

Is Office Housework an Organizational Citizenship Behavior?

By

Macie Ellis Mussleman

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 2020

Thesis Committee:

Dr. Judith Van Hein, Chair

Dr. Michael Hein, Committee Member

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Completing a graduate school program and thesis is no small feat and I certainly could not have done it alone. I would first like to thank my family for providing encouragement, listening to the stress-filled phone calls, and reminding me to take breaks. They supported me through two theses, and I would not have made it without their constant cheerleading.

Next, thank you to my thesis advisor, Dr. Van Hein, for always being dedicated and motivating. Despite how I felt about progress I may or may not have made, each meeting focused on the positive and moving forward. And maybe even food and travel. Also, thank you to my committee member Dr. Hein. I am grateful for your statistics guidance and patience regardless of how many times I popped into your office doorway with just “one more question.” A final thanks to my committee and psychology department staff for helping me submit my thesis during a pandemic. Thank you, Dr. Moffett for being my critical reader and providing key insight. I would also like to thank Dr. Jackson, for answering every question I had about Qualtrics and MTurk, and Dr. Frame, for keeping me calm and making sure I see the big picture.

Finally, I would like to thank my cohort—it is everything to have people going through the same experience so you can complain and celebrate with them. A special thank you to Seth Thomas, for listening to me vent, reading a sentence or two to ensure it made sense, or checking that I did not click all the wrong buttons in SPSS. I could not have finished my thesis with my sanity intact without your advice and support.

## ABSTRACT

The purpose of the study was to determine if the concept of Office Housework (OH) should be included as an Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) or if the two are different and form two separate constructs. Additionally, this study sought to explore self-efficacy between men and women as a potential cause of gender differences in OH task and OCB participation rates. Results provided evidence that Office Housework is not an Organizational Citizenship Behavior and the two should be viewed as separate forms of contextual behavior. Further, analyses failed to reveal gender differences in OCB and OH task performance as well as gender differences in confidence level. However, confidence level was predictive of OH task completion rates, being that higher confidence resulted in more OH task completion.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES .....	vi
CHAPTER 1: LITERATURE REVIEW .....	1
Introduction.....	1
Organizational Citizenship Behaviors .....	2
Determinants of Organizational Citizenship Behavior .....	6
Outcomes of Organizational Citizenship Behavior .....	10
Office Housework.....	10
Types of Office Housework.....	12
Determinants of Office Housework .....	13
Office Housework and Organizational Citizenship Behavior .....	14
Gender and Task Distribution.....	15
Summary .....	18
CHAPTER II: METHOD .....	19
Participants.....	19
Measures .....	20
CHAPTER III: RESULTS .....	23
Research Question One.....	23
Research Question Two .....	34
CHAPTER IV: DISCUSSION .....	39
Strengths .....	42

Limitations .....	43
Future Research .....	44
Conclusion .....	46
REFERENCES .....	48
APPENDICES .....	53
APPENDIX A: SCALE ITEMS .....	54
APPENDIX B: ORIGINAL SCALE STRUCTURES VERSUS CURRENT SCALE STRUCTURES.....	61
APPENDIX C: IRB APPROVAL .....	68

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: <i>OCB Model Category Congruency</i> .....	5
Table 2: <i>Pattern Matrix for Office Housework Tasks</i> .....	25
Table 3: <i>Pattern Matrix for OCB Scale</i> .....	28
Table 4: <i>Pattern Matrix for OCB Checklist</i> .....	30
Table 5: <i>Two-Tailed Pearson Correlation for OH and OCB Scale</i> .....	33
Table 6: <i>Descriptive Statistics for OH Task Frequency by Sex and Confidence Level</i> .....	36
Table 7: <i>Sidak Comparisons for Confidence Level of OH Task Frequency</i> .....	36
Table 8: <i>Descriptives Statistics for OH Task Frequency by Dimension and Sex</i> .....	37
Table 9: <i>Descriptive Statistics for OH Task Frequency by Ethnicity</i> .....	38

## CHAPTER 1: LITERATURE REVIEW

### **Introduction**

There are aspects of job performance that are not required by a person's job description and role, but when completed, benefit the organization (Beauregard, 2012; Adams, 2018). These tasks can include Organizational Citizenship Behaviors (OCB) (Sackett et al., 2006) and Office Housework (OH) (Adams, 2018). Some research has shown that the distribution of these types of tasks is different for men and women (Babcock et al., 2017; De Pater et al., 2009a; De Pater et al., 2009b). Further, there are differences in how men and women are perceived, evaluated, and rewarded in terms of promotability and career advancement when completing OCB or Office Housework tasks (Cameron & Nadler, 2013; Heilman & Chen, 2005). There are multiple variables influencing an individual's participation in OCB and Office Housework including task visibility, task promotability, intrinsic and extrinsic motivation, subjective task value, gender role stereotype expectations, perfectionism, self-efficacy, preferences, ambitions, beliefs, emotion, and assignments (Adams, 2018; Babcock et al., 2017; Beauregard, 2012; Cameron & Nadler, 2013; De Pater et al., 2010; Heilman & Chen, 2005; Spector & Fox, 2002).

In recent years, there has been growing interest in Office Housework and if women are pigeonholed in completing those tasks due to gender stereotypes (Adams, 2018; Heilman & Chen, 2005). Adams (2018) proposed that the key difference between OCB and Office Housework is that OCB tasks will likely lead to better performance evaluations while Office Housework tasks go unnoticed and unrewarded. Adams (2018) completed a study in which the goal was to create a list of Office Housework tasks and

determine a framework for the tasks. The results revealed four categories of Office Housework tasks: janitorial tasks, administrative tasks, emotional support tasks, and social event tasks. There was agreement between men and women on which tasks were Office Housework tasks based on the definition of OH provided in the study (Adams, 2018).

However, there is currently no consensus in the research about whether Office Housework is a type of OCB or a standalone concept (Adams, 2018). Before the continuation of Office Housework studies to determine gender differences and possible determinants, the concept must be further defined. Specifically, if Organizational Citizenship Behaviors include Office Housework or if the tasks are different and form two separate constructs.

### **Organizational Citizenship Behaviors**

Job performance at the most basic level involves all behaviors that employees participate in while on the job (Jex & Britt, 2014). This view of job performance is too broad in that it does not discriminate between work that is job related and work that is geared toward organizational functioning. In efforts to better define performance in the workplace, all positive behaviors were deemed productive behaviors, or any behavior that benefits the goals and objectives of the organization (Campbell, 1990). However, scholars and practitioners became worried there was neglect of an important domain of job performance (LePine et al., 2002). Specifically, it was felt work outside of the technical core aspects that benefited the social and psychological context of the organization were being ignored (LePine et al., 2002).

Therefore, productive behavior was divided into two main categories in an attempt to cover all performance referenced in future models of job performance (Jex & Britt, 2014). The two categories are in-role performance and extra-role performance. In-role performance, also known as task performance, involves transforming materials into the goods and services the organization exists to produce as well as any activity that supports the technical core of the organization (Motowildo & Van Scotter, 1994). Extra-role performance, also known as contextual performance, does not support the technical core, rather the organizational, social, and psychological environment in which the technical core exists (Motowildo & Van Scotter, 1994). During the late 1990s, in-role and extra-role performance became predominantly known as task and contextual performance, respectively (Jex & Britt, 2014), so for this paper, they will be referred to as such. Borman and Motowildo further defined contextual performance by creating five categories that further describe it: a) volunteering to carry out task activities that are not formally part of the job; b) persisting with extra enthusiasm when necessary to complete own task activities successfully; c) helping and cooperating with others; d) following organizational rules and procedures even when it is personally inconvenient; and e) endorsing, supporting, and defending organizational objectives (Motowildo & Van Scotter, 1994; Organ, 1997). In summary, task performance behaviors are role-prescribed and contextual performance behaviors are usually performed at the employee's discretion (Motowildo & Van Scotter, 1994).

There has long been interest in research and empirical studies regarding the behavior at work that is not included in the formal and technical aspects of the job (Hoffman, Blair, Meriac, & Woehr, 2007). This type of work behavior is also known as

discretionary work performance, such that it is behavior not prescribed in task statements and not an enforceable requirement (Organ, 1997; Hoffman et al., 2007). Yet, a key feature of discretionary work performance is that it is required for an organization to function effectively (Hoffman et al., 2007; LePine, Erez, & Johnson, 2002). The increased interest in discretionary behavior began in the 1980s when Organ and his team started using the term Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) (LePine et al., 2002).

In 1988, Organ originally defined OCB 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” (Organ, 1997, p. 86). Organ also described five types of OCB: altruism, courtesy, sportsmanship, conscientiousness, and civic virtue (Organ, 1997; Hoffman et al., 2007). Altruism is known as prosocial behavior or actions that are helpful with an organizationally relevant task or problem (Jex & Britt, 2014; Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Moorman, & Fetter, 1990). Courtesy refers to considering others at work in order to prevent work-related problems. Sportsmanship involves the employee positively tolerating poor circumstances and can present as absence of certain types of behavior, e.g., not complaining (Jex & Britt, 2014; Podsakoff et al., 1990). Conscientiousness is intentionally being a good citizen at work by going beyond requirements. Finally, civic virtue involves the positive citizenship behaviors that show the employee participates in and is concerned about the organization (Jex & Britt, 2014; Podsakoff et al., 1990).

A decade after his initial formulation, however, Organ addressed conceptual issues with his working definition of OCB (Organ, 1997; Hoffman et al., 2007). As a result, he broadened the definition to those behaviors that support the organizational,

social, and psychological environment in which the technical functions must occur, but not the technical functions themselves (Organ, 1997). Otherwise stated, “behavior that contributes indirectly to the organization through the maintenance of the organization’s social system” (LePine et al., 2002, p.52). This conceptualization of OCB mirrors that of contextual performance provided by Borman and Motowildo (Motowildo & Van Scotter, 1994; Organ, 1997; LePine et al., 2002). Additionally, Organ’s five types of OCB mirror Borman and Motowildo’s five categories of contextual performance (Organ, 1997). The comparison can be seen in Table 1. Therefore, there are blurred lines between contextual performance and OCB, but the key difference is that contextual does not require the work to be extra-role nor nonrewarded. The defining quality is that it be “non-task” in that it does not contribute to the work, but the *context* of the work (Organ, 1997).

Table 1

*OCB Model Category Congruency*

<b>Borman and Motowildo (Motowildo &amp; Van Scotter, 1994)</b>	<b>Organ (1997)</b>
<b>a)</b> volunteering to carry out task activities that are not formally part of the job	<b>Altruism:</b> actions that are helpful with an organizationally relevant task or problem
<b>b)</b> persisting with extra enthusiasm when necessary to complete own task activities successfully	<b>Sportsmanship:</b> employee positively tolerating poor circumstances
<b>c)</b> helping and cooperating with others	<b>Courtesy:</b> considering others at work in order to prevent work-related problems
<b>d)</b> following organizational rules and procedures even when it is personally inconvenient	<b>Conscientiousness:</b> intentionally being a good citizen at work by going beyond requirements
<b>e)</b> endorsing, supporting, and defending organizational objectives	<b>Civic Virtue:</b> positive citizenship behaviors that show the employee participates in and is concerned about the organization

Despite various other iterations and conceptualizations of OCB over the years, a meta-analytic review found that scales measuring Organ's five types of OCB are highly correlated and similarly predictive, and so Organ's OCB began to be viewed as a latent construct (Hoffman et al., 2007). Organ's interpretation has consistently been the most used and cited over several studies (LePine et al. 2002), therefore, this paper will use his definition of Organizational Citizenship Behavior and the five corresponding types when discussing OCB.

