

OFFICE HOUSEWORK, ORGANIZATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIORS, AND
WORK ETHIC: A CORRELATIONAL STUDY

By

Hailey G. Moss

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

Middle Tennessee State University

May 2024

Thesis Committee:

Dr. Judith Van Hein, Chair

Dr. Kimberly Ujcich Ward

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Completing my master's Thesis has been an incredible journey, and one that requires recognizing the incredible people who helped me to get this far. First, I would like to thank my husband Jared, for loving and supporting me through graduate school. Next, I would also like to thank my classmates, as their support and comradery has gotten me through the last 2 years. I have no doubts that each one of them will do incredible things in their careers and lives. Additionally, I would like to thank the staff of the MTSU I-O Psychology department. Thank you to Dr. Van Hein for serving as my chair and being a friendly face to guide me through the Thesis process. Thank you to Dr. Hein for seeing potential in me, and for bringing me into COHRE. Thank you to Dr. Frame for guiding the literature review process and for being my COHRE mentor. Lastly, thank you to Dr. Ujcich Ward for serving on my thesis committee and working with Dr. Van Hein on the office housework research. This would not be possible without all of you, so again, thank you.

ABSTRACT

This research focused on the relationship between individual work ethic and how that impacts employee contextual job performance, including both organizational citizenship behaviors and office housework. The office housework literature has grown over the past few years, but there is much research still needed to understand this contextual job behavior. Correlations between work ethic, organizational citizenship behaviors, and office housework were tested. A relationship was found between office housework and organizational citizenship behaviors aimed at the individual (OCB-Is), but not organizational citizenship behaviors focused on the organization (OCB-Os). Additionally, work ethic did not significantly relate to organizational citizenship behaviors focused on the organization (OCB-Os). Office housework and OCB-Is were both related to four work ethic dimensions: centrality of work, hard work, wasted time, and delay of gratification. Findings of this study help demonstrate the similarities and differences in the relationship between office housework and organizational citizenship behaviors, using work ethic. Further studies should attempt to help define the different types of contextual job performance behaviors, and what drives employees to complete them.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE.....	1
Contextual Job Performance.....	1
Organizational Citizenships Behaviors.....	2
Invisible Labor.....	3
Office Housework	5
Work Ethic.....	8
Work Ethic and Organizational Citizenships Behaviors.....	9
Current Study.....	10
CHAPTER II: METHOD.....	14
Participants.....	14
Measures.....	14
Procedures.....	16
CHAPTER III: RESULTS.....	18
CHAPTER IV: DISCUSSION.....	28
Limitations and Future Research.....	31
Conclusion.....	32
REFERENCES.....	33
APPENDICES.....	38
Appendix A: Descriptive statistics.....	38
Appendix B: IRB Approval Letter.....	39

Appendix C: Informed Consent.....	40
Appendix D: Screening Questions & Online Survey.....	44

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics for All Demographics.....	38
Table 2. Reliability Analysis for All Variables.....	19
Table 3. Descriptive Statistics for All Variables.....	19
Table 4. Correlation Matrix for Office Housework Dimensions and Work Ethic Dimensions.....	20
Table 5. Correlation Matrix for Organizational Citizenship Behaviors and Work Ethic Dimensions.....	24
Table 6. Correlation Matrix for Organizational Citizenship Behaviors and Office Housework Dimensions.....	25
Table 7. Descriptive Statistics for Office Housework scores by Race and Gender.....	27

CHAPTER I: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

Previous studies have investigated the work completed by employees that does not benefit them in any way or gain any recognition from others (Adams, 2018; Mussleman, 2020; Bourque, 2023). Office housework has been defined and measured as the completion of tasks beyond one's job description. These office housework tasks can be vast, such as planning office parties, having to take staff meeting notes, comforting other employee emotions, or maintaining a clean and organized working environment (Adams, 2018). Research has focused on defining activities that are not required according to job descriptions but are included in the reality of the work (Adams, 2018). To add to the minimal research of office housework, this study will assess how these behaviors relate to the different dimensions of work ethic. Because the context of office housework usually means doing more than the specified job duties require, understanding how one's personal work ethic might relate to their office housework completion could help the overall research of office housework.

Contextual Job Performance

To introduce the concept of office housework, it is important to acknowledge the academic literature regarding behaviors at work. Job performance has been studied frequently and defined as the "total expected value to the organization of the discrete behavioral episodes that an individual carries out over a standard period of time" (Motowidlo, 2003). It is important to note that job performance is a form of behavior

refers to the expected organizational value of that behavior (Motowidlo, 2003). Job performance can be split into two domains, including task performance and contextual performance. Task performance includes behaviors carried out to accomplish duties included in one's job description (Motowidlo, 2003). This could include communicating with or developing project reports. Contextual performance, on the other hand, are behaviors that do not directly come from one's job description but do contribute to the overall effectiveness of the organization through different psychological, social, and organizational influences on the organization (Motowidlo, 2003). Categories of contextual performance behaviors include personal support tasks, organizational support tasks, and conscientiousness initiative tasks (Motowidlo, 2003). An example of a personal support task would include aiding a coworker with a new tool. An example of an organizational support task would be completing office tasks for others. Lastly, an example of conscientiousness initiative tasks would be creating a planning spreadsheet for an event. There are multiple predictors of contextual job performance, including individual differences. Personality variables and cognitive ability have been shown to be predictors of both task and contextual performance (Motowidlo, Borman, & Schmit, 1997). Personality variable like extroversion, agreeableness, and conscientiousness are more indicative of contextual performance than task performance. (Motowidlo et al., 1997). There are multiple types of contextual job behaviors, including organizational citizenship behaviors, office housework, and invisible labor.

Organizational Citizenship Behaviors

Organizational citizenship behaviors (OCBs) and counterproductive workplace behaviors (CWB) are the two most researched types of contextual job performance (Motowidlo, 2003). CWBs are defined as “any intentional behavior on the part of the organizational member viewed by the organization as contrary to its legitimate interests” (Sackett, 2002). OCBs are defined by Organ (1988) as “individual behavior that is discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system, and that in the aggregate promotes the effective functioning of the organization”. Organizational citizenship behaviors are also defined in terms of individual, OCB-Is, and the organization, OCB-Os.

OCBs and office housework tasks occur when an employee positively impacts an organization in different psychological, social, and organizational ways, while not receiving any direct recognition for the behavior (Mussleman, 2020). Because of this similarity, there has been research conducted on whether organizational citizenship behaviors and office housework are the same construct, or if they are just related (Mussleman, 2020). Mussleman found that these constructs are indeed separate constructs, but are related to each other, and have a slight overlap in their measurements. This study will continue the investigation on whether OCBs and office housework are the same construct by evaluating how they relate to one another, and comparing how they each relate to work ethic values.

Invisible Labor

Invisible labor has been defined in many studies as “the unpaid activities that occur within the context of paid employment that workers perform in response to requirements from their employers and that are crucial for workers to generate income or retain jobs, and to further their careers, but are often overlooked, ignored, or devalued by employers and ultimately the legal system itself” (Toxtli, Suri, & Savage, 2021; Kaplan, 2022; Cherry, 2016; Seymour, 2022). It is important to acknowledge that these activities are paid, despite this definition claiming that these are unpaid activities in the context of paid employment. This is because activities completed during working hours are included in the employee’s pay. Some studies refer to invisible labor in a different context, focusing on the private sector of the home and the work completed by caretakers (Daniels, 1985). This included basic feminism beliefs and the invisible labor completed by caretakers. However, much of the available literature defines invisible labor as conducted in the workplace.

