:</i>							
		YC		NILIE Normbase		Medium 2-year		West	
Response Option	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	
<i>The extent to which...</i>									
<b>5</b> leaders of this institution communicate a clear sense of purpose	Strongly disagree	20	4%	1032	9%	379	10%	214	7%
	Disagree somewhat	75	16%	1552	13%	551	14%	355	12%
	Neither	100	22%	2678	22%	869	22%	705	24%
	Agree somewhat	193	42%	4550	38%	1439	37%	1128	39%
	Strongly agree	72	16%	2176	18%	646	17%	527	18%
<b>Total</b>	<b>460</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>11988</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>3884</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>2929</b>	<b>100%</b>	
<b>6</b> leaders of this institution effectively interact with internal constituents	Strongly disagree	24	5%	1007	9%	361	10%	265	9%
	Disagree somewhat	71	16%	1679	15%	602	16%	371	13%
	Neither	152	34%	3392	30%	1036	28%	859	31%
	Agree somewhat	150	34%	3824	33%	1246	33%	937	33%
	Strongly agree	44	10%	1580	14%	493	13%	376	13%
<b>Total</b>	<b>441</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>11482</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>3738</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>2808</b>	<b>100%</b>	
<b>7</b> leaders of this institution effectively interact with external constituents	Strongly disagree	15	4%	635	6%	198	6%	199	7%
	Disagree somewhat	23	6%	850	8%	275	8%	263	10%
	Neither	168	40%	3307	30%	1065	30%	851	31%
	Agree somewhat	153	37%	4052	37%	1358	38%	957	35%
	Strongly agree	58	14%	2087	19%	639	18%	441	16%
<b>Total</b>	<b>417</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>10931</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>3535</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>2711</b>	<b>100%</b>	
<b>8</b> leaders of this institution effectively address crises	Strongly disagree	26	6%	1120	10%	433	11%	285	10%
	Disagree somewhat	50	11%	1584	14%	606	16%	393	14%
	Neither	124	28%	2759	24%	868	23%	700	24%
	Agree somewhat	179	41%	4202	36%	1296	34%	1010	35%
	Strongly agree	58	13%	2017	17%	594	16%	475	17%
<b>Total</b>	<b>437</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>11682</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>3797</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>2863</b>	<b>100%</b>	



*YC compared with:*

<b>Leadership (continued)</b>	Response Option	<b>YC</b>		<b>NILIE Normbase</b>		<b>Medium 2-year</b>		<b>West</b>	
		Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
<i>The extent to which...</i>									
<b>9</b> leaders of this institution carefully plan resource allocation	Strongly disagree	39	9%	1118	10%	358	10%	247	9%
	Disagree somewhat	96	22%	1649	14%	549	15%	389	14%
	Neither	130	29%	3256	29%	1045	28%	850	31%
	Agree somewhat	130	29%	3667	32%	1212	33%	873	32%
	Strongly agree	49	11%	1722	15%	554	15%	405	15%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>444</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>11412</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>3718</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>2764</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Table 3. Decision-Making and Influence Frequency Distributions**

