OPERATIONALIZING OFFICE HOUSEWORK:
DEFINITION, EXAMPLES, AND ANTECEDENTS

by

Elizabeth Rene Adams

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

Middle Tennessee State University
August 2018

Thesis Committee:

Dr. Judith Van Hein, Chair

Dr. Kimberly Ujcich Ward, Committee Member

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

ABSTRACT

This study operationally defined Office Housework as non-role-specific work that a) benefits the organization, b) does not directly benefit the worker in their work capacity, and c) is underappreciated and generally goes unrecognized. Using this definition, the present study determined which tasks were considered to be Office Housework and evaluated task allocation, visibility, value, and enjoyment. Findings indicated that there were four groups of Office Housework tasks: janitorial, administrative, food-/event-related, and emotional support tasks. Overall, women were more likely to complete Office Housework tasks. Those who completed Office Housework were more likely to volunteer to complete it regularly than be assigned or volunteer once. Office Housework tasks were rated higher for peer visibility than for supervisor visibility. Task value varied based on the task and less than half of the Office Housework tasks were rated as enjoyable. This study lays the groundwork for future research in this developing topic.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

With many recent popular press articles citing the prevalence of "Office Housework," the lack of academic resources evaluating this phenomenon is surprising. Popular press definitions range from tasks that are low value, tasks that support the organization but do not help the employee completing them, invisible tasks, and more. In an empirical study, Babcock, Recalde, Vesterlund, & Weingart (2017) evaluated "low-promotability tasks" which describe organizational tasks that are necessary for organizational operations but that are unlikely to contribute to either a) perceptions of an individual's performance evaluations and/or b) opportunities for career advancement (p. 1). Combining the popular press definitions and Babcock et al.'s (2017) descriptions, we operationally define Office Housework as non-role-specific work that a) benefits the organization, b) does not directly benefit the worker in their work capacity, and c) is underappreciated and generally goes unrecognized. Tasks such as these may include planning retirement parties, mentoring other employees, serving on committees, or even cleaning out the office refrigerator. As an important note, workers whose roles include support, cleaning, and other commonly associated Office Housework tasks are not completing Office Housework but instead fulfilling core job responsibilities. The key distinction is that Office Housework tasks are not part of a worker's assigned duties.

Given the popular press' assertions that women are more likely to complete Office Housework tasks than men, much of the research evaluated will review constructs as they relate to sex or gender. Although this article has many implications for gender

studies at work, we will not delve into the sex versus gender debate in this article. Research will be described as it was originally reported. In addition, with the anecdotal assertion of gender differences in Office Housework completion, research will evaluate constructs in regards to gender/sex differences.

While researchers are still in the early phases of operational definition of Office Housework, we expect that the definition also will relate to other behaviors and individual differences characteristics such as organizational citizenship behavior (OCB), task-related constructs (task choice, allocation, and more), self-efficacy, and personality. In this first exploratory study, we will focus on defining Office Housework. Our research will pull resources from across a wide variety of disciplines to operationally define a topic that, while apparently oft-experienced, has only been empirically researched in a single published poster (Jang, Allen, Regina, & Radke, 2018). Next, we will put this operational definition to the test via a survey asking participants to help contribute to our understanding of Office Housework. Our goal will be to bring to light a phenomenon facing those in the workplace and help fill the research void. To help with this conceptualization, we turn to research exploring a variety of topics. Please note that, in the present research, we define a task as a piece of work or activity completed as a function of a job. Tasks may be core to a role or peripheral, assigned or volunteered for, and may be simple or complex. The research below spans a variety of types of tasks but has a common theme – the question of who, why, and how people complete certain tasks.

"Gendered" Office Work

In recent years, the term "Office Housework" has been popularized by Sheryl Sandberg, author of *Lean In* and Chief Operating Officer of Facebook. Sandberg credits the term to Dr. Kanter's 1977 book *Men and Women of the Corporation* and has used the term often while speaking about topics of gender in the workplace (Elliott, 2016). The general basis for the concept of Office Housework is that these are the "service and support," "thankless-but-necessary tasks [that] keep organizations humming" ("Tips for Managers;" Kolb & Porter, 2015).

