Invisible Labor Engagement

By

Ryah N. Al-Amin

A Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of Master of the Arts in
Industrial-Organizational Psychology

Middle Tennessee State University
July 2024

Thesis Committee

Judith Van Hein, Chair

Alexander T. Jackson, Committee Member

ABSTRACT

The present study aimed to identify reasons for employee engagement with invisible labor tasks. This study also measured task enjoyment. An online survey was distributed via Prolific. To sum the present findings, there were not gender differences between task frequency for administrative and physical care tasks. Also, task enjoyment was not related to task frequency suggesting there may be tasks employees enjoy but do not engage in. Overall, employees engaged in invisible labor tasks because they align with their personal values and are seen as beneficial to their colleagues.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost, I'd like to thank my Lord and Savior Jesus Christ for strengthening me throughout the thesis process and my time in graduate school (Isaiah 54). Next, I am immensely grateful for my parents and friends who encouraged me and fought for me every step of the way. Lastly, I am thankful to my thesis committee for the time and effort they put into this process and their willingness to challenge me.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF APPENDICES

CHAPTER I: LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

The term office housework has been used to describe house chores being completed while at work (Adams, 2018). Among current research, "invisible labor" appears to be an umbrella term for office housework and related tasks. Using different terms for the same construct can contribute to ambiguity and confusion, making it hard to synthesize and replicate studies.

While some studies have investigated satisfaction and engagement with office housework (Adams, 2018; Mussleman, 2020), research solely seeking to examine invisible labor engagement has yet to be conducted. The emergence of invisible labor tasks has introduced questions about employee motivations and satisfaction with these activities. Some studies have shown that people are motivated and satisfied with invisible labor activities because they enjoy the tasks (Adams, 2018) and feel they reflect their personal values (Lavee & Kaplan, 2022). Additionally, researchers have found that invisible labor tends to fall on minority groups (Espinosa & Ferriera, 2022; Kaplan, 2022) thus contributing to glass ceiling inequality (Espinosa & Ferriera, 2022). The current study aims to further investigate why people engage in invisible labor tasks.

Origins of Invisible Labor

The concept of invisible labor emerged to describe the underpaid, unrecognized, and undervalued work typically performed by women in both professional and domestic environments (Clarke et al., 2022; Daniels, 1987; Devault, 2014). These labors were first described as domestic housework with the time-old saying, "A mother's work is never done" (Ciciolla & Luthar, 2019). Women have been historically subjected to everyday

tasks that supported the household but were not seen as valuable or equitable to the tasks of their husbands, such as caretaking, emotional labor, mental labor, household management, and financial management (Ciciolla & Luthar, 2019). As women moved into the office, the term "office housework" was coined for similar domestic tasks being expected from women while at work (Ciciolla & Luthar, 2019).

Much like invisible labor, office housework (OHW) has been used as both a gender-neutral (Adams, 2018) and a gender-specific concept (Jang et al., 2021; Mussleman, 2020; Williams & Dempsey, 2014). OHW has been described as "menial administrative tasks that keep the office running" (Jang et al., 2021, p.794). The unofficial assignment of these duties was based on the premise that women are naturally more helpful and sometimes better at these tasks than men (Kaplan, 2022). Conversely, Adams (2018) defined OHW as "non-role-specific organizational tasks that a) benefit the organization, b) do not directly benefit the worker in their capacity, and c) are underappreciated and generally go unrecognized" (p.1). Both definitions describe the varying and undervalued tasks required of employees regardless of who is expected to participate in the tasks. OHW tasks may include taking out the trash, planning office events, listening to coworker frustrations, and covering for coworkers when they are out of the office (Adams, 2018, p.13; Jang et al., 2022).

Among recent studies, it appears that invisible labor and office housework (OHW) have been used interchangeably to refer to the same set of behaviors. Much like OHW, invisible labor outlines the undervalued and unrecognized behaviors that employees participate in while at work (Lavee & Kaplan, 2022; Sveinson et al., 2022; Toxtli et al., 2021). However, OHW appears to focus on domestic chores manifesting in

the workplace (Adams, 2018) while invisible labor includes OHW tasks and any other unrecognized, undervalued tasks such as organizing digital files, setting up office software, and monitoring office guests (Clarke et al., 2022; Daniels, 1987; Devault, 2014). Furthermore, OHW tasks have been included in invisible labor studies as peripheral labor. Wichroski (1994) described peripheral labor as gendered skills, expectations, and physical labors, such as housekeeping tasks and personal tasks for bosses. While this overlap should be explored more in future studies, invisible labor is often used to cover all aspects of work that are not included in the job description, including OHW tasks. Since invisible labor is expected to include similar tasks to OHW, this study will use invisible labor as an inclusive term rather than OHW.

Organizational Citizenship Behaviors

It has previously been proposed that invisible labor is an organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) (Jang et al., 2021; Mussleman, 2020). OCBs are behaviors that contribute to the social and psychological environment in the workplace (Organ, 1997), are essential for organizational functioning (Spector & Fox, 2002), and are not included in the formal job description or formally rewarded (Jex & Britt, 2014). Similar to OCBs, invisible labor tasks include social and psychological support (Adams, 2018; Mussleman, 2020). However, despite this overlap, invisible labor is not an OCB (Mussleman, 2020). When evaluated, OCBs have been considered as facets of job performance and influence human resource decisions (Gatewood et al., 2019) while invisible labor tasks typically go unnoticed (Kaplan, 2022). Therefore, OCBs will not be considered as invisible labor for this study.

Illegitimate Tasks

Illegitimate tasks are defined as work unrelated to the job or perceived as a waste of time by the employee engaging in the task (Thun et al., 2018). Illegitimate tasks are also seen as stressful and a threat to professional identity (Thun et al., 2018). These tasks can be categorized as either unreasonable or unnecessary tasks (Semmer et al., 2007; Semmer et al., 2010). Unreasonable tasks are tasks outside the scope of the job or an employee's occupational status (Semmer et al., 2010). Asking the Human Resource Generalist to empty the office trash cans when the company has a paid janitor would be considered an unreasonable task because it is not within the scope of the job. Unnecessary tasks are tasks that seem illogical or compromise efficiency and thus, should not be completed (Semmer et al., 2010). Being required to take meeting notes with pen and paper and then transfer them to a digital document would be considered an unnecessary task since the process could be streamlined by using a digital document initially. Much like invisible labor tasks, illegitimate tasks take time away from an employee fulfilling the formal job obligations. Invisible labor tasks, however, may be perceived as beneficial by the employee (Adams, 2018; Lavee & Kaplan, 2021) and can be done to help maintain a positive organizational environment (Adams, 2018; Kaplan, 2022). Because illegitimate tasks focus on tasks that are perceived as illogical and a waste of time by those who engage in the task, they will not be considered as invisible labor.

Difficulty Defining Invisible Labor

Throughout previous research, definitions for invisible labor have varied greatly. Many current definitions are too broad or only operationalize invisible labor for a specific population (i.e., race, gender) (Kaplan, 2022). General definitions for invisible labor

include personal resources not formally included in the job (Lavee & Kaplan, 2022) and energy spent on tasks that is not apparent to others (Sveinson et al., 2022). Though these descriptions quantify invisible labor as unnoticed and extra work outside the job description, they do not highlight the specific tasks within the term. A more quantifiable definition was provided by Kaplan (2022) who describes invisible labor as uncompensated, undervalued activities that occur in the workplace because of implicit or explicit requirements from employers. While this explanation provides a broader perspective of invisible labor tasks, it does not acknowledge that these tasks occur during the workday thus, making them paid tasks. Definitionally, invisible labor tasks are not formally rewarded, but any task performed during the workday is considered a paid task.

Since early conceptualizations of invisible labor were developed to explain the various types of unpaid labor typically completed by women in the workforce (Acker, 1990; Daniels, 1987), definitions have also been created to highlight minority group participation in these tasks. These gendered tasks have previously been described as the work required of women based on their gender that is not formally recognized by the organization (Wichroski, 1994). Wichroski (1994) focused on the invisible labor of secretaries, an occupation predominantly occupied by women. Wichroski appears to have laid a solid foundation for operationalizing invisible for women but does not include invisible labor tasks for men. Additionally, three decades have passed since Wichroski's (1994) study was published, and the workforce has shifted since then. It has also been argued that invisible labor includes the additional work racial and gender minorities engage in to mitigate negative perceptions and microaggressions from their majority counterparts (Melaku, 2022). For example, a black employee may avoid wearing their

natural hair to work because it may be perceived as unprofessional by their white counterparts (Melaku, 2022). While these perspectives of invisible labor emphasize it being unrelated to one's job, it has a restricted view as to who can engage in the task. Combining previous definitions of invisible labor, I define invisible labor as activities performed during the workday that are not included in the formal job description and are generally overlooked, underappreciated, and not formally rewarded or evaluated by the organization.