Decision-Making and Influence		<i>YC compared with:</i>							
		YC		NILIE Normbase		Medium 2-year		West	
Response Option	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	
<i>The extent to which...</i>									
<b>10</b> leaders use employee feedback to improve this institution	Strongly disagree	34	7%	1405	12%	493	13%	316	11%
	Disagree somewhat	73	16%	2153	18%	757	20%	484	17%
	Neither	153	33%	3394	28%	1060	27%	852	29%
	Agree somewhat	142	31%	3318	28%	1064	28%	822	28%
	Strongly agree	59	13%	1673	14%	494	13%	435	15%
<b>Total</b>	<b>461</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>11943</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>3868</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>2909</b>	<b>100%</b>	
<b>11</b> this institution considers employee feedback in decision-making	Strongly disagree	41	9%	1446	12%	495	13%	327	11%
	Disagree somewhat	86	19%	2224	19%	784	20%	506	17%
	Neither	134	29%	3395	28%	1027	27%	839	29%
	Agree somewhat	145	31%	3275	27%	1076	28%	831	28%
	Strongly agree	57	12%	1586	13%	485	13%	418	14%
<b>Total</b>	<b>463</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>11926</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>3867</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>2921</b>	<b>100%</b>	
<b>12</b> employees participate in decision-making	Strongly disagree	45	10%	1358	11%	489	12%	287	10%
	Disagree somewhat	114	25%	2432	20%	830	21%	497	17%
	Neither	133	29%	3034	25%	911	23%	737	25%
	Agree somewhat	122	26%	3659	30%	1180	30%	985	33%
	Strongly agree	48	10%	1562	13%	503	13%	437	15%
<b>Total</b>	<b>462</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>12045</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>3913</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>2943</b>	<b>100%</b>	
<b>13</b> employees are made aware of the outcome of decisions	Strongly disagree	33	7%	949	8%	347	9%	204	7%
	Disagree somewhat	86	19%	1996	16%	723	18%	474	16%
	Neither	109	24%	2828	23%	893	23%	700	23%
	Agree somewhat	177	39%	4617	38%	1455	37%	1144	38%
	Strongly agree	54	12%	1781	15%	523	13%	470	16%
<b>Total</b>	<b>459</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>12171</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>3941</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>2992</b>	<b>100%</b>	

**Table 4. Policies and Structural Organization Frequency Distributions**

*YC compared with:*

Policies and Structural Organization	Response Option	YC		NILIE Normbase		Medium 2-year		West	
		Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
<i>The extent to which...</i>									
<b>14</b> institutional policies allow for collaboration	Strongly disagree	12	3%	737	6%	245	6%	207	7%
	Disagree somewhat	54	12%	1278	11%	443	12%	332	11%
	Neither	167	37%	3283	28%	1030	27%	865	30%
	Agree somewhat	165	36%	4674	39%	1534	40%	1071	37%
	Strongly agree	55	12%	1870	16%	581	15%	438	15%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>453</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>11842</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>3833</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>2913</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>15</b> the structure of this institution allows for collaboration	Strongly disagree	25	5%	876	7%	300	8%	228	8%
	Disagree somewhat	67	15%	1721	14%	590	15%	419	14%
	Neither	115	25%	2717	23%	866	22%	722	24%
	Agree somewhat	196	42%	4739	39%	1544	39%	1104	37%
	Strongly agree	59	13%	2019	17%	615	16%	484	16%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>462</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>12072</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>3915</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>2957</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>16</b> the structure of this institution fosters innovation	Strongly disagree	18	4%	942	8%	315	8%	246	8%
	Disagree somewhat	76	17%	1796	15%	611	16%	440	15%
	Neither	144	32%	3092	26%	997	26%	791	27%
	Agree somewhat	157	35%	4254	36%	1393	36%	1029	35%
	Strongly agree	60	13%	1828	15%	555	14%	405	14%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>455</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>11912</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>3871</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>2911</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>17</b> this institution follows clear processes for recognizing employee achievement	Strongly disagree	27	6%	976	8%	314	8%	245	8%
	Disagree somewhat	69	15%	1762	15%	617	16%	389	13%
	Neither	129	28%	3074	26%	1050	27%	736	25%
	Agree somewhat	172	38%	4186	35%	1322	35%	1081	37%
	Strongly agree	56	12%	1825	15%	520	14%	449	15%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>453</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>11823</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>3823</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>2900</b>	<b>100%</b>

*YC compared with:*

<b>Policies and Structural Organization (Continued)</b>		<b>YC</b>		<b>NILIE Normbase</b>		<b>Medium 2-year</b>		<b>West</b>	
		Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
<i>The extent to which...</i>									
<b>18</b> institutional policies govern activities at this institution	Strongly disagree	19	4%	567	5%	176	5%	126	4%
	Disagree somewhat	47	10%	938	8%	319	8%	256	9%
	Neither	133	29%	3158	26%	1039	27%	800	27%
	Agree somewhat	194	43%	5127	43%	1655	43%	1230	42%
	Strongly agree	61	13%	2129	18%	655	17%	504	17%
<b>Total</b>		<b>454</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>11919</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>3844</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>2916</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Table 5. Teams and Cooperation Frequency Distributions**