### **Determinants of Organizational Citizenship Behavior**

Organizational Citizenship Behavior is critically important because it ensures the social mechanics of an organization are functioning efficiently and provides the needed flexibility to cope with unexpected change (Organ, 1983). It is equal parts challenging to encourage as well as enforce those types of behavior because it is difficult to measure and at times hard to identify. If OCB is exhibited frequently, it is typically noticed and may impact performance evaluations (Organ, 1983.) Although, due to poor execution of performance management systems and lack of freedom over formal rewards, it is unlikely employees participate in OCB in hopes of greater rewards or improved performance appraisals (Organ, 1983).

Beauregard (2012) posits that explanations of OCB are largely attributed to by a norm of reciprocity and social exchange theory. A few recently explored indicators of OCB includes favorable treatment, perceptions of organizational justice, and perceptions of organizational support (Beauregard, 2012). Perceived justice and organizational support have both been found to be connected to OCB. Additionally, personality

continues to be discussed as a predictor of OCB in that personality predicts contextual habits, skill, and knowledge (Beauregard, 2012).

### **Mood/Affect**

Social-psychological research provides the idea that a mood state or affect can increase or decrease the likelihood that someone will partake in citizenship behaviors (Organ, 1983; Jex & Britt, 2014). A positive mood makes it more likely that an employee would engage in OCB and oppositely, that a negative affect decreases the chance that an employee would engage in OCB (Organ, 1983). Helping behaviors and positive affect are cyclical causes of the other: helping others causes an employee to feel good, which will make them want to continue helping behavior (Jex & Britt, 2014).

### **Self-efficacy**

A person's self-efficacy involves one's belief in their ability to attain a given goal or outcome (Bandura, 2006). A key component of self-efficacy is the perception of being able to achieve something, opposed to whether a person actually can. Self-efficacy, then, plays a role in the determination of actions, goals, commitment, expected outcomes, perseverance, and resiliency (Bandura, 2006). Self-efficacy allows employees to assess how well they can cope with challenges and then depending on said assessment, employees determine and fulfill behavioral strategies to overcome challenges (Bandura, 1997; Beauregard, 2012). Therefore, high self-efficacy is associated with better performance in the workplace due to the identification of appropriate behavioral strategies. Behavioral strategies can include goal setting, rule development, and self-awareness (Beauregard, 2012).

Self-efficacy can also influence other predictors of OCB, like one's contextual knowledge and skills (Beauregard, 2012). High self-efficacy allows employees to know which OCB are appropriate in what situations as well as how to prepare and carry out those OCB. For example, those high in self-efficacy may be more willing to help coworkers with challenges at work or attend meetings voluntarily due to better planning and organization (Beauregard, 2012). Studies have shown that generalized self-efficacy is indicative of initiative and taking control. This gives reason to believe that employees with higher self-efficacy perform more OCB (Beauregard, 2012). However, Beauregard's (2012) study found that the influence of self-efficacy was only significant for men.

### **Gender**

Gender may impact the rate at which men and women partake in OCB (Beauregard, 2012). Eagly's social role theory posits that society has preexisting ideas about which characteristics are suitable for men and women and that these ideas then influence men and women's behavior. Due to sexual division of labor and gender hierarchy, women have become associated with communal behaviors (Beauregard, 2012; Allen & Jang, 2018; Cameron & Nadler, 2013). Communal behaviors are nurturing in nature and interpersonally helpful. Further, they are related to domestic caregiver or homemaker roles (Beauregard, 2012). However, men are thought to participate in agentic behaviors. Agentic behaviors present as assertive and independent and are related to the role of economic provider (Beauregard, 2012; Allen & Jang, 2018; Cameron & Nadler, 2013). Due to the common misconception that actions represent personality, when women and men perform communal and agentic behaviors respectively, it is assumed that women are nurturing, and men are assertive. It is by these assumptions that gender

roles are formed. Gender roles are “shared expectations of appropriate behaviors for women and men” (Beauregard, 2012, p.594)

People are expected to conform to their gender role and may face undesirable consequences if they do not (Beauregard, 2012; Allen & Jang, 2018). When people do conform to their gender role, the result is differences in behavior between men and women, which is especially prevalent in the workplace. Based on the assumptions associated with communal and agentic behaviors, women are stereotyped as warm, sociable, and relationship-oriented, while men are stereotyped as competent, independent, and achievement-oriented (Beauregard, 2012; Allen & Jang, 2018). Communal behaviors are similar to those of OCB; therefore, women may face greater expectations to perform more OCB. These expectations could then cause women to partake in more OCB than men. In fact, women more often view OCB as part of task performance (Beauregard, 2012).

However, there have been questions about the accuracy of the belief that women participate in more OCB than men. Allen and Jang (2018) completed a meta-analytic review of the Industrial/Organizational (I/O) Psychology literature that addressed the issue of whether gender is a predictor of OCB. The studies varied in source of data (self-report or supervisor report) and OCB operationalization (unidimensional or multidimensional). Out of 24 studies, 14 found no difference in OCB performance between genders (Allen & Jang, 2018). Additionally, Allen and Jang (2018) concluded that gender differences were more likely found with self-reports, multidimensional methods, and the altruism and sportsmanship dimensions.

## **Outcomes of Organizational Citizenship Behavior**

OCB performance is related to positive performance appraisals; however, gender role stereotypes may influence managers' opinions of employees (Cameron & Nadler, 2013). It is supported that since OCB aligns with female gender roles, males and females are judged differently even when performance is the same (Cameron & Nadler, 2013). Specifically, women do not always receive more positive performance ratings because they participate in OCB. Employee performance appraisal ratings are higher overall when viewed as having participated in more OCB, yet women who are seen as more OCB participative still have lower scores than their equivalent male colleagues (Cameron & Nadler, 2013). Also, women are viewed more negatively when they have not participated in altruistic citizenship behaviors than their male counterparts (Heilman & Chen, 2005). However, Cameron and Nadler's (2013) results showed that male and female managers who participated in OCB were perceived as equally communal as well as were rated the same on employee evaluations.

## **Office Housework**

The concept of Office Housework has been gaining traction in recent years and is consequently being increasingly investigated. It was said to have originated in 1977 from Dr. Rosabeth Moss Kanter's book *Men and Women of the Corporation* (Kanter, 1977; Adams, 2018). However, its popularity is growing and can be seen in *The Washington Post* and *Harvard Business Review*. For example, *Harvard Business Review* defines Office Housework as low importance tasks that no one likes to participate in (Olejarczyk, 2018). *The Washington Post* takes it further by describing it as administrative tasks, menial jobs, and undervalued assignments (Williams, 2014). Such tasks can include

ordering food, taking notes in meetings, planning parties, and cleaning around the office (Adams, 2018; Olejarz, 2018; Williams, 2014).

Outside of press and media, Office Housework is being included in empirical work as well. Work by the Society of Women Engineers which defined Office Housework in their study as various responsibilities including actual housework, administrative duties, and emotional labor (Williams, Li, Ricon, & Finn, 2016). Being one of the first to operationally define Office Housework through research, Adams (2018) defines it 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.13). This interpretation is similar to that of contextual performance and Organizational Citizenship Behavior except that Office Housework is expected to remain overlooked and underappreciated, thus helping the organization, but not the employee. For the purposes of this research, Adams (2018) definition will be used.

Similar to OCB, it is expected the women perform more Office Housework (OH) tasks (Adams, 2018). Williams (2014) reports that after many interviews with professional women, they reported being given disproportionately more OH tasks. These professional women include those that are academics, lawyers, scientists, and executives (Williams, 2014). The study conducted by the Society for Women Engineers found that women reported participating in OH more than white men (Williams et al., 2016). Further, Adams (2018) study found that women did complete more Office Housework than men.

## **Types of Office Housework**

Adams (2018) study sought to empirically define and conceptualize Office Housework. A list of 74 potential Office Housework tasks was created. To avoid potential bias in the study, Adams (2018) referred to an Office Housework as a “Low Appreciation Work Task (LAWT) and defined the term in the same way. Participants rated each task on a five-point Likert scale where 1 = Not at all a LAWT and 5 = Definitely a LAWT. Of the 74 tasks, 56 of them were identified as Office Housework tasks (Adams, 2018). Additionally, there was agreement between men and women on what was an Office Housework task, or LAWT. Further, exploratory factor analysis was used to examine the groupings of the tasks. The best fit was found to be a four factor solution and thus, the 56 tasks were organized into four types (Adams, 2018). The four identified types of Office Housework were best labeled as janitorial tasks, administrative tasks, emotional support tasks, and social event tasks.

Janitorial tasks are physical tasks like cleaning and restocking, e.g., emptying the trash (Adams, 2018). Administrative tasks involve the use of technology and those that support office management and administrative staff, e.g., troubleshooting computer problems. Emotional support tasks consisted of four tasks: listening to colleagues vent their frustrations, emotionally supporting upset colleagues, running errands for other employees, and handling employee and employee family well-being communications (Adams, 2018). Finally, social event tasks consist of food and event related tasks. For the purpose of this the study, the four factor conceptualization of Office Housework will be used.

## **Determinants of Office Housework**

### **Task Visibility**

Task visibility is how much an employee believes his or her supervisor, or another organizational member, notices his or her work contributions (George, 1992). Task visibility is low when an employee believes their actions are less likely to be noticed and high when an employee believes their actions are more likely to be noticed (Adams, 2018). High task visibility is similar to glamour work, which is work that is more noticeable and can lead to promotional opportunities and career success (Adams, 2018). Low task visibility is conceptually similar to OH, as they often go unrewarded and unnoticed. Therefore, perceived task visibility may influence willingness to participate in Office Housework (Adams, 2018). It has been reported that women have less access to high visibility glamour work and are more likely to complete low visibility Office Housework tasks. Additionally, Adams (2018) found that Office Housework tasks were less visible to supervisors than organizational peers.

### **Subjective Task Value**

Subjective Task Value (STV) is the worth an employee assigns to different tasks that influences the likelihood of the employee completing a given task (Adams, 2018). Therefore, the value an employee gives to an Office Housework task can partially determine if he or she completes the task. There are six factors that contribute to overall STV: Intrinsic Interest Value, Attainment Value/Importance, Extrinsic Utility Value, Ability/Expectancy, Task Difficulty, and Required Effort (Adams, 2018).

Intrinsic Interest Value is the degree to which an employee enjoys a task, such that greater interest in the task leads to intrinsic desire for the task (Adams, 2018).

Attainment Value/Importance is the personal value an employee assigns a task. Extrinsic Utility Value considers the way in which tasks will help achieve future goals or reward attainment (Adams, 2018). Ability/Expectancy is one's determination that they have the skills to complete the task. This component of STV is similar to self-efficacy discussed by Beauregard (2012). Task Difficulty is the difficulty an employee assigns to completing a task (Adams, 2018). Required Effort refers to the effort an employee thinks is required for task completion whether emotionally, socially, or physically. Additionally, it can represent the tradeoff when choosing one task instead of another (Adams, 2018).

Adams (2018) hypothesized that the first three (Intrinsic Interest Value, Attainment Value/Importance, and Extrinsic Utility Value) would better explain an employee's decision to participate in OH tasks because of the "value proposition motivations" involved when making the decision. Results suggest that different types of OH tasks may have different value propositions associated with them (Adams, 2018).

### **Office Housework and Organizational Citizenship Behavior**

Office Housework is still young in its conceptualization and uncertainty remains as how to classify it; is it a component of OCB or a standalone construct? OCB and OH tasks are both forms of contextual performance that positively influence the functioning of a workplace and are thought to be completed more by women (Beauregard, 2012; Allen & Jang, 2018; Adams, 2018; Williams, 2014). There are, however, important distinctions based on the differences in outcomes and determinants. For instance, employees who participate in OCB are viewed more positively by supervisors and may receive better performance evaluations (Cameron & Nadler, 2013). Office Housework is typically unnoticed and consequently unrewarded by organizational leaders and peers

(Adams, 2018). Due to the gap in recognition and appreciation, there are also differences in why an employee may choose to participate in OH or OCB tasks.