Types of Invisible Labor

Based on the current research, invisible labor is multi-faceted and should be measured as such. These facets include social support (Crain et al., 2016; Gordon et al., 2022; Kaplan, 2022; Melaku, 2022; Sveinson et al., 2022; Wichroski, 1994), social event tasks (Adams, 2018; Kaplan, 2020), administrative work (Adams, 2018; Kaplan, 2022; Wichroski, 1994), and taking care of the physical work environment (Kaplan, 2022).

Social Support

Social support tasks contribute to other's experiences and feelings of being cared for by others and included in a social network (Taylor, 2011). Social support includes attending to others' emotional needs, impression management, and maintaining a pleasant personality (Wichroski, 1994). It also includes informational and instrumentational support (Taylor, 2011). Information support involves providing others with advice or information (Taylor, 2011). Instrumental support involves providing tangible assistance (Taylor, 2011) like driving your coworker to the airport. Social support may include aspects of emotional support, but it is not solely emotional labor (Taylor, 2011). Emotional labor focuses on manipulating one's feelings to complete organizational and

professional goals (Wichroski, 1994), while social support focuses on managing the emotional, informational, and instrumentational needs of peers and clients (Taylor, 2011, p.189-190). This study will use social support to describe tasks related to providing emotional and informational support to colleagues.

Social Event Tasks

According to Adams (2018) social event tasks include purchasing birthday organizing celebration parties for employees. These tasks typically focus on celebrating others within the organization (Adams, 2018). Kaplan (2022) described a similar facet for invisible labor called team work. Team work is similar to social support in that it involves maintaining a positive affective atmosphere, but it also involves organizing focuses organizing social events (Kaplan, 2022). An example of a team work task would be organizing a team lunch (Kaplan, 2022). Kaplan's description of invisible team work shares tasks with Adams's (2018) office housework social event tasks. For example, both facets include organizing events for other employees. Because of the task similarities, my study will investigate team work and social event tasks as one task grouping for invisible labor.

Administrative Work

Administrative work serves to develop the workplace at a group level due to perceptions of social responsibility (Kaplan, 2022). Administrative work involves participating in secretarial tasks, such as writing meeting notes and coordinating work meetings (Adams, 2018, Kaplan, 2022). Administrative work can also include proofreading others' work and creating presentations for others (Adams, 2018). While these tasks may be useful, they also divert time away from more important activities

(Thun et al., 2018), such as fulfilling duties outlined in the formal job description (Kaplan, 2022). Because these tasks are considering devaluing (Kaplan, 2022) and distract from job-relevant duties (Thun et al., 2018; Kaplan, 2022), my study will include them as a facet of invisible labor.

Physical Care Tasks

Taking care of an organization's physical environment has been noted as a factor of invisible labor (Kaplan, 2022). Janitorial tasks also have been used to describe similar invisible labor tasks (Adams, 2018). For invisible labor, Kaplan (2022) found that invisible physical care included taking out the trash, washing dishes left in the sink, and maintaining the pleasant appearance of the office. Similarly, Adams (2018) found that janitorial tasks for office housework included cleaning-related tasks, killing pests, and decorating the office to maintain an attractive physical environment. Both Kaplan (2022) and Adams (2018) identified undervalued activities related to maintaining the physical work environment and cleaning. For my study, I will be using physical care tasks to identify the kinds of tasks described by Kaplan (2022) and Adams (2018).

Invisible Labor Engagement

Invisible labor research has primarily focused on tasks performed by women and racial minorities in the workplace (Acker, 1990; Co, 2022; Daniels, 1987; Lavee & Kaplan, 2022; Melaku, 2022), but emerging studies have shown that men and women both participate in invisible labor in different ways (Jang et al., 2021; Kaplan, 2022). Kaplan (2022) found that both genders participated in invisible labor tasks, such as physical care work and administrative work, but women were more likely to participate in team work and emotional labor than men.

Adams (2018) found that among those who regularly participate in office housework tasks, 48% volunteered regularly, 23% volunteered once, 21% were assigned to the task, and 7% reported a mix of the three options. Among the 48% who volunteered regularly, 70% were women and 30% were men. Among the 23% who volunteered once, 70% were women and 54% were men. Among the 21% that were assigned to the tasks, 62% were women and 37% were men. While it appears that women complete invisible labor tasks more than men, Adams's (2018) study had a higher percentage of women (61%) than men (39%) in her sample. It was also found that both genders enjoyed participating in the tasks (Adams, 2018). These findings demonstrate that not only do both genders involve themselves in invisible labor, but both genders can also enjoy the tasks they choose to participate in.

Reasons for engagement

Employees are motivated to engage in tasks for intrinsic reasons (Abid, 2017) or external pressures and expectations (Ryan & Deci, 2000). Intrinsic motivation would cause an employee to perform a task because of the enjoyment they may feel while engaging in it (Abid, 2017; Deci, 1975). Extrinsic pressures would cause an employee to perform a task because of external demands, such as the desire to please others (Deci, 1975), the want to be rewarded (Abid, 2017), or to avoid feeling guilty about not fulfilling expectations (Ryan & Deci, 2000).

Lavee and Kaplan (2022) suggest that people who involved themselves in invisible labor tasks do so because of intrinsic ideological values shaping their moral standards of character (individualism), their personal mission (devotion to work), and heart (devotion to others). Lavee and Kaplan (2022) suggest invisible labor tasks are of

value to those who participate in them. This study suggests that invisible labor engagement may bring a sense of value to the individual thus making the tasks intrinsically motivating. Adams (2018) found that social support tasks such as listening to colleagues' frustrations and event-planning tasks such as organizing work celebrations for another employee were rated as being the most enjoyable. These findings suggest that employees may feel intrinsically motivated to engage in invisible labor tasks if they align with their personal values and are viewed as enjoyable by the employee.

Melaku's (2022) study can be used to highlight the extrinsic pressures behind invisible labor tasks. Melaku (2022) argued that black women within white institutionalized spaces, such as elite law firms, notably experience racist practices as a form of invisible labor. These practices include changing their hair styles to fit corporate expectations and managing racial aggressions (Melaku, 2022). In this case, employees may complete invisible labor tasks to avoid making others uncomfortable in the workplace. Based on these findings, it appears that employees may feel pressured to engage in unfavorable invisible labor tasks to make the workplace more comfortable for others at one's own expense.

Summary

Invisible labor and office housework both focus on undervalued tasks employees engage in that are outside of their job descriptions. While office housework tasks have historically described gendered housekeeping tasks conducted while at work (Clarke et al., 2022; Daniels, 1987; Devault, 2014), invisible labor has been identified a more inclusive term. Invisible labor is defined as the activities performed during the workday that are not included in the formal job description and are generally overlooked,

underappreciated, and not formally rewarded by the organization. It has been argued that invisible labor tasks are predominately completed by minority employees (Melaku, 2022; Wichroski, 1994), but current findings show that men and women both engage in invisible labor tasks in different ways (Adams, 2018; Jang et al., 2021; Kaplan, 2022). While previous research has discussed invisible labor task allocation (see Adams, 2018), there is currently a lack of research examining why people engage in invisible labor tasks. The purpose of this study is to explore why employees engage in invisible labor tasks and if there are gender differences across task categories.

Research Question 1: Do employees engage more frequently with invisible labor tasks they enjoy?

Research Question 2: Why do employees engage in invisible labor tasks?

Hypothesis 1: Women are more likely to engage in social support tasks than men.

Hypothesis 2: Men are more likely to engage in physical care tasks than women.

CHAPTER II: METHOD

Participants

The population of interest for this study was individuals who have engaged in invisible labor tasks while employed within an organization. Two-hundred and fifty participants were recruited through Prolific and compensated $3.00 ($9/hour) for survey completion. Pay was determined by the minimum pay rate set by Prolific and the estimated duration of the survey (i.e., 20 minutes).

To be eligible for the study, participants had to be at least 18 years of age or older, fluent in English, actively working at any level within an organization, and working at least 30 hours per week. Participants were also required to be onsite workers or hybrid workers with at least 50% in the office. Based on the target population and literature used to inform this study, these work-related requirements were set to increase the likelihood of participants having the opportunity to complete invisible labor tasks.

After data cleaning, 219 participants remained (87.6% useable response rate). Four participants were removed for completing the survey in less than 5 minutes. Four participants were removed for not completing the consent form. Two participants were removed for indicating they did not complete invisible labor tasks while at work. Twenty-two participants were removed for not working at least 50% of their job onsite.

Of the final sample, 91 were men, 127 were women, and 1 identified as other. On average, participants were 40.5 years old (SD = 11.0), ranging from 18 to 86. In terms of race and ethnicity, 2% were American Indian or Alaska Native, 6% were Asian, 14% were Black or African American, 8% were Hispanic or Latino, 0.5% were Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, 67% were white or Caucasian, and 5% were multi-ethnic.

For educational background, 0.5% reported having less than a high school diploma, 12% reported having a high school diploma, 22% reported having some college experience, 10% reported having a two-year degree, 33% reported having a four-year degree, 20% reported having a professional degree, 1% reported having a Doctorate, and 0.5% indicated other. On average, participants indicated working 41.10 hours (*SD* = 5.04) per week, ranging from 30 to 70 hours. Participants indicated working 88.1% of their work hours (*SD* = 16.80) on site, ranging from 50% to 100%. Participants also reported being in their current job position for 8.87 years (SD = 7.42) on average, ranging from 0 to 35 years. See Appendices A-C for additional demographic information.