Invisible labor is believed to fit into 4 distinct factors: invisible teamwork, invisible physical care at work, invisible emotional labor, and invisible administrative work (Kaplan, 2022). Invisible teamwork includes organizing and initiating social activities. Invisible care at work includes cleaning tasks such as taking out the garbage or wiping down the tables. Invisible emotional labor includes helping your coworkers mentally through support and mentorship. Invisible administrative work includes taking meeting notes and coordinating work schedules (Kaplan, 2022). These categories are

clearly similar to the dimensions of office housework, which will be reviewed in the following section.

To understand why this labor is invisible to the organization, Hatton (2017) identified three sociological mechanisms that devalue the work. The first mechanism includes cultural ideologies, such as sex, gender, age, sexuality, etc. (Hatton, 2017). In the United States' idealistic culture, women are assumed to be the caretakers and considered helpful, caring, and friendly people. This ideology surrounding women has been found to be associated with women completing more invisible labor than men (Lavee & Kaplan, 2022). The second ideology includes the legal dimensions of employment (Hatton, 2017). Individuals in noneconomic workplaces, such as nonprofits, education, or rehabilitation, are likely to have their work be more invisible than individuals in other industries. The third ideology devaluing invisible labor would be any physical segregation, such as working in the domestic domain rather than in the public domain (Hatton, 2017).

Office Housework

On the other hand, office housework has been operationally defined as “non-role-specific work that a) benefits the organization, b) does not directly benefit the worker in their work capacity, and c) is underappreciated and generally goes unrecognized” (Adams, 2018; Mussleman, 2020). There are also four factors that are used to represent office housework, they are helping others, janitorial tasks, planning for work, and social planning. Helping others could include providing emotional support to coworkers or

supporting them with computer issues. Janitorial tasks include cleaning and watering the plants. Planning for work includes scheduling office maintenance or planning office parties. Social planning includes making dinner reservations or coordinating others' calendars (Adams, 2018; Mussleman, 2020).

Recent research focusing on the relationship between office housework completion and personality variables found a positive relationship between office housework and conscientiousness, extraversion, and openness (Bourque, 2023). Due to the significant relationship between office housework and organizational citizenship behavior, one would expect to find similar results with the assessment of the big 5 personality values. Evidence has in fact supported this, as conscientiousness has also been shown to have a significant relationship with organizational citizenship behavior (Motowidlo, 2003; Mahajan, 2017). Another study found evidence that OCBs (with prosocial motivations) are related to openness (Bourdage, Lee, K., Lee, J. H., & Shin, 2012). Conscientiousness has also been shown to have a relationship with OCBs (Chiaburu, Oh, Berry, Li, & Gardner, 2011). This indicates similar findings to that of office housework completion.

For both office housework and invisible labor studies, inequalities among different demographic groups have been found in completion rates. A qualitative study with a law firm organization found that black female lawyers completed more invisible labor than the white female lawyers in the office (Melaku, 2022). Another study found that women of color spent more time than any of their peer professors on committee work

(Gordon, Willink, & Hunter, 2022). Additionally, research on academic publishing found that women completed over 60% more service work than men, with service work being considered a form of invisible labor (Golubovic, Inglis, & Connel, 2022).

Further research has continued to demonstrate these demographic differences. Another study quantifying the amount of invisible labor completed by crowd workers found that 33% of their times was spent of invisible labor, and women completed more invisible labor than men (Toxtli, Suri, & Savage, 2021). Jang, Allen, and Regina (2021) found that women completed more social maintenance office housework than men. This included tasks such as caring for others' emotions and planning events. Additionally, men completed more objective maintenance than women, which included tasks such as taking out the trash or killing bugs. This study also found that the relationship between office housework and promotion was only significant for men (Jang et al., 2021). Additionally, a study conducted through an online survey assessing office housework completion found that women completed more office housework tasks than men (Adams, 2018). These inequalities among gender and race completion rates in office housework and invisible labor represent the need to continue research on the impacts of office housework/invisible labor completion on the employee.

In order to continue with the current study, it is best to maintain the office housework definition and measure. This is due to the similarities between the office housework studies and the invisible labor studies, there is reason to believe that they are both assessing the same construct, just with different names. The definitions of office

housework and invisible labor cover the same points, with the behaviors being non-role specific, invisible, or devalued, and not directly beneficial to the employee. The factors associated with each construct resemble each other as well, as they have different titles but represent similar constructs. Invisible labor factors like invisible teamwork, invisible physical care at work, invisible emotional labor, and invisible administrative work (Kaplan, 2022). The factors associated with office housework include helping others, janitorial tasks, planning for work, and social planning, which are different titles yet representing the same variables as the dimensions for invisible labor (Mussleman, 2020). For this reason, this study will consider invisible labor and office housework as one construct. This study will be utilizing the term “office housework”. The measure developed for office housework will be utilized in this study, rather than the invisible labor measure, due to survey length and item clarity (Kaplan, 2022; Adams, 2018; Mussleman, 2020).

Work Ethic

To understand why employees engage in office housework or organizational citizenship behaviors, this study will assess individual work ethic. Work ethic is defined as the commitment to hard work among employees (Miller et al., 2002). Work ethic is a multidimensional factor, containing seven dimensions of work ethic including: hard work, leisure, centrality of work, wasted time, religion/morality, self-reliance, and delay of gratification (Miller et al., 2002). Hard work is defined the attitudes and beliefs toward hard work. Leisure is the importance of participating in leisure activities. Centrality of

work is the importance of work in one's life. Wasted time is to a distaste for unproductive use of time. Religion/morality is personal beliefs. Self-reliance refers to beliefs towards independence from others. Lastly, delay of gratification is one's future orientation and beliefs on waiting for rewards.

Organization concerns today focus on an employee's job performance, including how to attract and maintain productive employees, and how an employee's work ethic could relate or predict these things (Miller, Woehr, & Hudspeth, 2002). An individual with a high work ethic would prioritize fairness, efficiency, hard work, autonomy, and delay of gratification in their workplace interactions (Miller et al., 2002). Work ethic demonstrates an individual's motivation to work, is learned, and refers to attitudes or beliefs related to work activities (Miller et al., 2002). Considering the need for a better understanding of office housework, and individual's work ethic beliefs could show an important pattern.

Work Ethic and Organizational Citizenship Behaviors

Adding to considerations of the relationship between office housework and work ethic, a previous study conducted by Meriac and Gorman (2017) focused on the relationship between OCBs, CWBs, and work ethic. They found that centrality of work and wasted time were significantly positively related to both OCB-Os and OCB-Is. OCB-Os focus on action completed that focus on the organization, while OCB-Is focus on actions towards other individuals. This study also found that both OCB-Os and OCB-Is had a significant negative relationship with the work ethic dimension of leisure. No

further significant relationships were found between the dimensions of work ethic and OCB-Os and OCB-Is. Furthermore, multiple researchers have found that work ethic and conscientiousness are related to one another, and significantly related to OCBs and office housework (Bourque, 2023; Miller, et. a., 2002, Meriac & Gorman, 2017).