Since OCB are known to be more visible to supervisors, the decision to participate in those behaviors is thought to be due to affect, personality, and self-efficacy (Organ, 1983; Motowildo & Van Scotter, 1994; Beauregard, 2012). However, OH tasks have lower visibility and the decision to take part in OH involves an assessment made by the employee of value that task will bring (Adams, 2018). The assessment involves consideration of task enjoyment, personal value, goal or reward attainment, ability, and effort required.

There is support for both classifications of Office Housework. Jang, Allen, Regina, and Radke (2018) conceptualized OH as an OCB due to the high similarity in their definitions as conceptual performance. On the other hand, Adams (2018) emphasized that OH is underappreciated which makes OH task completion different from OCB in terms of cause and results. It is clear, although, that more empirical work must be done to gain a better understanding of Office Housework.

### **Gender and Task Distribution**

Research has shown that one of the main predictors of career development is challenging job experiences (De Pater, Van Vianen, & Bechtoldt, 2010). Those who are challenged earlier in the job experience achieve greater success, as they are evaluated more positively even when employee ability is equal (De Pater et al., 2010; De Pater, Van Vianen, Humphrey, Sleeth, Hartman, & Fischer, 2009b). Studies offer that women experience fewer challenging work assignments (De Pater et al., 2009b) and thus, women receive fewer promotions due to lack of opportunities that develop managerial skills (De

Pater et al., 2010). De Pater et al. (2010) found continued support as even when demographics, ambition, and self-evaluations were controlled, women had fewer challenging work assignments than men. Additionally, jobs held by women have lower visibility and risk (De Pater et al., 2009b).

The difference in challenging job experiences between men and women could be caused by individual characteristics, motivation, self-efficacy, preferences, task choice, discrimination, or task allocation (De Pater et al., 2010; Babcock, Recalde, Vesterlund, & Weingart, 2017; De Pater et al., 2009b; De Pater, Van Vianen, Fischer, & Ginkel, 2009a). De Pater et al. (2009a) conducted a study to better understand gender differences in choosing challenging tasks. It was found that men and women agree on what a challenging work task is, but men selected to perform more challenging assignments than women. Further, that men were motivated to achieve success while women were more motivated to avoid failure (De Pater et al., 2009a). Results supported that men had more challenging experiences, and thus, were given better evaluations for career growth. However, gender differences in challenging work experiences were muted when controlling for proactive personality, or the disposition for proactive behaviors (De Pater et al., 2009a). Therefore, individual characteristics, task choice, and motive influenced the gender difference in challenging tasks.

The completion of challenging tasks can increase an employee's self-efficacy (De Pater et al., (2009a). Thus, the finding that women complete fewer challenging tasks could mean they have lower self-efficacy in regard of such tasks. The empirical work that has been done on gender and self-efficacy found that women rate their self-efficacy lower (De Pater et al., 2009b). However, De Pater et al. (2009b) found that men and women

were equivalent on challenging task choice. Further, that while self-efficacy influences the decision to complete a challenging task, men and women's self-efficacy was not significantly different. The researchers hypothesize that since men are expected to participate in Office Housework at lower rates, meaning underappreciated tasks like watering the plants or hanging office decorations, it may be due to low self-efficacy. Otherwise stated, it could be that men do not complete such tasks because they do not believe they can successfully achieve them.

When tasks are allocated by a supervisor, women may receive fewer tasks that lead to challenging experiences (De Pater et al., 2009b). A study by De Pater et al. (2010) demonstrated that managers more often allocate challenging tasks to men, even when demographics, ambition, and job performance was controlled for. The disparity in task allocation between men and women may be explained by ability, preferences, or discrimination (Babcock et al., 2017). Women have been found to accept and spend more time on tasks that are less relevant to performance evaluations and advancement, known as low promotability tasks (Babcock et al., 2017). Therefore, it is also thought that women complete such tasks because they do not negotiate or strive for such high promotability tasks which further hinders career growth. Despite ability and preferences, women more often volunteer, are asked to volunteer, and accept requests to volunteer for completion of low promotability tasks (Babcock et al., 2017). Specifically, Babcock et al. (2017) found that women agree to the allocation of low promotability tasks at two or three times the rate of men, however, a second study failed to replicate this result.

## Summary

Organizational Citizenship Behavior and Office Housework are similar in that they are both contextual performance that benefits the organization (Organ, 1997; Adams, 2018). However, Office Housework tasks generally go unnoticed and unrewarded while OCB can positively influence performance evaluations (Adams, 2018; Cameron & Nadler, 2013). There is currently a lack of agreement of whether OH is a type of OCB or if they represent different constructs. The present research aims to continue conceptualization of Office Housework by addressing the following question:

*Research Question 1: Is Office Housework part of Organizational Citizenship Behaviors or is Office Housework a different concept?*

A review of the literature revealed interesting ideas about the role of self-efficacy in OCB, OH, and task choice. Beauregard (2012) states that those with higher self-efficacy will perform more OCB as this allow better selection of specific OCBs and organization skills. On the other hand, De Pater et al., (2009a; 2009b) suggest that women participate in less challenging, low promotability tasks due to self-efficacy of the tasks. The researchers wonder, though, how self-efficacy influence males' participation in Office Housework. Therefore, this research will address the following question:

*Research Question 2: Do men participate in less Office Housework tasks because they have lower self-efficacy for tasks of that nature?*

## CHAPTER II: METHOD

### **Participants**

Four hundred participants were recruited through Amazon Mechanical Turk (MTurk). The eligibility requirements for participation include being 18 years of age or older, a resident of the United States, and currently employed (work 30 hours/week), as well as have at least one year of office work experience. Office work is defined as “work that takes place within on organization’s office” (Adams, 2018, p.18). The participants were paid a small incentive to participate (\$0.75).

The data was gathered in two collections. The first collection only sought 40 participants. One person was rejected for not meeting inclusion criteria initially and attempting to take the survey again. Therefore, the second collection sought to collect 361 participants for a total sample of 400. Two participants were removed for not meeting the inclusion initially and attempting to take the survey again and 18 were rejected because they completed the survey during the first round of collection. Additionally, 33 participants were removed for completing the survey in less than four minutes (less than a quarter of the time it took the average participant). There were three participants that completed the survey that did not enter the randomly generated code to be recorded in the MTurk system which resulted in a final sample size of 350.

Of the 350 participants, 226 were male and 124 were female. The average age was 31.65 years ( $SD = 8.14$ ) with a range of 18- 72 years old. The age range for females was 18- 60 and for males 18- 72. Asian participants made up 45% of the sample, 44% identified as white, 8% identified as black or African American, 2% identified as American Indian or Alaska Native, 1% identified as mixed race, and two participants

(0.6%) identified as “Other” and typed Latino and Hispanic. For educational background, 63% of the sample reported having a 4-year degree, 16% have a professional degree, Master’s degree, or Doctorate, 8% have an Associate’s degree, 8% have some college, and the remaining 4% have a high school diploma or less.

### **Measures**

The measures were gathered by means of a Qualtrics self-report survey designed for MTurk participants. The first page was Informed Consent and Introduction to the Study. Once participants gave informed consent, they were asked to provide their MTurk Worker ID. Then, they were presented with questions that ensure they met the eligibility requirements. They had to verify they are at least 18 years old, are currently employed, and have at least one year of office experience to continue to the survey. Those who did not meet the requirements were taken to the end of the survey which thanked them for their time, explained that they are ineligible, and provided contact information of the lead investigator.

Participants who meet all the eligibility requirements proceeded to the survey. The first part of the survey addressed research question one. A comprehensive list of OH tasks and OCB was made from an existing list of OH tasks and two OCB scales. After factor analysis, Adams (2018) was left with a list of 54 OH tasks that loaded onto four factors of Office Housework: Janitorial Tasks, Administrator/ Office Manager Tasks, Emotional Support Tasks, and Social Event Tasks (Adams, 2018). Reliability for the four factor scale items are as follows: Janitorial Tasks  $\alpha = .91$ , Administrative/ Officer Manager Tasks  $\alpha = .92$ , Emotional Support Tasks  $\alpha = .67$ , and Social Event Tasks  $\alpha = .85$ . Eleven items were removed from the list due to redundancy with the items in the

OCB measures, low factor loadings, or cross loadings. The remaining 43 tasks were combined with OCBs listed in Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Hoorman, and Fetter (1990) OCB Scale and Fox, Spector, Goh, Bruursema, and Kessler (2012) OCB Checklist (OCB-C).

The scale provided by Podsakoff et al. (1990) has five dimensions that represent the five types of OCB: conscientiousness, sportsmanship, civic virtue, courtesy, and altruism. There are five items per category except for civic virtue, which has four, for a total of 24 items. The items were factor analyzed and “the overall fit of the 5-factor model hypothesized by Organ (1988) to the data was quite good (TLI = .94), with all of the items ... loading significantly on their intended factors” (Podsakoff et al., 1990, p.122).

The OCB Checklist (OCB-C) by Fox et al. (2012) was created to measure the frequency of OCB tasks completed by employees. There are three versions of the checklist containing 42, 36, or 20 items. The scale has two subscales that separate acts of OCB into those directed at the organization (OCBO) and those geared toward helping coworkers with work-related problems (OCBP) (Fox et al., 2012). The scale was designed to use a 5-point Likert scale from 1 (*Never*) to 5 (*Every Day*). The internal consistency reliability reported for the OCB-C ranges from .89- .97, depending on sample and number of items (Fox, Spector, Goh, Bruursema, & Kessler, 2009). The 36 item scale was chosen for use in the study; however, 13 items were removed for redundancy leaving a total of 23.

The list of tasks and behaviors identified in Adams (2018) study, the OCB Scale (Podsakoff et al., 1990), and the OCB Checklist (Fox et al., 2012) were combined into a comprehensive list. The tasks were not be labeled such that participants did not know the

items' classification as an OCB or OH task. Each item was preceded by the statement "An ideal employee...". For example, "An ideal employee does not take extra breaks." The respondents rated each statement on a five-point Likert scale where 1 = "Strongly Disagree" and 5 = "Strongly Agree".

The next portion of the survey addressed the second research question.

Participants were asked to rate OH tasks and OCB from the OCB Checklist *only* (the Podsakoff et al. (1990) OCB Scale was not included) on the frequency they complete them in the workplace. The statements read, "Please rate each item on how frequently you complete it." The items were rated on a 5-point scale where 1 = "Never" and 5 = "Very Often." Then, participants were asked to rate just OH tasks on how well they can accomplish them. The OH task statements were preceded by "I'm good at...". For example, "I'm good at planning office events, parties, conferences, etc." The respondents rated each statement on a five-point Likert scale where 1 = "Strongly Disagree" and 5 = "Strongly Agree".

The final portion of the survey asked demographic and work biodata questions. Participants were asked to provide their sex, gender, ethnicity, and education level. The work biodata question asked for participants' sex make-up of the organization in which they currently work in the form of a percentage. For example, 60% women and 40% men. They were then thanked for their participation and provided with the lead researcher's contact information for questions and concerns. Finally, Qualtrics generated a random 5-digit code for the participant to enter into MTurk for proof of participation to receive the incentive (\$0.75).