Procedure

An online survey was distributed via Prolific. Eligible participants were given a study description and a link to the Qualtrics survey. Upon entering the survey, participants were provided with an informed consent form and asked to verify that they meet all the criteria to be eligible to engage in the study. If the participant did not meet all the criteria, they were dismissed from the study and did not receive compensation. If the participant met all the criteria, they were presented with my definition of invisible labor. Following, each invisible labor task category was displayed. For every task the participant indicated they engaged in, they were asked to report how much they enjoyed engaging in the task and why they engaged in it. The final section of questions included demographic measures. After the participant completed the survey, they were automatically redirected back to the Prolific.

Per Prolifics's nonsensical attention check policy, participants were not compensated for this study if they failed at least two attention checks. Throughout the

entire study, six attention checks appeared with nonsensical items. One attention check was displayed within the task lists and engagement items for physical care tasks, administrative tasks, and social event tasks. See Appendix D for these items.

Measures

Invisible Labor Task Engagement

Adams (2018) and Kaplan (2022) identified four overlapping types of invisible labor tasks. Though each study proposed different names for the task categories, the description and type of tasks are similar. For this study, I used Adams's (2018) factors of office housework (emotional support, party-planner, janitorial/cleaning tasks, administrative/office manager), Kaplan's (2022) factors of invisible labor (emotional labor, team work, physical care, administrative work) and Taylor's (2011) description of social support tasks to produce a list of invisible labor tasks across four categories. These categories included social support (7 tasks), physical care (14 tasks), administrative work (18 tasks), and social event (7 tasks). One item was updated to reflect today's work environment: filing for others was updated to include digital and physical files. Participants were asked to report how frequently they have completed each invisible labor task within the past year on a five-point Likert scale (1 = *never* to 5 = *daily)*. Scores were calculated by averaging the frequency responses for each category. See Appendix D for invisible labor engagement items.

Task Enjoyment

If a participant indicated they completed a task at least once within the past 12 months, they were presented with one item to report how much they enjoyed engaging in the completed task based on a five-point Likert scale (1 = *did not enjoy at all* to 5 = *enjoyed very much*). Since this item was only displayed if the participant completed the invisible labor task, there were large amounts of missing data. Missing data were excluded from the analyses. The overall score was calculated by averaging the responses for each task and category. Scores by category were used for group-level analyses. Scores by item were used to identify which tasks were rated as the most enjoyable. Reliability analyses were not able to be computed due to the large amounts of missing data. See Appendix D for task enjoyment items.

Reasons for Engagement

Participants who indicated engaging in invisible labor at least once annually were also asked to report why they completed the task on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = *strongly disagree* to 5 = *strongly agree*). The reasons for engagement included in the study were aggregated from Adams (2018), Lavee & Kaplan (2022), and Melaku (2022). Scores were calculated by averaging the responses for each reason within each task category (i.e., physical care, administrative, social support, social event). Cronbach's alpha reliability analyses were conducted for each category. Since this item was only displayed if the participant completed the invisible labor task, there were large amounts of missing data. Missing data were excluded from the analyses. See Table 1 for reliability analyses. See Appendix D for reasons for engagement items.

Table 1

Internal Consistency Reliability for Reasons for Engagement

Variable	Number of Items	Cronbach's Alpha
Physical Care Tasks	8	.67
Administrative Tasks	8	.75
Social Support Tasks	8	.78
Social Event Tasks	8	.64

CHAPTER III: RESULTS

Scale reliabilities for Invisible Labor Task List Engagement were analyzed before the research questions and hypotheses were tested. Cronbach's alpha for the subscales ranged from .78 to .89. See Table 2 for coefficient alphas. Descriptive statistics for each task can be found in Appendices E-H .

Of the 219 participants, 54% never completed physical care tasks, 67% never completed administrative tasks, 40% never complete social support tasks, and 81% never completed social event tasks. See Tables 3-6 for task frequencies separated by category (i.e., physical care, administrative, social support, social event).

Table 2

Internal Consistency Reliability for the Invisible Labor Task Engagement

Variable	Number of Items	Cronbach's Alpha
Overall Invisible Labor	46	.89
Physical Care Tasks	14	.81
Administrative Tasks	18	.88
Social Support Tasks	7	.78
Social Event Tasks	7	.80

Table 3

Frequency of Engagement for Physical Care Tasks

Task & Task Description	% of Total				
	Never	Annually	Monthly	Weekly	Daily
PCT 1 - Emptied the office trash	45%	3%	12%	26%	13%
PCT 2 - Watered the office plants	71%	4%	8%	15%	2%
PCT 3 - Refilling the water cooler	68%	6%	15%	10%	1%
PCT 4 - Cleaning-related tasks	66%	11%	10%	8%	6%
PCT 5 - Fixed the coffee machine	17%	7%	20%	30%	25%
PCT 6 - Set out candy or office snacks for colleagues	45%	12%	21%	16%	6%
PCT 7 - Hung wall items	63%	20%	12%	2%	3%
PCT 8 - Stocked kitchen supplies	60%	9%	17%	11%	3%
PCT 9 - Killed or removed pests	63%	14%	12%	9%	3%
PCT 10 - Made coffee for the office	53%	4%	11%	16%	17%
PCT 11 - Cleaned the restrooms	79%	6%	6%	6%	4%
PCT 12 - Decorated the office for holidays	44%	39%	15%	1%	1%
PCT 13 - Repaired or assembled furniture	58%	29%	12%	1%	1%
PCT 14 - Removed recently printed documents from the printer and took them to colleagues	29%	5%	20%	29%	17%

Note: Cumulative percentages may be greater than 100% due to rounding.

Table 4

Frequency of Engagement for Administrative Tasks

Task & Task Description	% of Total				
	Never	Annually	Monthly	Weekly	Daily
AT 1 - Set up office software	77%	11%	9%	2%	1%
AT 2 - Troubleshot computer or software issues	45%	12%	23%	13%	6%
AT 3 - Proof-read emails for colleagues	54%	10%	23%	11%	2%
AT 4 - Handled incoming mail	66%	5%	7%	13%	9%
AT 5 - Set up new employee offices/workstations	73%	17%	7%	2%	1%
AT 6 - Answered phones in the conference room	75%	4%	11%	4%	7%
AT 7 - Provided back-up for other employees when they are out	33%	9%	30%	19%	8%
AT 8 - Set up meeting spaces	72%	6%	12%	8%	3%
AT 9 - Printed, organized, and/or prepared meeting materials	56%	8%	20%	11%	5%
AT 10 - Filled out paperwork for colleagues	69%	6%	17%	5%	3%
AT 11 - Supervised or monitored office guests	74%	9%	11%	3%	3%
AT 12 - Shipped packages	68%	9%	14%	5%	3%
AT 13 - Coordinated others' calendars	78%	3%	11%	4%	4%
AT 14 - Scheduled office maintenance	82%	5%	9%	3%	1%
AT 15 - Created presentations for colleagues	72%	11%	11%	5%	1%
AT 16 - Gave directions to guests/visitors	48%	14%	18%	11%	9%
AT 17 - Researched or booked travel for colleagues	90%	6%	3%	1%	1%
AT 18 - Organized digital or physical files for colleagues	68%	8%	14%	7%	3%

Note: Cumulative percentages may be greater than 100% due to rounding.

Table 5

Frequency of Engagement for Social Support Tasks

Task & Task Description	% of Total				
	Never	Annually	Monthly	Weekly	Daily
SST 1 – Listened to colleagues vent their frustrations	12%	3%	15%	39%	31%
SST 2 – Emotionally supported upset colleagues	20%	7%	25%	30%	18%
SST 3 – Ran errands for colleagues	70%	10%	10%	10%	0%
SST 4 – Handled employee and employee family well-being communications	78%	6%	7%	6%	3%
SST 5 – Provided career or life advice to colleagues	37%	12%	25%	19%	7%
SST 6 – Provided general information to colleagues	16%	6%	12%	33%	34%
SST 7 – Shared professional connections with colleagues	47%	15%	18%	12%	8%

Note: Cumulative percentages may be greater than 100% due to rounding.

Table 6

Frequency of Engagement for Social Event Tasks

Task & Task Description	% of Total				
	Never	Annually	Monthly	Weekly	Daily
SET 1 - Ordered catering for the office	87%	6%	6%	1%	0%
SET 2 - Bought or prepared food for office events or parties	67%	23%	10%	1%	0%
SET 3 - Ordered flowers for employees, clients, or others	88%	9%	3%	0%	0%
SET 4 - Organized celebration parties for colleagues	82%	14%	3%	0%	0%
SET 5 - Planned office events, parties, conferences, etc.	82%	14%	5%	0%	0%
SET 6 - Purchased cards and/or gifts for employee birthday, retirement, condolences, etc.	68%	22%	10%	0%	0%
SET 7 - Made business lunch or dinner reservations for colleagues	93%	4%	3%	1%	0%

Note: Cumulative percentages may be greater than 100% due to rounding.