Current Study

Considering these significant relationships between organizational citizenship behaviors and work ethic, this study will assess if office housework relates to work ethic (Mussleman, 2020). Additionally, this study will continue to assess if office housework is related to OCBs.

Research Question 1: Is office housework completion related to work ethic?

Research Question 2: Is office housework completion related to organizational citizenship behaviors, OCB-Os and OCB-Is?

To better understand the complex relationship that could exist between office housework and work ethic, the construct of office housework will be analyzed at the dimensional level. The dimensions of office housework include helping, janitorial, planning for work, and social planning (Adams, 2018; Mussleman, 2020). In terms of relating to OCBs, helping would be considered an OCB-Is, since it is focused on helping individuals in the organization to complete their work. Considering the previous relationships discovered in this study between office housework and OCBs, the following hypotheses will remain consistent with the results found by Meriac and Gorman (2017; Mussleman, 2020).

Hypothesis 1: Helping will be positively related to centrality of work and wasted time.

Hypothesis 2: Helping will be negatively related to leisure.

The dimension of janitorial includes behaviors focused on maintaining the workplace environment, which is consistent with OCB-Os, so the following hypotheses will reflect the findings between OCBs and work ethic (Adams, 2018; Mussleman, 2020; Meriac & Gorman, 2017).

Hypothesis 3: Janitorial will be positively related to centrality of work and wasted time.

Hypothesis 4: Janitorial will be negatively related to leisure.

Planning for work includes behaviors focused on helping the organization, consistent with OCB-Os, so the following hypotheses will reflect the previous findings on the relationship between work ethic and OCBs, which are related to office housework (Adams, 2018; Meriac & Gorman, 2017; Mussleman, 2020).

Hypothesis 5: Planning for work will be positively related to centrality of work and wasted time.

Hypothesis 6: Planning for work will be negatively related to leisure.

Social planning focuses on behaviors that help the individuals in the work environment, consistent with OCB-Is, so the following hypotheses will reflect the findings between OCBs and work ethic (Adams, 2018; Meriac & Gorman, 2017; Mussleman, 2020).

Hypothesis 7: Social planning will be positively related to centrality of work and wasted time.

Hypothesis 8: Social planning will be negatively related to leisure.

It is also important to recall that office housework and organizational citizenship behaviors have been found to represent a similar yet distinguishable construct, therefore, significant relationships could be found, despite there not being a significant relationship between OCBs and certain work ethic dimensions (Meriac & Gorman, 2017; Mussleman, 2020). Considering this, a few more research questions emerged regarding the relationship between work ethic dimensions and office housework dimensions. Since helping contains behaviors of going out of one's way to support others at work, the relationship between completion of office housework tasks could be related to self-reliance (Adams, 2018; Mussleman, 2020; Miller et al., 2002).

Research Question 3: Is the office housework dimension helping related to the work ethic dimension self-reliance?

Considering the amount of extra effort extorted to complete janitorial tasks, it is assumed that there will be a relationship between janitorial and hard work (Miller, et. a., 2002; Adams, 2018; Mussleman, 2020).

Research Question 4: Is the office housework dimension janitorial related to the work ethic dimension hard work?

Next, since completing office housework tasks are associated with going over and beyond written responsibilities, this study will assess if office housework completion is related to morality/ethics (Miller et al., 2002).

Research Question 5: Is office housework completion related to morality/ethics?

Lastly, it is important to consider the significant differences found previously in office housework completion rates among men and women (Adams, 2018). Another aim of this study is to determine if gender differences moderate the relationship between office housework completion and OCBs with work ethic beliefs.

Research question 6: Does gender moderate the relationship between work ethic beliefs and office housework completion rates?

Research question 7: Does gender moderate the relationship between work ethic beliefs and OCBs?

CHAPTER II: METHOD

Participants

Participants were recruited through Prolific and were paid a \$2.50 to participate in the Work Tasks and Work Attitudes survey through Qualtrics. Initially, 113 participants were recruited through this method. To be considered for this study, participants had to be currently working in the United States, be fluent in English, enter the Prolific code accurately, and have at least one year of work experience in an office (In person at least 50% of the time).

After passing the screening questions, 99 (88%) participants completed the survey. This means that 14 (8%) participants were removed from the study due to failing eligibility requirements. Descriptive statistics for all participants are in Table 1, located in Appendix A. The average age of the participants was 39 years ($SD = 10$). For gender, 45% of the participants identified as males, 53% as females, and 2% as nonbinary or other. For race, 74% of the sample identified as white, 8% identified as Asian, 15% identified as black or African American, 2% identified as American Indian or Alaska native, and 1% identified as other. For education, 3% reported having a high school degree or equivalent, 10% reported have some college experience, 10% reported having an associate degree, 55% reported having a bachelor's degree, and 22% reported having a master's degree or higher. Participants were at their current job for an average of 5.8 years ($SD = 5.3$), with a total range of 1 to 25 years.

Measures

The measure of office housework was developed and improved upon through factor analysis and *contains* four dimensions including Janitorial (alpha = .92); Helping (alpha = .91); Planning for Work (alpha = .87); and Social Planning (alpha = .86) tasks (Adams, 2018; Mussleman, 2020). This revised scale has 40 task statements to assess the 4 dimensions of office housework, with statements such as “emotionally supports others” or “makes coffee”. A few of these statements have been revised to reflect the current workplace office behaviors completed in 2024. Participants were asked to rate how frequently they completed each of the 40 task statements using a 5 point Likert scale ranging between 1 (*Never*) and 5 (*Very Often*).

The MWEF is used as an assessment of work ethic, by including the seven dimensions of work ethic (Miller et al., 2002). The shortened version, the MWEF-SF, contains 28 items, with four items for each of the seven dimensions (Meriac, Woehr, Gorman, & Thomas, 2013). Cronbach’s alpha for each factor were acceptable, including centrality of work (alpha = .80), self-reliance (alpha = .80), hard work (alpha = .83), anti-leisure (alpha = .77), morality/ethics (alpha = .75), delay of gratification (alpha = .81), and wasted time (alpha = .71) dimensions (Wright, 2016). This assessment of work ethic contains belief statements, such as “A hard day’s work is very fulfilling” (Meriac et al., 2013). Participants are instructed to read these statements and rate them using a 5-point Likert scale ranging between 1 (*Strongly Disagree*) and 5 (*Strongly Agree*).

Next is the OCB measure, which includes 7 items to measure OCB-Os, or organizational citizenship behaviors aimed at helping the organization. Another 7 items

are presented to measure OCB-Is, or organizational citizenship behaviors aimed at helping individuals. Internal consistency has been demonstrated for both scales, with a Cronbach's alpha of .87 for OCB-Is and .77 for OCB-Os (Meriac et al., 2013). This study will leave out 7 items from this scale which are aimed at measuring in-role behaviors, or responsibilities found on one's job description. Since office housework is considered a contextual behavior, not on one's job description, this section has been removed. Participants will be instructed to rate each of the statements regarding their work using a 5-point Likert scale ranging between 1 (*Strongly Disagree*) and 5 (*Strongly Agree*).