## CHAPTER III: RESULTS

### **Research Question One**

To address the first research question, the three scales that formed the comprehensive list of OH tasks and OCBs were each factor analyzed via exploratory factor analysis to determine the factor structure of the three scales, as the current study did not use them as they were intended. Specifically, the OH task list from Adams (2018) were rated on well the task represented the definition of Office Housework, where Office Housework was labeled as “Low Appreciation Work Task” (LAWT) to avoid gender bias. The participants were asked to rate each task on a Likert Scale from 1 (Not at all a LAWT) to 5 (Definitely a LAWT). The OCB Scale as used by Podsakoff et al. (1990) to assess leader behavior by having participants rate the items on a 7-point Likert Scale where 1 = Strongly Disagree and 5 = Strongly Agree. Lastly, the OCB Checklist (Fox et al., 2012) was created to assess frequency of OCB behaviors and items were rated on a 5-point Likert scale where 1 = Never and 5 = Every Day. The present study, however, asked participants to rate items based on how much they represented an ideal employee on a Likert scale from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree).

For each analysis, only factors with eigenvalues greater than or equal to one were retained (Kaiser, 1958). Once the dimensions for each scale were determined, scale reliabilities were calculated for each dimension. Then scale scores were computed by averaging the responses for each dimension of the scale and Pearson correlations were run to evaluate relatedness of the scales.

### **Office Housework Tasks (Adams, 2018)**

Exploratory factor analysis of the OH tasks revealed a four-factor solution best fit the data; however, it was not the same four factors identified in Adams' (2018) study. The identified four-factor solution explained 51.36% of the variance in the data. Three items (Administrative Task 8—An ideal employee provides back-up for other employees when they are out; Administrative Task 19—An ideal employee gives directions to guests/visitors; and Administrative Task 23— An ideal employee files for others) did not effectively load onto any factor, reducing the number of tasks to load onto factors to 40.

Factor one had an extracted sum of squares loadings eigenvalue of 18.86, accounting for 14.73% of variance. The tasks for factor one dealt largely with helping others around the office directly and indirectly. A few example tasks include “An ideal employee emotionally supports upset colleagues” and “An ideal employee troubleshoots computer or software issues.” This scale for OH tasks was labeled “Helping.” Factor two had an extracted sum of squares loadings eigenvalue of 1.92 and explained for 14.66% of the variance. The tasks for factor two retained the majority of janitorial items from the original factor structure involving cleaning, stocking, and maintenance tasks. The scale was labeled “Janitorial.”

The third factor had an extracted sum of squares eigenvalue of 1.56, accounting for 11.79% of the variance. Factor three's tasks revolved around organizing work-related events. Example items include “An ideal employee sets up meeting spaces” and “An ideal employee prints, organizes, and prepares meeting materials.” This scale was labeled “Planning for Work.” Factor four had an extracted sum of squares eigenvalue of 1.20 and explained 10.19% of the variance. The tasks for this factor consisted largely for planning

for office events that were social in nature, for example, “An ideal employee organizes celebration parties for employees.” The scale was labeled “Social Planning.”

Each of the factors were assessed for internal consistency using Cronbach’s Alpha. Helping (12 items) had a high internal consistency,  $\alpha = .91$ ; Janitorial (12 items) had a slightly higher internal consistency,  $\alpha = .92$ ; Planning for Work (9 items) had an alpha of  $.87$ ; and Social Planning (7 items) internal consistency was  $\alpha = .86$ . The pattern matrix for the factor structure of OH tasks can be found in Table 2.

Table 2  
*Pattern Matrix for Office Housework Tasks*

OH Task Item	Factor			
	1	2	3	4
An ideal employee...				
Proofreads emails for colleagues	.69			
Supervises or monitor office guests	.67			
Emotionally supports upset colleagues	.65			
Troubleshoots computer or software issues	.63			
Listens to colleagues vent frustrations	.61			
Ships packages	.58	.43		
Runs errands for other employees	.57		.40	
Purchases cards and other gifts for employees	.54			
Handles incoming mail	.53			
Sets up office software	.47			
Handles employee and employee family well-being communications	.46		.42	
Fills out paperwork for others	.40			
Hangs wall items		.70		
Stocks kitchen supplies	.43	.68		
Repairs or assembles furniture		.65		.41

(Continued)

Table 2 Cont.  
*Pattern Matrix for Office Housework Tasks*

OH Task Item	Factor				
	An ideal employee...	1	2	3	4
Kills or removes pests			.64		
Cleans restrooms			.60		
Fixes the coffee machine			.59		
Decorates the office for holidays			.56		
Refills the water cooler			.56		
Does cleaning related tasks			.56	.48	
Sets out candy or office snacks for others			.55		
Waters the office plants			.50	.42	
Empties the office trash			.43		
Sets up meeting spaces				.65	
Sets up new employee offices/workstations				.58	
Prints, organizes, and/or prepares meeting materials				.58	
Makes coffee			.45	.56	
Orders catering for the office				.53	
Schedules office maintenance				.52	
Removes recently printed documents from the printer and takes them to employees				.47	
Creates presentations for others				.42	
Plans office events, parties, conferences, etc.				.41	
Makes business lunch or dinner reservations		.50			.44
Researches or books travel for others					.68
Buys or prepares food for office events or parties					.63
Orders flowers for employees, clients, or others					.54
Coordinates others' calendars		.50			.50
Answers phone in the conference room					.45
Organizes celebration parties for employees					.40

(Continued)

Table 2 Cont.  
*Pattern Matrix for Office Housework Tasks*

	Factor			
	1	2	3	4
Percentage of Variance	14.73	14.66	11.79	10.19
Eigenvalue	18.86	1.92	1.56	1.20
Cronbach's Alpha	.91	.92	.87	.86

### **OCB Scale (Podsakoff et al. (1990))**

The scale when used as intended has five dimensions representing five facets of organization citizenship behavior. Exploratory factor analysis revealed a three factor solution best fit the data explaining 49.06% of the variance. Two items (Conscientiousness 4—An ideal employee is one of my most conscious employees and Conscientiousness 5—An ideal employee believes in giving an honest day's work for an honest day's pay) failed to load on any factor, resulting in 22 items to form the factor structure.

Factor one had an extracted sum of squares eigenvalue of 7.14 and explained 20.82% of the variance. The behaviors in factor one largely involved those in which the employee's decisions are guided by what is best for coworkers and the organization. For example, "An ideal employee attends functions that are not required but help the company image." This scale was labeled "Consideration." Factor two had an extracted sum of squares eigenvalue of 3.52, accounting for 15.42% of the variance. The items in this factor held from the dimension of the original scale, Sportsmanship. These behaviors regard an employee's attitude about the organization, i.e., "An ideal employee tends to make mountains out of molehills." The scale kept the label "Sportsmanship." The third factor had an extracted sum of squares eigenvalue of 1.12 and explained 12.82% of the

variance. The behaviors in this factor deal with taking traditional organizational rule following one step further. Example items include “An ideal employee’s attendance at work is above the norm” and “An ideal employee obeys rules and regulations even when no one is watching.” The scale was labeled “Compliance.”

Each of the factors were assessed for internal consistency using Cronbach’s Alpha. Consideration (12 items) had an alpha of .87.; Sportsmanship (5 items) had the highest internal consistency,  $\alpha = .90$ ; and Compliance (5 items) internal consistency was  $\alpha = .76$ . The pattern matrix for the factor structure of the OCB Scale can be found in Table 3.

Table 3  
*Pattern Matrix for OCB Scale*

OCB Scale Item	Factor		
	1	2	3
An ideal employee...			
Is always ready to lend a helping hand to those around him/her	.68		
Takes steps to try to prevent problems with other workers	.68		
Helps other who have heavy workloads	.66		
Attends functions that are not required but help the company image	.65		
Helps others who have been absent	.63		
Helps orient new people even though it is not required	.62		
Willingly helps others who have work related problems	.57		
Reads and keeps up with organization announcements, memos, and so on	.55		
Does not abuse the rights of others	.49		.41
Keeps abreast of changes in the organization	.49		
Is mindful of how his/her behavior affects other people’s jobs	.49		.42

(Continued)

Table 3 Cont.  
*Pattern Matrix for OCB Scale*

OCB Scale Item	Factor		
	1	2	3
An ideal employee...			
Does not take extra breaks	.44		
Always finds fault with what the organization is doing (R)		.85	
Consumes a lot of time complaining about trivial matters (R)		.84	
Is the classic “squeaky wheel that always needs greasing (R)		.84	
Consumes a lot of time complaining about trivial matters (R)		.84	
Tends to make “mountains out of molehills” (R)		.82	
Attendance at work is about the norm			.86
Considers the impact of his/her actions on coworkers			.67
Obeys company rules and regulations even when no one is watching			.52
Tries to avoid creating problems for coworkers	.43		.51
Attends meetings that are not mandatory but are considered important	.40		.45
Percentage of Variance	20.82	15.42	12.82
Eigenvalue	7.14	3.52	1.12
Cronbach’s Alpha	.87	.90	.76

(R) = Reverse coded.

### **OCB Checklist (Fox et al., 2012)**

The OCB checklist is originally organized by behaviors that are either geared toward coworkers or the organization and while the factor analysis revealed a two factor structure, it did not match the original subscales. The two factor structure explained 43.47% of the variance and all items were retained in the factor structure. Factor one had an extracted sum of squares eigenvalue of 8.16 and accounted for 21.85% of the variance. The behaviors in this factor were largely oriented toward improving the workplace by

means of supporting, encouraging, and teaching others. For example, “An ideal employee offers suggestions to improve how work is one.” This scale is labeled “Benefit.” The second factor had an extracted sum of squares eigenvalue of 1.84, explaining 21.62% of the variance. The behaviors involved an employee giving up their time and resources for the sake of coworkers and the organization. An example item is “An ideal employee volunteered to work after hours or out-of-town events.” The scale was labeled “Sacrifice.”

Each factor was assessed for internal consistency using Cronbach’s Alpha. Benefit (11 items) had an alpha of .87 and Sacrifice (12 items) with an equivalent internal consistency  $\alpha = .87$ . The pattern matrix for the factor structure of the OCB Scale can be found in Table 4.

Table 4  
*Pattern Matrix for OCB Checklist*

OCB Checklist Item	Factor	
	1	2
An ideal employee...		
Helps a coworker learn new skills or shares job knowledge	.67	
Helps new employees get oriented to the job	.66	
Helps a less capable coworker lift a heavy box or other object	.66	
Offers suggestions to improve how work is done	.65	
Says good things about your employer in front of others	.65	
Lends a compassionate ear when someone has a work problem	.64	
Offers suggestions for improving the work environment	.62	
Goes out of the way to give a coworker encouragement or express appreciation	.60	
Defends a coworker who was being “put down” or spoken ill of by other coworkers or supervisor	.60	
Gives written or verbal recommendations for coworkers	.56	

(Continued)

Table 4 Cont.  
*Pattern Matrix for OCB Checklist*

OCB Checklist	Factor	
	1	2
An ideal employee...	1	2
Lends a compassionate ear when someone has a personal problem	.42	
Gives up meals and other breaks to complete work		.72
Uses own vehicle, supplies, or equipment for employer's business		.66
Comes in early or stays late without pay to complete a project or task		.66
Brings candy, doughnuts, snacks, or drinks for coworkers		.64
Changes vacation schedule, workdays, or shifts to accommodate coworkers' needs		.63
Works weekends or other days off to complete a project or task		.62
Brings work home to prepare for next day		.59
Volunteers to work after-hours or out-of-town events		.59
Volunteers to attend meetings or work on committees on own time		.55
Drives, escorts, or entertains company guests, clients, or out-of-town employees		.55
Tries to recruit a person to work for your employer		.52
Volunteers for extra work assignments		.44
Percentage of Variance	21.85	21.62
Eigenvalue	8.16	1.84
Cronbach's Alpha	.87	.87

The exploratory factor analyses of the three measures resulted in nine scales, four representing OH tasks and five representing OCB. Scale scores were calculated for the nine scales by averaging each person's ratings for the items that loaded onto the scale. Relationships between the nine scales were assessed through a two-tailed Pearson correlation using the scale scores. See the correlation matrix in Table 5 below. The

researchers determined that statistical significance of a correlation was not enough to conclude that there is overlap by the construct measured by the scale. Correlations coefficients of  $r \geq .60$  were considered meaningful. The strongest relationship was found between the Consideration and Benefit scales,  $r = .859, p < .001$ , which is likely because both scales involve an employee frame actions around improving the organization and coworkers. Another strong relationship was between Compliance and Benefit,  $r = .742, p < .001$ , probably due to the overlap in items about taking extra steps to improve the organizational functioning and employee skills. Outside of these two strong relationships, it is important to note that overall, the relationships among the five OCB scale dimensions were not as strong as those among the four OH scale dimensions. The lowest OH scale correlation was between Janitorial and Helping,  $r = .761, p < .01$ . The weakest relationship between OCB scales was with Benefit and Sportsmanship,  $r = .015, p = .787$ . This could indicate that OCB is widely defined, and the OCB scales are measuring different areas of performance, whereas OH tasks have been correctly identified.