Invisible Labor Task Enjoyment

Research question 1 asked whether employees engage more frequently with invisible labor tasks they enjoy. To test this question, a Pearson's correlation analysis was conducted. Before running the correlation for task frequency and task enjoyment, participants indicating "never" for task frequency were removed. Since we did not collect enjoyment data for participants who indicated "never" on a task, they were removed to allow for a more accurate comparison between frequency and engagement. Pearson's correlation indicated that frequency and engagement of physical care tasks were correlated, $r(219) = .29$, $p < .001$. Pearson's correlation indicated that frequency and engagement of administrative tasks were correlated, $r(196) = .17$, $p = .01$. Pearson's correlation indicated that frequency and engagement of social support tasks were

correlated, $r(209) = .18$, $p = .01$. Pearson's correlation indicated that frequency and engagement of social event tasks were not correlated, $r(108) = .15$, $p = .11$. Based on these findings, the answer to research question 1 is the relationship between invisible labor task frequency and enjoyment varies by task category. See Table 7 for the full correlation matrix. See Tables 8-11 for enjoyment levels for each task.

Table 7

Correlation Matrix for Frequency and Enjoyment

Variable	1	2	3	*4*	5	6	7
1. PCT Frequency							
2. PCT Enjoyment	.29*						
3. AT Frequency	.27*	.25*					
4. AT Enjoyment	.05	.48*	.17*				
5. SST Frequency	.36*	.10	.40*	.04			
6. SST Enjoyment	.07	.42*	.10	.40*	.19*		
7. SET Frequency	.23*	.31*	.40*	.19*	.30*	.14*	
8. SET Frequency	.06	.45*	.10	.43*	<.01	.42*	.15

Note. * indicates $p < .05$. PCT – Physical Care Tasks. AT – Administrative Tasks. SST – Social Support Tasks. SET – Social Event Tasks.

Table 8

Descriptive Statistics for Physical Care Task Enjoyment

Task & Task Description	*n*	% of Total	*M*	*SD*
PCT 1 - Emptied the office trash	120	55%	2.06	1.05
PCT 2 - Watered the office plants	64	29%	3.73	.96
PCT 3 - Refilling the water cooler	70	32%	2.74	1.05
PCT 4 - Cleaning-related tasks	73	33%	2.84	1.26
PCT 5 - Fixed the coffee machine	180	82%	2.43	1.13
PCT 6 - Set out candy or office snacks for colleagues	121	55%	3.95	1.04
PCT 7 - Hung wall items	81	37%	3.26	.28
PCT 8 - Stocked kitchen supplies	88	40%	3.03	1.08
PCT 9 - Killed or removed pests	82	37%	1.76	1.05
PCT 10 - Made coffee for the office	104	48%	3.71	1.07
PCT 11 - Cleaned the restrooms	46	21%	1.80	1.19
PCT 12 - Decorated the office for holidays	122	56%	4.03	1.00
PCT 13 - Repaired or assembled furniture	91	42%	2.93	1.25
PCT 14 - Removed recently printed documents from the printer and took them to colleagues	156	71%	2.96	0.99

Table 9

Descriptive Statistics for Administrative Task Enjoyment

Task & Task Description	*n*	% of Total	*M*	*SD*
AT 1 - Set up office software	50	23%	3.08	1.28
AT 2 - Troubleshot computer or software issues	119	54%	2.83	1.26
AT 3 - Proof-read emails for colleagues	99	45%	3.20	1.13
AT 4 - Handled incoming mail	74	34%	2.74	1.17
AT 5 - Set up new employee offices/workstations	50	23%	2.98	1.17
AT 6 - Answered phones in the conference room	55	25%	2.62	.99
AT 7 - Provided back-up for other employees when they are out	145	66%	2.88	1.00
AT 9 - Printed, organized, and/or prepared meeting materials	60	27%	3.27	1.02
AT 10 - Filled out paperwork for colleagues	95	43%	2.66	1.13
AT 11 - Supervised or monitored office guests	4	2%	3.00	.82
AT 12 - Shipped packages	31	14%	2.19	1.35
AT 13 - Coordinated others' calendars	59	27%	2.41	1.16
AT 14 - Scheduled office maintenance	34	16%	2.44	1.24
AT 15 - Created presentations for colleagues	34	16%	2.97	1.24
AT 16 - Gave directions to guests/visitors	34	16%	3.21	1.20
AT 17 - Researched or booked travel for colleagues	94	43%	2.27	1.17
AT 18 - Organized digital or physical files for colleagues	28	13%	3.21	1.48

Note. AT 8 was excluded from the enjoyment scale due to researcher error.

Table 10

Descriptive Statistics for Social Support Task Enjoyment

Task & Task Description	*n*	*% of Total*	*M*	*SD*
SST 1 - Listened to colleagues vent their frustrations	191	87%	3.35	1.10
SST 2 - Emotionally supported upset colleagues	174	80%	3.54	1.13
SST 3 - Ran errands for colleagues	65	40%	3.18	1.71
SST 4 - Handled employee and employee family well-being communications	47	22%	3.49	.98
SST 5 - Provided career or life advice to colleagues	138	63%	3.94	.95
SST 6 - Provided general information to colleagues	183	84%	3.86	.85
SST 7 - Shared professional connections with colleagues	115	53%	4.03	.88

Table 11
Descriptive Statistics for Social Event Task Enjoyment

Task & Task Description	*n*	% of Total	*M*	*SD*
SET 1 - Ordered catering for the office	28	12.8%	3.71	1.33
SET 2 - Bought or prepared food for office events or parties	72	33%	3.86	1.07
SET 3 - Ordered flowers for employees, clients, or others	26	12%	3.96	1.04
SET 4 - Organized celebration parties for colleagues	40	18%	4.15	1.05
SET 5 - Planned office events, parties, conferences, etc.	40	18%	4.22	.77
SET 6 - Purchased cards and/or gifts for employee birthday, retirement, condolences, etc.	71	32%	4.13	.91
SET 7 - Made business lunch or dinner reservations for colleagues	15	7%	4.07	1.03

Reasons for Invisible Labor Task Engagement

Research question 2 asked why employees engage in invisible labor tasks. To test this question, the means for each reason for enjoyment were assessed. On average, invisible labor tasks were completed because they were seen as helpful to one's colleagues and because the tasks aligned with one's personal values. These results are purely descriptive. Due to the large amount of missing data, inferential statistics could not be calculated. Descriptive statistics for engagement reasons can be found in Tables 12-15.

Table 12

Reasons for Engagement for Physical Care Tasks

Reason for Engagement	*n*	*M*	*SD*
I felt it was helpful to my colleague	209	3.69	0.93
I felt the task aligned with my personal values	209	3.34	1.07
I am the only one who cared about the task	209	2.87	0.91
I volunteered to complete this task every time I completed it	209	2.71	1.07
I volunteered once and have since been the only one to complete it	209	2.47	0.93
I am the only one who knew how to do the task	209	2.04	0.74
I felt completing the task was beneficial to my career	209	1.94	0.91
The task was assigned to me	209	1.77	0.97

Table 13

Reasons for Engagement for Administrative Tasks

Reason for Engagement	*n*	*M*	*SD*
I felt it was helpful to my colleague	197	3.91	0.93
I felt the task aligned with my personal values	197	3.44	1.07
I felt completing the task was beneficial to my career	197	2.89	1.16
The task was assigned to me	197	2.73	1.24
I volunteered to complete this task every time I completed it	197	2.39	1.18
I am the only one who cared about the task	197	2.27	1.03
I volunteered once and have since been the only one to complete it	197	2.20	1.15
I am the only one who knew how to do the task	197	2.15	1.01

Table 14

Reasons for Engagement for Social Support Tasks

Reason for Engagement	*n*	*M*	*SD*
I felt it was helpful to my colleague	209	4.50	0.66
I felt the task aligned with my personal values	209	4.05	0.97
I felt completing the task was beneficial to my career	209	2.51	1.24
I volunteered to complete this task every time I completed it	209	2.47	1.36
I am the only one who knew how to do the task	209	2.16	1.13
I volunteered once and have since been the only one to complete it	209	1.98	1.12
I am the only one who cared about the task	209	1.87	1.01
The task was assigned to me	209	1.71	0.93

Table 15
Reasons for Engagement for Social Event Tasks

Reason for Engagement	*n*	*M*	*SD*
I felt it was helpful to my colleague	107	4.10	1.01
I felt the task aligned with my personal values	107	4.08	0.96
I volunteered to complete this task every time I completed it	107	2.72	1.40
I felt completing the task was beneficial to my career	107	2.45	1.31
The task was assigned to me	107	2.31	1.40
I am the only one who cared about the task	107	2.15	1.11
I volunteered once and have since been the only one to complete it	107	2.08	1.20
I am the only one who knew how to do the task	107	1.68	0.95

Invisible Labor Task Engagement & Gender

Hypothesis 1 stated that women were more likely to engage in social support tasks than men. To test hypothesis 1, Welch's *t*-test was conducted since there were unequal sample sizes between genders. Welch's *t*-test indicated the average frequency of social support task engagement was not significantly different for men and women, $t(197) = -1.34$, $p = .18$, Cohen's d = -.18. Based on these findings, hypothesis 1 was not supported.