There has been increasing coverage of Office Housework in popular press ranging from Harvard Business Review to the New York Times to Cosmopolitan. By most accounts, women are expected to complete Office Housework because it aligns with commonly held stereotypical gender roles; women are often seen as more communal and altruistic while men are more ambitious and results oriented. At a very basic level, this anecdotal evidence is supported by most literature on gender stereotypes in the workplace (Burgess & Borgida, 1999; Cameron & Nadler, 2013; Chiaburu, Sawyer, Smith, Brown, & Harris, 2014; Eagly & Johnson, 1990; Eagly, 2009; Eagly & Crowley, 1986; Feingold, 1994; Heilman, 2001; Heilman & Chen, 2005; Heilman & Okimoto, 2007; Kidder & Parks, 2001; and many more; note: see Kidder, 2002 for interesting findings related to altruism and civic virtue).

Previously, gender stereotypes, gender norms, and gender at work are topics often explored in the social sciences and beyond. The new frontier of digital media, the current social and political environment, and the increase in general gender differences

awareness has also seen these and related topics becoming hot topics in the popular press as well. Indeed, Cosmopolitan even dedicated a two-page spread to "soft sexism" in the workplace (and included a handy quiz to determine if you are a soft sexist) that discussed the topic of Office Housework ("Don't be the office angel," 2018). In this brief article, Cosmo cited anecdotes from famous actresses and female executives and advised women not to be the "office angel" – the one who cleans up after other workers, makes the coffee, and bakes the cookies ("Don't be the office angel," 2018). With such a growing body of literature in popular press, Office Housework has a surprising lack of data to support the anecdotal evidence.

Adding quantitative support to the largely anecdotal evidence, the Society of Women Engineers worked in conjunction with the Center for WorkLife Law (based out of the University of California, Hastings College of the Law) to conduct a study on gender and racial bias in the engineering field and dedicated a small section of their research to Office Housework (Williams, Li, Rincon, & Rinn, 2016). Williams et al. (2016) define Office Housework as a collection of tasks ranging from literal housework (e.g., cleaning), to administrative work (e.g., note-taking), and emotional labor (e.g., resolving conflicts among coworkers). Their research, presented at the American Society for Engineering Education, described findings that suggested that women were more likely than white men to report completing Office Housework (55% compared to 26%, respectively). Findings from this report also suggest a differentiation between Office Housework and glamour work – the tasks or assignments that are more likely to be noticed by superiors and lead to greater promotability. While this study has not been

published in a peer-reviewed journal and has several limitations, their findings add to the anecdotal evidence supporting Office Housework as work typically completed by women.

Task Visibility

Task visibility also may play a role in willingness to complete Office Housework tasks. As defined by George (1992), task visibility refers to the degree to which a worker believes her supervisor is aware of her work contributions. Low task visibility occurs when workers believe that their actions are less likely to be observed by supervisors or other organizational members (Liden, Wayne, Jaworski, & Bennett, 2004). Conversely, high task visibility refers to situations where tasks are more likely to be seen by a supervisor or others in the organization (Liden et al., 2004). This is similar to Williams et al.'s concept of glamour work, which are the tasks or assignments that are more likely to get an individual noticed at work and, theoretically, lead to greater career ascension and success. Williams et al.'s (2016) industry report found that women are less likely to have access to highly desirable glamour work and instead complete less glamorous Office Housework.

Building on George's (1992) definition and incorporating Williams et al.'s (2016) conceptualization of glamor work, this study defines task visibility as the degree to which the task is perceived as noticeable to stakeholders within the organization (including supervisors) in such a way as to positively influence future career outcomes and/or promotability. Based on empirical research from George (1992), Liden et al. (2004), and others, combined with anecdotal evidence and less empirical research (Williams et al.,

2016), it seems that, not only are Office Housework tasks potentially lower visibility tasks, but these tasks are also the ones more likely to be completed by women.

