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ABSTRACT

Through the development and evaluation of the Museum Professionals’ Experiences Survey, this research blends Museum Studies and Organizational Behavior to understand managers’ perceptions regarding employee motivation, key drivers of motivation, trends in professional experiences’, and the different experiences of management and non-management personnel in the context of museum workplaces. With responses from 276 museum professionals in the United States, the application of this knowledge can be used to develop a workplace climate that encourages job satisfaction, high performance, and organizational commitment, and thus more positive outcomes for the museum. Recent controversies and public testimonies are evidence of negative professional experiences in museums. By applying survey results to the organizing framework,
the source of these issues can be identified, and actionable solutions can be recommended. There has never been a more appropriate time for museums to turn their evaluation skills inward to address the issues affecting employees.
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CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION

Background

Organizational behavior researchers have repeatedly demonstrated correlative relationships between employee motivation and positive work outcomes, such as job satisfaction and organizational commitment (Blais et al. 1993; Houkes et al. 2001; Locke and Latham 1990). By understanding what influences motivational processes in their employees, managers can encourage these outcomes within their teams and thus support higher success measures in their organizations. This study blends Museum Studies and Organizational Behavior to develop and evaluate results from a survey (the Museum Professionals Experience Survey, Appendix A, 105) of professional experiences in museums to uncover what managers think about motivating their employees, the motivational forces that drive museum professionals, and how managers can better support their teams. Organizational behavior provides practical tools that should be applied in museum settings to reveal areas of improvement, address tensions, and elicit a more positive work experience through understanding the inputs and processes that drive outcomes.

In the wake of rising dissatisfaction experienced by museum employees -- evidenced through public testimonies like @ChangeTheMuseum -- museum leaders need to assess organizational culture in their institutions. ChangeTheMuseum is an Instagram account that provides a platform for anonymous submissions detailing toxic work cultures within museums (Di Liscia 2020). Since its creation in 2020, it has exposed workers’ experiences with discrimination, sexual harassment, low pay,
and high volumes of turnover. The Coronavirus pandemic has brought further attention to these issues, through the disproportionate effect that personnel action has had on entry level and low paying roles within the museum structure. Museum managers have a responsibility to address these issues because of their positions of power within the institution. Addressing motivation is one small step forward in improving the well-being of museum professionals and creating a more nurturing work environment. There has never been a more appropriate time for museums to turn their evaluation skills inward to address the issues that affect their employees.

A Brief History of Museum Work

The Institute of Museum and Library Services estimates that there are over 35,000 museums in the United States (Institute of Museum and Library Services 2014). These institutions total more than 850 million visits annually (American Alliance of Museums, The Andrew W. Mellon Foundation, and Oxford Economics 2017, 5). Aside from providing a cultural impact through the service of their mission, museums also generate an economic impact by stimulating jobs, generating GDP, and contributing taxes. Per the 2017 national report “Museums as Economic Engines,” museums directly employ more than 372,000 people and generate over $15.9 billion in income each year (American Alliance of Museums, The Andrew W. Mellon Foundation, and Oxford Economics 2017, 14).

Professionalization of museum work has evolved in recent years. The advances led by professional organizations, most notably the American Alliance of Museums (AAM), have established best practices, codes of ethics, and accreditation
systems to legitimize the field. The American Alliance of Museums, founded in 1906, serves 35,000 museums and museum professionals through advocacy, community-building, and access to resources, knowledge, and inspiration (American Alliance of Museums, 2022). Early generations of museum professionals came primarily from backgrounds in traditional academic subjects, such as anthropology, art, history, and the sciences. More recently, the field of museum studies has garnered attention as a distinct discipline. Early courses for museum professionals date back to the early 1900s, and include classes taught by assistant curator Sarah Yorke Stevenson at the Philadelphia Museum in 1908 and graduate coursework established by Paul J. Sachs in 1923 (Alexander, Decker, and Alexander 2017, 339). Today there are approximately 188 museum studies programs in the United States, which offer formal training for emerging professionals and the opportunity to earn certificates or degrees in the study of museums (“Museum Studies Programs”, n.d.).

The evolution of the professionalization of museum work lacks accompanying research on the professional experiences of museum employees. Related discussions focus primarily on the economics of museum work, such as salary disparities between front-of-house staff (e.g. visitor services, education, and security roles) and executive leadership, the presence of gender pay gaps, and the expectation of unpaid labor through internship programs. Professional organizations publish annual reports relating to this industry, such as the Association of Art Museum Directors’ annual salary survey which benchmarks salaries for over 50 staff positions across all levels of museum work (Association of Art Museum Directors 2021). Other organizations, such as Museum Workers Speak, the National
Emerging Museum Professionals Network (NEMPN), and Art + Museum Transparency, have organized around these topics and provided actionable solutions such as the Museum Workers Relief Fund and NEMPN’s Salary Transparency Campaign (Santos 2020; National Emerging Museum Professionals Network 2022).

While museum professionals are organizing around these topics, they have yet to gain much traction at the institutional level. Museums are repeatedly coming under fire for unfair pay practices, particularly in relation to front-of-house staff. The San Francisco Museum of Modern Art, for example, was the center of numerous news stories highlighting significant layoffs, furloughs, and pay cuts during the COVID-19 pandemic that primarily affected the lowest paid staff of the museum (Bishara 2020; Kinsella and Cascone 2020; Kinsella 2020).

The impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic have been particularly hard on museum professionals. AAM is conducting ongoing studies on the cost of the pandemic on museums and their employees. Their research efforts found that over half (53%) of surveyed museums report that they had to furlough and lay off staff due to the pandemic, with an average of 28% of the total workforce laid off or furloughed (American Alliance of Museums and Wilkening Consulting 2020, 10). Over two-thirds (68%) of positions affected by layoffs or furloughs were front-of-house staff, which casts further attention on the low wages and lack of growth for entry level positions. Additional studies have found that while museums are reopening, they are only experiencing 62% of their pre-pandemic attendance numbers (American Alliance of Museums 2022).
Moreover, museums are now struggling to fill open staff positions, particularly in lower-paying jobs, such as front-of-house, security/maintenance, and education (Merritt 2022). The inability to find workers demonstrates that museums are not immune to the unexpected consequence of the pandemic, which has seen 4.5 million U.S. workers leave their jobs voluntarily (Merritt 2022). This transition, coined the “Great Resignation,” has impacted museums and continues to affect the field. While fair compensation is an important factor in the Great Resignation, other factors are at play and can be described using organizational behavior theories and concepts. Notably, there seems to be dissonance between the experiences of management and leadership compared to the experiences of non-management personnel. Beyond fair wages, non-management personnel value job design that provides proper motivation. This research will thus focus on the different individual experiences of managers and non-managers in museums, particularly with regard to workplace motivation techniques.

The Field of Organizational Behavior

Organizational behavior (OB) is an “applied, interdisciplinary field dedicated to understanding and managing people at work” (Kinicki and Fugate 2017, 4). Research in this field draws from numerous disciplines, such as anthropology, economics, management, organizational theory, psychology, and sociology. OB examines situations at work through the individual, team, and organizational levels to fully understand the dynamic nature of a workplace. The application of OB knowledge and tools equips employees, managers, and leadership with the skills
needed to be successful in workplace performance, relationship building, and overall operations. OB research addresses numerous topics relevant to all workplaces, such as employee values and attitudes, performance management, conflict management, negotiations, and employee motivation.

OB focuses on the interaction of “person factors” and “situation factors” along with the resulting behaviors of those combined circumstances. Evaluating workplace issues through these factors helps identify the source of an issue, thereby providing areas for improvement. Managers cannot easily manipulate person factors, but they have influence over situation factors. Thus, they can utilize an understanding of organizational behavior to encourage more positive outcomes among their teams.

Problem-Solving with the Organizing Framework

OB utilizes an “organizing framework” to understand and solve problems in the workplace. The organizing framework is a model in which inputs, such as person factors and situation factors, influence individual, team, and organizational processes, which then affect outcomes at those same levels (Kinicki and Fugate 2017, 28). With this understanding, problems can be defined in terms of outcomes. The causes are inputs (person and situation factors) or processes that occur at the individual, team, or organizational levels. For example, attitudes (a person factor) influence motivational drivers (an individual process), which affects overall job performance (an individual outcome). By analyzing how an input or process affects an outcome, managers can address the problem and encourage the desired outcome. Motivation is an example of an individual-level process that is influenced
by both person and situation factors and can be used to address workplace outcomes.

**Inputs**

Inputs are the interaction of person factors and situation factors that drive an individual's behavior. This process aligns with Lewin's Equation of Behavior, which states that a person's behavior is a function of a person's individual qualities and the situations present (Morf, Panter, and Sansone 2004, 119). This theory can be summarized by the equation $B = f(P, E)$, where $B$ is the behavior resulting from a function of $P$ (person factors) and $E$ (environment factors). OB uses this same description of the interactional perspective to describe why an individual behaves in a specific manner at work.

Person factors are the individual qualities that an employee brings to their work. These include constructs like values and attitudes. Values are abstract ideals that an individual holds and that guides their actions or thinking across situations (Kinicki and Fugate 2017, 46). Values are often described using Schwartz's Value Theory, which identifies ten broad categories of values that can be further organized into two opposing dimensions: self-transcendence versus self-enhancement and openness to change versus conservation (Kinicki and Fugate 2017, 46). Museum professionals' values are assessed in the Museum Professionals' Experiences Survey using the ten values identified by Schwartz.

Attitudes are negative or positive opinions or feelings held by an individual, which can be divided into three primary components (Kinicki and Fugate 2017, 50). The affective component describes feelings or emotions, the cognitive component
describes beliefs or ideas, and the behavior component reflects how an individual expects to act toward something or someone (Kinicki and Fugate 2017, 52). Some attitudes specifically describe how an individual feels or thinks about their workplace. Organizational commitment, for example, describes how connected and attached an individual feels to their workplace (Kinicki and Fugate 2017, 57). Job satisfaction, the emotional response toward a job, is another attitude that is an input in daily work behaviors (Kinicki and Fugate 2017, 62). These attitudes drive an individual to behave in a manner that aligns with how they feel about their job and organization. Individuals with strong organizational commitment and job satisfaction are likely to exhibit positive outcomes like higher performance and lower turnover intentions because they hold positive feelings about their work (Kinicki and Fugate 2017, 56). These key workplace attitudes hold a dual role within the organizing framework and can also serve as desired outcomes that managers may wish to inspire.

Situation factors describe the environment in which an individual is working. In the context of a workplace, most employees possess little control over situation factors, unless they are in a management or leadership position. Situation factors can include job demands, resources available to complete a job, and management style of supervisors. These are all characteristics that influence how a person behaves at work. Items like job demands will build self-efficacy if they match the skills of an individual, which gives employees the confidence to complete a task. The availability of resources will either hinder or facilitate an employee’s task completion. Management styles will influence how a person behaves, because employees who view their relationship with management as a partnership will experience trust and
internal motivation (e.g., voicing ideas for improvement, creativity), while employees
who feel controlled by managers with a more authoritarian style will lack trust and
internal motivation. For this research, managerial attitudes and beliefs were
assessed and were considered situation factors that impact employee outcomes.
The environment built by managerial attitudes and beliefs will interact with the
personal qualities of an employee to drive their behavior and thus influence the
processes that affect outcomes.

Motivational Processes

Motivation describes the “internal forces that underlie the direction, intensity,
and persistence of behavior or thought” (Schmidt, Beck, and Gillespie 2013, 311).
An individual’s motivation determines what an individual focuses on at a given time,
the amount of effort invested in this activity, and how long they maintain this focus
(Schmidt, Beck, and Gillespie 2013, 311). Motivation is an individual-level process,
meaning that an individual’s motivation affects outcomes (Kinicki and Fugate 2017,
160). Managers can influence the motivational processes because they control the
situation factors that shape the process. Motivation influences outcomes at all levels.
Individual outcomes include performance, turnover intentions, and work attitudes;
team outcomes include overall team performance; and organization outcomes
include customer satisfaction and organizational success (Kinicki and Fugate 2017,
160).

Motivation is widely viewed as originating from two major sources: extrinsic
motivation and intrinsic motivation. Extrinsic motivation is defined by the expectation
of external rewards, such as recognition, money, or a promotion (Kinicki and Fugate
Intrinsic motivation results from positive internal feelings generated by an activity, such as interest, self-fulfillment, or enjoyment (Kinicki and Fugate 2017, 162). This study assesses five motivational theories’ roles in a museum context, including McGregor’s Theory X and Theory Y, Self-Determination Theory, Goal Setting Theory, Justice Theory, and the Job Characteristics Model. These theories will be discussed further in Chapter 2.

**Outcomes**

This study focuses on the individual level of the organizing framework by assessing motivational processes and discussing three resulting individual level outcomes: individual performance, turnover intentions, and workplace attitudes.

The influence that motivation has on individual performance can be best described by the theory of goal setting and the high-performance cycle. The high-performance cycle, established by researchers Locke and Latham, describes how setting and achieving “high” goals will lead to “high performance” (Locke and Latham 2002). Goals drive internal motivation, because they provide a final outcome toward which an employee can focus their attention and persist. This directed attention can drive high performance, leading to desired rewards, resulting in higher job satisfaction and self-efficacy among employees. This cycle encourages employees to strive towards challenging goals because the previous achievement makes them feel more capable of success (Locke and Latham 2002). Therefore, goal setting is a technique managers can use to heighten employees’ internal motivation and subsequently, their individual performance. Specific components of goal setting will be provided in the following section about this theory.
Motivation drives an employee to do their job each day, but it can also drive turnover intentions and lead to employees resigning from their roles. Justice theory states that perceptions of fairness drive an individual but perceived unfairness can lead to lower job satisfaction, performance, and commitment (Kinicki and Fugate 2017, 175). If this perception continues, an individual will be more likely to consider leaving the organization because the organization's actions are not in line with the employee’s expectations. Managers can play a direct role in reducing employee turnover by addressing perceived inequities.

Turnover in an organization, particularly frequent or high-volume losses, can have significant impacts at the organizational level. Turnover results in the loss of experience, institutional knowledge, and skills that a person brought into the role (Kinicki and Fugate 2017, 70). Additionally, a notable financial cost is associated with turnover, estimated to be approximately 20% of an employee’s annual salary (Kinicki and Fugate 2017, 70). That cost increases with the amount of specialized knowledge and skills associated with a job. In museums, institutional knowledge and specialized skills play a vital role in operations, so turnover is a costly event.

High motivation will also drive more positive workplace attitudes. The job characteristics model posits that when an employees experience meaning in their work, responsibility for work outcomes, and knowledge of successful results (i.e., three critical psychological states), they will hold more positive attitudes about their work, experience greater satisfaction, and generate more positive outcomes (Hackman and Oldham 1975, 6-8). In particular, the critical psychological states of the job characteristics model foster intrinsic motivation in employees, which tends to
lead more strongly to positive workplace attitudes, compared to external drivers. Internal motivation often makes employees feel self-determined in accomplishing their work, which can heighten their organizational commitment because the needs of the organization align with their own values (Tremblay et al. 2009). In addition to organizational commitment, this study will address the workplace attitudes of job satisfaction and perceived person-job fit.

The Role of Managers

The organizing framework indicates that managers have the power to influence inputs that are affecting processes and outcomes. Person factors are deeply intertwined with an individual’s identity, and thus unlikely to change. Situation factors, however, can be manipulated to enhance processes, such as motivation, and encourage better outcomes. Managers do hold more power than non-management personnel, but often do not have the power to impact work policy, establish pay scales, or make operational changes. Regardless, it is management’s responsibility to advocate for their employees and convince museum leadership of the value of their contributions. The following chapter discusses five motivational theories that served as the framework for the Museum Professionals’ Experiences Survey. Results (discussed in Chapter 4) can inform museum managers of areas for improving motivational processes. The results of this study will provide actionable solutions that museum managers can use to adjust situation factors that may hinder motivation and limit desired outcomes.
CHAPTER 2 APPLIED MOTIVATIONAL THEORIES

Using motivational theories as a framework, the Museum Professionals’ Experiences Survey (MPES) was developed to understand what motivates museum professionals and how managers perceive motivation in the workplace. These theories include McGregor’s Theory X and Theory Y, Self-Determination Theory, Edwin Locke and Gary Latham’s Theory of Goal Setting, Justice Theory, and the Job Characteristics Model. This section will discuss the applied theories and provide an overview of the validated measures utilized in the MPES.

McGregor’s Theory X and Theory Y

Douglas McGregor’s theory of managerial attitudes focuses on “the assumptive world of managers” and describes the effects of such assumptions on employee behaviors at work (Kopelman, Prottas, and Falk 2012, 451). It was the first theory presented in the MPES, in a section only accessible to self-identified managers, because it pertains to managerial assumptions and not the attitudes of general employees.

McGregor’s Theory X and Theory Y presents a dichotomy of attitudes that managers hold regarding how employees behave at work. Theory X presents a pessimistic view, whereas Theory Y presents an optimistic one. Each side of the dichotomy contains three dimensions: employees are lazy or industrious; employees possess a limited or important capacity for useful contributions at work; and employees are untrustworthy or responsible (Kopelman, Prottas, and Falk 2012, 450). The resulting practices associated with these attitudes will influence employee motivation and behavior. The differences in managerial assumptions result in
predictable behavior patterns, affecting their management styles and the amount of trust a manager will put in their employees. For instance, managers holding Theory X attitudes (i.e., employees are lazy, untrustworthy, and will not work hard if left to their own devices) will exert more control over their employees (e.g., micromanage) and allow little decision making or voice from their employees. The managerial practices associated with Theory X or Y attitudes ultimately influence employee motivation and behavior (e.g., lower internal motivation and work engagement from employees of Theory X managers). However, managers are usually unaware that their attitudes are the influencing factor (Kopelman, Prottas, and Falk 2012, 451).

*Kopelman et al. Measure of Theory X and Y*

While McGregor's theories provide important insight into the attitudes and behaviors of managers, he did not conduct empirical research on these theories and his work remained untested for many years. In 2008, Kopelman et al. identified 11 items to measure Theory X/Y attitudes (Kopelman, Prottas, and Falk 2012, 452). This work was refined in 2012 because of three primary limitations: the scale was comprised of solely pessimistic Theory X statements; the original item pool was developed to represent the possible widest range of statements rather than aligning with the central dimensions of X/Y attitudes; and the abbreviated scale was unidimensional (Kopelman, Prottas, and Falk 2012, 452). The updated measure assessed Theory X and Theory Y attitudes through a 24-item scale that was designed to capture the distinct dimensions of X/Y assumptions (i.e., two dimensional; Kopelman, Prottas, and Falk 2012, 456). Eight statements capture each of the three component dimensions of X/Y attitudes (i.e., people are lazy or
industrious; have few or many contributions; are untrustworthy or trustworthy), and
the measure contains an equal number of X-related and Y-related statements
(Kopelman, Prottas, and Falk 2012, 456). An abbreviated 10-item scale was created
as well (Kopelman, Prottas, and Falk 2012, 466).

**Self-Determination Theory**

Self-determination theory (SDT) describes motivation as a process to address
“innate psychological needs for competence, autonomy, and relatedness” (Deci and
Ryan 2000, 227). These needs provide an understanding of an individual’s goals
and how they will pursue them. SDT expands the traditional understanding of
extrinsic and intrinsic motivators and considers the degree to which motivation is
self-determined versus controlled (Deci and Ryan 2000, 237). According to SDT,
intrinsic motivation is always fully self-determined and autonomous, but extrinsic
motivation ranges from fully controlled to fully self-determined.