Hypothesis 2 stated that men were more likely to engage in physical care tasks than women. To test hypothesis 2, Welch's *t*-test was conducted since there were unequal sample sizes between genders. Welch's *t*-test indicated the average frequency of physical care task engagement was not significantly different for men and women, $t(197) = -1.75$, $p = .08$, Cohen's d = -.24. Based on these findings, hypothesis 2 was not supported.

Exploratory Analyses

After addressing the hypotheses, I wanted to evaluate whether gender differences were present among social support and physical care tasks on the individual task level. For social support tasks, the Welch's *t*-test indicated that women were more likely to

engage in emotionally supporting upset colleagues than men. The remaining social support tasks did not have significant gender differences according to the Welch's *t*-tests. See Appendix I.

For physical care tasks, the Welch's t-test indicated that women were more likely to water office plants, fix the coffee machine, set out snacks for the office, stock office supplies, decorate the office for the holidays, and remove and distribute recently printed documents from the printer than men. The remaining physical care tasks did not have significant gender differences according to the Welch's *t*-tests. See Appendix J for *t*-test results for physical care tasks.

I also assessed gender differences on the category and task level for social event tasks and administrative tasks. To test these exploratory analyses, Welch's *t*-tests were used. Welch's *t*-tests indicated the average frequency of administrative task engagement were similar for men and women, $t(193) = -0.42$, $p = .68$, Cohen's d = -.06. On the individual task level, men were significantly more likely to set up office software than women. Additionally, women were significantly more likely to coordinate others' calendars and organize digital or physical files for colleagues. See Table 21 in Appendix K for *t*-test results for administrative tasks.

The Welch *t*-test also indicated the average frequency of social event tasks was significantly lower for men than for women, $t(213) = -2.83$, $p = .01$ Cohen's d = -.38. On the individual task level, women were significantly more likely to order catering for the office, buy or prepare food for office events, organize celebration parties for colleagues, and plan office events than men. See Appendix L for *t*-test results for social event tasks.

CHAPTER IV: DISCUSSION

Research related to invisible labor has largely focused on gender differences among task completion (e.g., citation; citation). However, research on why employees engage in invisible labor tasks was less common. The goals of this study were to determine why employees engage in invisible labor tasks and examine gender differences between task completion.

Of the 219 participants, 54% never completed physical care tasks, 67% never completed administrative tasks, 40% never complete social support tasks, and 81% never completed social event tasks. On average, only 5 tasks (11%) occurred monthly or more frequently (mean of 3.00 or more). This suggests that employees were not engaging in invisible labor tasks often. Social support tasks were done most frequently. This may be attributed to employees being able to participate in these tasks while working onsite or remotely, thus making them more accessible. This could also be attributed to employees developing close relationships with each other and wanting to support their work friends. Low task frequencies could be attributed to the types of tasks we included in our study. For the task list, we adapted the majority of our items from Adams (2018) and mainly focused on office tasks instead of invisible labor tasks that could be applicable to different industries. Future research should consider using tasks more reflective of today's hybrid workforce and include tasks that expand past the traditional office setting, such as monitoring and responding to online messages from colleagues.

Regarding task enjoyment, social support and social event tasks were rated as the most enjoyable. These tasks could be considered communal-based and involved encouraging or supporting another individual in ways that may not be directly related to

the work. Research question 1 asked if employees engage more frequently with invisible labor tasks they enjoy. Based on the Pearson's correlation analyses, there was a significant relationship between task frequency and task enjoyment for physical care, administrative, and social support tasks but not social event tasks. Therefore, the answer to research question 1 was that employee task engagement is related to task enjoyment for most categories, and vice versa. Employees my engage more frequently with tasks they enjoy, or they may enjoy tasks they enjoy in more frequently. Future analyses would need to be conducted to evaluate the direction of the relationship. Within our study, participants were only allowed to rate task enjoyment if they indicated completing the task within the past 12 months. However, there may be invisible labor tasks employees enjoyed but did not engage in. For example, an employee may have enjoyed running errands for a colleague but did not have the opportunity to do so within the past 12 months.

Research question 2 asked why employees engage in invisible labor tasks. The results of the reasons for engagement items indicated that invisible labor tasks were generally viewed as helpful to one's colleagues and in alignment with the participant's values. All 4 task categories had high ratings for these engagement reasons, but social support and social event tasks were rated the highest. These findings support Lavee and Kaplan's (2022) study which found that personal value and devotion to others lead employees to engage in invisible labor tasks. On the other hand, employees somewhat disagreed that invisible labor tasks were being assigned and that they were volunteering to complete them.

When assessing gender differences in task frequency, social event tasks was the only category with significant differences at the factor level with more women completing these tasks than men. On the task level, however, there were gender differences between men and women within every category.

Hypothesis 1 stated that women are more likely to engage in social support tasks than men. On average, there were not significant differences in task frequency between men and women. Thus, hypothesis 1 was not supported. On the individual task level, women were more likely to emotionally support upset colleagues than men.

Hypothesis 2 stated that men were more likely to engage in physical care tasks than women. On average, there were not significant differences in task frequency between men and women. Thus, hypothesis 2 was not supported. On the individual task level, women were more likely to water office plants, fix the coffee machine, set out snacks for the office, stock office supplies, decorate the office for the holidays, and remove and distribute recently printed documents from the printer than men.

The results of these hypotheses loosely support Jang et al.'s (2021) study, which suggested that women are more likely to engage in invisible labor tasks that involve social maintenance or focus on people, while men are more likely to participate in tasks that are more focused on object maintenance. Additionally, the tasks with significantly more women engaging in them than men could be considered secretarial tasks that have historically fallen upon women (Wichroski,1994).

Exploratory analyses were also conducted to examine gender differences among social event and administrative tasks. For social event tasks, on average, women were more likely to engage in these tasks than men. Additionally, women were more likely to

order catering for the office, buy or prepare food for office events, organize celebration parties for colleagues, and plan office events than men. For administrative tasks, there were not significant differences in the average task frequencies for men and women. On the individual task level, men were more likely to set up office software than women.

Strengths

One of the greatest strengths of this research is that it helped to operationalize invisible labor. This study provided a definition of invisible labor that included office housework tasks. It also distinguished invisible labor from organizational citizenship behaviors and illegitimate tasks. Another major strength is that the current study contributed to the growing evidence for both women and men completing invisible labor tasks in different ways. This study also helped to identify why employees engage in invisible labor tasks.

Limitations

There are many limitations to this study which affect its generalizability. The first limitation relates to the study's sample and sample size. While the sample included an almost 50/50 split for gender (57% women, 43% men), it was predominately comprised of Caucasian participants and thus lacked racial diversity. Our sample size (n = 219) was also small and only included desk workers. Between the lack of racial diversity, the small sample size, and only including office workers our sample was not representative of the larger population. Therefore, our results may not translate to the population or be replicable across other groups.

The second limitation of this research includes not collecting data from all participants for task enjoyment and reasons for engagement. As previously mentioned,

there may be tasks employees enjoy but are unable to complete for a variety of reasons. By not collecting data on task enjoyment for employees who did not engage in invisible labor tasks within the past 12 months, we were not able to correlate task frequency with task engagement for all participants. We also were not able to conduct regression analyses to determine which reasons for engagement predicted frequency of task engagement. Instead, descriptive statistics were used to suggest the most prominent reasons for invisible labor task engagement.

The third limitation is related to the invisible labor tasks included in this study. As previously mentioned, the majority of the tasks included in this study were identified by Adams (2018). These tasks were developed before the COVID-19 pandemic and thus did not account for changes in the workforce. For example, more remote/hybrid-focused invisible labor tasks, such as setting up virtual meetings, organizing breakout rooms, creating professional backgrounds for virtual meetings, etc. when these tasks are not included in the job description could be more relevant now than in 2018.

The final limitation of this study involved the survey missing a physical care task item when measuring reasons for engagement (i.e., cleaning-related tasks) and an administrative task item (i.e., set up meeting spaces) when measuring enjoyment. This information was not included due to faulty display logic within the survey. Data for these items could have provided additional insights for why employees engage in certain tasks. The administrative task, specifically, was a more inclusive tasks for both onsite and hybrid workers.

Future Directions

There are many options of future research within the topic of invisible labor. First, future studies should work to confirm or further develop my definition of invisible labor. By further developing a definition of invisible labor, there can be a greater distinction between invisible and visible tasks. This could be done by evaluating convergent and discriminant validity between invisible labor and illegitimate tasks, organizational citizenship behaviors, and counterproductive work behaviors.