Procedures

The Institutional Review Board reviewed and approved this study before any data were collected (Appendix B). Participants were first sent to an online Qualtrics survey beginning with participant screening questions. As previously mentioned, these questions assessed if the participant is currently working in the United States, with at least one year of work experience in an office (in person, at least 50% of the time). Participants that did not meet these eligibility requirements were sent to the end of the survey where they were provided information for the lead investigator, explained the reason for their removal in the study, and thanked for their time.

Eligible participants went on to the first part of the survey, addressing the completion rates of office housework tasks. After completing the office housework survey, participants continued to the shortened version of the Multidimensional Work

Ethic Profile (MWEF). Next, participants were taken to a measure of organizational citizenship behaviors, developed by Williams and Anderson (1991). After completion of the three measures, participants were asked demographic questions, including age, gender, education level, income, race, and the number of years in their current job. They were then thanked for their time in completing the survey and sent to the final page, where they were provided with contact information for the lead investigator.

CHAPTER III: RESULTS

Data analysis began with an internal consistency reliability analysis of each of the scales used, to determine if any items should be removed before conducting further analyses. The following scales were tested for reliability: Office Housework total, social planning, janitorial, helping, planning for work; work ethic total, self-reliance, morality/ethics, leisure, centrality of work, hard work, wasted time, delay of gratification; OCB total, OCB-I, and OCB-O. The final coefficient alpha of each scale is in Table 2.

Cronbach's alpha for the 16 scales ranged from .60 to .95. No items were removed from any of the scales. Descriptive statistics for all variables can be found in Table 3. Descriptive statistics revealed that the average office housework score for participants was 2.13 ($SD = .63$). This indicated lower than average completion rates, considering the scale of 1 to 5. The average score on the work ethic total measure (MWEP) was 3.97 ($SD = .38$). This indicated higher than average work ethic beliefs. Lastly, descriptive statistics revealed an average of 4.24 ($SD = .42$) for OCB completion, indicating a higher than average score.

Table 2
Reliability Analysis for All Variables

Variable	Number of Items	Cronbach's Alpha
Office Housework total	43	0.95
Social Planning	7	0.91
Janitorial	14	0.90
Helping	4	0.67
Planning for Work	18	0.91
Work Ethic total	28	0.83
Self-reliance	4	0.79
Morality/Ethics	4	0.60
Leisure	4	0.83
Centrality of Work	4	0.86
Hard Work	4	0.90
Wasted Time	4	0.79
Delay of Gratification	4	0.90
OCB total	14	0.75
OCB-I	7	0.77
OCB-O	7	0.63

n = 85

Table 3
Descriptive Statistics for All Variables

Variable	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Office Housework total	99	2.13	0.62
Social Planning	99	1.84	0.83
Janitorial	99	1.81	0.69
Helping	99	2.59	0.65
Planning for Work	99	2.26	0.72
Work Ethic total	99	3.97	0.38
Self-reliance	99	3.93	0.73
Morality/Ethics	99	4.72	0.38
Leisure	99	4.02	0.74
Centrality of Work	99	4.02	0.77
Hard Work	99	3.71	0.92
Wasted Time	99	4.06	0.68
Delay of Gratification	99	3.34	0.89
OCB total	99	4.24	0.42
OCB-I	99	4.21	0.55
OCB-O	99	4.26	0.52

Note: Scales for Office Housework, Work Ethic, and OCBs use a 1 - 5 Likert rating scale. Higher rating scores indicate more of the behavior or belief measures.

Office Housework and Work Ethic

Research question 1 asked whether office housework and work ethic are related constructs. Pearson's correlation indicated that there is a significant positive relationship between office housework total and work ethic total, $r(99) = .24, p = .02$.

Hypotheses 1-8 focused on the relationship between office housework dimensions and work ethic dimensions. The correlations between these dimensions can be found in Table 4.

Table 4
Correlation Matrix for Office Housework Dimensions and Work Ethic Dimensions

Variable	Office Housework Total	Janitorial	Planning for Work	Helping	Social Planning
Work Ethic Total	0.24*	0.11	0.21*	0.25*	0.24*
Self-reliance	-0.03	-0.06	-0.05	-0.05	0.05
Morality/Ethics	-0.11	-0.13	-0.04	-0.02	-0.16
Leisure	-0.13	-0.07	-0.12	-0.03	-0.20*
Centrality of Work	0.22*	0.03	0.21*	0.20*	0.31**
Hard Work	0.29**	0.20	0.26**	0.25*	0.27**
Wasted Time	0.20*	0.04	0.23*	0.20*	0.20*
Delay of Gratification	0.25*	0.25**	0.16	0.25*	0.21*

$n = 99$

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$

Hypotheses 1, 3, 5, and 7 were focused on the relationships between office housework dimensions and work ethic dimensions centrality of work and wasted time. Hypothesis 1 proposed that helping would be positively related to centrality of work and wasted time. Pearson's correlation indicated that office housework dimension helping is significantly positively related to both centrality of work, $r(99) = .20, p = .04$, and wasted time, $r(99) = .25, p = .01$. Hypothesis 5 included that office housework dimension planning for work would be positively related to centrality of work and wasted time. Pearson's correlation indicated that planning for work is significantly positively related to both centrality of work, $r(99) = 0.21, p = .04$, and wasted time, $r(99) = .23, p = .02$. Hypothesis 7 posited that office housework dimension social planning would be positively related to centrality of work and wasted time. Pearson's correlation indicated that social planning is significantly positively related to both centrality of work, $r(99) = 0.31, p = .00$, and wasted time, $r(99) = .20, p = .04$. These results indicate that hypotheses 1, 5, and 7 were supported.

Hypothesis 3 proposed that office housework dimension janitorial would be positively related to centrality of work and wasted time. Pearson's correlation indicated that janitorial is not significantly related to either centrality of work, $r(99) = .03, p = 0.75$, or wasted time, $r(99) = .04, p = .69$. These results indicate that hypothesis 3 was not supported.

Next, hypotheses 2, 4, 6, and 8 focused on the different office housework dimensions (helping, janitorial, planning for work, and social planning) relationships with work ethic dimension leisure. Hypothesis 2 indicated that helping would be negatively related to leisure. Pearson's correlation indicated that helping is not significantly related to leisure, $r(99) = -.03, p = .76$. Hypothesis 4 posited that janitorial would be negatively related to leisure. Pearson's correlation indicated that janitorial is not significantly related to leisure, $r(99) = -.07, p = .51$. Hypothesis 6 proposed that planning for work would be negatively related to leisure. Pearson's correlation indicated that planning for work is not significantly related to leisure, $r(99) = -.12, p = .25$. Lastly, hypothesis 8 indicated that social planning would be negatively related to leisure. Pearson's correlation indicated that social planning is significantly negatively related to leisure, $r(99) = -.20, p = .04$. These results indicate that hypotheses 2, 4, and 6 were not supported, but hypothesis 8 was supported, as only the office housework dimension of social planning had the only negative relationship with leisure.