SDT proposes that, through the process of internalization, individuals attempt
to “transform socially sanctioned mores or requests into personally endorsed values
and self-regulation,” meaning that individuals try to align externally driven actions
with their own internal values and identification (Deci and Ryan 2000, 235-236). The
internalization process allows external circumstances to be brought into alignment
with internal factors so that an individual is “self-determined” while acting on those
circumstances (Deci and Ryan 2000, 236).
Self-determination Continuum

SDT conceptualizes extrinsic and intrinsic motivation along a continuum of six factors: amotivation, external regulation, introjected regulation, identified regulation, integrated regulation, and intrinsic motivation (Deci and Ryan 2000, 237). These factors range from fully controlled behaviors to fully autonomous and self-determined behaviors.

Amotivation is the state in which an individual lacks the intention to behave, thus lacking motivation at all (Deci and Ryan 2000, 237). In SDT, individuals are likely to be amotivated "when they lack either a sense of efficacy or a sense of control" regarding potential outcomes (Deci and Ryan 2000, 237). Amotivation differs from the rest of the self-determination continuum because it represents the absence of motivation, both controlled and self-determined.

Extrinsic motivation is classified as the drive to behave due to external forces. According to SDT, extrinsic motivation ranges from fully controlled to fully self-determined, a continuum captured by the external regulation and integrated regulation factors, respectively (Deci and Ryan 2000, 236). Extrinsic motivation differs from intrinsic motivation in that it is instrumental and meant to achieve some external purpose rather than because the individual is satisfied by or enjoys the act on its own.

External regulation is when individuals behave to attain a desired outcome, such as to earn tangible rewards or to avoid punishment (Deci and Ryan 2000, 236). External regulation is the “most controlled form of extrinsic motivation” because an
individual’s behavior is fully regulated by the external administration of rewards or consequences (Deci and Ryan 2000, 236).

Introjected regulation is similar to external regulation in that control of behavior stems from concern for consequences, but in this case, the consequences are administered by the individual rather than an outside force (Deci and Ryan 2000, 236). These consequences may be positive in the form of pride or negative in the form of guilt and shame. Introjected regulation contains a partial internalization of motives, but motivation is still driven by external perceptions (e.g., pride at publicly performing better than others).

In identified regulation, the individual recognizes and accepts the value of a behavior (Deci and Ryan 2000, 236). When an individual personally recognizes the value of a behavior, they are more willing to accept that behavior as their own. This is still conceptualized as a form of extrinsic motivation because the behavior is performed to achieve a value, rather than due to internal satisfaction or enjoyment. Identification regulation is associated with higher work commitment and performance, because the rationale underlying the behaviors is fully internalized (Deci and Ryan 2000, 236).

Integrated regulation is the “fullest, most complete form of internalization of extrinsic motivation” because it involves “identifying with the importance of behaviors” and “integrating those identifications with other aspects of the self” (Deci and Ryan 2000, 236). This internalization aligns behaviors with aspects of the individual's values and identity. Integrated regulation brings a previously external regulation into a fully self-determined form of extrinsic motivation.
In SDT, intrinsic motivation is the standard to which the regulations of extrinsic motivation can be compared. Intrinsic motivation represents the highest level of self-determined behaviors because the individual is driven by their own satisfaction or enjoyment rather than external forces (Deci and Ryan 2000, 237).

The Work Extrinsic and Intrinsic Motivation Scale

The regulations proposed by SDT can be assessed through the Work Extrinsic and Intrinsic Motivation Scale (WEIMS), an 18-item measure of motivation regulations (Tremblay et al. 2009, 213). Tremblay et al. set out to develop the WEIMS because previous empirical research on the dimensions of SDT was conducted in French through a complex 31-item scale, the Blais Inventory of Work Motivation (BIWM). Results of this initial scale showed valuable correlations between varying levels of external regulation and both positive and negative work outcomes (Blais et al., 1993).

The WEIMS uses three items per regulation of SDT (amotivation, external regulation, introjected regulation, identified regulation, integrated regulation, and intrinsic motivation), which are drawn from the BIWM’s original constructs (Tremblay et al. 2009, 215). In initial testing of the WEIMS, participants were asked to “indicate on a Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (does not correspond at all) to 5 (corresponds exactly) the extent to which the items represent the reasons they are presently involved in their work” (Tremblay et al. 2009, 216).

The WEIMS measures alignment with each regulatory factor in SDT but can also be used to calculate a single score, such as the work self-determination index. The work self-determination index can be used to identify whether individuals exhibit
a non-self-determined or a self-determined motivational profile (Tremblay et al. 2009, 216).

**Edwin Locke and Gary Latham’s Theory of Goal Setting**

Goals are powerful motivational tools because they provide a final outcome that the direction, intensity, and persistence of action are aligned to achieve, thus providing a purpose that drives an individual’s behavior. Edwin Locke and Gary Latham’s Theory of Goal Setting emerged from nearly four decades of empirical research based on the premise that “conscious goals affect action” (Locke and Latham 2002, 705). They identified four mechanisms of goal setting that drive performance. First, goals direct attention and effort towards activities relating to the goal and away from irrelevant activities (Locke and Latham 2002, 706). Second, goals regulate the amount of effort put into an activity (Locke and Latham 2002, 706). Third, goals increase persistence (Locke and Latham 2002, 707). Finally, goals lead to the discovery and use of task-related knowledge and strategies (Locke and Latham 2002, 707).

Goal-setting theory proposes the following core tenets which can guide successful goal-setting practices. First, goals that are “specific and difficult lead to higher performance” than general or simple goals (Kinicki and Fugate 2017, 183). Second, individuals must have the ability, resources, and commitment necessary to achieve the goal (Kinicki and Fugate 2017, 183). Third, performance feedback and participation enhance performance when they reinforce the commitment to specific and difficult goals (Kinicki and Fugate 2017, 183). Finally, goal setting theory
proposes a high-performance cycle in which the satisfaction resulting from achieving goals motivates an employee to continue setting goals of higher performance (Kinicki and Fugate 2017, 183). In the MPES, goal setting theory was assessed with statements referencing the key tenets of successful goal setting.

**Justice Theory**

Justice theory reflects the idea that people are driven by the concept of fairness in decision-making and strive for justice in give-and-take relationships, such as in the workplace (Kinicki and Fugate 2017, 175). It emerged from equity theory, a “model of motivation that explains how people strive for fairness in social exchanges” (Kinicki and Fugate 2017, 173). Justice theory expands on that notion by assessing the extent to which “people perceive that they are treated fairly at work” (Kinicki and Fugate 2017, 175).

Justice theory covers four dimensions of justice within organizations. Distributive justice occurs when “outcomes are consistent with implicit norms for allocation,” such as equity and equality (Colquitt 2001, 386). Procedural justice is based on evaluations of the process by which rewards are distributed; it is often high when an individual has influence in a decision-making process (Colquitt 2001, 386). Interpersonal justice occurs when individuals perceive that they are treated with respect by leadership (Colquitt 2001, 386). Finally, informational justice occurs when explanations are perceived to be reasonable, timely, and specific (Colquitt 2001, 386).
Jason A. Colquitt, Justice Measure Items

The development of an acceptable measure of organizational justice has been an ongoing challenge due to debate about the validity of a four-factor structure of organizational justice. Numerous attempts at establishing measures have been re-evaluated or combined because the distinction between types of justice is often blurred (Colquitt 2001, 387). Researcher Jason Colquitt, however, was able to establish a valid measure that confirms “organizational justice is best conceptualized as four distinct dimensions” (Colquitt 2001, 396). Colquitt also found that justice measures predict many workplace outcomes, such as satisfaction, organizational commitment, leadership evaluation, and rule compliance (Colquitt 2001, 396).

Colquitt developed his measures by consulting seminal work in organizational justice, comparing multiple a priori factor structures, and conducting two independent studies to establish the validity of the final measure (Colquitt 2001, 388). Colquitt experimented with four different factor structures, starting with a one-factor model, and ending with the four-factor model that reflects the dimensions of justices described above (Colquitt 2001, 392). The studies were conducted in “intentionally diverse settings,” a university classroom and an automotive parts manufacturing company, to establish generalizations of the justice measures (Colquitt 2001, 388). The final measure contains 20 items to assess to what extent an individual has experienced the four dimensions of justice at work (Colquitt 2001, 389).
Job Characteristics Model

The Job Characteristics Model proposes that intrinsic motivation can be determined by three critical psychological states (Kinicki and Fugate 2017, 188). This model indicates that “positive work outcomes are obtained when three critical psychological states are present,” which include experiencing meaningfulness, responsibility for outcomes, and knowledge of the results of work activities (Hackman and Oldham 1975, 6). These psychological states are created by five core job dimensions: skill variety, task identity, task significance, autonomy, and feedback.

Skill variety is defined as the “degree to which a job requires a variety of different activities in carrying out the work,” which allows an employee to use a number of different skills or talents (Hackman and Oldham 1975, 9). Task identity describes “the degree to which a job requires completion of a “whole” and identifiable piece of work,” meaning that an employee can complete a job from beginning to end and is responsible for a visible outcome (Hackman and Oldham 1975, 9). Task significance describes the “degree to which the job has a substantial impact on the lives or work of other people” and may include the immediate organization or the external community (Hackman and Oldham 1975, 9). Autonomy is defined as the “degree to which the job provides substantial freedom, independence, and discretion of the employee” in determining how and when they carry out their work (Hackman and Oldham 1975, 9). Feedback describes “the degree to which carrying out the work activities results in the employee obtaining
direct and clear information about the effectiveness of their performance” (Hackman and Oldham 1975, 9).

The job characteristics model utilizes an evaluative tool called the Job Diagnostics Survey (JDS) to measure the degree to which jobs are designed in ways that enhance internal motivation and job satisfaction. The JDS is a valuable tool for assessing (a) the five core-characteristics of a job, (b) the three critical psychological states, and (c) the theoretical outcomes of these characteristics and states on employees (Hackman and Oldham 1975, 2). This is useful for determining the source of amotivation among employees and redesigning jobs as a result.

**Job Diagnostic Survey**

The Job Diagnostic Survey (JDS) is a complex instrument composed of four sections that address the core job dimensions, experienced psychological states, affective responses to the job, individual growth need strength, and the motivating potential score (Hackman and Oldham 1975, Appendix A). The motivating potential score is a numerical value that reflects the potential of a job to evoke positive internal motivation within employees (Hackman and Oldham 1975, Appendix B). Prior to publishing, the JDS was under development for over two years, with the initial version taken by over 500 individuals in more than 100 roles across 15 organizations (Hackman and Oldham 1975, 12). A “short form” version was also published without some of the scales mentioned above and with fewer items in others (Hackman and Oldham 1975, Appendix D). The JDS is often used in conjunction with the Job Rating Form, which an external party completes in relation
to a specific job (e.g., a manager might complete the Job Rating Form with respect to a specific employee’s role) (Hackman and Oldham 1975, Appendix E).

In 1987, researchers Idaszak and Drasgow found that the “negatively worded, reverse-scored JDS items” represented a sixth factor outside the five job characteristics dimensions (Kulik and Oldham 1988, 462). A revised version of the Job Diagnostic Survey was published in 1987 by Idaszak and Drasgow, which utilized 15 items found to conform more closely to the five-factor structure of the job characteristics model (Kulik and Oldham 1988, 462).

The Museum Professionals’ Experiences Survey

The aforementioned theories and accompanying measures form the bulk of the Museum Professionals’ Experiences Survey (MPES). Additional assessments were included to provide further context to how these theories affect professional experiences in museums. Results of these measures provided empirical data on the key drivers of motivation among museum professionals and identified trends across the profession. The following chapter provides an in-depth discussion of the methodology used to gather data through the MPES.
CHAPTER 3 METHODOLOGY

Research Approach

The Museum Professionals’ Experiences Survey (MPES) utilizes both quantitative and qualitative methods to gather measurable data about employment experiences in museums. This mixed-method approach captures generalized results from the sample, as well as detailed and specific insights from participants. This study utilizes the aforementioned motivational theories and accompanying validated measures to assess the following questions regarding employees’ professional experiences in museums:

- What range of perspectives do museum managers hold about motivation among museum professionals?
- What are the key drivers of motivation among museum professionals?
- What can applications of organizational behavior theories and concepts reveal about professional experiences in museums?
- How do experiences differ between museum professionals in management and non-management positions?

By answering these questions, this research will increase understanding of motivational processes among museum professionals and the effects on desired outcomes. The application of this knowledge can be used to develop a workplace climate that encourages job satisfaction, high performance, and organizational commitment and thus more positive outcomes for the museum.

The data was captured through the MPES, an online survey that was open to participants for one month from February 28 - March 31, 2022 (Appendix A, 105).
The survey was distributed through social media, email lists, and forums relating to museum work. All responses were voluntary and anonymous.

The MPES was divided into three sections: employment history, managerial perspectives, and employee perspectives. “Employment history” contained questions about each participant’s experience working in a museum and the type of museum they were most recently employed in, to ensure participant eligibility and diversity in the perspectives provided by museum professionals (Appendix A, 107).

“Managerial perspectives” was only accessible to those who indicated that they hold a management position at work, a question asked in “employment history.” Those who indicated that they do not have a management position automatically progressed to the “employee perspectives” section. “Managerial perspectives” contained questions about the types of employees a participant managed, as well as a host of assessments related to their own motivational tactics and their perceptions of factors that motivate museum employees (Appendix A, 114). This section asked museum managers to reflect on their attitudes and beliefs regarding employee behaviors and motivations.

Finally, “employee perspectives” contained measures of motivational theories, as well as questions about all participants’ values and workplace attitudes including, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, perceived person-job fit, and turnover intentions (Appendix A, 120). This section asked all participants, including managers, to reflect on their personal attitudes, values, and behaviors as an employee.
“Employment history” utilized multiple-choice and check-all-that-apply questions to standardize response options. There is significant variation in museum roles, and types of museums, so broad categories were offered to limit excessive specificity and preserve anonymity (Appendix A, 108 - 112). In “managerial perspectives” and “employee perspectives,” 7-point Likert scales (e.g., strongly disagree to strongly agree) were used for most measures. These sections also contained six open-ended questions and a series of ranked choice questions. Item statements were drawn from the validated measures discussed in the previous chapter, with slight modifications to wording to focus on the museum industry.

Participants

276 past or current museum professionals in the United States voluntarily and anonymously responded to the MPES. Participants were deemed eligible to participate if they were over 18 years old and held an employment position at a museum within the past three years. The inclusion criteria eliminated individuals who were volunteers, unpaid interns, contract employees, or left a museum job over three years ago. Understanding the motivations behind unpaid and volunteer labor would require a different approach than what is presented in this research. Contract employees were ineligible to participate because they typically do not receive the same benefits, adhere to the same expectations or policies, or experience the same involvement as regular employees of an organization. A limit of employment separation within the past three years was applied to allow participation from those who lost their job due to the COVID-19 pandemic, an estimated 23% of the
population per a study completed by the American Alliance of Museums (American Alliance of Museums 2022). This limit also allowed for the inclusion of individuals who may have recently left a museum job for reasons outside of the COVID-19 pandemic. Including perspectives from individuals who voluntarily dissolved their employment in a museum is necessary to avoid biased results that only address the perspectives of individuals who choose to remain in this industry. Most (68.90%; n = 206) participants were current full-time employees (Figure 1). Following that, 12.37% (n = 37) left a museum job within the past three years, 7.69% (n = 23) were current part-time employees, 3.01% (n = 9) were retired museum professionals, and 2.34% (n = 7) were current student employees or paid interns.

Figure 1. Responses to “what option best describes your employment status in museums?” Most respondents indicate that they are current, full-time employees in a museum (68.9%; n = 206). Three items were disqualifiers: previously employed but left a museum job more than three years ago (2.01%; n = 6), unpaid positions such as volunteer or intern (2.01%; n = 6), and those that have only worked as an independent contractor (1.67%; n = 5). 17 participants were disqualified based on these responses. “I have never been employed by a museum” was an additional disqualifying statement, however, no participants selected that option.
Nearly half (47.99%; n = 131) of participants indicated that they held a management position at work. Most participants (71.32%; n = 92) managed only 1 - 4 employees, but a few managed 21 or more (6.20%; n = 8). On average, participants managed between 1 - 9 employees. Participating museum managers indicated that they managed a wide range of employee types: primarily full-time employees (23.30%; n = 82), followed by part-time employees (20.45%; n = 72), student employees or paid interns (17.90%; n = 63), and volunteers (17.05%; n = 60) (Figure 2). Unpaid interns, volunteers, and contract employees were possible options but not treated as disqualifiers in this section, unless a participant only managed individuals in those roles. One participant’s data was removed from the “managerial perspectives” section, because the individual only managed volunteers. All other participants indicated that they managed paid employees of their organization in addition to unpaid interns, volunteers, or contract employees.
Managers were asked to indicate what type of employee they manage. Responses were primarily full-time and part-time employees. Unpaid interns, volunteers, and contract employees were not disqualifiers in this question because almost all responses included management of paid employees as well.

This study was not limited to a certain type of role or level of experience within a museum. It was developed to be intentionally broad so that the data could describe a general sample of museum professionals. Years of experience within a museum ranged from less than 1 year to 21+ years, with the average falling between 9 and 10 years of experience in the museum field. Education levels varied from high school graduates (0.36%; n = 1) to doctoral degrees (6.55%; n = 18), with most participants holding a master's degree (66.91%; n = 184). Nearly half of participants (42.03%; n = 116) identified as emerging museum professionals, meaning that they describe themselves as being in the early stages of their careers.

Participants shared which area(s) of work most closely fit their role by checking all options that applied from a list of 16 types of museum work (Figure 3). The most common areas were: collections (14.94%; n = 115), education (13.38%; n
Most participants held salaried positions (67.52%; n = 185), ranging from less than $10,000 (0.55%; n = 1) to greater than $150,000 (2.73%; n = 5) per year. The average salary range for participants was between $50,000 - $69,999 per year. Of those in an hourly position (32.48%; n = 89), hourly rates ranged from $11.50 - $45.00 per hour, with 5 to 80 hours worked per week.

Figure 3. Responses to “what area(s) most closely fit your role?”
The study did not focus on a specific type of museum or region of the United States. Respondents participated from all corners of the country, with 34 states represented by the data. Participants identified the type of museum at which they worked from a list of 13 common subjects represented by museums (Figure 4). Most participants (22.34%; n = 103) worked at an art museum, followed by history museums (20.17%; n = 93), historic house museums (9.33%; n = 43), and natural history museums (7.81%; n = 36). Most participants’ museums were private non-profits (52.59%; n = 142), followed by municipal or county governance (12.22%; n = 33), state governance (12.96%; n = 35), and federal governance (4.44%; n = 12). Museums varied in size, measured by the estimated number of employees. Most participants came from small museums with a maximum of 10 employees (33.82%;
n = 92); the average fell between 11 - 50 employees. Large museums were also represented, with 18.01% (n = 49) working at museums with over 100 employees.

In addition to assessing motivational processes, the MPES assessed individuals’ inputs and outcomes, including values, job satisfaction, turnover intention, perceived person-job fit, and organizational commitment. This was done to establish a general profile of museum professionals’ experiences to better understand the state of employment in museums and how those factors may influence or be affected by the assessed motivational processes. These results will be discussed in Chapter 4.

The amount of background information obtained in the MPES could present nearly endless ways to analyze this data, such as by role in the museum, education level, or salary ranges. However, this study focused on comparing experiences from manager and non-manager perspectives. Data from the “managerial perspectives” section was analyzed separately. Responses to the “employee perspectives” section were analyzed separately for managers (n = 131) and non-managers (n = 142).