Table 5

*Two-Tailed Pearson Correlation for OH and OCB Scales*

Scale	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
OH	1. Helping							
	2. Janitorial	.761**						
	3. Planning for Work	.808**	.801**					
	4. Social Planning	.794**	.788**	.801**				
OCB	5. Consideration	.402**	.279**	.354**	.266**			
	6. Sportsmanship	-.389**	-.508**	-.387**	-.431**	.137**		
	7. Compliance	.409**	.197**	.283**	.234**	.716**	.092	
	8. Benefit	.543**	.365**	.441**	.367**	.859**	.015	.742**
	9. Sacrifice	.661**	.637**	.649**	.624**	.562**	-.330**	.461**

\* Correction is significant at the .05 level (2-tailed)

\*\* Correlation is significant at the .01 level (2-tailed)

NOTE: only those correlations at or above .60 were considered meaningful

Sportsmanship was not meaningfully correlated to any of the other scales as the items describe attitudes about the organization rather than specific behaviors or tasks and are all negatively worded. Unsurprisingly, all of the OH task scales were strongly related to each other, which gives reason to believe the tasks and corresponding scales are appropriately categorized as Office Housework. In contrast, only one of the OCB scales was meaningfully related to the OH scales enough to suggest overlap of the construct measured: Sacrifice and Helping,  $r = .661, p < .001$ ; Sacrifice and Janitorial,  $r = .637, p < .001$ ; Sacrifice and Planning for Work,  $r = .649, p < .001$ ; and Sacrifice and Social Planning,  $r = .624, p < .001$ .

Sacrifice items are categorized by an employee making choices to help the organization at a cost to themselves which reflects critical components of the OH definition: benefits the organization and does not directly benefit the worker. Since the OCB scale with meaningful overlap with the OH scales has a nature mirroring that of OH tasks, there is reason to believe that Office Housework and Organizational Citizenship Behavior are different constructs.

### **Research Question Two**

The second research question was addressed with a two-way ANOVA to determine if OH tasks were completed at different rates based on sex and confidence level of OH tasks. Confidence of OH task completion was rated on five-point scale and averaged to represent each participant's confidence level for OH tasks. To create a confidence variable that was categorical, average confidence level was coded as follows: average confidence level between 1 and 2.5 is not confident; average confidence level

between 2.6 and 3.5 is neither confident nor not confident; and average confidence level between 3.6 and 5 is confident.

Descriptive statistics for the frequency of completion of Office Housework by sex and confidence level are in Table 6. A familywise alpha of .05 was used for all analyses. The sample sizes for the groups were unequal so the SPSS mixed procedure was used to conduct the two-way ANOVA without the assumption of equal population variances. The participant's sex (male or female) and level of confidence for completion of OH tasks (not confident, neither confident nor not confident, confident) were used to predict participant's frequency of completing OH tasks. The two-way ANOVA indicated there was not a significant interaction between sex and confidence level,  $F(2, 30.1) = 1.30, p = .287, \omega^2 = .001$ . The main effect for sex was not significant,  $F(1, 23.5) = 0.03, p = .871, \omega^2 = .00$ . Sidak comparisons also indicated OH task frequency was similar for males and females.

The frequency of OH task completion did differ by confidence level,  $F(2, 30.1) = 104.14, p < .001, \omega^2 = .38$ . Sidak comparisons showed that frequency was significantly higher for those who rated themselves as confident than for those who were neither confident nor not confident. Additionally, those who rated themselves as neither confident nor not confident completed significantly more OH tasks than those who were not confident. See Table 7. It important to note that very few people, approximately 6% of participants, were not confident and results should be interpreted carefully.

Additionally, a Welch ANOVA ( $\alpha_{FW} = .05$ ) revealed that there were not differences in OCB frequency between men and women,  $F(1, 223.47) = 0.45, p = .503, \omega^2 = .00$ .

Table 6  
*Descriptive Statistics for OH Task Frequency by Sex and Confidence Level*

		OH Task Frequency			
Sex	Confidence Level	<i>n</i>	Mean	95% Confidence Interval	
				Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Female	Confident	76	3.75	3.60	3.91
	Neither	39	2.71	2.47	2.95
	Not Confident	9	2.21	1.63	2.79
Male	Confident	132	3.80	3.68	3.91
	Neither	81	2.95	2.82	3.07
	Not Confident	13	1.99	1.66	2.32

Table 7  
*Sidak Comparisons for Confidence Level of OH Task Frequency*

(I)	(J)	Mean Difference	95% CI	
		(I-J)	Lower Bound	Upper Bound
<b>Confidence Level</b>				
Confident	Neither	0.946*	0.75	1.15
Confident	Not Confident	1.676*	1.27	2.09
Neither	Not Confident	0.730*	0.31	1.15

\* The mean difference is significant at the .05 familywise alpha level.

For research question two, this study shows that men and women are not completing OH tasks at different rates and they also do not differ in their level of confidence for completing such tasks. However, there is evidence that an employee's decision to participate in OH is influenced by their belief that they are good at those tasks. Specifically, the more confident one is, the more they partake in OH tasks.

Additional analyses were computed to determine if men and women completed the different dimensions of OH tasks identified through EFA (helping, janitorial, planning for work, and social planning) at different rates. Table 8 provides the descriptive of OH task completion by dimension for men and women. Welch ANOVAs ( $\alpha_{FW} = .05$ ) indicated that there were no differences based on sex for any of the OH scale dimensions: Helping,  $F(1, 234.28) = 0.53, p = .469, \omega^2 = .00$ ; Janitorial,  $F(1, 224.71) = 1.36, p = .244, \omega^2 = .001$ ; Planning for Work,  $F(1, 232.31) = 0.16, p = .688, \omega^2 = .00$ ; and Social Planning,  $F(1, 246.20) = 0.04, p = .837, \omega^2 = .00$ . This provides the insight that men and women are also completing the different types of OH tasks at equivalent rates. Participant confidence rates were also assessed for gender difference by OH scale dimension. In line with previous analyses, there were not gender differences in confidence level for any of the four scales.

Table 8  
*Descriptive Statistics for OH Task Frequency by Dimension and Sex*

Scale	Sex	<i>n</i>	OH Task Frequency		
			Mean	95% Confidence Interval	
				Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Helping	Female	124	3.40	3.25	3.55
	Male	226	3.47	3.37	3.57
Janitorial	Female	124	3.15	2.96	3.34
	Male	226	3.29	3.16	3.41
Planning for Work	Female	124	3.35	3.18	3.53
	Male	226	3.40	3.28	3.51
Social Planning	Female	124	3.31	3.13	3.48
	Male	226	3.33	3.21	3.46

Due to the large portion of Asian participants, the differences in OH completion were assessed by ethnicity. Descriptive statistics are in Table 9. A Welch ANOVA ( $\alpha_{FW} = .05$ ) indicated that there were differences in OH task frequency by ethnicity,  $F(5, 7.08) = 6.66, p = .013, \omega^2 = .10$ . Games Howell procedure indicated that Asian participants completed significantly more OH tasks than those that were white. All other comparisons in completion rates were not significant.

Table 9  
*Descriptive Statistics for OH Task Frequency by Ethnicity*

Ethnicity	<i>n</i>	OH Task Frequency		
		Mean	95% Confidence Interval	
			Lower Bound	Upper Bound
White	153	3.06	2.92	3.21
African American	27	3.46	3.08	3.85
Native Indian or Alaska Native	7	3.83	3.28	4.39
Asian	158	3.61	3.51	3.72
Other	2	4.00	0.63	7.37
Mixed Race	3	2.69	-2.05	7.44

Finally, a two-tailed Pearson correlation was run to assess the relationship between participant age and OH task frequency. Results revealed a significant negative correlation between age and frequency,  $r = -.295, p < .01$ . This demonstrates evidence that older employees are participating in OH tasks at a lower rate than younger employees. Age may be confounded with job level which could influence this relationship.

## CHAPTER IV: DISCUSSION

The study purported to clarify Office Housework's classification in the contextual performance framework and determine if it should be considered as an OCB or its own construct. Further, the study aimed to assess participant ratings of OCB and OH task frequency to compare the results with the reviewed literature's mixed findings of gender differences in contextual performance. Finally, the study tested self-efficacy as a determinant of participating in OH tasks and whether differences in confidence by gender could cause inequivalent OH task completion between men and women. The study found nine subscales of contextual performance, five for OCB and four for OH, that represent a range of behaviors and tasks and explored how they were related. The subscales did not match the original factor structure of the scales and this is most likely because the scales were not used as they were developed and previously assessed. For example, the OCB Scale has been used to rate a supervisor's or coworkers behavior.

The nine scale dimensions were correlated to reveal meaningful relationships among OCB and OH scales. The OCB scale dimensions were less related to each other compared to relatedness of the OH scale dimensions. Further, the Sportsmanship subscale was not meaningfully related to any other scales. All of the Sportsmanship items are negatively worded and revolve around attitudes opposed to behaviors. This could have influenced its factor structure and caused the low correlations with other scales.

The only OCB scale with a meaningful relationship with OH scales was Sacrifice. Being named for including behaviors in which the employee gives up their own time, resources, or opportunities for the sake of the employee's organization and colleagues, Sacrifice being meaningfully related to *all* OH scales indicates that there is redundancy in

what is being assessed. The nature of Sacrifice is that employees are effortfully trying to improve the organization by sacrificing something for themselves without any direct benefits. The accepted definition of Office Housework is work not assigned by an employee's job responsibilities that benefits the organization, does not directly benefit the employee in their capacity, and are underappreciated and underrecognized (Adams, 2018). The items representing OH tasks in the OH scales were shown to be reliable by Adams (2018) and the present study's high internal consistency values ( $\alpha = .87- .92$ ) of the OH scale as well as the meaningful correlations ( $r = .761 - .808$ ) between the four OH scale support that the OH has been accurately defined and measured. Therefore, its relatedness to only one OCB scale that is similar to OH brings to light evidence that Office Housework is likely a different concept from Organizational Citizenship Behavior. An alternate explanation is that OH is an OCB, but only represents a small facet of OCB types.

While still early in its definition and exploration, there was already disagreement in the literature of how to classify OH under the contextual performance umbrella. Jang et al. (2018) held that OH is an OCB because they are both types of contextual performance that positively influence the organizational, social, and psychological context of the workplace and thought to be completed more by women. Oppositely, Adams (2018) noted that OH is less likely to be recognized and rewarded by supervisors and other key organizational members which make it different from OCB based on cause and outcomes. The present study's findings support Adams' (2018) notion that OH and OCB are separate constructs, but with the recognition that further studies and research are needed for continued support.