Additional research questions investigated the relationship between office housework dimensions with other work ethic dimensions. Research question 3 questioned whether helping was related to self-reliance. Pearson's correlation indicated that helping was not significantly related to self-reliance, $r(99) = -.05, p = .65$. Research question 4 considered whether janitorial was related to hard work. Pearson's correlation indicated that janitorial was not significantly related to hard work, $r(99) = .20, p = .05$. Lastly, research question 5 posited whether office housework completion was related to the work

ethic dimension of morality/ethics. Pearson's correlation indicated that office housework was not significantly related to hard work, $r(99) = -.11, p = .29$. Thus, no relationships were found regarding research questions 3, 4, or 5.

Organizational Citizenship Behaviors and Work Ethic

Next, the relationship between organizational citizenship behaviors and work ethic will be discussed. The correlation matrix for these factors is included in Table 4.

Organizational citizenship behaviors focused on the individual (OCB-Is) were shown to be significantly related to multiple work ethic dimensions. Pearson's correlation indicated that OCB-Is significantly positively related to work ethic total, $r(99) = 0.41, p < .001$.

Pearson's correlations also indicated that OCB-Is are significantly positively related to morality/ethics, $r(99) = .28, p = .00$, centrality of work, $r(99) = .41, p < .001$, hard work, $r(99) = .23, p = .02$, wasted time, $r(99) = .50, p < .0001$, and delay of gratification, $r(99) = .25, p = .01$.

Organizational citizenship behaviors focused on the organization (OCB-Os) had different results than the OCB-Is. Pearson's correlation indicated that OCB-Os are not significantly related to work ethic, $r(99) = .09, p = .39$. OCB-Os were only significantly positively related to morality/ethics, $r(99) = .52, p < .001$, and wasted time, $r(99) = .31, p = .00$.

Table 5
Correlation Matrix for Organizational Citizenship Behaviors and Work Ethic Dimensions

Variable	OCB-I	OCB-O
Work Ethic total	0.41**	0.09
Self-reliance	-0.09	-0.05
Morality/Ethics	0.28**	0.52**
Leisure	-0.04	-0.15
Centrality of Work	0.41**	0.16
Hard Work	0.23*	-0.06
Wasted Time	0.50**	0.31**
Delay of Gratification	0.25*	-0.10

$n = 99$

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$

Office Housework and Organizational Citizenship Behaviors

Research question 2 posited whether office housework and organizational citizenship behaviors are related constructs. Table 6 shows the correlations for the dimensions of office housework with OCB-Is and OCB-Os. Pearson's correlations indicated that office housework in total is significantly positively related to OCB-Is, $r(99) = .35, p = .00$. In contrast, Pearson's correlations indicated that office housework is not significantly related to OCB-Os, $r(99) = -.19, p = .05$. This indicated varying support for office housework having a relationship with organizational citizenship behaviors, but also helps to distinguish the two constructs. Additionally, janitorial is the only office

housework dimension that had a significant relationship with OCB-Os, $r(99) = -.20$, $p < .05$, and but not with OCB-Is, $r(99) = .15$, $p > .05$.

Table 6
Correlation Matrix for Organizational Citizenship Behaviors and Office Housework Dimensions

Variable	OCB-I	OCB-O
Office Housework Total	0.35**	-0.19
Social Planning	0.26*	-0.17
Janitorial	0.15	-0.20*
Helping	0.39**	-0.18
Planning for Work	0.40**	-0.11

$n = 99$.

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$)

Moderating Factors

Research question 6 posited whether gender moderated the relationship between work ethic and office housework completion. The outcome variable (DV) in this analysis was office housework completion, while the predictor variable was work ethic, and the moderating variable was gender. The interaction between work ethic and gender was not significant, ($\beta = 0.21$, $p = 0.38$). This indicates that gender is not a moderator of the relationship between work ethic and office housework.

Research question 7 posited whether gender moderated the relationship between work ethic and organizational citizenship behaviors. The outcome variable (DV) in this analysis was organizational citizenship behaviors, while the predictor variable was work

ethic, and the moderating variable was gender. The interaction between work ethic and gender was not significant, ($\beta = 0.21, p = 0.20$). This indicates that gender is not a moderator of the relationship between work ethic and organizational citizenship behaviors.

Office Housework Scores

Further analyses were run to assess for demographic differences in office housework scores. Mean differences can be seen in Table 7 for office housework scores by race and gender. Further analyses were conducted to determine if office housework scores differed significantly by gender or race. A one-way ANOVA F test indicated no significant difference in office housework completion for gender, $F(1, 95) = 0.28, p = 0.60$. An additional one-way ANOVA indicated that there was a significant difference in office housework completion for race, $F(4, 94) = 3.16, p = 0.02$. It is important to note that mean differences by race, located in Table 6, reveals a restriction of range in office housework scores for race, along with an outlier. This suggests that there is likely not a significant difference in office housework completion by race. No significant differences can be seen through these average office housework scores among any demographic.

Lastly, an independent samples t-test was conducted to determine if there were significant differences in office housework scores among participants who worked a hybrid schedule ($M = 2.00, SD = 0.63$) versus a completely in-person schedule ($M = 2.45, SD = 0.60$). Results indicated that there was not a significant difference between the

two groups for office housework scores, $t(97) = -1.98, p = 0.05$. No other significant differences were found for office housework completion rates for any demographic.

Table 7
Descriptive Statistics for Office Housework scores by Race and Gender

Variable		n	M	SD
Gender	Male	45	2.15	0.65
	Female	52	2.13	0.60
	Non-Binary	2	1.63	0.61
Race	White	73	2.13	0.59
	Black or African American	15	2.16	0.73
	Asian	8	1.79	0.28
	American Indian or Alaska Native	2	2.00	0.13
	Other	1	4.00	0.00

CHAPTER IV: DISCUSSION

Results from this study can help to differentiate between office housework and organizational citizenship behaviors, and any similarities or differences in why employees choose to participate in these contextual job performance behaviors. Findings revealed that only three dimensions of office housework, social planning, helping, and planning for work, have a positive relationship with OCB-Is, and they are both also related to work ethic dimensions of centrality of work, wasted time, and hard work. These findings mean that individuals who value working, maximizing their work time, and completing hard work, are more likely to complete office housework tasks such as taking meeting notes, planning birthday events, or assisting a coworker with a new task. Additionally, these employees will be more likely to complete OCB-Is, such as providing a helping hand to a coworker in the office.

OCB-Os, on the other hand, did not have a relationship with work ethic in total. The dimensions of work ethic that do relate to OCB-Os are morality/ethics and wasted time, which are also related to OCB-Is. Since these dimensions were not related to office housework, it indicates that employees who have strong ethical values and strong work ethic are more likely to participate in OCB-Is and OCB-Os, but not office housework. Another interesting difference with OCB-Os and office housework is that the dimension of janitorial is significantly negatively related to OCB-Os, and not OCB-Is. This is intriguing, as the janitorial dimension assesses physical tasks employees do to help

maintain the work environment. So, a negative relationship with organizational citizenship behaviors aimed at the organization is unexpected.