Outside of clarifying the definition for invisible labor, future research could focus on expanding the invisible labor task list. As previously mentioned, the majority of tasks used within this study were developed pre-pandemic. By developing more items that include remote or hybrid tasks, researchers could better understand how invisible labor affects off-site employees. For example, are hybrid/remote workers more likely to engage in these tasks to feel more connected to the organization or their colleagues? Researchers could also examine if there are tasks that are specific to hybrid/remote employees such as troubleshooting the home wi-fi router or if there are tasks specific to blue collar employees such as reorganizing materials.

Finally, future studies should collect data for invisible labor enjoyment data on all participants. Some employees may enjoy certain invisible labor tasks, but the task may not be available to them. For example, a remote worker may like decorating the office for holidays but is not able to engage in the activity.

Conclusion

This study aimed to identify reasons for employee engagement with invisible labor tasks regardless of gender. This study also sought to measure task enjoyment. Research on this topic is important because most research investigating invisible labor

has predominantly focused on participation from racial and gender minorities. To sum the present findings, both genders completed invisible labor tasks, but the type of task varied by gender. Also, task enjoyment was related to task frequency for physical care, administrative, and social support tasks. This suggests that frequency of engagement only influences task enjoyment for certain types of tasks and vice versa. Overall, the highest rated reason for engaging in invisible labor tasks was because they align with their personal values and were seen as beneficial to their colleagues.

REFERENCES

Acker, J. (1990). Hierarchies, jobs, bodies: A theory of gendered organizations. *Gender & Society*, *4*(2), 139–158.

Adams, E. R. (2018). *Operationalizing office housework: Definition, examples, and antecedents.* [Master's thesis, Middle Tennessee State University]. ProQuest.

Baines, D., Cunningham, I., & Shields, J. (2017). Filling the gaps: Unpaid (and precarious) work in the nonprofit social services. *Critical Social Policy*, *37*(4), 625–645. https://doi.org/10.1177/0261018317693128

Ciciolla, L., & Luthar, S. S. (2019). Invisible household labor and ramifications for adjustment: Mothers as captains of households. *Sex Roles*, *81*(7–8), 467–486. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC8223758/

Clarke, R. I., Stanton, K. L., Grimm, A., & Zhang, B. (2022). Invisible labor, invisible value: Unpacking traditional assessment of academic library value. *College & Research Libraries*, *83*(6), 926. https://doi.org/10.5860/crl.83.6.926

Co, E. (2022). Weathering invisible labor. *Southwestern Law Review*, 51(2). https://heinonline.org/HOL/License

Crain, M. G., Poster, W. R., & Cherry, M. A. (2016). *Invisible labor: Hidden work in the contemporary world.* University of California Press.

Daniels, A. K. (1987). Invisible work. *Social Problems*, *34*(5), 403–415. https://doi.org/10.2307/800538

Deci, E. L. (1975). *Intrinsic motivation.* Plenum Press.

Devault, M. L. (2014). Mapping invisible work: Conceptual tools for social justice projects. *Sociological Forum*, 29(4), 775–790. https://doi.org/10.1111/socf.12119

Diab-Bahman, R. & Al-Enzi, A. (2020). The impact of COVID-19 pandemic on conventional work settings. *International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy*, 44(1), 909-927.

Espinosa, M. P. & Ferreira, E. (2022) Gender implicit bias and glass ceiling effects. *Journal of Applied Economics*, 25(1), 37-57. https://doi.org/10.1080/15140326.2021.2007723

Gatewood, R. D., Field, H. S., & Barrick, M. R. (2019). *Human resource selection.* Wessex Press, Inc.

Goldberg, B., Brintnell, E. S., & Goldberg, J. (2002). The relationship between engagement in meaningful activities and quality of life in persons disabled by mental illness. *Occupational Therapy in Mental Health, 18*(2), 17–44. https://doi.org/10.1300/J004v18n02_03

Gordon, H. R., Willink, K., & Hunter, K. (2022). Invisible labor and the associate professor: Identity and workload inequity. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*. https://doi.org/10.1037/dhe0000414

Hochschild, A. R. (1985). *The managed heart: The commercialization of human feeling*. University of California Press. https://www.ebsco.com/terms-of-use

Jang, S., Allen, T. D., & Regina, J. (2021). Office housework, burnout, and promotion: Does gender matter? *Journal of Business and Psychology*, *36*(5), 793–805. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-020-09703-6

Jex, S. M., Britt, T. W. (2014). Productive behavior in organizations. *Organizational psychology: A scientist-practitioner approach,*133–175. John Wiley & Sons.

Kaplan, A. (2022). “Just let it pass by and it will fall on some woman”: Invisible work in the labor market. *Gender and Society*, *36*(6), 838–868. https://doi.org/10.1177/08912432221128544

Lavee, E., & Kaplan, A. (2022). Invisible work at work and the reproduction of gendered social service organizations. *Gender, Work and Organization*, *29*(5), 1463–1480. https://doi.org/10.1111/gwao.12839

Melaku, T. M. (2022). Black women in white institutional spaces: The invisible labor clause and the inclusion tax. *American Behavioral Scientist*, *66*(11), 1512–1525. https://doi.org/10.1177/00027642211066037

Mussleman, M. E. (2020). *Is office housework an organizational citizenship behavior?* [Master’s thesis, Middle Tennessee State University]. Jewl Scholar.

Semmer, N. K., Jacobshagen, N., Meier, L.L., Elfering, A. (2010). Occupational stress research: The “stress-as-offense-to-self” perspective. *Occupational health psychology: European perspectives on research, education and practice*, 2, 41-59. University Press.

Semmer, N. K.,Tschan, F., Meier, L.L., Facchin, S., Jacobshagen, N. (2010). Illegitimate tasks and counterproductive work behavior. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 59(1), 70–96.

Social Sciences Feminist Network Research Interest Group. (2017). The burden of invisible work in academia. *Humboldt Journal of Social Relations*, *39*(39), 228–245. https://doi.org/10.2307/90007882

Spector, P. E. (1985). Measurement of human service satisfaction: Development of the job satisfaction survey. *American Journal of Community Psychology*,*13,* 693-713.

Spector, P. E. (1997). The nature of job satisfaction. *Job Satisfaction: Application, Assessment, Cause, and Consequences*, 1–22. Sage Publications.

Sveinson, K., Taylor, E., Keaton, A. C. I., Burton, L., Pegoraro, A., & Toffoletti, K. (2022). Addressing gender inequity in sport through women's invisible labor. *Journal of Sport Management*, *36*(3), 240–250. https://doi.org/10.1123/JSM.2021-0229

Taylor, S. E. (2011). Social support: A review. *The Oxford handbook of health psychology*, 189–214. Oxford University Press.

Toxtli, C., Suri, S., & Savage, S. (2021). Quantifying the invisible labor in crowd work. *Proceedings of the ACM on Human-Computer Interaction*, *5*(CSCW2). https://doi.org/10.1145/3476060

Wichroski, M. A. (1994). The Secretary: Invisible labor in the workworld of women. *Human Organization*, 53(1). https://about.jstor.org/terms

Williams, J. C., & Dempsey, R. (2014). *What works for women at work: Four patterns working women need to know*. New York University Press.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: FREQUENCIES FOR INDUSTRY

Frequencies of Industry

Industry	*n*	*% of Total*
Advertising	0	0%%
Computer & technology	16	7.3%
Construction	5	2.3%
Education	40	18.3%
Finance & economic	13	5.9%
Food & beverage	12	5.5%
Healthcare	30	13.7%
Hospitality	6	2.7%
Other	52	23.7%
Professional & business services	22	10.0%
Retail	16	7.3%
Transportation	7	3.2%

APPENDIX B: FREQUENCIES FOR " OTHER" INDUSTRIES

Frequencies of "Other" Industries

Industry	*n*	*% of Total*
Administration	1	1.9%
Aerospace	2	3.8%
Agriculture	1	1.9%
Architecture	1	1.9%
Commercial fishing	1	1.9%
Engineering	1	1.9%
Government	10	19.2%
Human services	4	7.7%
Information	1	1.9%
Leisure	1	1.9%
Manufacturing	10	19.2%
Media, arts & entertainment	6	11.5%
Nonprofit	4	7.7%
Public safety	1	1.9%
Public service	1	1.9%
Restoration	1	1.9%
Science	1	1.9%
Warehousing	3	5.8%
Wholesale Trade	2	3.8%

APPENDIX C: FREQUENCIES FOR JOB LEVEL

Frequencies of Job Level

Job Level	*n*	*% of Total*
Executive role	6	2.7%
Management role	88	40.2%
Professional role	72	32.9%
Support role	19	8.7%
Entry-level role	34	15.5%

APPENDIX D: MEASURES

Invisible Labor Tasks

On a scale of 1-5, please indicate how often you have completed each of the following tasks in the past 12 months.