Subjective Task Values

Another task-related factor that may relate to Office Housework is Subjective Task Values (STV), a construct that can be found in a model developed by Eccles et. al (1983). While the original Eccles et. al Model (1983) was developed using school-aged children, research since initial development has expanded to include college-age and adult audiences (Battle & Wigfield, 2003; MacDonald, Williams, Lazowski, Horst, & Barron, 2014; Kosovich, Flake, & Hulleman, 2017). Much of the Eccles et. al Model may relate to the present topic of Office Housework, but a specific construct known as Subjective Task Value (STV) may play a role in willingness to perform Office Housework (Eccles, 2011). In the context of Office Housework, STV can be thought of as the worth that a worker places on task options, which then contributes to the probability that the worker will perform the task (Eccles, 2011; Eccles, 2009).

STV can be further broken down into six factors: 1) Intrinsic Interest Value, 2) Attainment Value/Importance, 3) Extrinsic Utility Value, 4) Ability/Expectancy, 5) Task Difficulty, and 6) Required Effort (Eccles & Wigfield, 1995). Intrinsic Interest Value refers to one's enjoyment of a task whereby increased interest would correspond to greater intrinsic desire to complete the task (Eccles & Wigfield, 1995; Wigfield & Eccles, 1992). Attainment Value/Importance refers to the personal value that one places on completing a task (Eccles & Wigfield, 1995; Wigfield & Eccles, 1992). This could be in terms of completing tasks that align with one's self-schema or that fulfill "needs, personal

values, and explicit motives" (Eccles & Wigfield, 1995; Eccles, 2011, p. 197; Wigfield & Eccles, 1992). Extrinsic Utility Value evaluates how the task relates to future goals such that tasks with high utility value are more likely to contribute to future goals (Eccles & Wigfield, 1995; Wigfield & Eccles, 1992). Utility value may also relate to external reward attainment (Eccles, 2011). Ability/Expectancy refers to one's belief that they have the requisite skills required to complete the task (Eccles & Wigfield, 1995). Task Difficulty describes the personal difficulty associated with task completion (Eccles & Wigfield, 1995). Required Effort corresponds to the amount of effort one feels is necessary to complete the task (Eccles & Wigfield, 1995). This could relate to the emotional, social, or physical tolls of a task but it may also refer to the opportunity cost associated with completing one task over another (Eccles, 2011).

Of these six components, the first three (Intrinsic Interest Value, Attainment Value/Importance, and Extrinsic Utility Value) may best help explain why someone would choose to complete Office Housework tasks because they more specifically emphasize the value proposition motivations behind why a worker would complete an Office Housework task. The remaining three (Ability/Expectancy, Task Difficulty, and Required Effort) focus more on what it takes to complete the task. While these three should be explored in future studies, the emphasis on the present study is on the value that workers place on completing Office Housework tasks.

Task Choice & Allocation

Task choice and allocation have a variety of antecedents and consequences, one of which is gender. Anecdotal and research evidence have indicated a potential

relationship between gender and task choice (De Pater, Van Vianen, & Bechtoldt, 2010; De Pater, Van Vianen, Humphrey, Sleeth, Hartman, & Fischer, 2009a). De Pater et al. explain that "individuals' characteristics, motives, and task choice may, at least partly, explain evidenced gender differences in challenging experiences" but these characteristics may only skim the surface of the greater issue (2009a, p. 20). It could be that women are allocated different tasks, volunteer for or are being "voluntold" to complete different tasks, or simply that female workers may not have the same opportunities as male workers. De Pater et al. (2010) found that female middle-level workers were assigned fewer challenging tasks even when controlling for demographic or individual differences variables such as age, ambition, and performance. It could stand to reason that, in lieu of challenging tasks that could potentially advance their careers, these women could be relegated to Office Housework tasks.