Hypotheses for the relationships between office housework dimensions and work ethic were based on Meriac & Gorman's findings on the relationship between organizational citizenship behaviors and work ethic dimensions (2017). In their study, they found positive relationships between OCB-Os and centrality of work, along with wasted time. Additionally, OCBs were negatively related to leisure. This study had findings that differed from theirs. Specifically, only 4 out of 8 hypotheses were supported, showing a relationship between office housework and work ethic dimensions centrality of work, and wasted time. It is interesting to point out here that Meriac & Gorman found that OCB-Os had significant relationships with centrality of work and wasted time, but in this study OCB-Os were not related to these dimensions. This demonstrates the need for better defining of contextual performance, along with further research on work ethic and why employees engage in these behaviors.

Results from Bourque's (2022) study on office housework completion and work values indicated a significant positive relationship with office housework and values helping and supporting, enjoyment, and rule respecting. This is similar to the findings of this study, as the work ethic dimensions centrality of work, hard work and wasted time have similar underlying themes to those values and were also related to office housework. For instance, centrality of work refers to the employee's value of work, which can relate to enjoyment. Hard work refers to the employee's value of working diligently, which can

be related to rule respecting in order to work correctly. Further research is needed to determine how these findings of work ethics and work values can support the understanding of office housework.

Unexpected findings that were not hypothesized included a significant positive relationship with delay of gratification and office housework dimensions janitorial, helping, and social planning. These findings suggest that employees who value delay of gratification are likely to engage in office housework tasks such as cleaning the office or providing emotional support to a coworker. Based on these findings, centrality of work, wasted time, delay of gratification, and hard work are all considered to be indicators of contextual job performance, including office housework and OCB-Is. Understanding these relationships could help one to eventually predict contextual job performance, as these values align with these workplace behaviors.

After completing the literature review, it was expected to find gender differences in the completion of office housework. However, this study found no differences for gender, and gender was not found to be a moderator for office housework or organizational citizenship behaviors with work ethic. Interestingly, the only demographic with significant differences in office housework completion rates was race. This study had a sample with little diversity, which could indicate why there was a significant difference. Additionally, there was an outlier in the race category, which could have caused the false relationship. However, it is still important that further research should continue to assess the relationship of race to contextual job performance.

Limitations and Future Research

There are several limitations in this study. Firstly, there were lower than average office housework completion rates recorded with participants, which caused a restriction of range in data. This could potentially impact the quality of analysis, as there was a lack of participation in these behaviors recorded. Another limitation would be the lack consistency in the identification of office housework/invisible labor, as many different studies refer to the concept in different ways. Additionally, there is a lack of understanding the relationship between organizational citizenship behaviors and office housework and differentiating between the two contextual job behaviors. While this study helped to demonstrate a relationship between the two, there is still much more to consider, like what other differences exist. Another limitation would be completing this study after COVID-19, which has changed what a typical office space or workday looks like. This could impact our understanding of office housework, as individuals can work remotely and hybrid schedules. This study only included individuals with at least 50% of their time in office, but further studies could assess individuals who work remotely to see if office housework still occurs. Lastly, the participant sample from this study had a majority group of white participants, which is a limitation.

Future research could begin to investigate how completion in office housework impacts one's work abilities or career progression, particularly considering the significant differences found in office housework completion among difference races that this study found. It would be beneficial for future studies to see if completion in office housework

could impact one's job satisfaction, self-efficacy, or promotability. Additionally, as mentioned in the previous section, it would be beneficial to consider the different types of work offices, such as shared offices, virtual offices, or hybrid. This could impact the amount of office housework completed. Lastly, it would be beneficial for future researchers to refine both the office housework and organizational citizenship measures, as certain dimension scale alphas in this study showed room for improvement.

Conclusion

This study aimed to understand one's work ethic and how that impacts their contextual job performance: OCBs and office housework. This study also aimed to understand the differences in how office housework relates to work ethic with how OCBs relate to work ethic. Lastly, this study aimed to better understand the relationship between office housework and OCBs. By examining the correlations between work ethic and these contextual behaviors, results found that work ethic dimensions centrality of work, hard work, wasted time, and delay of gratification impacted one's performance in both office housework and organizational citizenship behaviors aimed at individuals (OCB-Is). Results also indicated that office housework, along with work ethic, does not significantly relate to organizational citizenship behaviors focused on the organization (OCB-Os). These relationships and differences indicate a need for further research on contextual job performance behaviors that are aimed at helping the organization or the individuals.

References

- Adams, E. R. (2018). Operationalizing office housework: Definition, examples, and antecedents. (Order No. 10841556). Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (2112305115).
<https://ezproxy.mtsu.edu/login?url=https://www.proquest.com/dissertations-theses/operationalizing-office-housework-definition/docview/2112305115/se-2>
- Bourdage, J. S., Lee, K., Lee, J. H., & Shin, K. H. (2012). Motives for organizational citizenship behavior: Personality correlates and coworker ratings of OCB. *Human Performance, 25*(3), 179–200. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08959285.2012.683904>
- Bourque, A. L. (2023). Office housework, the big 5 personality, and work values: A correlational study (Order No. 30575738). Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (2851656884).
<https://ezproxy.mtsu.edu/login?url=https://www.proquest.com/dissertations-theses/office-housework-big-5-personality-work-values/docview/2851656884/se-2>
- Cherry, M. A. (2016). People analytics and invisible labor. *Saint Louis University Law Journal, 61*(1), 1–16.
- Chiaburu, D. S., Oh, I. S., Berry, C. M., Li, N., & Gardner, R. G. (2011). The five-factor model of personality traits and organizational citizenship behaviors: A meta-

analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 96(6), 1140–1166.

<https://doi.org/10.1037/a0024004>

Daniels, A. K. (1985). Good Times and Good Works: The Place of Sociability in the Work of Women Volunteers. *Social Problems*, 32(4), 363–374. <https://doi-org.ezproxy.mtsu.edu/10.2307/800758>

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.ezproxy.mtsu.edu/10.1037/dhe0000414>

Golubovic, J., Inglis, K., & Connell, C. (2022). Gendered disruptions in academic publishing during COVID-19 Uncovering invisible labor at an anthropology journal. *AMERICAN ETHNOLOGIST*, 49(4), 595–609. <https://doi-org.ezproxy.mtsu.edu/10.1111/amet.13106>

Hatton, E. (2017). Mechanisms of invisibility: Rethinking the concept of invisible work. *Work, Employment & Society*, 31(2), 336–351.