Unlike the novelty with OH research, Organizational Citizenship Behaviors have been studied since the late 80s when Organ (1988) conceptualized the term and described five types of OCB (Organ, 1997; Hoffman et al., 2007). The most controversial view involving OCB is the rate at which men and women participate in these behaviors. Women are associated with communal behaviors which are congruent with OCB, and thus, it is thought that women complete OCB at higher rates due to gender roles and expectations (Beauregard, 2012). Similarly, OH is thought to have an even greater risk of being completed more by women due to volunteering, being voluntold, or pigeonholed for those tasks (Adams, 2018; Williams, 2014; Williams et al., 2016; Heilman & Chen, 2005). However, there are empirical studies that failed to find differences between men and women in contextual performance (Allen & Jang, 2018). The present study addressed these mixed findings.

This study failed to find any differences between men and women on the basis of OCB completion, OH task completion, and confidence of OH tasks. Therefore, for the second research question, self-efficacy was not needed to explain differences in OH task completion rates as there were no differences in OH task completion. However, the comparison of gender differences in OH confidence revealed it was equivalent for men and women. The four OH scales (Helping, Janitorial, Planning for Work, Social Planning) were assessed for frequency differences between men and women and there were still not differences at more specific levels of OH. Confidence for OH was predictive of the frequency at which participant's complete OH tasks across gender, which supports the literature that higher self-efficacy and ability/expectancy lead employees to perform more OH (Beauregard, 2012). Self-efficacy as confidence level

was supported as a determinant of contextual performance but not as a gender specific influence.

Age was found to be significantly negatively correlated with OH task frequency, lending to the idea that older employees are completing less OH. However, it is likely there are other variables that were not measured that could be causing the relationship. A few potential factors could be tenure in the organization or position/title. It could be that new employees feel the need to participate in OH where those who are tenured feel established and do not participate in contextual behaviors as much. Further, those who hold leadership positions may feel they are in their ideal role and no longer do OH tasks for promotions or better performance evaluations. However, without assessing these variables in addition to those measured in the current study, the exact nature of the relationship cannot be defined.

### **Strengths**

The study completed work that was necessary for guiding future research of Office Housework and adds important direction of classification for the literature on a relatively new construct of job performance. The results provide support regarding the classification of OH as a separate construct which allows for continued exploration with more clarity regarding the issue. It also found a complete lack of gender differences on all issues regarding contextual performance within the study, being confidence and completion rates. These results could be an indication of a shift in the workplace concerning gender stereotypes and corresponding work expectations.

Additionally, there are now five OCB scales and four OH scales with high internal consistencies ( $\alpha = .7- .9$ ) that could be used in future studies to explore opinions

of the population regarding ideal employee behavior. Finally, the study was taken by individuals where the majority received a college level education, and all have experience with office work in an organization. Therefore, the study results should generalize well to the population of interest.

### **Limitations**

Despite the study's strengths, there are still weaknesses to be addressed. The sample included a large portion of Asian participants which calls in to question the generalizability for organizations with a less racially diverse workforce. However, some analyses of gender differences were run without the Asian population and the results were the same as when the entire sample was included: no difference between men and women on OCB completion rate, OH completion rate, or confidence for OH tasks. Additionally, if there were problems in the ratings for items regarding ideal employee behavior between ethnicities, that would have negatively influenced internal consistency. There is reason to believe that having a high number of Asian participants did not greatly impact the study.

Further, the study failed to include items that served as an attention or quality assurance check. Typically, items are included in an online survey that requests participants to respond to an item with a specific answer. For example, "For quality assurance purposes, please select Strongly Agree." Depending on the length of the survey, several of these items are dispersed throughout and participants must pass a certain percentage (usually half) to be included in analyses, as failing to check the appropriate response indicates a lack of attention or care by the participant. The present study did not include such checks and had to rely on duration of survey completion to

attempt to control for those who did not provide effortful responses. Those that completed the survey in less than four minutes were removed. The participants were also paid to complete the survey, and this may have motivated participants to provide good responses.

The sample consisted of approximately 100 more men than women in the sample. While this was controlled for in all statistical analyses comparing gender, it would have been ideal to have equal or almost equal groups of men and women. The OH frequency ratings were self-report and thus, findings involving this variable rely on the assumption that participants provided honest and accurate ratings of their performance. However, Allen and Jang (2018) found that gender differences were *more likely* with self-report, so the present study's lack of gender differences could be indicative of a true lack of behavioral differences between gender.

In terms of survey content, participants were not asked for their confidence ratings of OCB. Therefore, researchers could not test if confidence was also predictive of OCB completion. While this was not a goal of the study's research questions, it could have benefited the literature regarding the relationship between confidence and contextual behavior. Additionally, the study did not assess any other determinants of contextual behavior like affect, personality, task assignment (volunteer versus voluntold), task visibility, or perceived task value. This would help to understand how influential confidence was in determining OH task performance relative to other potential predictors.

### **Future Research**

Future studies should aim to replicate the finding that OH and OCB are two separate constructs. This could be completed by using the scales that resulted from this

study's exploratory factor analyses and collecting data with the nine scales. At that time, continued use of factor analyses and potentially confirmatory factor analysis, as there is now a factor structure, could be used to confirm. Also, a higher order factor analysis could be run on OH tasks including the items from the sacrifice scale items. Depending on the study and data, structural equation modeling could be used to analyze the data. Additionally, the study could be replicated with using the two OCB measures and OH task list as they were intended to be used and see if the results replicate.

Further, similar studies could be conducted with just using the OH task structure developed from this study. While still asking for participant ratings of how frequently they complete OH tasks, questions about why they complete the task could be insightful. For example, assessing if they participate in OH tasks because they feel obligated to volunteer, want to volunteer, or forced to volunteer (voluntold) could be very insightful. If there are differences between men and women of OH completion, this could help explain that difference. Oppositely, if there were not gender differences in OH completion, but men only do OH tasks because they choose to and women feel forced, that could influence understanding of OH and further exploration of the topic.

Additionally, the study could also assess perceptions of and motivation sources for OH. An option could be to determine if participants feel that partaking in Office Housework is increasing the likelihood of success in their job. Also, in what ways they feel that OH is helpful. They may believe that OH leads to better performance reviews, increases work experiences and job opportunities, strengthens relationships with supervisors and coworkers, or improves the overall functioning of the organization,

leading to a better place to work. As seeing any of the mentioned perceived benefits as important, that could serve as sources of motivation to complete OH tasks.

Finally, the present study was largely concerned with Office Housework and its relatedness to Organizational Citizenship Behaviors. However, there are many other variables that may be related to OH and are critical to evaluate for increased understand of OH in the literature and application to the workplace. A few variables to assess in future studies include likeability, promotability, salary, tenure, position/title current workplace gender stereotypes, and other individual difference variables. Specifically, there are often misconceptions about generational differences at work and it would be useful and interesting to begin exploring any age differences in OH.

## **Conclusion**

Office Housework has seen recent recognition in the empirical work, press, and media (Jang et al., 2018; Adams, 2018; Olejarz, 2018; Williams, 2014; Williams et al., 2016). However, there is a lack of consensus about OH's classification as an OCB. The study aimed to add clarity on this issue, as the results have an influence over how the concept is defined, classified, and researched. Results of the present study demonstrated evidence that OH is a standalone concept due to its meaningful relation to only one of the OCB scale dimensions that is similar in nature to OH tasks. This could mean that a key differentiating factor between the two is that OH tasks often come at a cost to the employee with little or no benefit, despite the motivation being the same for OCB. Further, the study addressed potential gender differences in OH task participation and whether it is caused by differences in confidence for such tasks. The results failed to find any significant differences between men and women in contextual behavior performance

and confidence level. However, confidence level was predictive of OH task completion rates, in that the more confident a person was, the more OH tasks they reported completing.

## REFERENCES

- Adams, E. R. (2018). *Operationalizing office housework: Definition, examples, and antecedents* (Order No. 10841556). Available from Dissertations & Theses @ Middle Tennessee State University. (2112305115). Retrieved from <https://ezproxy.mtsu.edu/login?url=https://search.proquest.com/docview/2112305115?accountid=4886>
- Allen, T. D., & Jang, S. R. (2018). Gender and organizational citizenship behavior. In P. M. Podsakoff, S. B. MacKenzie, & N. P. Podsakoff (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Organizational Citizenship Behavior* (pp. 221-238). New York, U.S.: Oxford University Press.
- Babcock, L., Recalde, M. P., Vesterlund, L., & Weingart, L. (2017). Gender differences in accepting and receiving requests for tasks with low promotability. *American Economic Review*, *107*(3), 714-747. doi: 10.1257/aer.20141734.
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise in changing societies*. New York: Freeman.
- Bandura, A. (2006). Guide for constructing self-efficacy scales. In F. Parajes & T. Urdan (Eds.), *Self-Efficacy Beliefs of Adolescents*, (pp. 307-337). Greenwich, CT: Information Age.
- Beauregard, T. A. (2012). Perfectionism, self-efficacy and OCB: The moderating role of gender. *Personnel Review*, *41*(5), 590-608. Retrieved from <https://ezproxy.mtsu.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=edsgao&AN=edsgcl.309599819&site=eds-live&scope=site>

- Campbell, J. P. (1994). Alternative models of job performance and their implications for selection and classification. In M. G. Rumsey, C. B. Walker, & J. H. Harris (Eds.) *Personnel selection and classification* (pp. 33–51). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Campbell, J. P. (1990). Modeling the performance prediction problem in industrial and organizational psychology. In M. D. Dunnette & L. M. Hough (Eds.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (2nd ed., Vol. 1, pp. 687–732). Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Cameron, S. M., & Nadler, J. T. (2013). Gender roles and organizational citizenship behaviors: Effects on managerial evaluations. *Gender in Management: An International Journal*, 28(7), 380-399.
- De Pater, I. E., Van Vianen, A. E., & Bechtoldt, M. N. (2010). Gender differences in job challenge: A matter of task allocation. *Gender Work and Organization*, 17(4), 433-453.
- De Pater, I. E., Vianen, A. E., Fischer, A. H., & Ginkel, W. P. (2009a). Challenging experiences: Gender differences in task choice. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, (1), 4-28. doi: 10.1108/02683940910922519.
- De Pater, I. E., Van Vianen, A. M., Humphrey, R. H., Sleeth, R. G., Hartman, N. S., & Fischer, A. H. (2009b). Individual task choice and the division of challenging tasks between men and women. *Group & Organization Management*, 34(5), 563-589.
- Fox, S., Spector, P. E., Goh, A., Bruursema, K., & Kessler, S. R. (2009). *The deviant citizen: Clarifying the measurement of organizational citizenship behavior and its relation to counterproductive work behavior*. Loyola University, Chicago.

- Fox, S., Spector, P. E., Goh, A., Bruursema, K., & Kessler, S. R. (2012). The deviant citizen: Measuring potential positive relations between counterproductive work behavior and organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 85*, 199-220.
- George, J. (1992). Extrinsic and intrinsic origins of perceived social loafing in organizations. *The Academy of Management Journal, 35*(1), 191-202.
- Heilman, M. E., & Chen, J. J. (2005). Same behavior, different consequences: Reactions to men's and women's altruistic citizenship behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 90*(3), 431-441.
- Hoffman, B. J., Blair, C. A., Meriac, J.P., & Woehr, D. J. (2007). Expanding the criterion domain? A Quantitative review of the OCB literature. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 92*(2), 555- 566.
- Jang, S., Allen, T. D., Regina, J., & Radke, W. (2018, April). Office housework, career success, and health: Does gender matter? Poster session presented at the meeting of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Chicago, IL.
- Jex, S. M., & Britt, T. W. (2014). *Organizational psychology: A scientist-practitioner approach*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.
- Kaiser, H.F. (1958). The varimax criterion for analytic rotation in factor analysis. *Psychometrika, 23*(3), 187-200. doi:10.1007/BF02289233.
- Kanter, R. M. (1977). *Men and women of the corporation*. New York: Basic Books.
- LePine, J. A., Erez, A., & Johnson, D. E. (2002). The nature and dimensionality of organizational citizenship behavior: A critical review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*(1), 52-65.