While previously discussed research has demonstrated that women may not be assigned or delegated as many challenging tasks as men, research from Babcock et al. (2017) suggests that women may also be more likely to choose or accept "non-promotable" tasks more frequently than their male counterparts. Non-promotable tasks are described as tasks that, "while benefitting the organization, are less likely to affect … evaluation and career advancement" (Babcock et al., 2017, p. 1). Results from the first experiment in their study reveal that women accept these tasks at two to three times the rate of their male counterparts. However, their second study did not find significant gender differences in task choice. They attribute this different finding to their manipulation of the composition of the sexes within participant pools.

In their study, Babcock et al. (2017) conducted experiments in two settings – a mixed-sex and a single-sex environment. Intriguingly, the sex composition negated the results of the gender differences in accepted non-promotable tasks. In single-sex environments, the gender gap is eliminated. Additional evidence to support the assertion that task choice also may be affected by the social conditions of the selection environment can be seen in Heilman, Rivero, and Brett (1991). They used preferential selection as a testing condition to evaluate the effects of social environment on task choice. They found that women who were preferentially selected (as opposed to selected based on merit) were less likely to choose challenging tasks than women in the merit-based category or men in either category (Heilman et al., 1991). Beyond choosing less challenging tasks, women in the preferential selection category also rated themselves lower on ability and competence than women in the merit category and men in either category (Heilman et al., 1991). This may indicate that women who feel they are receiving special treatment may not evaluate themselves as highly as those who seemingly "earned" their status. In terms of the present research, this could be related to why some workers choose to complete Office Housework tasks that require less skill or competency – perhaps they truly undervalue their ability to contribute and feel that Office Housework is the best use of their time.

Sex differences also may be a result of task choice. De Pater et al. (2009a) found that, when given the option, women elected to complete fewer challenging tasks than their male peers. However, this finding was not consistent in other research published by De Pater in the same year (De Pater, Van Vianen, Humphrey, Sleeth, Hartman, &

Fischer, 2009b). In their other study, De Pater et al. found no sex differences in task

choice (2009b). Although researchers admit that their conflicting results may be due to

study design or participant demographics, it nonetheless underscores how conflicting

research on task choice and allocation truly is.

Task choice may be influenced by a wide variety of topics including individual

differences in OCBs, personality, self-efficacy, interest in the task, goal-orientation,

motivation, and much more (De Pater et al., 2009a; De Pater et al., 2010; Eccles, Barber,

& Jozefowicz, 1999). The scope of interrelated topics is vast and there is much

disagreement among scholars. For example, De Pater et al. (2009a) found that task choice

was related to motivation such that women displayed greater levels of failure avoidance

than males and thus chose fewer challenging tasks. However, Vieira and Grantham

(2011) found seemingly opposite results. While evaluating a similar construct (goal-

setting), they found that women were less concerned with avoiding failure and thus

actually set more challenging task goals than their male counterparts (Vieira &

Grantham, 2011).

In addition to the many discrepancies in research findings, there also are

problematic assumptions that need further development. In terms of Babcock et al.

(2017), the conceptualization of tasks as being "promotable" versus "non-promotable"

inherently suggests that there are distinct, objective value differences between the two.

Although they address this disparity in terms of promotability, there may be differences

between jobs and even between individuals in terms of this value proposition.

The relationship between the worker and the task may play a key role in conceptualizing why workers engage in Office Housework Tasks. Applying previous research in task segregation, allocation, choice, visibility, and value may help better explain this relationship to answer the question of why workers complete Office Housework. It could be that workers initially chose to complete tasks that they enjoyed or with which they had success. Over time, however, they may have found themselves pigeon-holed into those roles. Similarly, it could be a situation where one worker had experience with or were successful at accomplishing a specific task. This task could then become uniquely associated with that individual such that the choice to complete the task was heavily influenced by the expectations of others in the work environment. The research on task choice and allocation may be vast but there is a great deal of variability in research findings.