<b>Teams and Cooperation</b>		<i>YC compared with:</i>							
		<b>YC</b>		<b>NILIE Normbase</b>		<b>Medium 2-year</b>		<b>West</b>	
<b>Response Option</b>		Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
<i>The extent to which...</i>									
<b>19</b> there is effective collaboration among employees	Strongly disagree	17	4%	798	7%	251	6%	197	7%
	Disagree somewhat	66	14%	1619	13%	538	14%	387	13%
	Neither	125	27%	3097	26%	956	24%	821	28%
	Agree somewhat	194	42%	4671	39%	1547	40%	1075	37%
	Strongly agree	63	14%	1886	16%	618	16%	455	16%
<b>Total</b>		<b>465</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>12071</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>3910</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>2935</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>20</b> employee expertise is considered when forming teams	Strongly disagree	34	8%	923	8%	285	8%	255	9%
	Disagree somewhat	73	17%	1699	15%	608	16%	382	13%
	Neither	122	28%	3019	26%	972	26%	766	27%
	Agree somewhat	157	36%	4113	36%	1341	36%	1022	36%
	Strongly agree	54	12%	1782	15%	550	15%	413	15%
<b>Total</b>		<b>440</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>11536</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>3756</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>2838</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>21</b> teams utilize expertise to accomplish tasks	Strongly disagree	16	4%	426	4%	119	3%	135	5%
	Disagree somewhat	19	4%	834	7%	276	7%	202	7%
	Neither	87	19%	2730	23%	877	23%	724	25%
	Agree somewhat	230	51%	5365	46%	1775	47%	1262	44%
	Strongly agree	98	22%	2316	20%	750	20%	519	18%
<b>Total</b>		<b>450</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>11671</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>3797</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>2842</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>22</b> teams accomplish tasks	Strongly disagree	10	2%	412	4%	120	3%	121	4%
	Disagree somewhat	19	4%	851	7%	291	8%	238	8%
	Neither	94	21%	2854	24%	915	24%	750	26%
	Agree somewhat	240	54%	5492	47%	1819	48%	1258	44%
	Strongly agree	85	19%	2077	18%	669	18%	482	17%
<b>Total</b>		<b>448</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>11686</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>3814</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>2849</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Table 6. Communication and Information Sharing Frequency Distributions**

*YC compared with:*

Communication and Information Sharing		YC		NILIE Normbase		Medium 2-year		West	
		Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
<i>The extent to which...</i>									
<b>23</b> there is good communication at this institution	Strongly disagree	49	11%	1273	11%	406	12%	311	11%
	Disagree somewhat	96	21%	2311	21%	742	22%	567	19%
	Neither	118	26%	2573	23%	745	22%	750	26%
	Agree somewhat	146	32%	3621	32%	1096	32%	924	31%
	Strongly agree	49	11%	1461	13%	407	12%	389	13%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>458</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>11239</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>3396</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>2941</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>24</b> campus climate encourages differences of opinion to be aired openly	Strongly disagree	37	8%	1223	10%	458	12%	267	9%
	Disagree somewhat	94	20%	2113	18%	770	20%	451	15%
	Neither	124	27%	2808	23%	857	22%	735	25%
	Agree somewhat	154	33%	4103	34%	1297	33%	1032	35%
	Strongly agree	53	11%	1752	15%	523	13%	431	15%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>462</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>11999</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>3905</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>2916</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>25</b> the administration at this institution shares information with employees in a timely manner	Strongly disagree	29	6%	1113	9%	390	10%	239	8%
	Disagree somewhat	83	18%	1874	16%	681	17%	405	14%
	Neither	113	25%	2909	24%	908	23%	791	27%
	Agree somewhat	173	38%	4293	36%	1375	35%	1064	36%
	Strongly agree	59	13%	1819	15%	540	14%	433	15%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>457</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>12008</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>3894</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>2932</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>26</b> the information shared by the administration at this institution is useful	Strongly disagree	13	3%	752	6%	250	6%	201	7%
	Disagree somewhat	38	8%	1233	10%	434	11%	348	12%
	Neither	129	28%	3304	28%	1092	28%	866	30%
	Agree somewhat	214	47%	4812	40%	1565	40%	1071	37%
	Strongly agree	63	14%	1901	16%	555	14%	423	15%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>457</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>12002</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>3896</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>2909</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Table 7. Mission Item Mean Comparisons**