1	2	3	4	5
Never	Annually	Monthly	Weekly	Daily

Physical Care Tasks

1. Emptied the office trash
2. Watered the office plants
3. Refilling the water cooler
4. Cleaning-related tasks
5. Fixed the coffee machine
6. Set out candy or office snacks for colleagues
7. Hung wall items
8. Stocked kitchen supplies
9. Killed or removed pests
10. Made coffee for the office
11. Cleaned the restrooms
12. Decorated the office for holidays
13. Repaired or assembled furniture
14. Removed recently printed documents from the printer and took them to colleagues

Attention check task

1. Organized the bathroom with unicorns.

Administrative Tasks

1. Set up office software

2. Troubleshot computer or software issues

3. Proof-read emails for colleagues

4. Handled incoming mail

5. Set up new employee offices/workstations

6. Answered phones in the conference room

7. Provided back-up for other employees when they are out

8. Set up meeting spaces

9. Printed, organized, and/or prepared meeting materials

10. Filled out paperwork for colleagues

11. Supervised or monitored office guests

12. Shipped packages

13. Coordinated others' calendars

14. Scheduled office maintenance

15. Created presentations for colleagues

16. Gave directions to guests/visitors

17. Researched or booked travel for colleagues

18. Organized digital or physical files for colleagues

Attention check task

1. Coordinating parking for the giraffes

Social Support Tasks

1. Listened to colleagues vent their frustrations

2. Emotionally supported upset colleagues

3. Ran errands for colleagues

4. Handled employee and employee family well-being communications

5. Provided career or life advice to colleagues

6. Provided general information to colleagues

7. Shared professional connections with colleagues

Social Event Tasks

1. Ordered catering for the office
2. Bought or prepared food for office events or parties
3. Ordered flowers for employees, clients, or others
4. Organized celebration parties for colleagues
5. Planned office events, parties, conferences, etc.
6. Purchased cards and/or gifts for employee birthday, retirement, condolences, etc.
7. Made business lunch or dinner reservations for colleagues

Attention Checks

1. Purchased trash to fill my shoes.

Invisible Labor Task Enjoyment

How much did you enjoy completing each of the following tasks?

1	2	3	4	5
Did not enjoy at all	Somewhat did not enjoy	Neutral	Somewhat enjoyed	Enjoyed very much

Physical Care Tasks

1. Emptied the office trash
2. Watered the office plants
3. Refilling the water cooler
4. Cleaning-related tasks
5. Fixed the coffee machine
6. Set out candy or office snacks for colleagues
7. Hung wall items
8. Stocked kitchen supplies
9. Killed or removed pests
10. Made coffee
11. Cleaned the restrooms
12. Decorated the office for holidays
13. Repaired or assembled furniture
14. Removed recently printed documents from the printer and took them to colleagues

Administrative Tasks

1. Set up office software
2. Troubleshot computer or software issues
3. Proof-read emails for colleagues
4. Handled incoming mail

5. Set up new employee offices/workstations
6. Answered phones in the conference room
7. Provided back-up for other employees when they are out
8. Set up meeting spaces
9. Printed, organized, and/or prepared meeting materials
10. Filled out paperwork for colleagues
11. Supervised or monitored office guests
12. Shipped packages
13. Coordinated others' calendars
14. Scheduled office maintenance
15. Created presentations for colleagues
16. Gave directions to guests/visitors
17. Researched or booked travel for colleagues
18. Organized digital or physical files for colleagues

Social Support Tasks

1. Listened to colleagues vent their frustrations
2. Emotionally supported upset colleagues
3. Ran errands for colleagues
4. Handled employee and employee family well-being communications
5. Provided career or life advice to colleagues
6. Provided general information to colleagues
7. Shared professional connections with colleagues

Social Event Tasks

1. Ordered catering for the office
2. Bought or prepared food for office events or parties
3. Ordered flowers for employees, clients, or others
4. Organized celebration parties for colleagues

5. Planned office events, parties, conferences, etc.
6. Purchased cards and/or gifts for employee birthday, retirement, condolences, etc.
7. Made business lunch or dinner reservations for colleagues

Reasons for Task Engagement

You indicated why you engaged in _____ task within the past 12 months. Why did you engage in this task?

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly disagree	Somewhat disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree

1. The task was assigned to me
2. I felt it was helpful to my colleague
3. I felt completing the task was beneficial to my career
4. I felt the task aligned with my personal values
5. I am the only one who cared about the task
6. I am the only one who knew how to do the task
7. I volunteered to complete this task every time I completed it
8. I volunteered to complete this task once and since have been the only one to complete it

Demographic Questions

1. What is your current age in years? [Free response]
2. What is your gender?
    a. Man, Woman, Other, Prefer not to say
3. What is your ethnicity?
    a. Caucasian, African American, Latino or Hispanic, Asian, Native American, Native Hawaiian pr Pacific Islander, Multi-ethnic, Other (specify)
4. What is the highest degree or level of education you have completed?
    a. Less than high school, high school graduate, some college, two-year degree, four-year degree, professional degree, Doctorate, Other
5. Which industry do you work in?
    a. Advertising, Computer and technology, Construction, Education, Finance and economic, Food and beverage, Healthcare, Hospitality, Professional and business services, Retail, Transportation, Other
6. How many hours a week do you work on average? [Free response]
7. What percentage of your work is completed on-site.
8. What job level would you classify yourself as?
    a. Executive role (generally refers to those who have authority over entire business units; they often manage managers)
    b. Management role (generally refers to those who manage other employees - whether they be other managers or individual contributors)

c. Professional role (generally refers to individual contributors who prioritize, plan and execute long term work projects)
d. Entry-level role (generally refers to employees whose work requires minim education and experience)
e. Support role (generally refers to individual contributors whose work and its prioritization is done by a manager)

9. How many years have you been working at your current job level? [Free response]

APPENDIX E: DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS FOR PHYSICAL CARE TASKS

Descriptive Statistics for Physical Care Task Frequency

Task & Task Description	*n*	*M*	*SD*
Physical Care Tasks (PCT) Overall	219	2.06	0.67
PCT 1 - Emptied the office trash	218	2.59	1.57
PCT 2 - Watered the office plants	219	1.74	1.24
PCT 3 - Refilling the water cooler	219	1.71	1.13
PCT 4 - Cleaning-related tasks	217	1.76	1.23
PCT 5 - Fixed the coffee machine	218	3.38	1.39
PCT 6 - Set out candy or office snacks for colleagues	218	2.28	1.34
PCT 7 - Hung wall items	219	1.62	0.98
PCT 8 - Stocked kitchen supplies	219	1.89	1.22
PCT 9 - Killed or removed pests	219	1.75	1.14
PCT 10 - Made coffee for the office	219	2.40	1.62
PCT 11 - Cleaned the restrooms	219	1.50	1.09
PCT 12 - Decorated the office for holidays	219	1.76	0.82
PCT 13 - Repaired or assembled furniture	218	1.57	0.77
PCT 14 - Removed recently printed documents from the printer and took them to colleagues	219	3.00	1.48

APPENDIX F: DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS FOR ADMINISTRATIVE TASKS

Descriptive Statistics for Administrative Task Frequency

Task & Task Description	*n*	*M*	*SD*
Administrative Tasks (AT) Overall	219	1.71	0.62
AT 1 - Set up office software	219	1.39	0.83
AT 2 - Troubleshot computer or software issues	218	2.21	1.30
AT 3 - Proof-read emails for colleagues	218	1.97	1.19
AT 4 - Handled incoming mail	216	1.95	1.44
AT 5 - Set up new employee offices/workstations	218	1.40	0.78
AT 6 - Answered phones in the conference room	216	1.64	1.22
AT 7 - Provided back-up for other employees when they are out	217	2.59	1.33
AT 8 - Set up meeting spaces	216	1.64	1.30
AT 9 - Printed, organized, and/or prepared meeting materials	217	2.00	1.28
AT 10 - Filled out paperwork for colleagues	216	1.66	1.11
AT 11 - Supervised or monitored office guests	212	1.53	1.03
AT 12 - Shipped packages	215	1.65	1.09
AT 13 - Coordinated others' calendars	215	1.54	1.11
AT 14 - Scheduled office maintenance	214	1.34	0.80
AT 15 - Created presentations for colleagues	215	1.50	0.91
AT 16 - Gave directions to guests/visitors	218	2.18	1.37
AT 17 - Researched or booked travel for colleagues	216	1.17	0.59
AT 18 - Organized digital or physical files for colleagues	218	1.69	1.14

APPENDIX G: DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS FOR ADMINISTRATIVE TASKS

Descriptive Statistics for Social Support Task Frequency

Task & Task Description	*n*	*M*	*SD*
Social Support Tasks (SST) Overall	219	2.60	0.82
SST 1 - Listened to colleagues vent their frustrations	219	3.73	1.28
SST 2 - Emotionally supported upset colleagues	217	3.18	1.36
SST 3 - Ran errands for colleagues	219	1.59	1.01
SST 4 - Handled employee and employee family well-being communications	218	1.48	1.03
SST 5 - Provided career or life advice to colleagues	218	2.47	1.33
SST 6 - Provided general information to colleagues	217	3.64	1.40
SST 7 - Shared professional connections with colleagues	218	2.18	1.34
Social Event Tasks (SET)	**219**	**1.25**	**0.37**
SET 1 - Ordered catering for the office	218	1.44	0.71
SET 2 - Bought or prepared food for office events or parties	219	1.21	0.60
SET 3 - Ordered flowers for employees, clients, or others	219	1.15	0.43
SET 4 - Organized celebration parties for colleagues	219	1.21	4.71
SET 5 - Planned office events, parties, conferences, etc.	219	1.42	0.67
SET 6 - Purchased cards and/or gifts for employee birthday, retirement, condolences, etc.	219	1.23	0.52
SET 7 - Made business lunch or dinner reservations for colleagues	218	1.11	0.42