Other Related Constructs

Per our definition, Office Housework may be conceptualized as a form of extra-role or citizenship behavior that betters the organization – often at the performer's expense. As such, Office Housework may be conceptually related to Organizational Citizenship Behavior. Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) is defined by Organ (1997) as "performance that supports the social and psychological environment in which task performance takes place" (p. 95) and further refined by Bolino, Hsiung, Harvey, and LePine as "employee behavior that is more discretionary, is less likely to be formally linked with organizational rewards, and contributes to the organization by promoting a positive social and psychological climate" (2015, p. 56). Essentially, OCBs are

discretionary tasks that workers complete that benefit the organization. The key

distinction here is that OCBs are also likely to have a positive impact on employees'

performance evaluations (for more information, see Organ, 1994; Podsakoff, MacKenzie,

Paine, & Bachrach, 2000; Organ, Podsakoff, & Podsakoff, 2011). Indeed, research by

Podsakoff et al. found that, while "objective performance uniquely accounted for 9.5% of

the variance in performance evaluations, organizational citizenship behaviors uniquely

accounted for 42.9% of the variance in performance evaluations" (2000, p. 536).

     In the present study, researchers operationally defined Office Housework as being

different from OCBs in that Office Housework tasks do not directly benefit the worker in

their work capacity and are generally underappreciated and unrecognized. However,

while we operationally defined Office Housework differently than OCBs, other research

being conducted concurrently by researchers at the University of South Florida defines

Office Housework as a type of OCB (Jang et al., 2018). In a poster presented at the 2018

conference for the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Jang et al.

distinguished between traditional forms of OCBs and Office Housework by emphasizing

that, while OCBs traditionally involve job-relevant tasks that yield positive

organizational outcomes, Office Housework tasks are less job-relevant and are less likely

to contribute directly to major organizational outcomes (2018). Indeed, while the

definition between the present research and Jang et al. (2018) differs somewhat, the core

elements are the same: Office Housework tasks are tasks that are outside the scope of the

worker's assigned work duties but that benefit the organization nonetheless. While the

relationship between the Office Housework and OCBs should continue to be explored in

the future, the first stage of exploratory analyses conducted herein was to a) isolate the tasks commonly associated with Office Housework and b) explore some of the potential antecedents of Office Housework.

Summary

Office Housework is often discussed in the popular press and within the workforce but has not been operationally defined in empirical research published in peer-reviewed journals (yet). In this current research, Office Housework is operationally defined as non-role-specific organizational tasks that a) benefit the organization, b) do not directly benefit the worker in their work capacity, and c) are underappreciated and generally go unrecognized. Based on the task visibility literature, it could be that Office Housework tasks are considered low visibility tasks – meaning that they are tasks that are unlikely to gain the worker recognition from – or perhaps even be noticed by – supervisors, colleagues, or others (George, 1992; Liden et al., 2004). As such, it could be that Office Housework tasks are the low visibility tasks that would not gain workers recognition and thus are avoided. It could be the case that those who complete Office Housework benefit from completion in ways beyond worker recognition. Perhaps those individuals actually enjoy the tasks or find value in them despite the fact that they're low visibility (Eccles, 2011).

Another potential factor could be how the individual came to complete the task. If the worker was delegated or "voluntold" to complete the task, they may feel like they must complete the task or risk adverse penalties from others. Interestingly, even when given the opportunity to complete more complex or "promotable" tasks, some audiences

– namely women – were still more likely to *choose* the more simple or less promotable tasks (De Pater et al., 2009a; Babcock et al., 2017). This may indicate that there are gender or sex differences in task choice – which may have implications on completion of Office Housework. The results, while not conclusive, indicate that there may indeed be gender differences in terms of task choice and allocation. Further, while no causality is being implied in terms of which tasks are considered Office Housework, it could be that the tasks commonly described as Office Housework tasks could be tasks traditionally completed by women in the workplace and that is why they came to be known as Office Housework. Even the term "Office Housework" is, in and of itself, often considered a gendered term. The word "housework" has a feminine connotation and may be associated with feminine gender role ideology – that is, it may be too closely associated with women's socially expected role as caregiver and home worker (Blair & Lichter, 1991; Blair, 2013).

The current study leaned heavily on task research as a research base. Task research has focused on a wide variety of factors but no studies had been published (at the time of the present study) that have separated tasks into groups based on their type, visibility level within the organization, and subjective value (to the task completer). As such, this research asked participants to help us answer the question of, "What is Office Housework?" by outlining the tasks they believe to be Office Housework, the tasks' allocation, visibility, subjective value, and enjoyment of the task itself. Put plainly, the research questions of this study were:

Research Question 1: Which tasks are considered to be Office Housework?