It is important to note that the number of participants who started the survey (n = 276) is inconsistent with the number of participants who completed the survey (n = 213). Some participants did not respond to all of the questions or complete the survey, resulting in a varying number of responses across measures. Because of this, the motivational theories, attitudes, and values are assessed individually and results are based on the total number of responses to each measure.
Measures

The motivational theories presented in Chapter 2 were assessed using published scales, whenever possible, or using items developed for this survey based on prior research on those theories. A 7-point Likert scale ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (7) was used for each measure, except where noted below. Some aspects were evaluated through ranked-choice questions or open-ended questions. The specifics of each measure are discussed below.

Kopelman et al. Measure of Theory X and Y Managerial Assumptions

The 2012 Measure of Theory X and Y Managerial Assumptions, presented by Kopelman et al., was used to assess managers’ attitudes towards museum professionals in general. This set of questions was presented in “Managerial Perspectives” and thus only answered by participants who indicated that they hold a management position (n = 114) (Appendix A, 116 - 117). The original measure contains 24 items aligning with Theory X and Theory Y assumptions. Due to the length of the MPES, an abbreviated 9-item version of the scale was used to limit attrition early in the survey.

The 9-item scale was developed from statements in the 24-item scale with the highest factor loadings. It included five statements aligning with Theory X assumptions and four statements aligning with Theory Y assumptions. Slight adjustments were made to the wording of each statement to focus participants’ responses on their assumptions associated with museum employees. Example statements include: “Most museum employees are industrious,” “Most museum
employees will slack off if left alone by management”, and “Most museum employees are trustworthy.”

*Work Extrinsic and Intrinsic Motivation Scale*

The Work Extrinsic and Intrinsic Motivation Scale (WEIMS) was used to assess (a) what regulatory factors museum managers think drive museum professionals and (b) what regulatory factors actually drive museum professionals per their self-report. The WEIMS asked participants to indicate the degree to which they (dis)agreed with statements about why people choose to work in the museum field. Slight adjustments were made to the measure’s wording for clarity and to reinforce the focus on the museum field. The WEIMS was presented twice in the MPES, both in “Managerial Perspectives” and “Employee Perspectives,” so that managerial beliefs can be compared to employee realities.

In “Managerial Perspectives,” the WEIMS asked participants (n = 112) to indicate how strongly they (dis)agreed with “reasons why people may choose to work in the museum field” (Appendix A, 117 - 118). This form of the measure only used 12 statements, rather than the full 18-item scale. The full WEIMS uses three statements to assess the six dimensions of self-determination theory. For the abbreviated version presented to museum managers, the two statements with the highest factor loadings were selected for each of the six dimensions. This presentation of the WEIMS asked managers to reflect on why individuals may choose to work in the museum field to evaluate what managers think regulates motivation among museum professionals.
In “Employee Perspectives,” the WEIMS asked participants (n = 226) to indicate the degree to which they (dis)agreed with “reasons why you chose to work in the museum field” (Appendix A, 122 - 123). This presentation of the WEIMS utilized the full 18-item scale with three statements to describe the six dimensions of self-determination theory. Presenting two versions of this scale created a comparison of what managers think about motivational regulators versus what actually drives motivation among museum professionals. Results from the WEIMS were used to calculate the Work Self-Determination Index for museum professionals.

Goal Setting Theory

The prevalence of goal setting in museums was assessed with a combination of 7-point Likert scale statements and three open-ended questions. The scale items evaluated the prevalence of goal setting, managerial involvement, elements of successful goal setting, and the presence of reward/acknowledgment systems for goal achievement. Questions were presented in both “Managerial Perspectives” and “Employee Perspectives” to create comparable datasets.

In “Managerial Perspectives,” managers (n = 115) were presented with an 8-item Likert scale that asked them to identify the degree to which they (dis)agreed with statements regarding the goal setting practices of their employees (Appendix A, 116). This scale evaluated the key aspects of Locke and Latham’s goal setting theory. Managers were also asked one open-ended question, prompting them to describe how goal achievement is acknowledged and/or rewarded in their workplace (Appendix A, 116).
In “Employee Perspectives,” all participants (n = 231) were presented with a 9-item Likert scale that asked them to identify the degree to which they (dis)agreed with statements regarding their goal setting practices (Appendix A, 121). This scale also evaluated the key aspects of Locke and Latham’s goal setting theory. Participants were asked two open-ended questions, prompting them to describe how they feel when they accomplish a goal and how their managers recognize their achievement of goals (Appendix A, 121 - 122).

**Jason A. Colquitt, Organizational Justice Measure**

The MPES contained the organizational justice measure by Colquitt (2001) using a 7-point Likert scale (as opposed to the 5-point scale used by Colquitt to allow for more significant variation in responses). The measure assesses the extent to which a participant has experienced the four dimensions of organizational justice: procedural justice, distributive justice, interpersonal justice, and informational justice. Colquitt left statements intentionally general so that they could be applied to any industry, and so wording of each statement in the MPES was adjusted to reinforce the focus on organizational justice in museum workplaces.

All of the organizational justice items were presented in the “Employee Perspectives” (Appendix A, 123 - 124). The measure assessed the extent to which participants (n = 223) (dis)agreed with statements about justice experiences in their workplaces. Examples include: “I have influence over my role at work,” “My salary is justified, given my performance,” “Museum leadership treats me with respect,” and “My manager’s actions are reasonable.”
The Revised Job Diagnostic Survey

The revised Job Diagnostic Survey (JDS) was used to assess core job characteristics (skill variety, task identity, task significance, autonomy, and feedback) present in museums, aligning with the job characteristics model. A 7-point Likert scale was used to assess the degree to which each participant (n = 215) (dis)agreed with each statement regarding the characteristics of their jobs (Appendix A, 124 - 125). Examples include “I have almost complete responsibility for deciding how and when the work is to be done,” “What I do is of little consequence to anyone else,” and “My job provides me with the chance to finish completely any work I start.”

The revised JDS contains 15 items, with three statements corresponding to each of the five core job dimensions. Some items were negatively worded, alluding to a lack of a specific characteristic, and thus reverse scored as the inverse of the response corresponds to the presence of that characteristic. Results from the revised JDS were used to calculate the Motivating Potential Score.

Two open-ended questions also evaluated job characteristics (Appendix A, 120). The first asked participants to share what characteristic of their job gives them the most satisfaction at work. The second asked participants to reflect on the last time they were excited by their work and to share the cause of their excitement. Responses were coded to correspond with the core job characteristics, critical psychological states, and the additional dimensions of “dealing with others.”

Attitudes and Values Measures

Outside of motivational theories, additional measures were included to provide further context for the study. Constructs such as values, job satisfaction,
perceived fit, organizational commitment, and turnover intentions were evaluated to determine their relative roles as inputs and outcomes of motivation among museum professionals. Additionally, managers’ understanding of motivation was evaluated to determine what role motivation plays in their managerial practice and how much value they place in the motivational process.

Values among museum professionals were assessed through a series of three ranked choice questions that asked participants (n = 212) to rank sets of values from most to least personal importance (Appendix A, 125 - 127). Value items stemmed from the Short Schwartz's Value Survey and were presented in two different formats (Lindeman and Verkasalo 2005, 176). The first format broke the ten value items into two groups of five and asked participants to rank each of the five values from most to least important. A weighted average was calculated for each value item using a weight of 5 to correspond with “most important” and a weight of 1 to correspond with “least important.” The second format asked participants to identify the two most important and least important values from the list of ten value items. Each format used different wording. The first format listed three descriptors of the value (e.g. “social power, authority, and wealth” were used to describe the value of power), and the second format named the values directly.

Job satisfaction, perceived person-job fit, organizational commitment, and turnover intentions were assessed as individual inputs and outcomes that both influence and are influenced by the process of motivation. Job satisfaction in participants (n = 236) was assessed through the 3-item Michigan Organizational Assessment Questionnaire (Cammann et al. 1983) on a 7-point Likert scale
(Appendix A, 120 - 121). Perceived person-job fit in participants (n = 213) was assessed with a 9-item measure by Cable and DeRue (2002), also on a 7-point Likert scale (Appendix A 127 - 128). The measure has three distinct scales: person-organization fit, needs-supplies fit, and demand-abilities fit (Cable and DeRue 2002). Organizational commitment in participants (n = 214) was evaluated with a 5-item measure by Rhoades, Eisenberger, and Armeli (Appendix A, 128), also on a 7-point scale (Rhoades, Eisenberger, and Armeli 2001, 828). Lastly, participants’ turnover intentions (n = 236) were assessed with a 2-item measure (Appendix A, 120 - 121), by Balfour and Wechsler, also on a 7-point scale (Balfour and Wechsler 1996, 274).

**Managerial Perspectives**

Managers’ understanding of motivation was assessed through a 3-item measure rated on a 7-point scale (Appendix A, 116 - 117). These questions were only presented in “Managerial Perspectives.” Questions evaluated to what degree managers (n = 114) (dis)agreed with factual statements about motivation, such as “High motivation within a team can lead to better performance.” Managers were also directly asked how often they think about motivating employees in a week (Appendix A, 115 - 116).

The relationship between managers and their employees was also assessed using a 4-item measure (7-point scale) that prompted managers (n = 128) to indicate how strongly they (dis)agreed that their relationships with their employees is a partnership, mentorship, authoritarian, and hands-off (Appendix A, 115). In “Employee Perspectives,” all survey participants (n = 237) were asked to indicate
how strongly they (dis)agreed that their relationships with their managers are a partnership, mentorship, authoritarian, and hands-off (Appendix A, 120).

Managers were also asked to share how they motivate their employees and to identify what factors they think motivate museum professionals. This data was captured with a series of ranking questions and open-ended responses. Ranking questions asked managers (n = 105) to rank a variety of extrinsic and intrinsic motivators from “most motivating” to “least motivating,” such as a pay raise, public acclaim, solving a challenging problem, or achieving a goal (Appendix A, 118 - 119). The open-ended questions prompted managers to share specific actions, initiatives, and tactics that they associate with “employee motivation” (Appendix A, 116). The responses were coded to identify extrinsic tactics compared to intrinsic tactics.

**Analysis**

Descriptive statistics (means and standard deviations) were calculated for the Likert scale measures. Some measures utilized a combination of positive and negative statements. In those instances, negative statements were inverted. For example, in the Kopelman et al. measure of Theory X/Y attitudes, statements that aligned with Theory X attitudes were reverse-scored to provide an overall measure of Theory Y attitudes among the sample. Results were compared between response groups of managers, non-managers, and all participants. When applicable, results from “Managerial Perspectives” were compared to the corresponding results from “Employee Perspectives.” Qualitative responses were coded to identify patterns
among responses (Appendix B, 129). Correlations between measures were also calculated and presented in a correlation matrix (Table 26).

**Internal Consistency**

The internal consistency of the MPES measures were tested by calculating Cronbach’s Alpha, which measures the reliability of a scale and determines how closely related a set of questions is within a group. The following formula was used:

\[
\text{Cronbach’s Alpha (}\alpha\text{)} = \frac{\text{Number of Survey Items}}{\text{Number of Survey Items} - 1} \times (1 - \frac{\text{Variation of Each Item}}{\text{Variation of Total Survey Score}})
\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha ((\alpha)) =</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(\frac{\text{Number of Survey Items}}{\text{Number of Survey Items} - 1} \times (1 - \frac{\text{Variation of Each Item}}{\text{Variation of Total Survey Score}}))</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Cronbach’s Alpha formula.

The MPES yielded reliable data on the professional experiences of museum work. The assortment of assessments provided the insights necessary to address these experiences through the context of the organizing framework with conceptualization of the inputs, processes, and outcomes that interact in a museum workplace. Results of each measure are discussed thoroughly in the following chapter.
CHAPTER 4 RESULTS

Attitudes and Values

To assess motivation among museum professionals, it is important to understand what museum professionals value, think about their work, and feel at work. Because motivation is influenced by inputs and affects outcomes, those constructs were evaluated to build a clearer picture of professional experiences in the context of a museum workplace.

Values

In the context of the organizing framework, values are a person factor input that influences the process of motivation. Values guide thought and action at an individual level. By understanding what museum professionals value, managers can influence motivation by aligning situation factors at work with the personal values of their employees. The MPES used an arrangement of questions to identify which values are most and least important to museum professionals.

The first format of questions split the 10 value items into two groups of five. Group 1 included power, achievement, hedonism, stimulation, and self-direction. Of these items, 62.26% (n = 132) of participants selected self-direction as the most important value and 69.34% (n = 147) of participants (n = 147) selected power as the least important value. Group 2 included universalism, benevolence, tradition, conformity, and security. Of those items, 50.00% (n = 104) of participants selected universalism as the most important value and 39.90% (n = 83) selected conformity as the least important value. However, when comparing the overall weighted values, self-direction emerges as the most important value, followed by benevolence. While
universalism was ranked more important by a higher volume of participants, benevolence earned a higher rating when considering the full 5-point scale. Power remained the least important value, followed by conformity.

When presented with all ten values at once, most participants (n = 108) selected achievement as the most important value and most participants (n = 139) selected conformity as the least important value (Figure 5). Self-direction was identified as the second most important value (n = 103), and power was identified as the second least important value (n = 121).

Figure 5. Responses to "which values are most important to museum professionals? Least important?"
Participants were presented with a list of 10 value items from Schwartz’s Value Theory and asked to select the top two most important values and bottom two least important values. Achievement and self-direction were identified as most important to museum professionals and conformity and power were identified as least important to museum professionals.
Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction results indicated that, on average, museum professionals only experience a moderate amount of job satisfaction ($\bar{x} = 5.07$; a value of 5 corresponds with “somewhat agree” on a 7-point Likert scale). Half of participants (50.84%; $n = 120$) “agreed” or “strongly agreed” that they like working in their museums and only 8.05% ($n = 19$) “disagreed” or “strongly disagreed” that they like working in their museums. There was not a strong sense of agreement across items. For example, most responses (24.98%; $n = 59$) indicated that they only “slightly agree” that, all in all, they are satisfied with their job, while only 13.50% ($n = 32$) “strongly agreed.”

When comparing satisfaction between managers and non-managers, there was a stronger sense of satisfaction for those in management positions (Table 2). More managers (40.57%; $n = 43$) “agreed” or “strongly agreed” that they are satisfied with their job. In contrast, only 25.19% ($n = 33$) of non-managers “agreed” or “strongly agreed” that they are satisfied with their job. Almost one-third of non-managers (32.82%; $n = 43$) disagreed to some extent (i.e., somewhat disagree, disagree, or strongly disagree) that they are satisfied with their jobs, while only 24.53% ($n = 26$) of managers expressed some dissatisfaction.
In general, I like working here. $\bar{X} = 5.38$ \(\sigma = 1.46\)

In general, I do not like my job.* $\bar{X} = 2.33$ \(\sigma = 1.50\)

All in all, I am satisfied with my job. $\bar{X} = 4.73$ \(\sigma = 1.78\)

Overall Job Satisfaction Measure $\bar{X} = 5.26$ \(\sigma = 1.58\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Managers</th>
<th>Non-Managers</th>
<th>All Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In general, I like working here.</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 5.38$</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 4.99$</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 5.17$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\sigma = 1.46$</td>
<td>$\sigma = 1.68$</td>
<td>$\sigma = 1.60$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In general, I do not like my job.*</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 2.33$</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 2.57$</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 2.46$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\sigma = 1.50$</td>
<td>$\sigma = 1.60$</td>
<td>$\sigma = 1.56$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All in all, I am satisfied with my job.</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 4.73$</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 4.32$</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 4.50$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\sigma = 1.78$</td>
<td>$\sigma = 1.71$</td>
<td>$\sigma = 1.75$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Job Satisfaction Measure</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 5.26$</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 4.91$</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 5.07$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\sigma = 1.58$</td>
<td>$\sigma = 1.66$</td>
<td>$\sigma = 1.64$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Job satisfaction in managers, non-managers, and all participants.

Job satisfaction was measured through a 3-item 7-point Likert scale assessing the extent to which a participant strongly agrees (7) or strongly disagrees (1) to the statements above. Mean values represent the average responses for each item. Means fall between 2.33 to 5.38, indicating a range of average responses from “disagree” (2) to “agree” (6). *To obtain an overall job satisfaction measure, the scores from “in general, I do not like my job” were inverted to create a score indicating job satisfaction, and then all three items were averaged.

Job satisfaction appeared to increase with annual salary (Table 3). Almost one-quarter of participants (23.44%; n = 15) who earned less than $50,000 annually indicated that they were generally satisfied with their job; over one-third of participants (35.90%; n = 28) who earned between $50,000 and $99,999 annually indicated that they were generally satisfied with their job; and most individuals (69.23%; n = 9) who earned $100,000 or more annually indicated that they were generally satisfied with their job.
In general, I like working here. \( \bar{X} = 5.20 \) \( \sigma = 1.54 \) in the $50,000-$99,999 range, \( \bar{X} = 5.21 \) \( \sigma = 1.52 \) in the $100,000+ range.

In general, I do not like my job.* \( \bar{X} = 2.56 \) \( \sigma = 1.57 \) in the $50,000-$99,999 range, \( \bar{X} = 2.39 \) \( \sigma = 1.50 \) in the $100,000+ range.

All in all, I am satisfied with my job. \( \bar{X} = 4.42 \) \( \sigma = 1.49 \) in the $50,000-$99,999 range, \( \bar{X} = 4.58 \) \( \sigma = 1.72 \) in the $100,000+ range.

Overall Job Satisfaction Measure \( \bar{X} = 5.02 \) \( \sigma = 1.53 \) in the $50,000-$99,999 range, \( \bar{X} = 5.13 \) \( \sigma = 1.58 \) in the $100,000+ range.

Table 3. Job satisfaction comparisons across salary ranges. Job satisfaction was measured through a 3-item 7-point Likert scale assessing the extent to which a participant strongly agrees (7) or strongly disagrees (1) to the statements above. Mean values represent the average responses for each item. Means fall between 1.77 to 5.85, indicating a range of average responses from “strongly disagree” (1) to “agree” (6). *To obtain an overall job satisfaction measure, the scores from “in general, I do not like my job” were inverse to create a score indicating job satisfaction and then all three items were averaged.

**Turnover Intentions**

There was a stronger prevalence of turnover intentions among non-managers (Table 4). Over one-quarter (26.15%; \( n = 34 \)) of non-managers “agreed” or “strongly agreed” that they often thought about quitting their job and 44.62% (\( n = 58 \)) “agreed” or “strongly agreed” that they would probably look for a different job in the next year. Only 19.81% (\( n = 21 \)) of managers “agreed” or “strongly agreed” that they often thought about quitting their jobs, but 28.57% (\( n = 30 \)) “agreed” or “strongly agreed” that they would probably look for a different job in the next year.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Managers</th>
<th>Non-Managers</th>
<th>All Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I often think about quitting this job.</td>
<td>$X = 3.41$</td>
<td>$X = 3.62$</td>
<td>$X = 3.53$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\sigma = 2.07$</td>
<td>$\sigma = 2.12$</td>
<td>$\sigma = 2.10$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I will probably look for a different job during the next year.</td>
<td>$X = 3.69$</td>
<td>$X = 4.53$</td>
<td>$X = 4.15$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\sigma = 2.32$</td>
<td>$\sigma = 2.31$</td>
<td>$\sigma = 2.35$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Turnover Intentions Measure</td>
<td>$X = 3.55$</td>
<td>$X = 4.08$</td>
<td>$X = 3.84$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\sigma = 2.20$</td>
<td>$\sigma = 2.22$</td>
<td>$\sigma = 2.23$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Turnover intentions in managers, non-managers, and all participants.
Turnover intentions were measured through a 2-item, 7-point Likert scale assessing the extent to which a participant strongly agrees (7) or strongly disagrees (1) to the statements above. Mean values represent the average responses for each item. Means fall between 3.41 to 4.53, indicating a range of average responses from “somewhat disagree” (3) to “somewhat agree” (5). To obtain an overall turnover intention measure, the scores from all three measures were averaged. While the average scores indicate a tight cluster towards somewhat indifferent responses, the wide variation indicates that the museum professional experience is widely diverse.