APPENDIX H: DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS FOR ADMINISTRATIVE TASKS

Descriptive Statistics for Social Event Task Frequency

Task & Task Description	*n*	*M*	*SD*
Social Event Tasks (SET) Overall	219	1.25	0.37
SET 1 - Ordered catering for the office	218	1.44	0.71
SET 2 - Bought or prepared food for office events or parties	219	1.21	0.60
SET 3 - Ordered flowers for employees, clients, or others	219	1.15	0.43
SET 4 - Organized celebration parties for colleagues	219	1.21	4.71
SET 5 - Planned office events, parties, conferences, etc.	219	1.42	0.67
SET 6 - Purchased cards and/or gifts for employee birthday, retirement, condolences, etc.	219	1.23	0.52
SET 7 - Made business lunch or dinner reservations for colleagues	218	1.11	0.42

APPENDIX I: EXPLORATORY ANALYSIS RESULTS FOR SOCIAL SUPPORT TASKS

t-Test Results for Social Support Tasks

	Men			Women						
Task & Task Description	*n*	*M*	*SD*	*n*	*M*	*SD*	*t*	*df*	*p*	Cohen's d
Social support tasks overall	91	2.51	0.78	127	2.66	0.84	-1.34	197	.18	-.18
SST 1 - Listened to colleagues vent their frustrations	91	3.55	1.39	127	3.87	1.26	-1.81	192	.07	-.25
SST 2 - Emotionally supported upset colleagues	90	2.88	1.35	126	3.41	1.33	-2.89	191	<.01*	-.40
SST 3 - Ran errands for colleagues	91	1.52	0.96	127	1.65	1.05	-0.94	204	.35	-.13
SST 4 - Handled employee and employee family well-being communications	91	1.44	0.99	126	1.51	1.06	-0.49	201	.63	-.07
SST 5 - Provided career or life advice to colleagues	91	2.48	1.30	126	2.47	1.36	0.08	199	.93	.01
SST 6 - Provided general information to colleagues	91	2.63	1.44	125	3.66	1.37	-0.19	189	.85	-.03
SST 7 - Shared professional connections with colleagues	91	2.14	1.24	126	2.21	1.42	-0.39	207	.69	-.05

Note: * indicates $p < .05$

APPENDIX J: EXPLORATORY ANALYSIS RESULTS FOR PHYSICAL CARE TASKS

t-Test Results for Physical Care Tasks

	Men			Women						
Task & Task Description	*n*	*M*	*SD*	*n*	*M*	*SD*	*t*	*df*	*p*	Cohen's d
Physical care tasks overall	91	1.97	0.66	127	2.13	0.67	-1.75	197	.08	-.24
PCT 1 - Emptied the office trash	91	2.66	1.56	126	2.55	1.59	0.52	197	.61	.07
PCT 2 - Watered the office plants	91	1.49	1.08	126	1.93	1.32	-2.67	212	.01*	-.36
PCT 3 - Refilling the water cooler	91	1.69	1.13	126	1.72	1.13	-0.21	194	.84	-.03
PCT 4 - Cleaning-related tasks	91	1.90	1.28	126	1.66	1.19	1.43	186	.16	.20
PCT 5 - Fixed the coffee machine	91	3.05	1.51	126	3.63	1.26	-2.95	172	<.01*	-.41
PCT 6 - Set out candy or office snacks for colleagues	91	1.83	1.13	126	2.60	1.40	-4.44	211	<.001*	-.60
PCT 7 - Hung wall items	91	1.52	0.96	126	1.70	0.99	-1.38	197	.17	-.19
PCT 8 - Stocked kitchen supplies	91	1.68	1.20	126	2.04	1.21	-2.15	194	.03*	-.30
PCT 9 - Killed or removed pests	91	1.79	1.20	126	1.73	1.09	0.37	183	.71	.05
PCT 10 - Made coffee for the office	91	2.65	1.67	126	2.24	1.57	1.84	187	.07	.25
PCT 11 - Cleaned the restrooms	91	1.55	1.12	126	1.47	1.08	0.51	189	.61	.07
PCT 12 - Decorated the office for holidays	91	1.52	0.77	126	1.94	0.82	-3.87	202	<.001*	-.53
PCT 13 - Repaired or assembled furniture	91	1.58	0.75	126	1.56	0.79	0.26	200	.80	.04
PCT 14 - Removed recently printed documents from the printer	91	2.74	1.47	126	3.20	1.46	-2.29	193	.02*	-.31

and took them to colleagues	

Note: * indicates $p < .05$

APPENDIX K: EXPLORATORY ANALYSIS RESULTS FOR ADMINISTRATIVE TASKS

t-Test Results for Administrative Tasks

	Men			Women						
Task & Task Description	*n*	*M*	*SD*	*n*	*M*	*SD*	*t*	*df*	*p*	Cohen's d
Administrative tasks overall	91	1.69	0.63	127	1.72	0.62	-0.42	193	.68	-.06
AT 1 - Set up office software	91	1.56	0.96	127	1.28	0.71	2.41	157	.01*	.34
AT 2 - Troubleshot computer or software issues	91	2.31	1.37	126	2.14	1.24	0.91	182	.37	.13
AT 3 - Proof-read emails for colleagues	90	1.93	1.22	127	1.99	1.17	-0.36	187	.72	-.05
AT 4 - Handled incoming mail	90	1.91	1.44	125	1.98	1.44	-0.37	192	.72	-.05
AT 5 - Set up new employee offices/workstations	90	1.53	0.90	127	1.31	0.66	1.95	154	.05	.28
AT 6 - Answered phones in the conference room	90	1.61	1.15	125	1.67	1.28	-0.37	203	.72	-.05
AT 7 - Provided back-up for other employees when they are out	90	2.60	1.37	126	2.60	1.30	-0.02	186	.99	-.00
AT 8 - Set up meeting spaces	90	1.54	1.03	125	1.71	1.20	-1.10	206	.27	-.15
AT 9 - Printed, organized, and/or prepared meeting materials	90	1.91	1.22	126	2.06	1.31	-0.88	199	.38	-.12
AT 10 - Filled out paperwork for colleagues	90	1.60	1.08	125	1.71	1.14	-0.73	197	.46	-.10
AT 11 - Supervised or monitored office guests	90	1.41	0.86	121	1.63	1.14	-1.58	209	.12	-.21
AT 12 - Shipped packages	90	1.70	1.12	124	1.59	1.04	0.74	183	.46	.10

AT 13 - Coordinated others' calendars	89	1.35	0.87	125	1.68	1.24	-2.31	212	.02*	-.31
AT 14 - Scheduled office maintenance	89	1.38	0.82	125	1.31	0.79	0.63	285	.53	.09
AT 15 - Created presentations for colleagues	89	1.44	0.87	124	1.55	0.95	-0.88	199	.38	-.12
AT 16 - Gave directions to guests/visitors	91	2.10	1.40	126	2.25	1.36	-0.82	190	.42	-.11
AT 17 - Researched or booked travel for colleagues	91	1.24	0.75	124	1.12	0.43	1.38	134	.17	.20
AT 18 - Organized digital or physical files for colleagues	91	1.52	0.97	126	1.83	1.23	-2.06	213	.04*	-.28

Note: * indicates $p < .05$

APPENDIX L: EXPLORATORY ANALYSIS RESULTS FOR SOCIAL EVENT TASKS

t-Test Results for Social Event Tasks

	Men			Women						
Task & Task Description	*n*	*M*	*SD*	*n*	*M*	*SD*	*t*	*df*	*p*	Cohen's d
Social event task overall	91	1.17	0.32	127	1.31	0.40	-2.83	213	.01*	-.38
SET 1 - Ordered catering for the office	91	1.10	0.40	127	1.29	0.70	-2.57	206	.01*	-.34
SET 2 - Bought or prepared food for office events or parties	91	1.30	0.59	126	1.56	0.77	-2.82	214	.01*	-.38
SET 3 - Ordered flowers for employees, clients, or others	91	1.14	0.44	127	1.15	0.42	-0.11	189	.91	-.02
SET 4 - Organized celebration parties for colleagues	91	1.08	0.27	127	1.31	0.56	-4.05	193	<.001*	-.53
SET 5 - Planned office events, parties, conferences, etc.	91	1.12	0.33	127	1.31	0.61	2.90	202	<.01*	-.38
SET 6 - Purchased cards and/or gifts for employee birthday, retirement, condolences, etc.	91	1.35	0.66	127	1.48	0.68	-1.41	298	.16	-.19
SET 7 - Made business lunch or dinner reservations for colleagues	91	1.12	0.49	126	1.10	0.37	0.42	159	.68	.06

Note: * indicates $p < .05$