Research Question 2: Is there a hierarchy of more or less prototypical Office

Housework tasks?

Research Question 3: How are Office Housework tasks allocated? Are they assigned or

do those who complete Office Housework tasks volunteer for them?

Research Question 4: Are tasks considered to be Office Housework highly visible tasks

within the organization?

Research Question 5: Do those who complete Office Housework tasks value the tasks?

Research Question 6: Do those who complete Office Housework tasks enjoy the tasks?

CHAPTER II: METHOD

Developing the Measure

Prior to assessing Office Housework as a construct and the item-level tasks

associated with Office Housework, a measure and tasks had to be developed. First,

researchers used popular press definitions in combination with the extant literature to

define the construct. After this point, items were generated from extant literature, from

the principle researcher and thesis committee, and from a posting made to the principle

researcher's undergraduate alma mater alumnae Facebook page. Of note, the principle

researcher's alma mater is an all-women's college in the Atlanta area. The following

prompt was used on the Agnes Scott College Alumnae Facebook group:

> Hi! Have you ever had to do any tasks at work that don't contribute to your
> job, performance evaluations, or career goals but that help support the
> organization? Tell me about it (no seriously).
>
> I'm a class of 2013 alumna and I'm currently pursuing a master's in
> industrial/organizational psychology and am looking at office housework
> for my thesis. There aren't many solid peer-reviewed studies on it and I'm
> hoping that my research can help operationally define it.
>
> As part of that, I'm trying to generate a list of tasks that can be considered
> office housework tasks. If you have a moment, could you comment with
> an example, short anecdote, or even what the term "office housework"
> means to you? Much appreciated and have a great day!

Comments from the above sources then were content coded. When applicable,

comments were combined to form single tasks (e.g. "cleaning the office fridge,

microwave, coffee maker, or other kitchen appliances") whereas others were discarded

for being too specific (e.g. covering the security guard's post while he was on break).

Task items then were pulled from the content coded list and combined with a previously

developed task list. Items that were too specific or unclear were removed from the pool.

The final list of potential Office Housework tasks consisted of 68 tasks. Four of

these tasks were explicitly specified as being completed for other workers (e.g., creating

presentations for others, filing for others, etc.). Researchers wanted to evaluate whether

the tasks themselves were Office Housework, that is, if creating presentations or filing

were Office Housework tasks, or if the act of completing work tasks for another worker

were what made these tasks Office Housework tasks. As such, researchers chose four of

these items (making copies for others, filing for others, filling out paperwork for others,

creating presentations for others) and created self-oriented versions of these tasks

(making copies for yourself, filing for yourself, filling out paperwork for yourself,

creating presentations for yourself). The subsequent list contained 72 items. Two

additional non-Office Housework items were added for discriminant validity purposes

and/or to be used as quality assurance items to ensure participants understand what Office

Housework tasks are. The items (arriving to work on time and responding promptly to

emails) were expected to be rated lowly, thus indicating that they are not Office

Housework tasks. The final task list contained 74 items.

Reducing the Risk of Bias

Researchers were concerned that the term "Office Housework" may be considered

a gendered term and thus may introduce bias into the sample. The word "housework" has

a feminine connotation and may be associated with feminine gender role ideology – that

is, it may be too closely associated with women's socially expected role as caregiver and

home worker (Blair & Lichter, 1991; Blair, 2013). As such, the term, despite potentially

being an accurate representation of the sex-typical work task assignments, may be off-

putting to some. For that reason, the term "Office Housework" was avoided in the survey

itself to minimize gender norm stereotyping and potential bias. Instead, researchers used

the term "Low Appreciation Workplace Tasks" ("LAWTs") to describe Office

Housework tasks. The definition for LAWTs was the same as the one used to describe

Office Housework tasks.