- Motowildo, S. J. & Van Scotter, J. R. (1994). Evidence that task performance should be distinguished from contextual performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 79(4), 475- 480.
- Organ, D. W. (1983). Organizational citizenship behavior: Its nature and antecedents. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 68(4), 653- 663.
- Olejarz, JM. (2018, July 09). How to say no to office housework. *Harvard Business Review*. Retrieved from <https://hbr.org/tip/2018/07/how-to-say-no-to-office-housework>
- Organ, D. W. (1997). Organizational citizenship behavior: It's construct clean-up time. *Human Performance*, 10(2), 85-97.
- Podsakoff, P.M., MacKenzie, S.B., Moorman, R.H., Fetter, R. (1990). Transformational leader behaviors and their effects on followers' trust in leader, satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behaviors. *Leadership Quarterly*, 1(2), 107-142.
- Sackett, P. R., Berry, C. M., Wiemann, S. A., & Laczko, R. M. (2006). Citizenship and counterproductive behavior: Clarifying relations between the two domains. *Human Performance*, 19(4), 441–464.
- <https://doiorg.ezproxy.mtsu.edu/10.1207/s15327043hup1904pass>
- Spector, P. E., Bauer, J. A., & Fox, S. (2010). Measurement artifacts in the assessment of counterproductive work behavior and organizational citizenship behavior: Do we know what we think we know? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 95(4), 781-790.
- doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0019477>

- Spector, P. E., & Fox, S. (2002). An emotion-centered model of voluntary work behavior: Some parallels between counterproductive work behavior and organizational citizenship behavior. *Human Resource Management Review, 12*(2), 269.  
[https://doi-org.ezproxy.mtsu.edu/10.1016/S1053-4822\(02\)00049-9](https://doi-org.ezproxy.mtsu.edu/10.1016/S1053-4822(02)00049-9)
- Williams, J. C. (2014, April 16). Sticking women with the office housework. *The Washington Post*. Retrieved from  
[https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/onleadership/wp/2014/04/16/sticking-women-with-the-office-housework/?utm\\_term=.16dd212dc704](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/onleadership/wp/2014/04/16/sticking-women-with-the-office-housework/?utm_term=.16dd212dc704)
- Williams, J. C., Li, S., Rincon, R., & Finn, P. (2016). Climate control: Gender and racial bias in engineering? [Report], Society for Women Engineers. Retrieved from  
<https://research.swe.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/11/16-SWE-020-Work-Study-11-01-LM.pdf>

## APPENDICES

## APPENDIX A: SCALE ITEMS

**OCB Scale by Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Hoorman, and Fetter (1990)****Conscientiousness**

1. Attendance at work is above the norm.
2. Does not take extra breaks.
3. Obeys company rules and regulations even when no one is watching.
4. Is one of my most conscientious employees.
5. Believes in giving an honest day's work for an honest day's pay.

**Sportsmanship** (R denotes reverse coding)

6. Consumes a lot of time complaining about trivial matters. (R)
7. Always focuses on what's wrong, rather than the positive side. (R)
8. Tends to make "mountains out of molehills." (R)
9. Always finds fault with what the organization is doing. (R)
10. Is the classic "squeaky wheel" that always needs greasing. (R)

**Civic Virtue**

11. Attends meetings that are not mandatory but are considered important.
12. Attends functions that are not required but help the company image.
13. Keeps abreast of changes in the organization.
14. Reads and keeps up with organization announcements, memos, and so on.

**Courtesy**

15. Takes steps to try to prevent problems with other workers.
16. Is mindful of how his/her behavior affects other people's jobs.
17. Does not abuse the rights of others.

18. Tries to avoid creating problems for coworkers.

19. Considers the impact of his/her actions on coworkers.

**Altruism**

20. Helps others who have been absent.

21. Helps others who have heavy workloads.

22. Helps orient new people even though it is not required.

23. Willingly helps others who have work related problems.

24. Is always ready to lend a helping hand to those around him/her.

**36 Item OCB Checklist (OCB-C) by Fox, Spector, Goh, Bruursema, & Kessler, (2012)**

OCBO: acts directed toward the organization that benefit the organization

OCBP: acts directed toward coworkers that help with work-related issues

**OCBO**

2. Drove, escorted, or entertained company guests, clients, or out-of-town employees.
4. Helped a co-worker learn new skills or shared job knowledge.
5. Helped new employees get oriented to the job.
7. Used own vehicle, supplies or equipment for employer's business.
11. Offered suggestions to improve how work is done.
12. Offered suggestions for improving the work environment.
15. Came in early or stayed late without pay to complete a project or task.
17. Volunteered for extra work assignments.
19. Tried to recruit a person to work for your employer
20. Worked weekends or other days off to complete a project or task.
22. Brought work home to prepare for next day.
23. Volunteered to attend meetings or work on committees on own time.
25. Said good things about your employer in front of others.
26. Gave up meal and other breaks to complete work.
29. Volunteered to work at after-hours or out-of-town events.

**OCBP**

6. Lent a compassionate ear when someone had a work problem.
8. Lent a compassionate ear when someone had a personal problem.
10. Changed vacation schedule, workdays, or shifts to accommodate co-worker's needs.
14. Helped a less capable co-worker lift a heavy box or other object.
27. Brought candy, doughnuts, snacks, or drinks for co-workers.
31. Gave a written or verbal recommendation for a co-worker.
32. Went out of the way to give co-worker encouragement or express appreciation.
36. Defended a co-worker who was being "put-down" or spoken ill of by other co-workers or supervisor.

**Office Housework Tasks Identified by Adams (2018)**

**Janitorial Tasks-** Note: Items 4, 7, and 13 were removed.

1. Emptying the office trash
2. Watering the office plants
3. Refilling the water cooler
5. Cleaning-related tasks
6. Fixing the coffee machine
8. Setting out candy or office snacks for others
9. Hanging wall items
10. Stocking kitchen supplies
11. Killing or removing pests
12. Making coffee
14. Cleaning restrooms
15. Decorating the office for holidays
16. Repairing or assembling furniture
17. Removing recently printed documents from the printer and taking them to employees

**Administrative Tasks-** Note: Items 1, 14, 15, 21, 22, and 24 were removed.

2. Setting up office software
3. Troubleshooting computer or software issues
4. Proof-reading emails for colleagues
5. Handling incoming mail
6. Setting up new employee offices/ workstations

7. Answering phones in the conference room
8. Providing back-up for other employees when they are out
9. Setting up meeting spaces
10. Printing, organizing, and/or preparing meeting materials
11. Filling out paperwork for others
12. Supervising or monitoring offices guests
13. Shipping packages
16. Coordinating others' calendars
17. Scheduling office maintenance
18. Creating presentations for others
19. Giving directions to guests/visitors
20. Researching or booking travel for others
23. 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- Note: Items 5 and 9 were removed**

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

**Social Event Tasks Cont.**

6. Planning office events, parties, conferences, etc.
7. Purchasing cards and/or gifts for employee birthday, retirement, condolences, etc.
8. Making business lunch or dinner reservations

APPENDIX B: ORIGINAL SCALE STRUCTURES VERSUS CURRENT SCALE STRUCTURES

Office Housework Tasks (Adams, 2018)

Office Housework Tasks Present Study

<b>Factor 1: Janitorial</b>	<b>Factor 1: Helping</b>
Janitorial 1- empties the office trash	Administrative 4 - proofreads emails for colleagues
Janitorial 2- waters the office plants	Administrative 12- supervises or monitor office guests
Janitorial 3 - refills the water cooler	Emotional Support 2 – emotionally supports upset colleagues
Janitorial 5- cleaning-related tasks	Administrative 3- troubleshoots computer or software issues
Janitorial 6- fixes the coffee machine	Emotional Support 1- listens to colleagues vent frustrations
Janitorial 8- sets out candy or office snacks for others	Administrative 13- ships packages
Janitorial 9- hangs wall items	Emotional Support 3- runs errands for other employees
Janitorial 10- stocks kitchen supplies	Social Event 7- purchases cards and other gifts for employees
Janitorial 11- kills or remove pests	Administrative 5- handles incoming mail
Janitorial 12- makes coffee	Administrative 2- sets up office software
Janitorial 14- cleans restrooms	Emotional Support 4- handles employee and employee family well-being communications
Janitorial 15- decorates the office for holidays	Administrative 11- fills out paperwork for others
Janitorial 16- repairs or assembles furniture	<b>Factor 2: Janitorial</b>
Janitorial 17- removes recently printed documents from the printer and takes them to employees	Janitorial 9- hangs wall items
<b>Factor 2: Administrative</b>	Janitorial 10- stocks kitchen supplies
Administrative 2- sets up office software	Janitorial 16- repairs or assembles furniture
Administrative 3- troubleshoots computer or software issues	Janitorial 11- kills or removes pests
Administrative 4- proof-reads emails for colleagues	Janitorial 14- cleans restrooms

<b>Factor 2: Administrative</b>	<b>Factor 2: Janitorial</b>
Administrative 5- handles incoming mail	Janitorial 6- fixes the coffee machine
Administrative 6- sets up new employee offices/workstations	Janitorial 15- decorates the office for holidays
Administrative 7- answers phones in the conference room	Janitorial 3- refills the water cooler
Administrative 8- provides back-up for other employees when they are out	Janitorial 5- does cleaning related tasks
Administrative 9- sets up meeting spaces	Janitorial 8- sets out candy or office snacks for others
Administrative 10- prints, organizes, and/or prepares meeting materials	Janitorial 2- waters the office plants
Administrative 11- fills out paperwork for others	Janitorial 1- empties the office trash
Administrative 12- supervises or monitors office guests	<b>Factor 3: Planning for Work</b>
Administrative 13- ships packages	Administrative 9- sets up meeting spaces
Administrative 16- coordinates others' calendars	Administrative 6- sets up new employee offices/workstations
Administrative 17- schedules office maintenance	Administrative 10- prints, organizes, and/or prepares meeting materials
Administrative 18- creates presentations for others	Janitorial 12- makes coffee
Administrative 19- gives directions to guests/visitors	Social Event 1- orders catering for the office
Administrative 20- researches or books travel for others	Administrative 17- schedules office maintenance
Administrative 23- files for others	Janitorial 17- removes recently printed documents from the printer and takes them to employees
<b>Factor 3: Emotional Support Tasks</b>	Administrative 18- creates presentations for others
Emotional Support 1- listens to colleagues vent their frustrations	Social Event 6- plans office events, parties, conferences, etc.
Emotional Support 2- emotionally supports upset colleagues	<b>Factor 4: Social Planning</b>
Emotional Support 3- runs errands for other employees	Social Event 8- makes business lunch or dinner reservations
Emotional Support 4- handles employee and employee family well-being communications	Administrative 20- researches or books travel for others

<b>Factor 4: Social Event Tasks</b>	<b>Factor 4: Social Planning</b>
Social Event 1- orders catering for the office	Social Event 2- buys or prepares food for office events or parties
Social Event 2- buys or prepares food for office events or parties	Social Event 3- orders flowers for employees, clients, or others
Social Event 3- orders flowers for employees, clients, or others	Administrative 16- coordinates others' calendars
Social Event 4- organizes celebration parties for employees	Administrative 7- answers phone in the conference room
Social Event 6- plans office events, parties, conferences, etc.	Social Event 4- organizes celebration parties for employees
Social Event 7- purchases cards and/or gifts for employee birthday, retirement, condolences, etc.	
Social Event 8- makes business, lunch, dinner reservations	

Note: three items (Administrative 8, Administrative 19, Administrative 23) from the original structure did not effectively load onto any factor in the current structure.