*YC compared with:*

Mission	YC		NILIE Normbase			Medium 2-year			West		
	N	Mean	Mean	Sig.	Effect size	Mean	Sig.	Effect size	Mean	Sig.	Effect size
<i>The extent to which...</i>											
<b>1</b> employees in this institution share a common definition of its mission	456	3.504	3.616	*	-.105	3.665	**	-.156	3.498		
<b>2</b> employees are supportive of the mission of this institution	454	3.894	3.874			3.939			3.770	**	.134
<b>3</b> employees take action to fulfill the mission of this institution	455	3.910	3.876			3.942			3.770	**	.151
<b>4</b> there is consensus among employees about the goals of the institution	461	3.330	3.420			3.441	*	-.103	3.359		

\* p < .05, \*\* p < .01, \*\*\* p < .001

**Table 8. Leadership Item Mean Comparisons**

*YC compared with:*

Leadership	YC		NILIE Normbase			Medium 2-year			West		
	N	Mean	Mean	Sig.	Effect size	Mean	Sig.	Effect size	Mean	Sig.	Effect size
<i>The extent to which...</i>											
<b>5</b> leaders of this institution communicate a clear sense of purpose	460	3.483	3.441			3.366	*	.098	3.478		
<b>6</b> leaders of this institution effectively interact with internal constituents	441	3.270	3.287			3.243			3.281		
<b>7</b> leaders of this institution effectively interact with external constituents	417	3.518	3.559			3.556			3.435		
<b>8</b> leaders of this institution effectively address crises	437	3.442	3.378			3.267	**	.144	3.348		
<b>9</b> leaders of this institution carefully plan resource allocation	444	3.122	3.283	**	-.137	3.284	**	-.139	3.289	**	-.146

\* p < .05, \*\* p < .01, \*\*\* p < .001



**Table 9. Decision-Making and Influence Item Mean Comparisons**

*YC compared with:*

Decision-Making and Influence	YC		NILIE Normbase			Medium 2-year			West		
	N	Mean	Mean	Sig.	Effect size	Mean	Sig.	Effect size	Mean	Sig.	Effect size
<i>The extent to which...</i>											
<b>10</b> leaders use employee feedback to improve this institution	461	3.258	3.142	*	.096	3.080	**	.148	3.198		
<b>11</b> this institution considers employee feedback in decision-making	463	3.197	3.112			3.070	*	.104	3.174		
<b>12</b> employees participate in decision-making	462	3.030	3.136			3.097			3.268	***	-.200
<b>13</b> employees are made aware of the outcome of decisions	459	3.290	3.352			3.275			3.402	*	-.099

\* p < .05, \*\* p < .01, \*\*\* p < .001

**Table 10. Policies and Structural Organization Item Mean Comparisons**

*YC compared with:*

Policies and Structural Organization	YC		NILIE Normbase			Medium 2-year			West		
	N	Mean	Mean	Sig.	Effect size	Mean	Sig.	Effect size	Mean	Sig.	Effect size
<i>The extent to which...</i>											
<b>14</b> institutional policies allow for collaboration	453	3.435	3.478			3.460			3.412		
<b>15</b> the structure of this institution allows for collaboration	462	3.426	3.439			3.405			3.405		
<b>16</b> the structure of this institution fosters innovation	455	3.363	3.355			3.326			3.312		
<b>17</b> this institution follows clear processes for recognizing employee achievement	453	3.355	3.349			3.292			3.379		
<b>18</b> institutional policies govern activities at this institution	454	3.509	3.614	*	-.103	3.597			3.593		

\* p < .05, \*\* p < .01, \*\*\* p < .001

**Table 11. Teams and Cooperation Item Mean Comparisons**

*YC compared with:*

Teams and Cooperation	YC		NILIE Normbase			Medium 2-year			West		
	N	Mean	Mean	Sig.	Effect size	Mean	Sig.	Effect size	Mean	Sig.	Effect size
<i>The extent to which...</i>											
<b>19</b> there is effective collaboration among employees	465	3.473	3.433			3.446			3.410		
<b>20</b> employee expertise is considered when forming teams	440	3.282	3.358			3.336			3.337		
<b>21</b> teams utilize expertise to accomplish tasks	450	3.833	3.712	*	.124	3.727	*	.111	3.643	***	.190
<b>22</b> teams accomplish tasks	448	3.828	3.682	**	.152	3.689	**	.148	3.611	***	.221