Turnover intentions were not clearly associated with annual salary (Table 5). Individuals who earned more than $100,000 annually indicated that they thought about quitting their jobs (23.07%; n = 3) more than individuals who earned less than $50,000 (21.88%; n = 14). Over one-third (37.50%; n = 24) of individuals who earned less than $50,000 annually “agreed” or “strongly agreed” that they will look for another job in the next year; 30.76% (n = 4) of individuals who earned more than $100,000 annually “agreed” or “strongly agreed” that they would probably look for a new job in the next year; and 25.97% (n = 20) of individuals who earned between $50,000 and $99,999 “agreed” or “strongly agreed” that they would probably look for a new job in the next year.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Less than $50,000</th>
<th>$50,000 - $99,999</th>
<th>$100,000+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I often think about quitting this job.</td>
<td>X̅ = 3.66, σ = 2.06</td>
<td>X̅ = 3.44, σ = 1.95</td>
<td>X̅ = 3.08, σ = 2.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I will probably look for a different job during the next year.</td>
<td>X̅ = 4.30, σ = 2.21</td>
<td>X̅ = 3.68, σ = 2.27</td>
<td>X̅ = 3.31, σ = 2.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Turnover Intentions Measure</td>
<td>X̅ = 3.98, σ = 2.14</td>
<td>X̅ = 3.56, σ = 2.11</td>
<td>X̅ = 3.20, σ = 2.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5. Turnover intentions comparisons across salary ranges. Turnover intentions were measured through a 2-item, 7-point Likert scale assessing the extent to which a participant strongly agrees (7) or strongly disagrees (1) to the statements above. Mean values represent the average responses for each item. Means fall between 3.08 to 4.303, indicating a range of average responses from “somewhat disagree” (3) to “somewhat agree” (5). To obtain an overall turnover intention measure, the scores from all three measures were averaged. While the average scores indicate a tight cluster towards somewhat indifferent responses, the wide variation indicates that the museum professional experience is widely diverse.

Years of experience did not appear to correlate with turnover intentions (Table 6). Over one-third (37.08%; n = 28) of participants with 5 or fewer years of experience “agreed” or “strongly agreed” that they will probably look for a new job in the next year; 39.81% (n = 41) of participants with 6 to 14 years of experience “agreed” or “strongly agreed” that they would probably look for a new job in the next year; and 30.00% (n = 18) of participants with 15 or more years of experience “agreed” or “strongly agreed” that they will probably look for a new job in the next year. Across all groups, significant variation implies that while the average responses may indicate low turnover intentions, this attitude is widely varied among museum professionals.
Table 6. Turnover intentions comparisons across years of experience.

Turnover intentions were measured through a 2-item, 7-point Likert scale assessing the extent to which a participant strongly agrees (7) or strongly disagrees (1) to the statements above. Mean values represent the average responses for each item. Means fall between 3.42 to 4.33, indicating a range of average responses from "somewhat disagree" (3) to "somewhat agree" (5). To obtain an overall turnover intention measure, the scores from all three measures were averaged. While the average scores indicate a tight cluster towards somewhat indifferent responses, the wide variation indicates that the museum professional experience is widely diverse.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>5 years or less</th>
<th>6 to 14 years</th>
<th>15+ years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I often think about quitting this job.</td>
<td>( \bar{x} = 3.42 ) ( \sigma = 2.23 )</td>
<td>( \bar{x} = 3.62 ) ( \sigma = 2.04 )</td>
<td>( \bar{x} = 3.44 ) ( \sigma = 2.02 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I will probably look for a different job during the next year.</td>
<td>( \bar{x} = 4.28 ) ( \sigma = 2.34 )</td>
<td>( \bar{x} = 4.33 ) ( \sigma = 2.32 )</td>
<td>( \bar{x} = 3.65 ) ( \sigma = 2.36 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Turnover Intentions Measure</td>
<td>( \bar{x} = 3.85 ) ( \sigma = 2.29 )</td>
<td>( \bar{x} = 3.98 ) ( \sigma = 2.18 )</td>
<td>( \bar{x} = 3.55 ) ( \sigma = 2.19 )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Perceived Person-Job Fit

Perceived person-job fit was assessed across three dimensions: person-organization fit, needs-supplies fit, and demand-abilities fit (Cable and DeRue 2002). Each dimension contained 3 items.

Person-organization fit items capture how well an organization’s values align with an individual employee’s values. Among surveyed museum professionals, there is not a strong sense of person-organization fit (\( \bar{x} = 4.65 \); a value of 4 corresponds to “neither agree nor disagree” and a value of 5 corresponds to “somewhat agree” on a 7-point scale).

Needs-supplies fit items capture how “fulfilled” an individual feels by the characteristics of their job. The results show that there is not a strong sense of fit between what a museum professional is looking for in a job and what they are experiencing in their current job (\( \bar{x} = 4.53 \)).
Demands-abilities fit items capture how well the requirements and demands of a job aligns with one’s skills and training. This dimension demonstrated the strongest perceived fit between museum professionals and their roles, with a mean value of 5.56 (a value of 5 corresponds to “somewhat agree” on a 7-point scale).

Managers perceived a slightly better fit with their roles and organizations than non-managers, but the difference was not particularly significant (Table 7).

\[
\begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
\text{Measure} & \text{Managers} & \text{Non-Managers} & \text{All Participants} \\
\hline
\text{Person-organization Fit} & \bar{x} = 4.86 & \bar{x} = 4.47 & \bar{x} = 4.65 \\
& \sigma = 1.52 & \sigma = 1.64 & \sigma = 1.60 \\
\hline
\text{Needs-supplies Fit} & \bar{x} = 4.90 & \bar{x} = 4.21 & \bar{x} = 4.53 \\
& \sigma = 1.62 & \sigma = 1.72 & \sigma = 1.71 \\
\hline
\text{Demands-Abilities Fit} & \bar{x} = 5.74 & \bar{x} = 5.57 & \bar{x} = 5.65 \\
& \sigma = 1.41 & \sigma = 1.52 & \sigma = 1.47 \\
\hline
\text{Overall Perceived Person-Job Fit Measurement} & \bar{x} = 5.17 & \bar{x} = 4.75 & \bar{x} = 4.94 \\
& \sigma = 1.52 & \sigma = 1.63 & \sigma = 1.59 \\
\hline
\end{array}
\]

Table 7. Perceived person-job fit in managers, non-managers, and all participants. Perceived person-job fit was measured across 3 dimensions on a 7-point Likert scale assessing the extent to which a participant strongly agrees (7) or strongly disagrees (1) to the statements addressing each dimension. Mean values represent the average responses for each dimension. Means fall between 4.21 to 5.74, indicating a range of average responses from “neither agree nor disagree” (4) to “agree” (6). To obtain an overall perceived person-job fit measure, the scores from all three measures were averaged. The average scores indicate a tight cluster towards somewhat indifferent responses.

**Organizational Commitment**

Organizational commitment describes the emotional bond that an employee has to their organization and is a determinant of dedication and loyalty (Rhoades, Eisenberger, and Armeli 2001, 825). Results of the MPES demonstrated a moderate level of employee commitment to their museums (\(\bar{x} = 5.06\); a value of 5 corresponds to “somewhat agree” on a 7-point Likert scale). However, this attitude had significant
variation ($\sigma = 1.72$) (Table 8). Across all five measures, 18.89% of respondents indicated that they do not feel committed to their organization; 13.00% indicated that they feel neither committed nor uncommitted; 68.09% indicated that they do feel some extent of commitment to their organization.

Table 8. Organizational commitment in managers, non-managers, and all participants. Organizational commitment was measured through 5-items applied on a 7-point Likert scale assessing the extent to which a participant strongly agrees (7) or strongly disagrees (1) to the statements above. Mean values represent the average responses for each statement. Means fall between 4.25 to 5.96, indicating a range of average responses from “neither agree nor disagree” (4) to “agree” (6). To obtain an overall perceived person-job fit measure, the scores from all measures were averaged.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Managers</th>
<th>Non-Managers</th>
<th>All Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I feel a strong sense of commitment to my museum.</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 5.66$ $\sigma = 1.52$</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 4.98$ $\sigma = 1.85$</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 5.29$ $\sigma = 1.74$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel personally attached to my museum.</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 5.56$ $\sigma = 1.55$</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 4.92$ $\sigma = 1.83$</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 5.21$ $\sigma = 1.73$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am proud to tell others I work at my museum.</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 5.96$ $\sigma = 1.28$</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 5.44$ $\sigma = 1.67$</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 5.68$ $\sigma = 1.53$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel excited to be at work each day.</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 4.67$ $\sigma = 1.73$</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 4.25$ $\sigma = 1.9$</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 4.44$ $\sigma = 1.84$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I want to do my job each day.</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 4.87$ $\sigma = 1.71$</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 4.56$ $\sigma = 1.78$</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 4.7$ $\sigma = 1.76$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall organizational Commitment Measurement</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 5.34$ $\sigma = 1.56$</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 4.83$ $\sigma = 1.81$</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 5.06$ $\sigma = 1.72$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Managerial Perspective

Understanding of Motivation

To leverage motivation as a tool to encourage employee success, managers must understand the value of motivation and the role they play in individual
employee motivation. Managers were asked, “On a weekly basis, how often do you think about motivating your employees?” (Figure 6). Only 4.65% (n = 6) of participants indicated that they “nearly always” think about motivating their employees. In comparison, 4.65% (n = 6) of participants indicated that they “never” or “rarely” think about motivating their employees. Most participants (33.33%; n = 43) indicated that they “occasionally” think about motivating their employees. Following that, 27.13% (n = 35) of participants indicated that they think about motivating their employees “most of the time.”

![Figure 6. Responses to "On a weekly basis, how often do you think about motivating your employees?"

In “Managerial Perspectives,” managers were asked to share how frequently they think of motivating their employees on a weekly basis. Most managers (33.3%; n = 43) indicated that they only “occasionally” think about motivating their employees throughout the week.

While managers in museums do not spend a significant amount of time thinking about motivating their employees, they do recognize the value of motivation
in the workplace (Table 9). Most managers (88.60%; n = 101) “agreed” or “strongly agreed” that low motivation within a team can have a negative impact on the overall museum, while 90.35% (n = 103) of managers “agreed” or “strongly agreed” that high motivation leads to better performance. Most managers (87.72%; n = 100) “disagreed” or “strongly disagreed” that managers do not play a role in individual employee motivation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Managers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low motivation within a team can have a negative impact on the overall museum.</td>
<td>( \bar{X} = 6.46 ) ( \sigma = 1.15 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers play a role in individual employee motivation in museums.*</td>
<td>( \bar{X} = 6.37 ) ( \sigma = 1.05 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High motivation within a team can lead to better performance.</td>
<td>( \bar{X} = 6.58 ) ( \sigma = 0.76 )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9. Managerial understanding of motivation. Managers were asked to indicate how strongly they agree (7) or disagree (1) with factual statements about motivation through a 7-point Likert scale to assess how well managers understand the importance of motivation. Mean values represent the average responses for each dimension. Means fall between 6.37 - 6.58, indicating average responses of “agree” (6) to “strongly agree” (7). *The statement was displayed in the survey as “managers do not play a role in individual employee motivation in museums” but inverted for the purpose of data clarity and alignment with the other factual statements regarding motivation.

Motivating Factors and Initiatives

Managers ranked extrinsic and intrinsic motivating factors based on the motivating potential of each item for museum professionals, ranging from “most likely to motivate” (1) to “least likely to motivate” (4). Passion was ranked as the key motivating factor for museum employees (\( \bar{X} = 1.65 \); lower values correspond with a higher perceived potential to motivate museum professionals). Wage increases,
however, were ranked as the second highest motivating factor for museum employees ($\bar{x} = 1.86$). Responses indicated that managers believe both intrinsic and extrinsic factors are likely to motivate museum employees (Figure 7). Overall, intrinsically motivating factors had a lower mean ($\bar{x} = 2.28$) indicating that managers perceive intrinsic motivators as possessing higher motivating potential than extrinsically motivating factor ($\bar{x} = 2.78$).

Figure 7. Managerial responses indicating the motivating potential of intrinsic and extrinsic factors. Responses to the four-item scales of potential motivating factors were combined and weighted based on how managers scored them from "most likely to motivate" (4) to "least likely to motivate" (1). Managers indicate a near balance between the motivating potential of intrinsic and extrinsic factors, with a tendency towards intrinsic factors.

In one open-ended question, managers were asked to share specific examples of "actions, initiatives, or tactics" that come to mind when they think of employee motivation ($n = 88$). Qualitative responses were coded to assess whether
managers rely more on extrinsic and intrinsic avenues of motivation (Figure 8; Appendix B, 131 - 132).

Extrinsically motivating initiatives were characterized by tangible rewards, praise, or initiatives with an external focus, such as HR assessments or working towards a common organization-identified goal. Responses coded as “extrinsic motivation” indicated external forces as the perceived primary drivers, rather than self-determination in the motivation process. Examples of these referenced external forces included gifts, wage increases, words of praise, or setting clear expectations for the job.

Intrinsically motivating initiatives were characterized by a sense of individual purpose, drive or enjoyment. Responses coded as “intrinsic motivation” indicated
supporting the pursuit of an individual's interests or passions, focusing on developing a fun and inclusive work culture, and allowing employees to approach their work in ways they find enjoyable. Examples included allowing employees to take on projects of their own or adopting additional responsibilities (if desired), developing trust and respect between employee and manager, and understanding each employees' personal needs and values.

Most responses (43.18%; n = 38) indicated that managers associated motivating initiatives with extrinsically motivating factors (Figure 8). Nearly one-third of responses (31.82%; n = 28) indicated that managers associated motivating initiatives with intrinsically motivating factors. One-quarter of responses (25.00%; n = 22) indicated that managers used a blend of extrinsic and intrinsically motivating factors. There was a strong emphasis on the motivating potential of a museum's mission and alignment with that sense of purpose; 22.22% of participants (n = 19) specifically mentioned employee contributions to the museum and their connection to the museum's mission as a primary motivating factor.

McGregor's Theory X and Theory Y

Individuals in management positions were surveyed to identify if there was a stronger association with McGregor's Theory X or Theory Y attitudes. Out of 114 responses, there was an overwhelmingly positive association with Theory Y attitudes (Table 10). Most responses (74.34%) indicated they “agreed” or “strongly agreed” with Theory Y statements. Furthermore, 87.88% of respondents indicated that they “disagreed” or “strongly disagreed” with Theory X attitudes.
Breaking the data down further to consider the three dimensions of Theory X and Theory Y attitudes, managers reinforced their alignment with Theory Y attitudes (Table 10). The responses indicated a strong belief that museum employees are capable of making positive and significant contributions to their organizations, with 79.39% of managers selecting “agree” or “strongly agree”. Additionally, 75.44% of managers indicated that they “agreed” or “strongly agreed” that museum employees are trustworthy and 63.16% of managers “agreed” or “strongly agreed” that museum employees are industrious.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension Measure</th>
<th>Managers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Museum employees are capable</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 6.30$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\sigma = 1.05$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Museum employees are industrious</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 6.24$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\sigma = 0.89$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Museum employees are trustworthy</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 5.94$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\sigma = 1.05$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Theory X/Y Measure</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 6.23$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\sigma = 0.98$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10. Theory Y assumptions of museum managers. Theory X and Theory Y assumptions were measured across 3 dimensions on a 7-point Likert scale assessing the extent to which a participant strongly agrees (7) or strongly disagrees (1) to the statements addressing each dimension. Agreement with statements indicate a prevalence towards Theory Y attitudes. Mean values represent the average responses for each dimension. Means fall between 5.94 to 6.30, indicating average responses corresponding to an agreement with Theory Y assumptions. To obtain an overall Theory X/Y, the scores from all three measures were averaged. There is little variation indicating that almost all museum managers hold Theory Y attitudes.

Managers with Theory Y attitudes towards employees were less likely to adopt an authoritarian management style and were more likely to trust their employees to complete their work independently. Most managers (78.91%) “disagreed” or “strongly disagreed” that they have an authoritarian relationship with
their employees. Over half of managers (54.69%) indicated that they trust their employees to complete work independently.

**Relationship Between Managers and Employees**

Managers were asked to indicate how strongly they (dis)agreed with the characterizations of their employee relationships as a partnership, mentorship, authoritarian, or hands-off (Table 11). On average, managers most strongly characterized their employee relationships as a partnership ($\bar{x} = 5.71; 35.16\% [n = 45] \text{ “strongly agreed”}$). There was also a strong tendency toward describing relationships as a mentorship ($\bar{x} = 5.41; 32.37\% [n = 45] \text{ “strongly agree.”}$) Managers generally “disagreed” or “strongly disagreed” that these relationships are authoritarian ($\bar{x} = 1.91; 49.22\% [n = 63] \text{ “strongly disagree”}$). Managers "somewhat disagreed" that their relationships with employees were hands-off ($\bar{x} = 3.31; \text{ a value of 3 corresponds to “somewhat disagree” on a 7-point scale}$).
Table 11. Characterization of relationships between employees and managers.

The characterization of relationships between employees and their managers was measured across 4 dimensions on a 7-point Likert scale assessing the extent to which a participant strongly agrees (7) or strongly disagrees (1) to the statements addressing each dimension. Mean values represent the average responses for each dimension. Means fall between 1.91 to 5.71, indicating a range of average responses from “disagree” (6) to “agree” (6). There is a lot of variation across these datasets, indicating that museum professionals experience a wide range of relationships with their managers.

Comparing these managerial statistics to employees’ perceptions suggests that managers have a more positive outlook on these relationships (Table 11). Employees disagreed less that managerial relationships were authoritarian (In “managerial perspectives” $\bar{x} = 1.91$, whereas “employee perspectives” $\bar{x} = 3.90$; a value of 1 corresponds to “strongly disagree” and a value of 4 corresponds to “neither agree nor disagree” on a 7-point scale). There was also a significant difference in the characterization of relationships as mentorship; employee perspectives averaged 3.62 while managers’ perspectives averaged 5.41.

Employees also indicated a stronger agreement that these relationships were hands-off ($\bar{x} = 4.08$) and a lower agreement that these relationships were a partnership ($\bar{x} = 4.47$). These numbers fall even further from alignment with managerial perspectives when the dataset of non-managers is isolated.
**Work Extrinsic and Intrinsic Motivation Scale**

Motivational regulators were assessed through the Work Extrinsic and Intrinsic Motivation Scale (WEIMS), which measures the six kinds of motivation presented by Deci and Ryan’s Self-Determination Theory on an 18-item scale. The overall sample size of participants responding to this subsection of questions was 226, which was further divided into 112 managers indicating their perceptions of museum employees in general, 102 managers indicating their personal motives, and 124 non-managers indicating their personal motives.