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

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.ezproxy.mtsu.edu/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), 1463-1480–1480. <https://doi-org.ezproxy.mtsu.edu/10.1111/gwao.12839>
- Mahajan, R. (2017). Impact of big five personality traits on OCB and satisfaction. *International Journal of Business Insights & Transformation*, 11(1), 46–51.
- Melaku, T. M. (2022). Black women in white institutional spaces: The invisible labor clause and the inclusion tax. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 66(11), 1512-1525–1525. <https://doi-org.ezproxy.mtsu.edu/10.1177/00027642211066037>
- Meriac, J., & Gorman, C. (2017). Work ethic and work outcomes in an expanded criterion domain. *Journal of Business & Psychology*, 32(3), 273–282. <https://doi-org.ezproxy.mtsu.edu/10.1007/s10869-016-9460-y>
- Meriac, J. P., Woehr, D. J., Gorman, C. A., & Thomas, A. L. E. (2013). Development and validation of a short form for the multidimensional work ethic profile. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 82(3), 155–164. <https://doi-org.ezproxy.mtsu.edu/10.1016/j.jvb.2013.01.007>
- Miller, M. J., Woehr, D. J., & Hudspeth, N. (2002). The meaning and measurement of work ethic: Construction and initial validation of a multidimensional inventory. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 60(3), 451–489. <https://doi-org.ezproxy.mtsu.edu/10.1006/jvbe.2001.1838>

- Motowidlo, S. J. (2003). Job performance. In W. C. Borman, D. R. Ilgen, & R. J. Klimoski (Eds.), *Handbook Psychology: Industrial and organizational psychology*, (Vol. 12, pp. 39–53). John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Motowidlo, S. J., Borman, W. C., & Schmit, M. J. (1997). A theory of individual differences in task and contextual performance. *Human Performance*, 10(2), 71–83. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327043hup1002_1
- Mussleman, M. E. (2020). Is office housework an organizational citizenship behavior? (Order No. 27832063). Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (2399164238).
<https://ezproxy.mtsu.edu/login?url=https://www.proquest.com/dissertations-theses/is-office-housework-organizational-citizenship/docview/2399164238/se-2>
- Organ, D. W. (1988). *Organizational citizenship behavior: The good soldier syndrome*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- Sackett, P. R. (2002). The structure of counterproductive work behaviors: Dimensionality and relationships with facets of job performance. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 10, 5–11.
- Seymour, K. (2022). Circling the divide: Gendered invisibility, precarity, and professional service work in a UK business school. *Gender, Work & Organization*, 1. <https://doi-org.ezproxy.mtsu.edu/10.1111/gwao.12933>
- Toxtli, C., Suri, S., & Savage, S. (2021). Quantifying the invisible labor in crowd work. <https://doi-org.ezproxy.mtsu.edu/10.1145/3476060>

Wichroski, M. A. (1994). The secretary: Invisible labor in the workworld of women.

Human Organization, 53, 33–41.

Williams, L. J., & Anderson, S. E. (1991). Job Satisfaction and organizational commitment as predictors of organizational citizenship and in-role behaviors.

Journal of Management, 17(3), 601-617. <https://doi-org.ezproxy.mtsu.edu/10.1177/014920639101700305>

Wright, D. A. (2016). Verifying work ethic's factor structure and examining the MWEP short-form using the NEO-PI-R (Order No. 10111198). Available from

Dissertations & Theses @ Middle Tennessee State University. (1797944605).

<https://ezproxy.mtsu.edu/login?url=https://www.proquest.com/dissertations-theses/verifying-work-ethics-factor-structure-examining/docview/1797944605/se->

Appendix A: Descriptive Statistics

Table 1
Descriptive Statistics for all Demographic Variables

Variable		Frequency (n)	Percent (%)
Gender	Male	45	45.5
	Female	52	52.5
	Non-Binary	2	2
Race	White	73	73.7
	American Indian or Alaska Native	2	2
	Black or African American	15	15
	Asian	8	8
	Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	0	0
	Other	1	0.01
Education	High School Diploma or GED	3	3
	Some college	10	10.1
	Associate Degree	10	10.1
	Bachelor's degree	54	54.5
	Master's degree or higher	22	22.2
Income	Less than \$40,000	16	16
	\$40,000 – 69,999	38	38.4
	\$70,000 – 99,999	18	18.2
	\$100,000 – 129,999	15	15.2
	\$130,000 +	12	12.1
Work Type	Hybrid	49	49.5
	In person	50	50.5

Variable	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Age	39.2	10.4
Years in Current Job	5.8	5.5
Hours per week	41.8	5.5

Appendix B: IRB Approval Letter



Office of Research Compliance
2269 Middle Tennessee Blvd.
Sam H. Ingram Bldg (ING) Room 010A
Box 124
Murfreesboro, TN 37132
www.mtsu.edu/irb

Date: March 1, 2024
PI: Hailey Moss
Department: Middle Tennessee State University, Psychology
Re: Initial - IRB-FY2024-25
Office Housework, Organizational Citizenship Behaviors, and Individual Work Ethic Values: A Correlational Study

The Middle Tennessee State University Institutional Review Board has rendered the decision below for the above referenced study.

Decision: Exempt
Category: Category 2.(i). Research that only includes interactions involving educational tests (cognitive, diagnostic, aptitude, achievement), survey procedures, interview procedures, or observation of public behavior (including visual or auditory recording) if at least one of the following criteria is met:
The information obtained is recorded by the investigator in such a manner that the identity of the human subjects cannot readily be ascertained, directly or through identifiers linked to the subjects;

Findings:
Research Notes:

Please note that even though your proposed study is deemed exempt from further IRB review, the following apply to your approved study:

1. In accordance with 45 CFR 46.110, expiration dates do not apply to research eligible for Exempt Review under the Common Rule, and continuing review is not required by the IRB.
2. Any unanticipated harm to participants or adverse events must be reported to the Office of Compliance.
3. All modifications to the approved study must be submitted for review through Cayuse IRB for approval before their implementation. Adding new researchers constitutes a modification to the protocol. Per MTSU Policy, a researcher is defined as anyone who handles the data or interacts with participants. Everyone meeting this definition for this project must have completed the required CITI training and received IRB approval prior to becoming actively involved in the project.
4. Closure of the study must be submitted within Cayuse when the study ends or when personal identifiers are removed from the data and all codes and keys are destroyed.
5. All research materials must be retained by the PI for at least three (3) years after study completion and then destroyed in a manner that maintains confidentiality and anonymity.

Sincerely,

The Middle Tennessee State University Institutional Review Board

Appendix C: Prolific Informed Consent

Principal Investigator: Hailey Moss and Judith Van Hein, Ph.D.

Study Title: Work Tasks and Work Attitudes

Approval date: 3/1/2024

Protocol Number: IRB-FY2024-25

Institution: Middle Tennessee State University

The following information is provided to inform you about the research project and your participation in it. Please read this form carefully. Your participation in this research study is voluntary. You are also free to withdraw from this study at any time.

Purpose of the study: The purpose of this study is to investigate the completion of office tasks.

Description of procedures to be followed and approximate duration of the study:

You will be asked to complete measures assessing different office tasks, work ethic, and organizational citizenship behaviors. In addition, you will be asked to answer some open ended questions and demographic questions. The study should take approximately 20 minutes to complete.

Description of the discomforts, inconveniences, and/or risks that can be reasonably

expected as a result of participation in this study: There are little to no known or expected risks/discomforts for participants volunteering in this study.

Anticipated benefits from this study: There are no direct benefits to participating in this study. However, further understanding of contextual job performance is a benefit to this

study.

Alternative treatments available: N/A

Here are your rights as a participant:

Your participation in this research is voluntary. You may skip any item that you don't want to answer, and you may stop the research at any time. Note that if you leave an item blank, you will be warned that you missed one, just in case it was an accident. You can still click that you don't want to answer. Some items may be required in order to accurately present the study. There are no risks associated with your participation besides possible discomfort with some of the questions. There are no real benefits to you from participating besides possibly learning something about the research. You will NOT be asked to provide any identifiable personal information. All efforts, within reason, will be made to keep the personal information in your research record private, but total privacy cannot be promised. Your information may be shared with people at MTSU (such as the MTSU Institutional Review Board) or other agencies (such as the Federal Government Office for Human Research Protection) if you or someone else is in danger or if we are required to do so by law.