\* p < .05, \*\* p < .01, \*\*\* p < .001

**Table 12. Communication and Information Sharing Item Mean Comparisons**

*YC compared with:*

Communication and Information Sharing	YC		NILIE Normbase			Medium 2-year			West		
	N	Mean	Mean	Sig.	Effect size	Mean	Sig.	Effect size	Mean	Sig.	Effect size
<i>The extent to which...</i>											
<b>23</b> there is good communication at this institution	458	3.109	3.150			3.105			3.174		
<b>24</b> campus climate encourages differences of opinion to be aired openly	462	3.199	3.254			3.168			3.312		
<b>25</b> the administration at this institution shares information with employees in a timely manner	457	3.328	3.319			3.255			3.357		
<b>26</b> the information shared by the administration at this institution is useful	457	3.604	3.490	*	.107	3.447	**	.149	3.401	***	.190

\* p < .05, \*\* p < .01, \*\*\* p < .001

**Table 13. Mean Comparisons by Personnel Classification**

*YC compared with:*

What is your personnel classification?	YC		NILIE Normbase			Medium 2-year			West		
	N	Mean	Mean	Sig.	Effect size	Mean	Sig.	Effect size	Mean	Sig.	Effect size
Overall	470	3.429	3.429			3.405			3.412		
Faculty	113	3.258	3.436	*	-.189	3.444	*	-.206	3.428		
Administrator	37	3.454	3.485			3.487			3.415		
Staff	285	3.474	3.418			3.357	*	.135	3.391		

\* p < .05, \*\* p < .01, \*\*\* p < .001

-- indicates results redacted for confidentiality

N/A indicates response option previously unavailable

**Table 14. Mean Comparisons by Race/Ethnicity**

*YC compared with:*

Please select the race/ethnicity that best describes you?	YC		NILIE Normbase			Medium 2-year			West		
	N	Mean	Mean	Sig.	Effect size	Mean	Sig.	Effect size	Mean	Sig.	Effect size
Overall	470	3.429	3.429			3.405			3.412		
African American or Black	0	--	3.613			3.438			3.497		
Alaska Native or American Indian	2	--	3.250			3.650			3.060		
Asian	4	--	3.670			3.747			3.653		
Hispanic/Latina/o/x	18	3.830	3.599			3.752			3.588		
Middle Eastern or North African	1	--	N/A			N/A			N/A		
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	0	--	3.419			--			3.473		
White	343	3.464	3.410			3.398			3.395		
Two or more races	26	3.149	3.139			3.104			3.157		
Prefer to self-describe	18	3.109	N/A			N/A			N/A		

\* p < .05, \*\* p < .01, \*\*\* p < .001

-- indicates results redacted for confidentiality

N/A indicates response option previously unavailable

**Table 15. Mean Comparisons by Employment Status**

*YC compared with:*

<b>Your status at this institution is?</b>	<b>YC</b>		<b>NILIE Normbase</b>			<b>Medium 2-year</b>			<b>West</b>		
	N	Mean	Mean	Sig.	Effect size	Mean	Sig.	Effect size	Mean	Sig.	Effect size
Overall	470	3.429	3.429			3.405			3.412		
Full-Time	327	3.311	3.346			3.347			3.286		
Part-Time	102	3.764	3.701			3.640			3.783		