In general, there was a high presence of self-determined regulators, particularly through intrinsic motivation (all responses $\bar{x} = 5.90$) and integrated regulation (all responses $\bar{x} = 5.39$) (Table 12). However, it should be noted that there was no disagreement with the presence of extrinsic motivation among museum professionals. Combining external regulation, introjected regulation, identified regulation, and integration regulation averaged 4.29 across all responses, corresponding to “neither agree nor disagree” with the presence of external regulators.
Table 12. WEIMS measures of motivation regulators.

Motivation forces were measured across 6 dimensions on a 7-point Likert scale assessing the extent to which a participant strongly agrees (7) or strongly disagrees (1) to the statements addressing each dimension. Mean values represent the average responses for each dimension. Means fall between 2.66 to 5.93, indicating a range of average responses from “disagree” (2) to “agree” (6). “Extrinsic motivation was determined by calculating the average across all elements of extrinsic motivation regulators.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Managerial Perspective</th>
<th>Managers</th>
<th>Non-Managers</th>
<th>All Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amotivation</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 3.63$</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 2.66$</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 3.09$</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 2.90$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\sigma = 1.80$</td>
<td>$\sigma = 1.65$</td>
<td>$\sigma = 1.89$</td>
<td>$\sigma = 1.80$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Regulation</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 3.24$</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 3.56$</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 3.04$</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 3.28$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\sigma = 1.59$</td>
<td>$\sigma = 1.64$</td>
<td>$\sigma = 1.67$</td>
<td>$\sigma = 1.68$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introjected Regulation</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 4.32$</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 4.28$</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 4.13$</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 4.20$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\sigma = 1.29$</td>
<td>$\sigma = 1.73$</td>
<td>$\sigma = 1.64$</td>
<td>$\sigma = 1.69$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identified Regulation</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 4.04$</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 4.28$</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 4.32$</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 4.30$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\sigma = 1.26$</td>
<td>$\sigma = 1.71$</td>
<td>$\sigma = 1.51$</td>
<td>$\sigma = 1.61$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated Regulation</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 5.23$</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 5.47$</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 5.33$</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 5.39$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\sigma = 1.22$</td>
<td>$\sigma = 1.36$</td>
<td>$\sigma = 1.37$</td>
<td>$\sigma = 1.37$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic Motivation</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 5.78$</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 5.93$</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 5.87$</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 5.90$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\sigma = 0.98$</td>
<td>$\sigma = 1.09$</td>
<td>$\sigma = 1.20$</td>
<td>$\sigma = 1.16$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Extrinsic Motivation (External + Introjected + Identified + Integrated)</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 4.21$</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 4.40$</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 4.20$</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 4.29$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\sigma = 1.34$</td>
<td>$\sigma = 1.61$</td>
<td>$\sigma = 1.55$</td>
<td>$\sigma = 1.59$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the managerial perspective (what managers think about museum professionals in general), there was consistency between managerial beliefs and museum professionals’ experiences in most cases. However, there was a stronger managerial belief that museum professionals experience amotivation, indicating that some managers believed museum professionals lack motivation to complete their work ($\bar{X} = 3.63$, compared to $\bar{X} = 2.90$ from all responses). There were also slight differences between responses from managers and non-managers. In general, managers adhered more strongly to intrinsic personal motivators than non-managers. Non-managers, however, demonstrated a higher level of amotivation.
Variance in responses was particularly high. The highest levels of variance were present in amotivation, while the lowest levels of variance were present in intrinsic motivation. This implies that intrinsic motivation is consistently a high driver of reasons to work in the museum industry, whereas amotivation is a bigger issue for some than others. The variance of responses shows that managers should not discount any of these regulating factors, because what is true for one employee may not be true for others.

**Work Self-Determination Index**

The work self-determination index (W-SDI) was also calculated from the responses to WEIMS. The W-SDI is calculated by multiplying the means of each dimension by weights that correspond to the level of self-determination (Tremblay et al. 2009, 216). For a 7-point Likert scale, the total W-SDI score could range from -36 points to +36 points, indicating a scale from non-self-determined motivational profiles to fully self-determined motivational profiles. This is calculated with the following formula:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Work-Self Determination Index =</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(3 x Intrinsic Motivation) + (2 x Integrated Regulation) + 1 x Identified Regulation) + (-1 x Introjected Regulation) + (-2 x External Regulation) + (-3 x Amotivation)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13. Work-Self Determination Index formula.

Overall, museum professionals display a self-determined motivational profile with a W-SDI of 13.32 (Figure 9). Managers exhibited a slightly higher potential for personal self-determined motivation, with an average of 13.63, compared to the non-
managers’ average of 13.11. Managers indicated lower perceptions of self-determined motivation on behalf of other museum professionals, with a W-SDI mean of 10.15. This implies that managers believe museum professionals are less self-determined than they are measured to be.

Figure 9. W-SDI scores across datasets.

**Workplace Goals**

As demonstrated by Locke and Latham’s Theory of Goal Setting, goals can be powerful tools to drive higher performance at work. The MPES assessed the following aspects of goal setting: the presence of formal goal setting in museums, involvement of managers in setting goals, elements of successful goal setting, and acknowledgement systems (i.e., feedback) for achieving goals.
Goal Setting in Museums

Goal setting ("I set personal goals at work") appears to be a moderately active part of museum work, with a mean of 5.53 (n = 230) on a 7-point scale. Most respondents (80.86%) indicated that they at least somewhat agreed with the above statement (Figure 10). However, this number drops to only 56.95% when looking at responses of “agree” or “strongly agree.”

This trend remained consistent when the data was separated into response groups of managers (n = 102) and non-managers (n = 128). Most managers (89.21%; n = 91) indicated that they at least somewhat agreed that they set personal goals at work, compared to 74.23% (n = 95) of non-managers. This difference is further highlighted when comparing responses to the statement “I set personal goals at work.” Over one-third of managers (37.25%; n = 38) “strongly agreed” with this statement, whereas only 28.13% (n = 36) of non-managers “strongly agreed.” The
standard deviation across all categories remains between 1.39 - 1.5, showing a wide amount of dispersion in the data.

Managerial Involvement in Goal Setting

Managerial involvement in goal setting was assessed both from the perspectives of managers and employees’ reports of their managers. “Managerial Perspectives” contained the statements “I am very involved with setting goals for my employees” and “I check on my employees' progress towards achieving goals.” Similarly, “Employee Perspectives” contained the statements “My manager is very involved in my goal setting,” “My manager regularly checks progress towards achieving goals,” and “My manager does not support my goals.” The presentation of these statements from both perspectives allowed an analysis of how managers’ perceptions compared to employee perceptions.

The results showed that managers believe that they are more involved in goal setting than employees perceive them to be (Table 14). Managers reported being moderately involved in goal setting ($\bar{x} = 5.13$; a value of 5 corresponds to “somewhat agree” on a 7-point scale) and in checking progress towards goal achievement ($\bar{x} = 5.59$). However, employees believed that their managers are not very involved in goal setting ($\bar{x} = 3.7$; a value of 3 corresponds to “somewhat disagree” on a 7-point scale) and that their managers do not regularly check on their progress towards achievement ($\bar{x} = 3.54$). This lack of involvement does not translate into a lack of perceived support from managers. On average, museum professionals disagreed that their managers do not support their goals ($\bar{x} = 2.8$; a value of 2 corresponds to “disagree” on a 7-point Likert scale) (Figure 11).
Table 14. Managerial involvement in goal setting.
Managerial involvement in goal setting was measured with 2 items on a 7-point Likert scale assessing the extent to which a participant strongly agrees (7) or strongly disagrees (1) to the above statements. Mean values represent the average responses for each dimension. Means fall between 3.50 to 5.59, indicating a range of average responses from "somewhat disagree" (3) to "agree" (6).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Managerial Perspective</th>
<th>Manager Responses</th>
<th>Non-Manager Responses</th>
<th>All Participant Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My manager is very involved in my goal-setting.</td>
<td>( \bar{X} = 5.13 ) ( \sigma = 1.39 )</td>
<td>( \bar{X} = 3.93 ) ( \sigma = 1.98 )</td>
<td>( \bar{X} = 3.51 ) ( \sigma = 1.89 )</td>
<td>( \bar{X} = 3.70 ) ( \sigma = 1.94 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My manager regularly checks on progress towards achieving goals.</td>
<td>( \bar{X} = 5.59 ) ( \sigma = 1.07 )</td>
<td>( \bar{X} = 3.59 ) ( \sigma = 1.88 )</td>
<td>( \bar{X} = 3.50 ) ( \sigma = 1.92 )</td>
<td>( \bar{X} = 3.54 ) ( \sigma = 1.90 )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Managers were somewhat less likely to report that their supervisors were involved in goal setting (\( \bar{X} = 3.70 \)) compared to non-managers (\( \bar{X} = 3.93 \)). It is important to note that some managers who responded to this survey might hold top
executive-level positions and thus do not formally report to anyone else in the institution. Additionally, those in management positions have more autonomy and may be less directly supervised, thereby explaining these differences.

Elements of Successful Goal Setting

The theory of goal setting provides key criteria that leads to enhanced performance. Goals should be specific, difficult, but achievable (Kinicki and Fugate 2017, 183). To be achievable, individuals must have the ability and resources necessary to achieve the goal (Kinicki and Fugate 2017, 183). Feedback and participation are valuable, but only when associated with specific and difficult goals (Kinicki and Fugate 2017, 183). Achieving goals that meet these criteria will lead to higher performance (Kinicki and Fugate 2017, 183).

Managers indicated that the goals their employees set are not particularly difficult. Managers moderately agreed that their employees set goals that are specific and measurable ($\bar{x} = 5.02$; a value of 5 corresponds to "somewhat agree" on a 7-point scale) (Table 15). Managers believed that their employees have the resources needed to achieve their goals ($\bar{x} = 5.08$), but employees generally disagreed that necessary resources were available ($\bar{x} = 3.77$; a value of 3 corresponds to "somewhat disagree" on a 7-point scale) (Table 15).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Managerial Perspective</th>
<th>Manager Responses</th>
<th>Non-Manager Responses</th>
<th>All Participant Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Achievable</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 5.71$</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 5.41$</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 5.66$</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 5.55$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\sigma = 1.28$</td>
<td>$\sigma = 1.43$</td>
<td>$\sigma = 1.27$</td>
<td>$\sigma = 1.35$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of Resources</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 5.08$</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 3.95$</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 3.63$</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 3.77$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\sigma = 1.35$</td>
<td>$\sigma = 1.80$</td>
<td>$\sigma = 1.89$</td>
<td>$\sigma = 1.85$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific and Measurable</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 5.02$</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 5.06$</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 4.99$</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 5.02$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\sigma = 1.32$</td>
<td>$\sigma = 1.44$</td>
<td>$\sigma = 1.32$</td>
<td>$\sigma = 1.38$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 15. Elements of successful goal setting. Elements of successful goal setting were assessed through a 3-item measure applied to a 7-point Likert scale assessing the extent to which a participant strongly agrees (7) or strongly disagrees (1) to the above dimensions. Mean values represent the average responses for each dimension. Means fall between 3.63 to 5.71, indicating a range of average responses from “somewhat disagree” (3) to “agree” (6).

Acknowledgment Systems for Achieving Goals

Acknowledgment of achieving goals is a valuable tactic that managers could employ to better support their teams. When asked how achieving a goal makes them feel, most participants (81.73%; n = 161) reported positive feelings, such as pride, excitement, or satisfaction (Figure 12). However, in some cases, those positive feelings were overshadowed by a lack of recognition from management or leadership (9.32% of individuals who reported positive feelings also reported a lack of recognition for achievements; n = 15). A small group of respondents (10.15%; n = 20) reported feeling indifferent about achievement, or reported negative feelings associated with goal achievement (4.57%; n = 9). It is also valuable to note that 9.64% of respondents (n = 19) were concerned about their next goal and that 5.58% of respondents (n = 11) experienced relief when they achieved a goal. This could suggest that goals cause stress among some museum professionals.
Managers believed that they acknowledge employees' achievement of goals ($\bar{x} = 5.99$; a value of 6 corresponds to "agree" on a 7-point Likert scale), but employees felt neutral about whether their achievements were acknowledged ($\bar{x} = 4.02$). There also appeared to be a lack of rewards systems for goal achievement integrated into museums. Most managers “neither agreed nor disagreed” that employees were rewarded for goal achievement ($\bar{x} = 4.74$). Employees “disagreed” that they were rewarded when they met goals ($\bar{x} = 3.15$).

Managers were provided with the opportunity to describe how goals were acknowledged or rewarded. The most common process for acknowledging goal achievement was through verbal acknowledgment (66.29%; $n = 59$) and was often done in a public avenue, such as staff meetings (34.83%; $n = 31$) (Figure 13). Goal achievement was rarely acknowledged through monetary resources, such as wage increases or bonuses (20.22%; $n = 18$). In terms of frequency, goal achievement
was primarily acknowledged at annual evaluations (28.09%; n = 25). More frequent acknowledgments were rarely seen, with only a handful of responses indicating bi-weekly (1.12%; n = 1) or monthly (3.37%; n = 3) acknowledgments.

Survey respondents were provided with the opportunity to describe how their managers recognize their goal achievement. Most responses matched the tactic mentioned above in terms of utilizing verbal praise or words of affirmation (39.29%; n = 77) (Figure 13). Less than a quarter of respondents (21.43%; n = 42) shared that acknowledgment occurs in a public avenue, such as during staff meetings. However, 27.55% (n = 54) of respondents indicated no recognition of goal achievement in their workplaces.
Justice Theory

Justice theory proposes that employees are motivated by fairness in their workplace and that “unfair” situations lead to corrective action, such as changes in attitudes or behaviors. Organizational justice contains four dimensions, each of which was assessed in the MPES.
Distributive Justice

Distributed justice is experienced when an individual perceives that the outcome (result) of their input (actions) is reasonable. Results from the MPES showed that museum professionals feel a low sense of distributive justice at work \( n = 223, \bar{x} = 2.91; \) a value of 2 correlates with “disagree” and a value of 3 correlates with “somewhat disagree” on a 7-point scale (Table 16). This was true for managers \( n = 100, \bar{x} = 3.41 \) and non-managers \( n = 123, \bar{x} = 2.51 \). Statements reflecting distributive justice explicitly asked if participants felt that their salary was “appropriate for the amount of work they do,” “reflects their contribution to the museum,” and “reflects the effort that they put into their work.” One third of all participants (33.03%) “strongly disagreed” with these statements reflecting their salary. These responses emphasize what is already widely known in the museum field: employees do not feel that their work is valued, or their salary is fair.
Table 16. Distributive justice measures.
Experiences of distributive justice were measured with three statements applied to a 7-point Likert scale assessing the extent to which a participant strongly agrees (7) or strongly disagrees (1) with each statement. Mean values represent the average responses for each dimension. Means fall between 2.45 to 3.55, indicating a range of average responses from “disagree” (2) to “neither agree nor disagree” (4). To obtain an overall distributive justice measure, the scores from all three measures were averaged. The standard deviation highlights that while the average falls in a narrow range, experiences are diverse across this sample of museum professionals.

### Procedural Justice

Procedural justice is experienced when an individual can express their views and influence their work, reflecting an employee’s belief that the decision-making procedures were fair. Procedural justice also includes consistent enforcement of policies at work. Again, participants indicated that they “neither agreed nor disagreed” with statements regarding procedural justice at work ($\bar{x} = 4.39$; a value of 4 correlates with “neither agree nor disagree” on the 7-point scale) (Table 17). Over one third of participants (34.29%) indicated that they “agreed” or “strongly agreed” with statements reflecting procedural justice, while 22.01% indicated that they “disagreed” or “strongly disagreed” with these statements. Managers indicated a higher level of procedural justice ($\bar{x} = 4.73$) than non-managers ($\bar{x} = 4.12$).
Table 17. Procedural justice measures.
Experiences of procedural justice were measured with three statements applied to a 7-point Likert scale assessing the extent to which a participant strongly agrees (7) or strongly disagrees (1) with each statement. Mean values represent the average responses for each dimension. Means fall between 3.61 to 5.40, indicating a range of average responses from “somewhat disagree” (3) to “agree” (6). To obtain an overall distributive justice measure, the scores from all three measures were averaged. The averages and standard deviations indicate that experiences are diverse across this sample of museum professionals.

Informational Justice

Informational justice is experienced when explanations at work are reasonable, timely, and specific. This usually refers to explanations of policies and expectations, as well as trust in the communicator. Participants of the MPES indicated that they “neither agreed nor disagreed” (\( \bar{x} = 4.47 \)) with statements regarding informational justice, indicating that there is neither a clear perception of informational justice nor a clear experience of injustice (Table 18). Over one third of participants (36.48%) “agreed” or “strongly agreed” with statements regarding informational justice, but 21.41% “disagreed” or “strongly disagreed” with those statements. Non-managers perceived slightly less informational justice (\( \bar{x} = 4.32 \)) than managers (\( \bar{x} = 4.65 \)).
Table 18. Informational justice measures.

Experiences of informational justice were measured with three statements applied to a 7-point Likert scale assessing the extent to which a participant strongly agrees (7) or strongly disagrees (1) with each statement. Mean values represent the average responses for each dimension. Means fall between 3.98 to 4.99, indicating a range of average responses from "somewhat disagree" (3) to "somewhat agree" (5). To obtain an overall distributive justice measure, the scores from all three measures were averaged. The standard deviation highlights that while the average falls in a narrow range, experiences are diverse across this sample of museum professionals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Managers</th>
<th>Non-Managers</th>
<th>All Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My manager is truthful and straightforward when communicating with me.</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 4.99$</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 4.60$</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 4.78$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\sigma = 1.84$</td>
<td>$\sigma = 2.16$</td>
<td>$\sigma = 2.03$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My manager explains their expectations thoroughly.</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 4.28$</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 3.98$</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 4.12$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\sigma = 1.87$</td>
<td>$\sigma = 2.10$</td>
<td>$\sigma = 2.0$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My manager’s explanations regarding work procedures and policies are reasonable.</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 4.67$</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 4.39$</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 4.52$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\sigma = 1.82$</td>
<td>$\sigma = 1.86$</td>
<td>$\sigma = 1.84$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Informational Justice Measurement</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 4.65$</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 4.32$</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 4.47$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\sigma = 1.84$</td>
<td>$\sigma = 2.04$</td>
<td>$\sigma = 1.96$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interpersonal Justice

Interpersonal justice is experienced when an individual feels they are treated with respect and sensitivity by decision-makers within their organizations. This was evaluated with statements about the extent to which museum leadership treats employees politely, respectfully, and with dignity. Museum professionals indicated that they “neither agree nor disagree” with statements regarding how museum leadership treats them in the workplace ($\bar{X} = 4.60$) (Table 19). Though the mean falls near the scale’s midpoint, 39.22% of respondents indicated that they “agreed” or “strongly agreed” with statements reflecting interpersonal justice. However, it should not be ignored that 17.67% of participants indicated that they do not experience
interpersonal justice from leaders in their institution. Managers reported higher interpersonal justice (\(\bar{x} = 4.94\)) than non-managers (\(\bar{x} = 4.33\)).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Managers</th>
<th>Non-Managers</th>
<th>All Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Museum leadership treats me in a polite manner.</td>
<td>(\bar{x} = 5.09) (\sigma = 1.77)</td>
<td>(\bar{x} = 4.55) (\sigma = 1.89)</td>
<td>(\bar{x} = 4.79) (\sigma = 1.86)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Museum leadership treats me with dignity.</td>
<td>(\bar{x} = 4.88) (\sigma = 1.83)</td>
<td>(\bar{x} = 4.26) (\sigma = 1.97)</td>
<td>(\bar{x} = 4.54) (\sigma = 1.94)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Museum leadership treats me with respect.</td>
<td>(\bar{x} = 4.85) (\sigma = 1.81)</td>
<td>(\bar{x} = 4.18) (\sigma = 2.01)</td>
<td>(\bar{x} = 4.48) (\sigma = 1.95)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Interpersonal Justice Measurement</td>
<td>(\bar{x} = 4.94) (\sigma = 1.80)</td>
<td>(\bar{x} = 4.33) (\sigma = 1.96)</td>
<td>(\bar{x} = 4.60) (\sigma = 1.92)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 19. Interpersonal justice measures.