## OCB Scale (Podsakoff et al., 1990)

## OCB Scale Present Study

<b>Factor 1: Conscientiousness</b>	<b>Factor 1: Consideration</b>
Conscientiousness 1- attendance at work is above the norm	Altruism 24- is always ready to lend a helping hand to those around him/her
Conscientiousness 2- does not take extra breaks	Courtesy 15- takes steps to try to prevent problems with other workers
Conscientiousness 3- obeys company rules and regulations even when no one is watching	Altruism 21- helps other who have heavy workloads
Conscientiousness 4- is one of my most conscientious employees	Civic Virtue 12- attends functions that are not required but help the company image
Conscientiousness 5- believes in giving an honest day's work for an honest day's pay	Altruism 20- helps others who have been absent
<b>Factor 2: Sportsmanship</b>	Altruism 22- helps orient new people even though it is not required
Sportsmanship 6- consumes a lot of time complaining about trivial matters (R)	Altruism 23- willingly helps others who have work related problems
Sportsmanship 7- always focuses on what's wrong rather than the positive side (R)	Civic Virtue 14- reads and keeps up with organization announcements, memos, and so on
Sportsmanship 8- tends to make "mountains out of molehills" (R)	Courtesy 17- does not abuse the rights of others
Sportsmanship 9- always finds fault with what the organization is doing (R)	Civic Virtue 13- keeps abreast of changes in the organization
Sportsmanship 10- is the classic "squeaky wheel" that always need greasing (R)	Courtesy 16- is mindful of how his/her behavior affects other people's jobs
<b>Factor 3: Civic Virtue</b>	Conscientiousness 2- does not take extra breaks
Civic Virtue 11- attends meetings that are not mandatory but are considered important	<b>Factor 2: Sportsmanship</b>
Civic Virtue 12- attends functions that are not required but help the company image	Sportsmanship 9- always finds fault with what the organization is doing
Civic Virtue 13- keeps abreast of changes in the organization	Sportsmanship 6- consumes a lot of time complaining about trivial matters
Civic Virtue 14- reads and keeps up with organization announcements, memos, and so on	Sportsmanship 10- is the classic "squeaky wheel that always needs greasing
<b>Factor 4: Courtesy</b>	Sportsmanship 7- consumes a lot of time complaining about trivial matters
Courtesy 15- takes steps to try to prevent problems with other coworkers	Sportsmanship 8- tends to make "mountains out of molehills"

<b>Factor 4: Courtesy</b>	<b>Factor 3: Compliance</b>
Courtesy 17- does not abuse the rights of others	Conscientiousness 1- attendance at work is about the norm
Courtesy 16- is mindful how his/her behavior affects other people's jobs	Courtesy 19- considers the impact of his/her actions on coworkers
Courtesy 18- tries to avoid creating problems for coworkers	Conscientiousness 3- obeys company rules and regulations even when no one is watching
Courtesy 19- considers the impact of his/her actions on coworkers	Courtesy 18- tries to avoid creating problems for coworkers
<b>Factor 5: Altruism</b>	Civic Virtue 11- attends meetings that are not mandatory but are considered important
Altruism 20- helps others who have been absent	
Altruism 21- helps others how have heavy workloads	
Altruism 22- helps orient new people even though it is not required	
Altruism 23- willingly helps others who have work related problems	
Altruism 24- is always ready to lend a helping hand those around him/her	

(R) = reverse coded. Note: Two items (Conscientiousness 4 and Conscientiousness 5) from the original structure did not effectively load onto any factor in the current structure.

## OCB Checklist (Fox et al., 2012)

## OCB Checklist Present Study

<b>Factor 1: OCBO</b>	<b>Factor 1: Benefit</b>
OCBO 2- drives, escorts, or entertains company guests, clients, or out-of-town employees	OCBO 4- helps a coworker learn new skills or shares job knowledge
OCBO 4- helps a co-worked learn new skills or job knowledge	OCBO 5- helps new employees get oriented to the job
OCBO 5- helps a new employee get oriented to the job	OCBP 14- helps a less capable coworker lift a heavy box or other object
OCBO 7- uses own vehicle, supplies, or equipment for employer's business	OCBO 11- offers suggestions to improve how work is done
OCBO 11- offers suggestions to improve how the work is done	OCBO 25- says good things about your employer in front of others
OCBO 12- offers suggestions for improving the work environment	OCBP 6- lends a compassionate ear when someone has a work problem
OCBO 15- comes in early or stays late without pay to complete a project or task	OCBO 12- offers suggestions for improving the work environment
OCBO 17- volunteers for extra work assignments	OCBP 32- goes out of the way to give a coworker encouragement or express appreciation
OCBO 19- tries to recruit a person to work for your employer	OCBP 36- defends a coworker who was being "put down" or spoken ill of by other coworkers of supervisor
OCBO 20- works weekends or other days off to complete a project or task	OCBP 31- gives written or verbal recommendations for coworkers
OCBO 22- brings work home to prepare for the next day	OCBP 8- lends a compassionate ear when someone has a personal problem
OCBO 23- volunteers to attend meetings or work on committees on own time	<b>Factor 2: Sacrifice</b>
OCBO 25- says good things about your employer in front of others	OCBO26- gives up meals and other breaks to complete work
OCBO 26- gives up meals and other breaks to complete work	OCBO 7- uses own vehicle, supplies, or equipment for employer's business
OCBO 29- volunteers to work after-hours or out-of-town events	OCBO15- comes in early or stays late without pay to complete a project or task
<b>Factor 2: OCBP</b>	OCBP 27- brings candy, doughnuts, snacks, or drinks for coworkers
OCBP 6- lends a compassionate ear when someone has a work problem	OCBP 10- changes vacation schedule, workdays, or shifts to accommodate coworkers' needs
OCBP 8- lends a compassionate ear when someone has a personal problem	OCBO 20- works weekends or other days off to complete a project or task

<b>Factor 2: OCBP</b>	<b>Factor 2: Sacrifice</b>
OCBP 14- helps a less capable coworker lift a heavy box or other object	OCBO 22- brings work home to prepare for next day
OCBP 10- changes vacation schedule, workdays, or shifts to accommodate coworkers needs	OCBO 29- volunteers to work after-hours or out-of-town events
OCBP 27- brings candy, doughnuts, snacks, or drinks for coworkers	OCBO 23- volunteers to attend meetings or work on committees on own time
OCBP 31- gives a written or verbal recommendation for a coworker	OCBO 2- drives, escorts, or entertains company guests, clients, or out-of-town employees
OCBP 32- goes out of the way to give coworker encouragement or express appreciation	OCBO 19- tries to recruit a person to work for your employer
OCBP 36- defends a coworker who was being “put-down” or spoken ill of by other coworkers or supervisor	OCBO 17- volunteers for extra work assignments

## APPENDIX C: IRB APPROVAL

**IRB**  
**INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD**  
 Office of Research Compliance,  
 010A Sam Ingram Building,  
 2269 Middle Tennessee Blvd  
 Murfreesboro, TN 37129



## IRBN007 – EXEMPTION DETERMINATION NOTICE

Friday, November 15, 2019

Principal Investigator **Macie Mussleman** (Student)  
 Faculty Advisor **Judith Van Hein**  
 Co-Investigators **Michael Hein**  
 Investigator Email(s) *mem8d@mtmail.mtsu.edu; judith.vanhein@mtsu.edu; michael.hein@mtsu.edu*  
 Department **Psychology**

Protocol Title ***Is office housework an organizational citizenship behavior (OCB)?***  
 Protocol ID **20-1066**

Dear Investigator(s),

The above identified research proposal has been reviewed by the MTSU Institutional Review Board (IRB) through the **EXEMPT** review mechanism under 45 CFR 46.101(b)(2) within the research category (2) *Educational Tests*. A summary of the IRB action and other particulars in regard to this protocol application is tabulated as shown below:

IRB Action	<b>EXEMPT from further IRB review***</b>	Date	11/15/19
Date of Expiration	<b>7/31/2020</b>		
Sample Size	300 (THREE HUNDRED)		
Participant Pool	<b>Adults (18 years or older) - Recruited through MTurk</b>		
Exceptions	1. Online informed consent permitted. 2. Approved to use non-standard template for recruitment.		
Mandatory Restrictions	1. Participants must be 18 years or older 2. Informed consent must be obtained from the participants 3. Identifying information must not be collected		
Restrictions	<b>1. All restrictions for exemption apply. 2. Mandatory active informed consent. 3. Participants must be compensated once they consent. 4. Mandatory Final Report (next page)</b>		
Approved IRB Templates	IRB Online Informed Consent and Non-MTSU Templates: Abbreviated recruitment script		
Funding	NONE		
Comments	NONE		

\*\*\*Although this exemption determination allows above defined protocol from further IRB review, such as continuing review, MTSU IRB will continue to give regulatory oversight to ensure compliance.

**Summary of Post-approval Requirements:**

The investigator(s) indicated in this notification should read and abide by all applicable post-approval conditions (Visit <https://www.mtsu.edu/irb/FAQ/PostApprovalResponsibilities.php> for more information)

- PI must close-out this protocol by submitting a final report before **7/31/2020**; if more time is needed to complete the data collection, the PI must request an extension. **NO reminders will be sent. Failure to close-out (or request extension) may result in penalties** including cancellation of the data collected using this protocol or withholding student diploma.
- IRB approval must be obtained for all types of amendments, such as:
  - Addition/removal of subject population and sample size
  - Change in investigators
  - Changes to the research sites – appropriate permission letter(s) from may be needed if the study will be conducted at a non-MTSU location
  - Alteration to funding
- Modifications to procedures must be clearly described in an addendum request form and the proposed changes must not be incorporated without an approval
- The proposed change must be consistent with the approved protocol and comply with exemption requirements
- Research-related injuries to the participants and other events, such as, deviations & misconduct, must be reported within 48 hours of such events to [compliance@mtsu.edu](mailto:compliance@mtsu.edu)

**Post-approval Protocol Amendments:**

The current MTSU IRB policies allow the investigators to implement minor and significant amendments that would not result in the cancellation of the protocol's eligibility for exemption. **Only THREE procedural amendment requests will be entertained per year. This amendment restriction does not apply to minor changes such as language usage and addition/removal of research personnel.**

Date	Amendment(s)	IRB Comments
NONE	NONE.	NONE

**Post-approval IRB Actions:**

Date	IRB Action(s)	IRB Comments
NONE	NONE.	NONE

**Mandatory Data Storage Requirement:** All research-related records (signed consent forms, investigator training and, etc.) must be retained by the PI or the faculty advisor (if the PI is a student) at the secure location mentioned in the protocol application. The data must be stored for at least three (3) years after the study is closed. Subsequently, the data may be destroyed in a manner that maintains confidentiality and anonymity of the research subjects. **The IRB reserves the right to modify/update the approval criteria or change/cancel the terms listed in this notice.** Be advised that IRB also reserves the right to inspect or audit your records if needed.

Sincerely,

Institutional Review Board  
Middle Tennessee State University

**Quick Links:**

- Post-approval Responsibilities: <http://www.mtsu.edu/irb/FAQ/PostApprovalResponsibilities.php>
- Expedited Procedures: <http://www.mtsu.edu/irb/FAQ/PostApprovalResponsibilities.php>