\* p < .05, \*\* p < .01, \*\*\* p < .001

-- indicates results redacted for confidentiality

N/A indicates response option previously unavailable

**Table 16. Mean Comparisons by Highest Level of Education Earned**

*YC compared with:*

What is the highest level of education you have earned?	YC		NILIE Normbase			Medium 2-year			West		
	N	Mean	Mean	Sig.	Effect size	Mean	Sig.	Effect size	Mean	Sig.	Effect size
Overall	470	3.429	3.429			3.405			3.412		
First Professional degree (e.g., M.D., D.D.S., J.D., D.V.M.)	7	3.690	3.426			3.382			3.501		
Doctoral degree (e.g., Ph.D., Ed.D.)	29	3.056	3.294			3.466	*	-.421	3.296		
Master's degree	153	3.370	3.422			3.405			3.400		
Bachelor's degree	108	3.390	3.447			3.418			3.431		
Associate's degree	53	3.531	3.505			3.468			3.428		
Certificate	25	3.731	N/A			N/A			N/A		
High School diploma or GED	48	3.635	3.614			3.527			3.599		
No diploma or degree	0	--	3.631			3.884			3.615		

\* p < .05, \*\* p < .01, \*\*\* p < .001

-- indicates results redacted for confidentiality

N/A indicates response option previously unavailable



**Table 17. Mean Comparisons by Gender Identity**

*YC compared with:*

What is your gender identity?	YC		NILIE Normbase			Medium 2-year			West		
	N	Mean	Mean	Sig.	Effect size	Mean	Sig.	Effect size	Mean	Sig.	Effect size
Overall	470	3.429	3.429			3.405			3.412		
Man	162	3.453	3.504			3.508			3.518		
Woman	231	3.465	3.491			3.471			3.448		
Trans Man	0	--	N/A			N/A			N/A		
Trans Woman	0	--	N/A			N/A			N/A		
Gender Queer	4	--	N/A			N/A			N/A		
Prefer to self-describe	9	3.066	N/A			N/A			N/A		

\* p < .05, \*\* p < .01, \*\*\* p < .001

-- indicates results redacted for confidentiality

N/A indicates response option previously unavailable

**Table 18. Mean Comparisons by Years at this Institution**

*YC compared with:*

How many years have you worked at this institution?	YC		NILIE Normbase			Medium 2-year			West		
	N	Mean	Mean	Sig.	Effect size	Mean	Sig.	Effect size	Mean	Sig.	Effect size
Overall	470	3.429	3.429			3.405			3.412		
5 years or less	213	3.650	3.657			3.642			3.677		
6-10 years	75	3.165	3.329			3.292			3.294		
11-15 years	42	3.200	3.316			3.307			3.209		
16-20 years	33	3.298	3.287			3.293			3.233		
21-25 years	18	3.193	3.297			3.349			3.234		
26 years or more	17	3.150	3.362			3.406			3.366		

\* p < .05, \*\* p < .01, \*\*\* p < .001

-- indicates results redacted for confidentiality

N/A indicates response option previously unavailable

**Table 19. Mean Comparisons by Years in Higher Education**

*YC compared with:*

How many years have you worked in higher education?	YC		NILIE Normbase			Medium 2-year			West		
	N	Mean	Mean	Sig.	Effect size	Mean	Sig.	Effect size	Mean	Sig.	Effect size
Overall	470	3.429	3.429			3.405			3.412		
5 years or less	162	3.723	3.705			3.661			3.734		
6-10 years	65	3.222	3.415			3.375			3.429		
11-15 years	50	3.297	3.377			3.409			3.289		
16-20 years	44	3.185	3.326			3.327			3.268		
21-25 years	36	3.351	3.278			3.334			3.195		
26 years or more	39	3.194	3.368			3.385			3.363		

\* p < .05, \*\* p < .01, \*\*\* p < .001

-- indicates results redacted for confidentiality

N/A indicates response option previously unavailable

**Table 20. Mean Comparisons by Age**

*YC compared with:*

What is your age?	YC		NILIE Normbase			Medium 2-year			West		
	N	Mean	Mean	Sig.	Effect size	Mean	Sig.	Effect size	Mean	Sig.	Effect size
Overall	470	3.429	3.429			3.405			3.412		
29 or younger	38	3.984	3.793			3.788			3.675	*	.362
30 - 39	52	3.499	3.519			3.535			3.538		
40 - 49	54	3.378	3.473			3.469			3.454		
50 - 59	92	3.381	3.461			3.476			3.388		
60 or older	106	3.381	3.498			3.480			3.429		

\* p < .05, \*\* p < .01, \*\*\* p < .001

-- indicates results redacted for confidentiality

N/A indicates response option previously unavailable