Experiences of interpersonal justice were measured with three statements applied to a 7-point Likert scale assessing the extent to which a participant strongly agrees (7) or strongly disagrees (1) with each statement. Mean values represent the average responses for each dimension. Means fall between 4.18 to 5.09, indicating a range of average responses from “neither agree nor disagree” (4) to “somewhat agree” (5). To obtain an overall distributive justice measure, the scores from all three measures were averaged. The standard deviation highlights that while the average falls in a narrow range, experiences are diverse across this sample of museum professionals.

**Summary of Justice Results**

Across all dimensions of justice, not one is strongly perceived as fair, but distributive justice is strongly perceived as unfair (Figure 14). Across all dimensions, responses contained wide variance from the mean (average standard deviation was 1.90) indicating that museum professionals do not have a cohesive experience of justice in the workplace; experiences widely vary across the field.
Job Characteristics Model

Utilizing the revised Job Diagnostic Survey, the presence of the five core job dimensions proposed by the job characteristics model was evaluated. 215 participants completed this section of the MPES.

Participants indicated that they “somewhat agree” that they have autonomy in their roles ($\bar{x} = 5.18$) (Table 20). Less than one-third of participants (29.55%) “strongly agree” that they have autonomy in their roles whereas 6.38% “strongly disagree.” As is likely to be expected, there was a noticeable difference in the presence of autonomy between manager and non-manager roles. Managers “somewhat agree” or “agree” ($\bar{x} = 5.52$) that they have autonomy in their roles but
non-managers “neither agree nor disagree” or “somewhat agree” ($\bar{x} = 4.89$) that they have autonomy in their roles.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Managers</th>
<th>Non-Managers</th>
<th>All Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have almost complete responsibility for deciding how and when the work is to be done.</td>
<td>$\bar{x} = 5.33$ $\sigma = 1.65$</td>
<td>$\bar{x} = 4.57$ $\sigma = 2.03$</td>
<td>$\bar{x} = 4.92$ $\sigma = 1.9$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have freedom in deciding how the work is to be done.*</td>
<td>$\bar{x} = 5.77$ $\sigma = 2.22$</td>
<td>$\bar{x} = 5.12$ $\sigma = 1.77$</td>
<td>$\bar{x} = 5.42$ $\sigma = 1.67$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My job allows me an opportunity to use discretion or participate in decision making.*</td>
<td>$\bar{x} = 5.45$ $\sigma = 1.81$</td>
<td>$\bar{x} = 4.97$ $\sigma = 1.78$</td>
<td>$\bar{x} = 5.19$ $\sigma = 1.81$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Autonomy Measure</td>
<td>$\bar{x} = 5.52$ $\sigma = 1.65$</td>
<td>$\bar{x} = 4.89$ $\sigma = 1.86$</td>
<td>$\bar{x} = 5.18$ $\sigma = 1.79$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 20. Job characteristics: autonomy. Autonomy was measured with 3 items applied to a 7-point Likert scale assessing the extent to which a participant strongly agrees (7) or strongly disagrees (1) with each statement. Mean values represent the average responses for each dimension. Means fall between 4.57 to 5.77, indicating a range of average responses from “neither agree nor disagree” (4) to “agree” (6). To obtain an overall autonomy measure, the scores from all three measures were averaged. *For data clarity, these statements were inverted to indicate the presence of autonomy; the survey utilized negative versions of these statements (I have very little freedom… My job does not allow me…)

Across all respondents, skill variety was the most endorsed core job dimension among museum professionals (Table 21). Most participants (64.60%) indicated that they “agree” or “strongly agree” that they experience skill variety in their roles, with a mean value of 5.67 (a value of 5 correlates to “somewhat agree” and a value of 6 correlates to “agree” on a 7-point scale). Managers reported higher skill variety ($\bar{x} = 5.97$) than non-managers ($\bar{x} = 5.42$).
Table 21. Job characteristics: skill variety.
Skill variety was measured with 3 items applied to a 7-point Likert scale assessing the extent to which a participant strongly agrees (7) or strongly disagrees (1) with each statement. Mean values represent the average responses for each dimension. Means fall between 5.02 to 6.21, indicating a range of average responses from “somewhat agree” (5) to “agree” (6). To obtain an overall autonomy measure, the scores from all three measures were averaged. *For data clarity, these statements were inverted to indicate the presence of skill variety; the survey utilized negative versions of these statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Managers</th>
<th>Non-Managers</th>
<th>All Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| I have a chance to do a number of different tasks, using a wide variety of different skills and talents. | $\bar{x} = 6.07$  
$\sigma = 1.35$ | $\bar{x} = 5.78$  
$\sigma = 1.43$ | $\bar{x} = 5.92$  
$\sigma = 1.40$ |
| The job is not simple or repetitive.*                                | $\bar{x} = 6.21$  
$\sigma = 1.02$ | $\bar{x} = 5.45$  
$\sigma = 1.47$ | $\bar{x} = 5.80$  
$\sigma = 1.34$ |
| The demands of my job are not highly routine and predictable.*        | $\bar{x} = 5.64$  
$\sigma = 1.42$ | $\bar{x} = 5.02$  
$\sigma = 1.59$ | $\bar{x} = 5.30$  
$\sigma = 1.55$ |
| Overall Skill Variety Measure                                         | $\bar{x} = 5.97$  
$\sigma = 1.26$ | $\bar{x} = 5.42$  
$\sigma = 1.50$ | $\bar{x} = 5.67$  
$\sigma = 1.43$ |

Task significance was ranked only slightly lower than skill variety, indicating that museum professionals believe that their work significantly impacts others (Table 22). Most participants (63.45%) “agreed” or “strongly agreed” that they experience task significance in their roles, with a mean value of 5.64 (a value of 5 correlates to “somewhat agree” and a value of 6 correlates to “agree” on a 7-point scale). Again, managers experienced higher task significance ($\bar{x} = 5.89$) than non-managers ($\bar{x} = 5.42$).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Managers</th>
<th>Non-Managers</th>
<th>All Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What I do affects the well-being of other people in very important ways.</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 5.67$ $\sigma = 1.40$</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 4.85$ $\sigma = 1.42$</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 5.23$ $\sigma = 1.47$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What I do is of significant consequence to others.*</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 5.95$ $\sigma = 1.37$</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 5.74$ $\sigma = 1.31$</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 5.84$ $\sigma = 1.34$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My job is very important to the museum’s survival.*</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 6.05$ $\sigma = 1.54$</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 5.68$ $\sigma = 1.67$</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 5.85$ $\sigma = 1.62$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Task Significance Measure</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 5.89$ $\sigma = 1.44$</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 5.42$ $\sigma = 1.47$</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 5.64$ $\sigma = 1.48$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 22. Job characteristics: task significance.

Task significance was measured with 3 items applied to a 7-point Likert scale assessing the extent to which a participant strongly agrees (7) or strongly disagrees (1) with each statement. Mean values represent the average responses for each dimension. Means fall between 4.85 to 6.05, indicating a range of average responses from “neither agree nor disagree” (4) to “agree” (6). To obtain an overall task significance measure, the scores from all three measures were averaged. *For data clarity, these statements were inverted to indicate the presence of skill variety; the survey utilized negative versions of these statements.

Task identity was among the lowest of core job characteristics experienced by museum professionals, followed by feedback. Half of all participants (50.08%) indicated that they “agree” or “strongly agree” that they are able to complete a distinct item of work with a visible outcome, with a mean value of 5.09 (a value of 5 correlates to “somewhat agree” on a 7-point Likert scale) (Table 23). The difference between managers and non-managers was quite significant in this dimension. Managers indicated that they “somewhat agree” with having task identity in their roles ($\bar{X} = 5.09$), while non-managers “neither agree nor disagree” ($\bar{X} = 4.33$).
Table 23. Job characteristics: task identity.
Task identity was measured with 3 items applied to a 7-point Likert scale assessing the extent to which a participant strongly agrees (7) or strongly disagrees (1) with each statement. Mean values represent the average responses for each dimension. Means fall between 4.00 to 5.89, indicating a range of average responses from “neither agree nor disagree” (4) to “agree” (6). To obtain an overall task identity measure, the scores from all three measures were averaged. *For data clarity, these statements were inverted to indicate the presence of skill variety; the survey utilized negative versions of these statements.

Feedback was the lowest endorsed job characteristic among museum professionals (Table 24). Less than a quarter of participants (23.8%) “agreed” or “strongly agreed” that they experience feedback in their roles, while 21.62% of participants “disagreed” or “strongly disagreed” that they experience feedback in their roles. The mean value was 4.21, indicating that the average museum professional “neither agreed nor disagreed” that they experience feedback at work. Although managers indicated receiving slightly more feedback ($\bar{x} = 4.35$; a value of 4 correlates to “neither agree nor disagree” on a 7-point scale) than non-managers ($\bar{x} = 4.09$), this difference was not as great as those for other job characteristics.
Table 24. Job characteristics: feedback.
Feedback was measured with 3 items applied to a 7-point Likert scale assessing the extent to which a participant strongly agrees (7) or strongly disagrees (1) with each statement. Mean values represent the average responses for each dimension. Means fall between 3.31 to 4.49, indicating a range of average responses from “somewhat disagree” (3) to “somewhat agree” (5). To obtain an overall feedback measure, the scores from all three measures were averaged. *For data clarity, these statements were inverted to indicate the presence of skill variety; the survey utilized negative versions of these statements.
Motivating Potential Score

The Motivating Potential Score (MPS) is calculated using results from the JDS in the following formula:

\[
\text{The Motivating Potential Score} = (\text{Skill Variety} + \text{Task Identity} + \text{Task Significance}/3) \times \text{Autonomy} \times \text{Feedback}
\]

Table 25. Motivating Potential Score formula.

The MPS can range from 1 to 343. The original Job Diagnostic Survey (1975) included sample scores based on eight Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.
job categories (Hackman and Oldham 1975, Appendix F). Scores ranged from 115 in maintenance/services roles (e.g., bus drivers, custodians, and construction workers) to 167 among professionals (e.g., individuals with specialized and theoretical knowledge, such as doctors, psychologists, and accountants) (Hackman and Oldham 1975, Appendix F). The average MPS originally published with the JDS was 125 (Hackman and Oldham 1975, Appendix F).

The MPS for museum professionals was calculated using the means of each core job dimension, identified from the JDS results, which averaged 119.14 (Figure 16). This number represents the potential for museum jobs to elicit positive, internal motivation among museum professionals. The MPS shows that management positions offer a greater potential for internal motivation (MPS = 136) than non-management positions (MPS = 101).
Motivating potential scores (MPS) for all survey responses, museum managers, and museum non-managers were calculated from the Museum Professionals’ Experiences Survey data. The remaining scores were pulled from Hackman and Oldham’s sample data for the Job Diagnostic Survey (Hackman and Oldham 1975).

Qualitative Responses

Hackman and Oldham’s job characteristics model was also assessed using two open-ended questions to gather qualitative responses (Figure 17). The first question asked participants to share which job characteristics provide them with the most satisfaction. Responses were coded to align with the job dimensions discussed by Hackman and Oldham (autonomy, feedback, skill variety, task identity, task significance; plus, one additional dimension: dealing with others). Of the 213 participants who responded to the prompt, 8 responses were excluded because they did not align with the five core job characteristics or because they were not specific.
enough on which to base a reasonable judgment. Responses that did not align with the core job characteristics were related to items like salary and benefits.

Figure 17. Qualitative responses indicating satisfaction and excitement caused by job dimensions.

There was notable overlap across the five job characteristics, but participants indicated that they found satisfaction in activities that align with task significance (31.75%; n = 67), such as making positive changes to the museum, amplifying voices of underrepresented communities, or working with important collections items. Following that, museum professionals were almost equally satisfied by the skill variety (25.59%; n = 54) and task identity of their work (24.64%; n = 52). Examples of skill variety included working in multiple areas of museum operations or enjoying the dynamic scope of job duties. Examples of task identity included seeing
through all stages of exhibition development or successful completion of education programs. Less than one-quarter of participants (21.33%; n = 45) indicated that they felt satisfied by the autonomy and flexibility provided by their roles. A small group of participants (11.37%; n = 24) indicated that they felt satisfied with the level of feedback on their work.

The second open-ended question prompted participants to “think back to the last time you truly felt excited at work” and share the cause of that excitement. Responses to this prompt were also coded to align with the job dimensions discussed by Hackman and Oldham. 211 responses were collected but 19 responses were excluded because they did not provide a specific cause for excitement in their roles. When considering what caused excitement at work, most respondents (n = 81; 38.39%) indicated task identity (i.e., feeling ownership over the completion of a project or achievement), followed by task significance (i.e., experienced meaningfulness of their work) (n = 51; 24.17%), and finally, feedback on their work (n = 26; 12.32%). Skill variety (n = 15; 7.11%) and autonomy (n = 5; 2.37%) were not mentioned frequently.

Responses to these questions indicated a potential issue with the application of the revised JDS in museum settings. The revised JDS and the MPS do not include “dealing with others” among the measured job dimensions. “Dealing with others” is labeled as an additional dimension that helps conceptualize “jobs and employee reactions to them,” which is apt to be highly responsible for museum professionals’ job satisfaction and excitement (Hackman and Oldham 1975, 9).
In the first open-ended question, nearly half of respondents (45.02%; n = 95) indicated that museum professionals experience satisfaction in dealing with others, through staff collaborations, visitor interactions, working with artists and scientists, and serving the community. Of those 95 responses, 27.37% (n = 26; 12.21% of all responses) reported that dealing with others is the primary source of satisfaction in their role and did not mention any other job characteristics. In the second open-ended question, 23.22% of responses (n = 49) indicated that dealing with others was the most recent source of excitement for them at work. Of the 49 responses, 53.06% (n = 26) indicated that dealing with others was the sole source of recent excitement at work.

Outside of the job dimensions established by Hackman and Oldham, there were a few interesting patterns. The specific subject matter or area of collections is often a source of satisfaction and excitement for museum professionals. A small group of participants (12.68%; n = 27) indicated that working with the museum’s subject or area of collections was a source of satisfaction, while 9.95% (n = 21) indicated that those same items were a recent cause of excitement. Involvement in community impact was also a valuable source of satisfaction (10.33%; n = 22) and excitement (9.00%; n = 19). Only 6 (2.84%) participants indicated that they were unsure of or did not find excitement in their work.

**Correlations Across Measures**

The correlation coefficients between the measures of “Employee Perspectives” were calculated to identify the relationships between each construct. Table 26 displays a correlation matrix that depicts correlations between all possible
pairs of measures. Most measures were averaged into one overall score, except for the Work Extrinsic and Intrinsic Motivation Scale. Because this scale measures distinctly different drivers of motivation, along with the lack of motivation, it was included as separate measures (amotivation, extrinsic motivation, and intrinsic motivation.)

Table 26. Correlation matrix of employee perspectives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Managerial Relationship</th>
<th>Amotivation</th>
<th>Extrinsic Motivation</th>
<th>Intrinsic Motivation</th>
<th>Goal-Setting</th>
<th>Overall Justice Measure</th>
<th>Overall Job Characteristics</th>
<th>Job Satisfaction</th>
<th>Turnover Intentions</th>
<th>Overall Person-Job Fit</th>
<th>Organizational Commitment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Managerial Relationship</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>-0.65</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amotivation</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>-0.65</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extrinsic Motivation</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>-0.65</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic Motivation</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>-0.65</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal-Setting</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>-0.65</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Justice Measure</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>-0.65</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Job Characteristics</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>-0.65</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>-0.65</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnover Intentions</td>
<td>-0.65</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>-0.65</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Person-Job Fit</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>-0.65</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Commitment</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The correlation matrix illustrates a few interesting findings from the MPES. First, the justice measures correlated most strongly with positive work outcomes, ranging from $r = 0.63$ with organizational commitment to $r = 0.78$ with job satisfaction. The outputs of job satisfaction, perceived person-job fit, and organizational commitment were also strongly intercorrelated, with correlation coefficients between $r = 0.73 - 0.74$. Second, turnover intentions negatively correlated with all measures except for amotivation. Amotivation also negatively correlated with all other measures. Most measures’ correlations ranged from $r = 0.30 - 0.49$, except for measures derived from the WEIMS. The correlation matrix shows
that there is not a significant correlation between intrinsic and extrinsic motivation and the remaining measures, except for correlations with person-job fit and organization commitment ($r = 0.30 - 0.32$). The understanding of correlations across measures helps conceptualize the interactions of these measures in the context of the organizing framework. The overarching significance of these results will be interpreted in the final chapter.
CHAPTER 5 DISCUSSION

Museum professionals make up a valuable section of the U.S. workforce, with over 372,000 people employed to contribute to a significant cultural impact while serving each museum’s mission. While professionalization of the field has grown through the emergence of professional organizations and a distinct field of study, little empirical research has been conducted to understand what museum professionals experience at work. Through an application of the organizing framework and organizational behavior theories and concepts, this article has investigated the following research questions:

● What range of perspectives do museum managers hold about motivation among museum professionals?
● What are the key drivers of motivation among museum professionals?
● What can applications of organizational behavior theories and concepts reveal about professional experiences in museums?
● How do experiences differ between museum professionals in management and non-management positions?

With responses from 276 museum professionals in the United States, the Museum Professionals’ Experiences Survey (MPES) was a reliable tool used to conceptualize the interaction of individual inputs, processes, and outcomes in the museum industry. The data provided through this study can help managers shape their practice in a manner that supports the wellbeing of their employees, and thus the museum overall.
Key Findings

The MPES identified significant patterns in the experiences of museum professionals. The most significant finding is that, on average, museum jobs are not well-designed to support motivation among museum professionals. Museum professionals are primarily driven by intrinsic motivation, but job design does not align with their personal values. Across all measures, there was only a moderate prevalence of the key drivers behind each motivational theory. There are also significant differences in the perceptions and experiences of managers and non-managers. Overall, while museum professionals are not dissatisfied with their work, they are not satisfied either. Among non-managers, these findings are experienced to a stronger degree. The outlined key findings provide a foundation for practical recommendations that managers could employ to enhance intrinsic motivation and elicit more positive work-related outcomes.

Managerial Attitudes and Behaviors

Museum managers understand that motivation is a powerful tool that can be used to drive success at work, but do not invest much time in thinking about their employees' motivation despite knowing that they play a role in the process. Managers indicated that they see a higher potential for intrinsically motivating factors to drive museum professionals. However, in practice, managers employ more extrinsic methods within their own teams. Managers should evaluate their motivational tools to ensure their methods are consistent with the strongest motivational drivers among museum professionals.
In particular, managers could focus on strengthening goal setting processes among their teams. Managers believed that they are involved in goal setting processes, but employees perceived that their managers are not. Similarly, managers believed that the resources needed to achieve employee goals are available, but employees disagreed. Many employees also indicated a lack of recognition for goal achievement, often expressing that although they feel positively about achieving a goal, those feelings are overshadowed by the lack of recognition from leadership. This is a clear area where managers could adjust a situation factor (lack of recognition systems and availability of resources) to influence a process (motivation driven by goal achievement) and impact an outcome (leading to higher employee performance and satisfaction).