Compensation for participation:

Compensation will be provided (\$2.50) through the Prolific access code at the end of the survey. Note: Completion of the survey is mandatory to receive compensation for your participation. Participants who pass the attention check, complete the survey in a

reasonable time frame, and provide the completion access code will be compensated.

What happens if you choose to withdraw from study participation:

You may refuse to participate or quit at any time.

Contact Information:

If you should have any questions about this research study or possible injury, please feel free to contact Hailey Moss, at hgb2m@mtmail.mtsu.edu. Alternatively, you may contact the project advisor, Dr. Judith Van Hein, via email at judith.vanhein@mtsu.edu.

For additional information about giving consent or your rights as a participant in this study, please contact the Middle Tennessee State University (MTSU) Office of Compliance at 615-494-8918 or via email at irb_information@mtsu.edu.

(<http://www.mtsu.edu/irb>).

Confidentiality:

Every attempt will be made to see that your study results are kept confidential. The results of this study will NOT be published or presented at meetings. The results of this study will only be used for the class project being conducted by those listed as researchers. Your responses, informed consent document, and records will be kept completely confidential.

Please do not use the "Back" button on your internet browser while completing this survey.

By continuing with this survey, you are also acknowledging that you have read and

understand this consent form, and willingly agree to participate in this study under the terms described.

I consent. I do not consent.

Appendix D: Screening Questions & Online Survey

Screening Questions

Do you consent to participate in this research?

1. Yes, I consent.
2. No, I do not consent.

Do you have at least 1 year of full time work experience in an office setting (at least 50% in person)?

1. Yes
2. No

Do you currently work in the United States?

1. Yes
2. No

Office Housework Tasks Identified by Adams (2018) and edited by Mussleman (2018)

This section lists a series of statements.

Note. Items should be rated on a 5-point Likert-type scale from 5=Very Often to 1=Never.

Please rate how often you engage in the following tasks.

Janitorial Tasks

1. Emptying the office trash
2. Watering the office plants
3. Refilling the water cooler
4. Cleaning-related tasks
5. Fixing the coffee machine
6. Setting out candy or office snacks for others
7. Hanging wall items
8. Stocking kitchen supplies
9. Killing or removing pests
10. Making coffee
11. Cleaning restrooms
12. Decorating the office for holidays
13. Repairing or assembling furniture

14. Removing recently printed documents from the printer and taking them to employees

Administrative Tasks

1. Setting up office software
2. Troubleshooting computer or software issues
3. Proof-reading emails for colleagues
4. Handling incoming mail
5. Setting up new employee offices/ workstations
6. Answering phones in the conference room
7. Providing back-up for other employees when they are out
8. Setting up meeting spaces
9. Printing, organizing, and/or preparing meeting materials
10. Filling out paperwork for others
11. Supervising or monitoring office guests
12. Shipping packages
13. Coordinating calendars for meetings
14. Scheduling office maintenance
15. Creating presentations for others
16. Giving directions to guests/visitors
17. Researching or booking travel for others

18. Filing for others

Emotional Support Tasks

1. Listening to colleagues vent their frustrations
2. Emotionally supporting upset colleagues
3. Running errands for other employees
4. Handling employee and employee family well-being communications

Social Event Tasks

1. Ordering catering for the office
2. Buying or preparing food for office events or parties
3. Ordering flowers for employees, clients, or others
4. Organizing celebration parties for employees
5. Planning office events, parties, conferences, etc.
6. Purchasing cards and/or gifts for employee birthday, retirement, condolences, etc.
7. Making business lunch or dinner reservations

MWEP-SF Scale and Scoring Key

This section lists a series of statements.

Note. Items should be rated on a 5-point Likert-type scale from 5=Strongly Agree to 1=Strongly Disagree. To score the short form, take means of the four items corresponding to each subscale as follows.

Please choose the alternative that best represents your agreement with how well each statement describes you.

1. It is important to stay busy at work and not waste time.
2. I feel content when I have spent the day working.
3. One should always take responsibility for one's actions.
4. I would prefer a job that allowed me to have more leisure time.
5. Time should not be wasted, it should be used efficiently.
6. I get more fulfillment from items I had to wait for.
7. A hard day's work is very fulfilling.
8. Things that you have to wait for are the most worthwhile.
9. Working hard is the key to being successful.
10. Self-reliance is the key to being successful.
11. If one works hard enough, one is likely to make a good life for oneself.
12. I constantly look for ways to productively use my time.
13. One should not pass judgment until one has heard all of the facts.
14. People would be better off if they depended on themselves.

15. A distant reward is usually more satisfying than an immediate one.
 16. More leisure time is good for people.
 17. I try to plan out my workday so as not to waste time.
 18. The world would be a better place if people spent more time relaxing.
 19. I strive to be self-reliant.
 20. If you work hard you will succeed.
 21. The best things in life are those you have to wait for.
 22. Anyone who is able and willing to work hard has a good chance of succeeding.
 23. It is important to treat others as you would like to be treated.
 24. I experience a sense of fulfillment from working.
 25. People should have more leisure time to spend in relaxation.
 26. It is important to control one's destiny by not being dependent on others.
 27. People should be fair in their dealings with others.
 28. A hard day's work provides a sense of accomplishment.
- Self-Reliance: 10, 14, 19, 26; Morality/Ethics: 3, 13, 23, 27; Leisure: 4, 16, 18, 25;
Centrality of Work: 2, 7, 24, 28; Hard Work: 9, 11, 20, 22; Wasted Time: 1, 5, 12, 17;
Delay of Gratification: 6, 8, 15, 21.

Organizational Citizenship Items

This section lists a series of statements.

Note. Items should be rated on a 5-point Likert-type scale from 5=Strongly Agree to 1=Strongly Disagree.

OCB-I Items

1. Helps others who have been absent.
2. Helps others who have heavy workloads.
3. Assists supervisor with his/her work (when not asked).
4. Takes time to listen to co-workers' problems or worries.
5. Goes out of way to help new employees.
6. Takes a personal interest in other employees.
7. Passes along information to co-workers.

OCB-O Items

1. Attendance at work is above the norm.
2. Gives advance notice when unable to come to work.
3. Takes underserved work breaks. R.
4. Great deal of time spent with personal phone conversations. R.
5. Complains about insignificant things at work. R.
6. Conserves and protects organizational property.
7. Adheres to informal rules devised to maintain order.

Demographic Items

Please indicate your gender

1. Male
2. Female
3. Nonbinary or other
4. Prefer not to say

What is your age?

What is your race?

1. White
2. Black
3. Asian
4. American Indian or Alaska Native
5. Latino and Hispanic
6. Other _____

What is the highest level of education you have received?

1. High school diploma or GED equivalent
2. Some college
3. Associate degree

4. Bachelor's Degree
5. Master's Degree or higher

What is your income?

1. Less than \$40,000
2. \$40,000 – \$69,999
3. \$70,000 - \$99,999
4. \$100,000 - \$129,999
5. \$130,000 and above

How many years have you held your current job?

What type of work is your current position?

1. In person
2. Hybrid - In person and remote