Museum managers hold an optimistic view of their employees and of their own practices. Managers believed that museum professionals are industrious, trustworthy, and possess the capacity for valuable contributions to their museums. While managers indicated that they see value in their employees, that is not felt by museum professionals, who indicated widespread feelings of being undervalued by their organization. Managers also viewed their employee relationships as a partnership, implying that they work in tandem towards positive outcomes for the museum. However, this is a more positive view than what responses indicated about employees’ experiences. Employees are less likely to view the relationship as a mentorship or partnership and indicated a higher experience of authoritarian relationships.
These disparities suggest that managers should critically assess their behaviors to determine if they are in alignment with their beliefs and felt by their teams. The disconnect evidenced by the inconsistency across response groups is a probable contributing factor to negative work attitudes, such as low job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Managers have the power to manipulate situation factors that are contributing to these feelings and should focus on aligning their actions with their beliefs. Focusing on behaviors that demonstrate the value and trust that managers expressed will result in better experiences, generating stronger employee satisfaction and organizational commitment.

Key Drivers of Motivation

The MPES found that museum professionals are strongly driven by self-determined motivators, primarily through intrinsic motivation. There was also a high degree of internalizing extrinsic motivators, indicating that museum professionals are able to integrate the demands of their job and needs of their organization with their own personal values and sense of identity. While there is little presence of amotivation, there is evidence that the potential for amotivation is stronger in non-managers. According to self-determination theory, individuals are more likely to be "amotivated when they lack either a sense of efficacy or a sense of control" at work (Deci and Ryan 2000, 237). This understanding is valuable, because it suggests that managers could address amotivation by building self-efficacy and providing autonomy among their teams.

Motivation among museum professionals is guided by the values of achievement and self-direction. These values directly reflect intrinsic motivation and
suggest that goal setting is a powerful tool to enhance motivation. Most participants indicated that they experienced positive feelings when they achieved a goal, demonstrating that achievement is linked to intrinsic motivation. Museum managers should implement and be involved in goal setting; however they should allow employees to lead the process to establish self-directed goals. Leveraging goal setting will not only drive high performance but could lead to a higher experience of the core job characteristics identified by Hackman and Oldham.

The revised JDS showed that there were moderate experiences of the core job characteristics, with feedback and task identity scoring the lowest. Goal setting could be used to address this issue and thus enhance employee satisfaction and performance through the job characteristics model. Setting and completing identifiable goals will raise awareness of task identity, because employees will be able to see through the completion of a distinct project. Implementing recognition systems will create feedback mechanisms, confirming that museum professionals have performed effectively and successfully. Furthermore, museum professionals indicated that they are excited when they experience task identity at work. Supporting these characteristics in job design will translate that satisfaction and excitement towards their work.

**Trends in Museum Professionals’ Experiences**

Motivation is both informed by and informs important workplace attitudes, including job satisfaction, turnover intentions, perceived person-job fit, and organizational commitment. Understanding these attitudes is necessary to understand what role motivation plays in the larger experience of work. Museum
professionals hold a wide range of attitudes about their work, including both negative and positive feelings.

Museum professionals are only moderately satisfied in their roles, indicating that work conditions could be improved to generate more satisfaction. Some participants expressed that their jobs do not elicit any satisfaction or enjoyment. While those percentages are small, those statements are not insignificant. These responses indicate that there are severe levels of amotivation and dissatisfaction among museum professionals. Across the three dimensions of person-job fit, the needs-supplies fit is scored lowest, indicating that museum professionals are not fulfilled by the characteristics of their roles. Organizational commitment is also only moderately positive, indicating that there is not a strong sense of attachment to the museums at which they work.

Overall, turnover intentions are low, but responses are so varied that there is a clear risk of turnover in the industry. Turnover is a costly event in museums, so managers should pay close attention to these attitudes in their own teams. This attitude is negatively correlated with the other measured attitudes, indicating that when turnover intentions are high, job satisfaction, perceived person-job fit, and organizational commitment are low. Employees who do not feel positively about their work or organization are at-risk of leaving their jobs.

Justice theory provided possible explanations for the indifferent attitudes. Justice theory measures indicated that there is not a strong sense of fairness in museum work, particularly in distributive justice. Across all groups, responses indicated that museum professionals do not feel that their salary is appropriate for
the work that they do or reflects the contributions that they make to the museum. This is a widely known experience across the field, but the MPES provided empirical confirmation. On average, museum professionals neither agreed nor disagreed that they experience the remaining three dimensions of organizational justice. The dimensions of organizational justice are correlated with positive work outcomes, so it is clear that this needs to be addressed in museum workplaces. Museum employees desire stronger experiences of distributive justice, procedural justice, informational justice, and interpersonal justice. This is a vital step that managers should take to develop a more supportive work environment.

Museum professionals indicated that they most strongly value achievement and self-direction, but these values are not being supported in their organizations. This is evidenced through a variety of measures in the MPES, such as the degree of authoritarian managerial styles, the lack of goal setting and acknowledgment of achievements, the low presence of autonomy in job characteristics, and the measure of person-organization fit. Museum professionals neither agreed nor disagreed that their organization’s values aligned with their personal values. By aligning roles to support these values, managers could increase the perception of person-job fit and thus encourage higher satisfaction and organizational commitment. The experiences of these workplace attitudes demonstrate how inputs in the organizing framework affect processes and are also conceptualized as desirable outcomes.

Differences Between Management and Non-Management Experiences

Overall, managers demonstrated consistently more positive workplace outcomes than non-managers. Across all measures, non-management responses
indicated that they experienced fewer of the motivating drivers and have more negative workplace attitudes. Non-managers are experiencing lower job satisfaction, perceived person-job fit, and organizational commitment, while exhibiting a stronger probability of turnover intentions. They also experience less organizational justice and fewer of the core job characteristics. In some areas, this difference is not significant, but in others, it should be considered a cause of concern. Non-managers have a lower MPS score, indicating that their jobs are not designed to enhance intrinsic motivation and elicit positive outcomes. The “Great Resignation” has had a significant impact on entry level and lower-paid positions in museums. The trends identified by the MPES describe potential reasons why museums are struggling to fill these positions.

The nature of management positions provides individuals in those roles with greater autonomy and more power in the overall museum structure. Non-managers indicated a much lower experience of autonomy and task identity in their roles, indicating that they are not able to make decisions regarding their work and are often unable to identify a complete project as their own. They are also at greater risk of experiencing amotivation, indicating a lack of self-efficacy and control over their work. Non-managers experience significant levels of intrinsic motivation, however, and so providing opportunities to self-direct work will lead to greater satisfaction. In general, non-managers feel less supported by their organizations, evidenced by the perceptions of managers being uninvolved in goal setting and the lack of resources to achieve their goals. They experience a higher prevalence of authoritarian relationships and are less likely to characterize managerial relationships as a
partnership or mentorship. If managers truly believe their role is a partnership with employees, they need to address this difference by exhibiting greater trust and allowing more self-direction among non-management personnel.

**Limitations of the Study**

This research is a survey of motivational theories applied to museum workplaces; it provides a broad overview of the subject without getting highly in-depth on a single theory. The museum field would benefit from continued research along this vein and further focus on the intricacies of each theory and the accompanying tools. The full Job Diagnostic Survey (JDS), for example, is a complex tool that managers could utilize to redesign roles for their dissatisfied staff. Similarly, many of these motivational theories were assessed on an abbreviated scale due to the overall complexity of the MPES. A more in-depth and further-reaching survey could provide additional valuable information on trends in museum professionals’ experiences.

Perhaps the most significant limitation of this study is that it does not specifically address how connecting to the mission and purpose of a museum may impact or drive the work of museum professionals. While "mission" came up organically in qualitative responses (30.86% of managers believed that mission-related work is a primary driver of employee motivation in a museum context) and could be linked to ideas presented by motivational theories and work outcomes (such as the job characteristics associated with experiencing meaningfulness and the perceived person-organization fit measures), it would be valuable to assess how
connecting to the purpose of a museum may or may not directly impact motivation among museum professionals. The high prevalence of integrated regulation and intrinsic motivation suggests that museum professionals are motivated by a self-directed drive to support the work of museums, but it would be important to evaluate this specifically so that managers could apply those findings to their practice.

With this critique in mind, it is possible that some of the measures cannot accurately describe experiences in museum work. The JDS is a clear example of potential shortcomings because it does not measure “dealing with others” as a core characteristic that elicits internal motivation and positive outcomes. However, this dimension contributes to job satisfaction experienced by museum professionals. Motivating potential scores among museum professionals were likely low because this dimension is not included in that calculation. Organizational behavior theories and concepts have demonstrated value in the museum field, but a more thorough application would require discussions of the role that mission and public service play in the experiences of museum professionals.

**Implications for Future Research**

This study has revealed that there is much to learn about the workplace dynamics in museums. Additionally, the dissatisfaction among museum professionals that should be further explored. These results could be analyzed through the lens of other factors, such as role in the museum, salary range, or years of experience. There are notable differences in the attitudes between those in and not in management positions. This identifies a significant area of research that should be pursued to reconcile these differences. The application of Theory X/Y
measures determined that museum managers hold an optimistic view of employees, but whether employees are experiencing the behaviors associated with those assumptions should be further explored. Responses indicated a disconnect between managerial perspectives and employee experiences, suggesting that managers should critically assess their own practices to determine if their actions are in alignment with their beliefs.

In the wake of the COVID-19 pandemic, museums are at a turning-point and experiencing a reckoning for how staff, particularly non-leadership positions, are valued. Further research into how and why museum professionals experience work in this field could reconcile the disparities identified and create more nurturing work environments. It is time for museum leadership to invest in the wellbeing of their staff and address the controversies and toxicity that is prevalent in museums.

**Conclusion and Recommendations**

This study does not address a particular problem in museums. Rather it demonstrates the cyclical nature of the organizing framework and the value of understanding the interaction of inputs, processes, and outcomes in a museum environment. Managers have a responsibility to support the growth, success, and satisfaction of their employees. Managers also have the unique ability to manipulate situation factors to elicit better outcomes, while it is unlikely that museum professionals will change the person factors that influence their behaviors. While supporting employees should be enough, the reality is that museum operations are creeping closer to being driven by a bottom line like a business. Managers should be
advocating for their employees simply out of a desire to empower them, but that is often not enough. That is why it is crucial to demonstrate the organizational value of supporting positive individual-level outcomes. The following recommendations represent how motivational processes can be the catalyst that inspires more positive experiences among museum professionals.

1. Managers should employ initiatives that support intrinsic motivation by increasing autonomy and self-driven projects among employees. However, there is still value in extrinsic motivators. Employees should be awarded and recognized for their achievements, and the value of their work should be reflected in their financial compensation. Museum professionals are highly motivated by intrinsic drivers but still desire to feel valued by their organization.

2. Managers should establish formal goal-setting processes, outside of annual performance evaluations. Encourage employees to set specific, difficult, but achievable goals and provide the resources necessary for achievement. Museum professionals value self-direction and achievement, so allowing employees to lead the goal setting process will close the gap between perceived person-job fit. Celebrate the achievement of goals (more frequently than once per year) because it feels good to do so!

3. Managers should advocate for employee raises and emphasize the importance of their teams’ contributions to museum leadership. Museum professionals feel that their work is not appropriately valued by their organization. Perceived organizational justice correlates to positive work outcomes, but scores across all dimensions in museum professionals were relatively low indicating the presence
of an unfair environment. All employees should be compensated fairly, treated as equals, have input in decisions that impact them, and be a part of an environment where open and honest communication is expected. Establishing an environment that is fair to all employees will lead to increased job satisfaction, perceived person-job fit, organizational commitment, and motivation through organizational justice.

4. Managers should redesign jobs to increase experiences of autonomy, feedback, skill variety, task identity, and task significance. These characteristics speak directly to the values of self-direction and achievement, but will also create the three psychological states that support more positive work outcomes. Museum workers are satisfied and excited by dealing with others, task identity, and task significance. Increasing autonomy in roles is also a tactic that managers can use to demonstrate their trust in employees. The inclusion of these dimensions in daily work will translate to satisfaction and excitement for their roles.

5. Managers should focus particularly on supporting the growth of non-management employees. These roles often carry out the day-to-day success of a museum but are experiencing more negative workplace outcomes than their colleagues in management positions. Non-managers are experiencing lower job satisfaction, perceived person-job fit, and organizational commitment, while exhibiting higher turnover intentions. Investing in non-management employees will create an environment that elicits more positive outcomes and supports the career development of these individuals.
APPENDICES

APPENDIX A - THE MUSEUM PROFESSIONALS’ EXPERIENCE SURVEY

Section I: Informed Consent

You are being asked to participate in a research project that is being completed by Dr. Lisa Marchiondo, Assistant Dean and Associate Professor from the University of New Mexico Anderson School of Management, and Devin Geraci, a Master’s student from the University of New Mexico Museum Studies Program. The purpose of this study is to gather data regarding employment experiences in museums to support the Master's Thesis being completed by Devin Geraci. You are invited to participate because of your eligibility as an individual who is 18+ years old and has been employed by a museum in the past three years.

Participation involves answering a series of questions regarding your background working in museums, workplace attitudes and values, and your experience as a manager, if applicable. Question types are primarily rating scales, but do include some multiple choice, check all that apply, ranking, short answer and long answer questions. Examples of questions include: “Have you been employed by a museum in the past three years?” “Please describe how achieving goals is
acknowledged/rewarded in your workplace” and rating agreement with statements such as “I am able to express my views and feelings at work.” This survey should take approximately 20 - 25 minutes to complete.

Your involvement in this research is voluntary, and you may choose not to participate. You may refuse to answer any of the questions or exit the survey at any time. There are no names or identifying information associated with your responses. Questions regarding museum workplaces will be analyzed in aggregate, eliminating the chance of identifying specific museums. There are no known risks in this research, but some individuals may experience discomfort or loss of privacy when answering questions about their workplace experiences. Data will be stored electronically in a password protected folder that is only accessible by the research team. No personal identifiable information will be collected. The data collected will not be used for any future research projects.

The findings from this project will provide information on the attitudes and experiences of museum professionals, along with perspectives from those in management positions. If published, results will be presented in summary form only and will not provide any identifying information, such as names of museums.

If you have any questions, concerns, or complaints about the research, please contact Devin Geraci at dgeraci@unm.edu. If you have questions regarding your rights as a research participant, or about what you should do in case of any harm to you, or if you want to obtain information or offer input, please contact the UNM Office of the IRB (OIRB) at (505) 277-2644 or irb.unm.edu.
By clicking “Yes” and completing this survey you will be agreeing to participate in the above described research.

- Yes

- No (Disqualifying answer. If selected, participants will advance to the end of the survey.)

Section II: Employment History

- Have you been employed by a museum in the past three years? Please select the option that best describes your employment status.
  
  ○ Current full-time employee
  
  ○ Current part-time employee
  
  ○ Current student employee or paid intern
  
  ○ Retired museum professional
  
  ○ Previously employed but left a museum job in the past three years
  
  ○ Previously employed but left a museum job more than three years ago (Disqualifying answer. If selected, participants will advance to the end of the survey.)
  
  ○ I have only held unpaid positions, such as volunteer or intern (Disqualifying answer. If selected, participants will advance to the end of the survey.)
○ I have only worked as an independent contractor in museums (Disqualifying answer. If selected, participants will advance to the end of the survey.)

○ I have never been employed by a museum (Disqualifying answer. If selected, participants will advance to the end of the survey.)

● Your age:

○ 18 - 24

○ 25 - 34

○ 35 - 44

○ 45 - 54

○ 55 - 64

○ 65+

● How long have you worked in museums?

▼ Less than 1 year (1) ... 21+ years (22)

● Do you identify as an emerging museum professional?

○ Yes

○ Unsure

○ No

● What area(s) most closely fits your role in a museum? Select all that apply.

○ Administrative
● Collections

● Curatorial

● Development

● Director

● Education

● Evaluation

● Event Planning

● Exhibition Design

● Finance

● Human Resources

● Maintenance

● Marketing/Public Relations

● Preparator

● Security

● Visitor Services

● What is the highest degree you hold?

○ Less than high school

○ High school graduate
○ Some college

○ 2 year degree

○ 4 year degree

○ Professional degree

○ Master's degree

○ Doctorate

● Are you an hourly or salaried employee?

○ Hourly

¶ Display This Question:

If “Are you an hourly or salaried employee?” = Hourly

● What is your hourly rate?

● What is your average number of hours worked per week?

○ Salaried

¶ Display This Question:

If “Are you an hourly or salaried employee?” = Salaried

● What is your annual salary?

○ Less than $10,000

○ $10,000 - $19,999
- $20,000 - $29,999
- $30,000 - $39,999
- $40,000 - $49,999
- $50,000 - $59,999
- $60,000 - $69,999
- $70,000 - $79,999
- $80,000 - $89,999
- $90,000 - $99,999
- $100,000 - $149,999
- More than $150,000

- City of museum:
- Type of museum (select all that apply):
  - Anthropology Museum
  - Art Museum
  - Children’s Museum
  - Cultural Museum
  - Historic House Museum
  - History Museum
- Living History Museum
- Maritime Museum
- Military Museum
- Natural History Museum
- Science Museum
- Special Focus Museum
- Other

- Governance type:
  - Private nonprofit: 501(c)(3) or operating as private trust
  - Municipal or county
  - State
  - Federal
  - Tribal
  - College or university
  - For-profit
  - Dual governance
  - Other

- Number of employees at museum:
- Number of employees within your department:
  - 1 - 4
  - 5 - 9
  - 10 - 19
  - 20 - 49
  - 50 - 100
  - 101 - 200
  - 201 - 500
  - 501+
  - There are no distinct departments

- Do you manage other paid employees at work?
  - Yes
Section III: Managerial Perspectives

This section is only displayed if participants selected “yes” to the preceding question, indicating that they hold a management position at work. Participants who selected “no” skipped this section and proceeded directly to Section IV: Employee Perspectives.

- How many employees do you manage?
  - 0
  - 1 - 4
  - 5 - 9
  - 10 - 14
  - 15 - 20
  - 21+

- Please select all levels of employment that you manage:
  - Full-time employees
  - Part-time employees
  - Student employees or paid interns
Unpaid interns

Volunteers

Contract employees

- Please rate the following statements regarding your relationship with your employees from "strongly disagree" (1) to "strongly agree" (7).

If you have left the museum field in the last three years, please reflect on the last museum you worked at.

- My relationship with my employees is a partnership.
- My relationship with my employees is a mentorship.
- My relationship with my employees is authoritarian.
- My relationship with my employees is hands-off.
- I trust my employees to complete their work independently.

- On a weekly basis, how often do you think about motivating your employees?

- Never
- Rarely
- Occasionally
- About half the time
- Most of the time
- Almost all of the time
- Nearly always

- Please rate the following statements regarding *goal-setting with your employees* from "strongly disagree" (1) to "strongly agree" (7).

  - I am very involved with setting goals for my employees.
  - My employees have the resources needed to achieve their goals.
  - It is acknowledged when an employee meets their goals.
  - My employees are rewarded when they meet their goals.
  - My employees set goals that are impossible to achieve.
  - My employees set goals that are specific and measurable.
  - My employees set goals that are easy to achieve.
  - I check on my employees’ progress towards achieving goals.

- Please describe how achieving goals is acknowledged and/or rewarded:

- When you think of “employee motivation,” what actions, initiatives, or tactics come to mind? Please provide specific examples from your experience.

- Please rate the following statements from "strongly disagree" (1) to "strongly agree" (7).
  - Low motivation within a team can have a negative impact on the overall museum.
○ Managers do not play a role in individual employee motivation in museums.

○ High motivation within a team can lead to better performance.

○ Most museum employees will try to do as little work as possible.

○ Most museum employees are industrious.

○ Most museum employees are lazy and don’t want to work.

○ Museum employees possess imagination and creativity.

○ Most museum employees will slack off if left alone by management.

○ Most museum employees are capable of providing ideas that are helpful to their museum.

○ Museum employees’ ideas are generally not useful to their museum.

○ Most museum employees lack the ability to help their museum.

○ Most museum employees are trustworthy.

● Please rate the following statements describing reasons why people may choose to work in the museum field from "strongly disagree" (1) to "strongly agree" (7).

   People may choose to work in the museum field because…

○ Because this is the type of work chosen to attain a certain lifestyle.

○ Because they derive much pleasure from learning new things.

○ Because they want to succeed at this job.
Because they chose this type of work to attain their career goals.

Because this type of work provides them with security.

I don’t know; too much is expected of us.

For the satisfaction they experience from taking on interesting challenges.

Because it allows them to earn money.

Because it is part of the way in which they have chosen to live their life.

I don’t know why; we are provided with unrealistic working conditions.

Because they want to be a “winner” in life.

Because this job is part of their life.

Please rank the following factors from most likely to motivate museum employees to least likely to motivate museum employees. Drag and drop items to correspond with most likely (1) to least likely (4).

A raise

Successful completion of a project

Public acclaim

Solving a challenging issue

Please rank the following factors from most likely to motivate museum employees to least likely to motivate museum employees. Drag and drop items to correspond with most likely (1) to least likely (4).
○ Pay

○ Creativity

○ Passion

○ Power

● Please rank the following factors from most likely to motivate museum employees to least likely to motivate museum employees. Drag and drop items to correspond with most likely (1) to least likely (4).

○ Employee benefits

○ Feeling competent in their role

○ Independence in their role

○ A bonus

● Please rank the following factors from most likely to motivate museum employees to least likely to motivate museum employees. Drag and drop items to correspond with most likely (1) to least likely (4).

○ Positive contributions to the community

○ Achievement of a goal

○ Increases to paid time off accrual

○ Merit-based raises
Section IV: Employee Perspectives

● Please rate the following statements regarding your relationship with the individual(s) you report to from "strongly disagree" (1) to "strongly agree" (7).

   If you have left the museum field in the last three years, please reflect on the last museum you worked at.

   **Thinking about the person that I report to...**

   ○ The relationship is a partnership.

   ○ The relationship is a mentorship.

   ○ The relationship is authoritative.

   ○ The relationship is hands off.

● What characteristics of your job give you the most satisfaction?

● Think back to the last time you felt truly excited about your work—what was the cause of that excitement?

● Please rate the following statements regarding your workplace from "strongly disagree" (1) to "strongly agree" (7).

   If you have left the museum field in the last three years, please reflect on the last museum you worked at.

   **Thinking about my workplace...**

   ○ In general, I like working here.

   ○ I often think about quitting this job.
- My organization really cares about my well-being.

- I will probably look for a different job during the next year.

- In general, I don’t like my job.

- My organization strongly considers my goals and values.

- All in all, I am satisfied with my job.

- Please rate the following statements regarding setting goals at work from "strongly disagree" (1) to "strongly agree" (7).

  If you have left the museum field in the last three years, please reflect on the last museum you worked at.

  - I set personal goals at work.

  - My manager is very involved in my goal setting.

  - I have the resources needed to achieve my goals.

  - It is acknowledged when I meet my goals.

  - I am rewarded when I meet my goals.

  - I set goals that are impossible to achieve.

  - I set goals that are specific and measurable.

  - My manager regularly checks on my progress towards achieving goals.

  - My manager does not support my goals.

- How do you feel when you achieve a goal at work?
● How does your manager recognize your achievement of goals?

● Please rate the following statements describing possible reasons why you chose to work in the museum field from “strongly disagree” (1) to “strongly agree” (7).

I chose to work in the museum field because...

○ Because this is the type of work I chose to do to attain a certain lifestyle.

○ For the income it provides me.

○ I ask myself this question; I have a hard time managing tasks related to this type of work.

○ Because I derive much pleasure from learning new things.

○ Because it has become a fundamental part of who I am.

○ Because I want to succeed at this job, if not I would be very ashamed of myself.

○ Because I chose this type of work to attain my career goals.

○ For the satisfaction I experience from taking on interesting challenges.

○ Because it allows me to earn money.

○ Because it is part of the way in which I have chosen to live my life.

○ Because I want to be very good at this work, otherwise I would be very disappointed.

○ I don’t know why; we are provided with unrealistic working conditions.
Because I want to be a “winner” in life.

Because it is the type of work I have chosen to attain certain important objectives.

For the satisfaction I experience when I am successful at doing difficult tasks.

Because this type of work provides me with security.

I don’t know; too much is expected of us.

Because this job is part of my life.

Please rate the following statements regarding your workplace from “strongly disagree” (1) to "strongly agree" (7).

If you have left the museum field in the last three years, please reflect on the last museum you worked at.

Thinking about my workplace…

I am able to express my views and feelings at work.

My salary reflects the effort that I put into my work.

Museum leadership treats me in a polite manner.

My manager is truthful and straightforward when communicating with me.

I have influence over my role at work.

My salary is appropriate for the amount of work I do.

Museum leadership treats me with dignity.
○ My manager explains their expectations thoroughly.

○ Work policies are applied consistently.

○ My salary reflects my contribution to the museum.

○ Museum leadership treats me with respect.

○ My manager’s explanations regarding work procedures and policies are reasonable.

● Please rate the following statements regarding your workplace from “strongly disagree” (1) to "strongly agree” (7).

If you have left the museum field in the last three years, please reflect on the last museum you worked at.

Thinking about my workplace...

○ I have almost complete responsibility for deciding how and when the work is to be done.

○ I have a chance to do a number of different tasks, using a wide variety of different skills and talents.

○ What I do affects the well-being of other people in very important ways.

○ My manager provides me with constant feedback about how I am doing.

○ I make insignificant contributions to the museum.

○ I have very little freedom in deciding how the work is to be done.
○ Just doing the work provides me with opportunities to figure out how well I am doing.

○ The job is quite simple and repetitive.

○ My supervisors or coworkers rarely give me feedback on how well I am doing the job.

○ What I do is of little consequence to anyone else.

○ I am not able to complete my projects at work.

○ My job does not allow me an opportunity to use discretion or participate in decision making.

○ The demands of my job are highly routine and predictable.

○ My job is not very important to the museum’s survival.

○ My job provides me with the chance to finish completely any work I start.

● Please rank the following factors from most important to you to least important to you. Drag and drop items to correspond with most important (1) to least important (5).

  ○ Social power, authority, wealth.

  ○ Success, capability, ambition.

  ○ Gratification of desires, enjoyment in life, self-indulgence.

  ○ Daring, a varied and challenging life, an exciting life.
○ Creativity, freedom, curiosity.

● Please rank the following factors from most important to you to least important to you. Drag and drop items to correspond with most important (1) to least important (5).

○ Wisdom, beauty of nature and art, social justice.

○ Helpfulness, honesty, forgiveness.

○ Respect for tradition, humbleness, devotion.

○ Obedience, self-discipline, politeness.

○ Family security, social order, reciprocation of favors.

● Of the ten values listed below, please select the two that are most important to you and the two that are least important to you.

○ Power

○ Achievement

○ Hedonism

○ Stimulation

○ Self-direction

○ Universalism

○ Benevolence

○ Tradition
Conformity

Security

• Please rate the following statements regarding your workplace from “strongly disagree” (1) to "strongly agree" (7).

If you have left the museum field in the last three years, please reflect on the last museum you worked at.

Thinking about my workplace...

○ The things that I value in life are very similar to the things that my museum values.

○ My personal values match my museum's values and culture.

○ My museum's values and culture provide a good fit with the things that I value in life.

○ There is a good fit between what my job offers me and what I am looking for in a job.

○ The attributes that I look for in a job are fulfilled very well by my present job.

○ The job that I currently hold gives me just about everything that I want from a job.

○ The match is very good between the demands of my job and my personal skills.

○ My abilities and training are a good fit with the requirements of my job.
○ My personal abilities and education provide a good match with the demands that my job places on me.

● Please rate the following statements regarding your workplace from "strongly disagree" (1) to "strongly agree" (7).

   If you have left the museum field in the last three years, please reflect on the last museum you worked at.

   Thinking about my workplace...

   ○ I feel a strong sense of commitment to my museum.

   ○ I feel personally attached to my museum.

   ○ I am proud to tell others I work at my museum.

   ○ I feel excited to be at work each day.

   ○ I want to do my job each day.
APPENDIX B - QUALITATIVE RESPONSE CODING

The MPES contained six open-ended questions to offer the opportunity for participants to provide detailed and specific responses about their professional experiences. To preserve anonymity of participants, responses will not be shared but the following coding guide outlines how each qualitative response was analyzed. General examples are included for each code. In each question, codes often overlapped so percentages out of total responses will not equal 100%.

Qualitative Question 1.1 - Managerial Perspectives
Prompt: *Please describe how achieving goals is acknowledged and/or rewarded.*

Responses (n = 89) were coded in three categories: actions, avenue of public acknowledgement, and frequency.

- **Actions:** Specific actions to acknowledge goal achievement were identified, creating a series of 12 codes.

- **Venue:** Responses that indicated a public acknowledgement of goal achievement were further coded to identify the most common ways of publicly acknowledging achievement. This resulted in 7 codes.

- **Frequency:** Responses that indicated a frequency for acknowledging goal achievements were coded further. This resulted in 9 codes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Frequency in Responses</th>
<th>% out of Total Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Verbal acknowledgement</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>66.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Frequency in Responses</td>
<td>% out of Total Responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Meetings</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>34.83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board Meetings</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appreciation Events</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Report</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blog Post</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newsletter</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Media</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annually</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Qualitative Question 1.2 - Managerial Perspectives

**Prompt:** *When you think of “employee motivation,” what actions, initiatives, or tactics come to mind? Please provide specific examples from your experience.*

Responses (n = 88) were coded as extrinsic motivators, intrinsic motivations, or both.

- **Extrinsic motivators:** responses indicated that motivation is primarily driven by an external force, such as the administration of rewards or consequences, public recognition, or expectations set by managers.
  - Examples included gifts, wage increases, verbal praise, or outlining clear expectations for work.

- **Intrinsic motivators:** responses indicated that motivation is primarily driven through internal feelings of alignment to personal values, enjoyment or interest in work, autonomy, personal achievements, or individual needs.
  - Examples included providing employees with opportunities to take on projects aligning with their interests, developing trust and respect...
between employee and manager, and providing opportunities that align with the individual career goals of an employee.

- Both: responses indicated that motivation is driven by both extrinsic and intrinsic motivators.
  - Examples included tangible rewards and pursuit of individual interests, and public recognition and increased autonomy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Frequency in Responses</th>
<th>% out of Total Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extrinsic Motivation</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>43.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic Motivation</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>31.82%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Qualitative Question 2.1 - Employee Perspectives**

**Prompt:** *What characteristics of your job gives you the most satisfaction?*

**Primary Codes**

Responses (n = 213) were coded to align with the five core job characteristics proposed by Hackman and Oldham (1975) and the additional dimension of “dealing with others”. Additional codes include “nothing” and “N/A” Codes were assigned based on the following definitions:

Core Job Dimensions:
• Autonomy: responses indicated satisfaction stemming from freedom, independence, and personal discretion relating to work activities.
  ○ Examples included ability to provide input in decisions, having control over deadlines, and being trusted to complete work independently.

• Feedback: responses indicated satisfaction stemming from witnessing evidence of performance effectiveness.
  ○ Examples included positive acknowledgement of successful work and ideas, seeing ideas shape an exhibition, and positive feedback from the public.

• Skill Variety: responses indicated satisfaction stemming from work that requires a variety of skills or talents.
  ○ Examples included creative problem solving, dynamic scope of job duties, and working on different projects.

• Task Identity: responses indicated satisfaction stemming from the completion of a project.
  ○ Examples included the ability to quantify results of work, experiencing the completion of an exhibition, and implementing new programs.

• Task Significance: responses indicated satisfaction stemming from impactful contributions on individuals, the organization, or the external community.
  ○ Examples included providing employment to others, witnessing the impact on visiting children and families, and serving the community.

Additional Dimension:
• Dealing with Others: responses indicated satisfaction stemming from working closely with others.
  ○ Examples included collaborating with colleagues, working around people who appreciate the creative sector, and engaging with life long learners.

Other:
• N/A: Responses were not specific enough to identify the source of satisfaction or did not align to the outlined codes.
• Nothing: Response indicated that the participant does not experience satisfaction at work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Frequency in Responses</th>
<th>% out of Total Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dealing With Others</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>45.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Significance</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>31.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skill Variety</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>25.59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Identity</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>24.64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>21.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>11.37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nothing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.47%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Secondary Codes

Secondary codes were assigned to identify further trends in responses. Codes were assigned based on the following definitions:

- **Community Impact**: responses indicated that satisfaction stemmed from contributing to community impact.
  - Examples included connecting Indigenous community members to the collection, creating programs that respond to community needs, and providing representation of underserved communities.

- **Mission**: responses indicated that satisfaction stemmed from serving the museum’s mission.
  - Examples specifically mentioned the museum’s mission.

- **Museum Subject/Collections Area**: responses indicated that satisfaction stemmed from working with materials relating to the museum’s subject or collections areas.
  - Examples included sharing something really cool from the collection, handling collections materials, and learning about the museum’s subject matter.

- **Positive Institutional Change**: responses indicated that satisfaction stemmed from contributing to positive institutional change.
  - Examples included shaping policy, enhancing positive results of the organization, and making the museum better.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Frequency in Responses</th>
<th>% out of Total Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Museum Subject/Collections Area</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>12.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Impact</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Institutional Change</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.94%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Qualitative Question 2.2 - Employee Perspectives**

Prompt: *Think back to the last time you felt truly excited about your work--what was the cause of that excitement?*

*Primary Codes*

Responses \( n = 211 \) were coded to align with the five core job characteristics proposed by Hackman and Oldham (1975) and the additional dimension of “dealing with others”. Additional codes include “nothing” and “N/A” Codes were assigned based on the following definitions:

Core Job Dimensions:

- **Autonomy**: responses indicated satisfaction stemming from freedom, independence, and personal discretion relating to work activities.
  - Examples included independence in work, freedom to create and develop materials, and discretion in decision-making.

- **Feedback**: responses indicated satisfaction stemming from witnessing evidence of performance effectiveness.
○ Examples included seeing visitors’ excitement in an exhibition, getting recognition from the director, and receiving positive feedback from tour participants.

● Skill Variety: responses indicated satisfaction stemming from work that requires a variety of skills or talents.
  ○ Examples included pursuing new opportunities for growth, working in areas outside of job duties, and working with visitors in a variety of ways.

● Task Identity: responses indicated satisfaction stemming from the completion of a project.
  ○ Examples included planning and implementing a large event, seeing an exhibition turn out better than expected, or completion of long-range planning.

● Task Significance: responses indicated satisfaction stemming from impactful contributions on individuals, the organization, or the external community.
  ○ Examples included preserving significant objects, facilitating important educational programs, and establishing DEAI training programs.

Additional Dimension:

● Dealing with Others: responses indicated satisfaction stemming from working closely with others.
  ○ Examples included working as a team, service to Indigenous community members, and training others.
Other:

- N/A: Responses were not specific enough to identify the source of excitement or did not align to the outlined codes.
- Nothing: Response indicated that the participant does not experience satisfaction at work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Frequency in Responses</th>
<th>% out of Total Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Task Identity</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>38.39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Significance</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>24.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing With Others</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>23.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12.32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Enough Information</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skill Variety</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nothing</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.37%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Secondary Codes

Secondary codes were assigned to identify further trends in responses. Codes were assigned based on the following definitions:

- Community Impact: responses indicated that satisfaction stemmed from contributing to community impact.
○ Examples included working on new community outreach programs, bringing art programming to a Juvenile Detention Center, and making positive change in the community.

- Museum Subject/Collections Area: responses indicated that satisfaction stemmed from working with materials relating to the museum’s subject or collections areas.
  ○ Examples included passion for subject matter, sharing behind-the-scenes collections work, and cool exhibition topics.

- Positive Institutional Change: responses indicated that satisfaction stemmed from contributing to positive institutional change.
  ○ Examples included earning accreditation by the American Alliance of Museums, completing projects that will help the museum, and creating more efficient processes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Frequency in Responses</th>
<th>% out of Total Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Museum Subject/Collections Area</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9.95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Impact</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8.53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Institutional Change</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.90%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Qualitative Question 2.3 - Employee Perspectives**

Prompt: *How do you feel when you achieve a goal at work?*
Primary Codes

Primary codes were assigned to responses (n = 197) based on the type of feelings experienced. Codes were assigned to the following categories:

- Positive feelings (e.g., pride, joy, and excitement)
- Negative feelings (e.g., exhausted, unrecognized, and sad)
- Indifferent feelings (e.g., fine, little impact on satisfaction, and just crossing something off of the list)
- N/A (e.g., there are no set goals, or goals are not achieved)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Frequency in Responses</th>
<th>% out of Total Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive Feelings</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>81.73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indifferent Feelings</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Feelings</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.55%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Secondary Codes

Secondary codes were applied within the primary code categories to identify more specific feelings about goal achievement, within the overarching framework of negative vs. positive feelings. Codes included:

- No recognition for goal achievement
- Experiencing concern about the next goal
- No formal goal setting processes
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary Code</th>
<th>Secondary Codes</th>
<th>Frequency in Primary Codes</th>
<th>% out of Primary Codes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive Feelings (n = 161; 81.73% of total responses)</td>
<td>No Recognition</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9.32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Concern about next goal</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indifferent Feelings (n = 20; 10.15% of total responses)</td>
<td>Concern about next goal</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>40.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No recognition</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Feelings (n = 9; 4.57% of total responses)</td>
<td>No recognition</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>66.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Concern about next goal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A (n = 7; 3.55% of total responses)</td>
<td>No set goals</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>85.71%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Qualitative Question 2.4 - Employee Perspectives**

*Prompt: How does your manager recognize the achievement of your goals?*

Responses (n = 189) were coded in three categories: actions, avenue of public acknowledgement, and frequency.
• **Actions:** Specific actions to acknowledge goal achievement were identified, creating a set of 15 codes.

• **Venue:** Responses that indicated a public acknowledgement of goal achievement were further coded to identify the most common ways of publicly acknowledging achievement. This resulted in 8 codes.

• **Frequency:** Responses that indicated a frequency for acknowledging goal achievements were coded further. This resulted in 10 codes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Frequency in Responses</th>
<th>% out of Total Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Verbal acknowledgement</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>48.48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Recognition</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>28.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal Evaluation</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wage increases</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written acknowledgement</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing Support</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased Responsibilities</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback on Work</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check-ins</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awards</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celebrations</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifts</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Formal Goals</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time-off</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.01%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Venue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Frequency in Responses</th>
<th>% out of Total Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff Meetings</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board Meetings</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Report</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Members</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donors</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Events</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.51%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Frequency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Frequency in Responses</th>
<th>% out of Total Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annually</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bi-monthly</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarterly</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regularly</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.51%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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