Sampling Methods

Two sampling methods were used to recruit participants – convenience sampling

and Amazon Mechanical Turk (MTurk). Participants from both samples had to be 18

years of age or older, live within the United States, be currently employed, and had to

have at least one year of office work experience. Office work experience was defined as

work that takes place within an organization's office.

To help encourage participation in the convenience sampling of the survey, an

incentive was offered in the form of a random prize drawing following the closing of the

survey period. Participants who completed the survey were given the opportunity to

continue to a separate survey where they had the option of providing their name and

email address to serve as entry in the random prize drawing. Five participants were

randomly selected to win an Amazon digital gift card worth $20. For MTurk participants,

small incentives ($1.30) were offered to those who completed the survey.

In order to help ensure that participants engaged in sufficient effort in responding,

four quality assurance items were used. The first item required participants to "check

their understanding" of the definition and the other three explicitly instructed participants to select a specific response on a Likert scale. Data were only used from participants who correctly answered the first quality assurance item (ensuring they read and understood the definition provided to them) and two of the remaining three quality assurance questions.

Participants

Seventy-three participants were recruited through convenient sampling methods and 226 were recruited through MTurk. After removing participants who failed to meet the quality control guidelines and/or who completed the survey in under five minutes (less than a quarter of the time it took the average participant), 54 participants from the convenient sample and 170 participants from the MTurk sample were retained.

The convenient sample consisted of 47 women and 5 men. The mean age of participants in the convenient sample was 38 years ($SD = 12.12$) and 83% of the sample self-identified as white, 4% self-identified as black or African American, 2% identified as Hispanic or Latinx, 2% identified as American Indian or Alaska Native, 4% identified as Asian, 4% identified as biracial or multiracial, and 2% indicated that they preferred not to say. In terms of education, 77% of participants from the convenient sample indicated that they either had a bachelor's degree or a master's degree. Two percent indicated that they had completed a doctorate and the remaining 21% had less than a bachelor's degree.

The MTurk sample consisted of 88 women, 80 men, and one participant who preferred not to answer. The mean age of participants in the MTurk sample was 38 years ($SD = 10.94$) and 75% of the sample self-identified as white, 10% self-identified as black or African American, 6% identified as Hispanic or Latinx, 8% identified as Asian, 1%

identified as biracial or multiracial, and <1% indicated that they preferred not to say. In terms of education, 49% of participants indicated that they had a bachelor's degree, 19% indicated they had some college credit but no degree, 11% selected master's degree, and the remaining 21% was distributed across the other education levels.

Measures

All measures were collected via two nearly identical Qualtrics© surveys. The first survey was designed for convenient recruiting of participants (email, social media, word of mouth, etc.). The second Qualtrics© survey was designed for MTurk participants. The two separate surveys ensured that each audience (convenient versus MTurk) received the appropriate incentive. The only differences between the two surveys were the Informed Consent and Introduction to the Study section and the end of survey options. For the convenient sampling survey, participants had the option to follow a link to a new survey where they could input their name and email address as entry into the random prize drawing. For the MTurk survey, the final item was a random code generated by Qualtrics©. This was added to the MTurk survey to ensure that participants actually completed the survey in order to claim their payment in MTurk.

The first pages of both surveys were the Informed Consent and Introduction to the Study. As previously mentioned, the term "Office Housework" may be considered a "gendered" or biased term by prospective participants. In order to prevent any potential biasing of participants, researchers opted to use the term "Low Appreciation Workplace Task," abbreviated to "LAWT," in lieu of the term "Office Housework."

After consenting to participate in the study, participants were asked a series of

eligibility items. Participants had to acknowledge that they were 18 years of age or older, were currently employed, and had at least one year of office experience (which was operationally defined for them) in order to participate in the survey. Participants who did not meet eligibility requirements were presented with a message that thanked them for their time, explained that they were ineligible for the survey, provided the lead researcher's contact information (should they have any questions), and then routed the participant to the end of the survey.

Participants who passed the eligibility screenings then were taken to the survey itself. The survey was split into three major sections: demographics, task section I, and task section II. The demographics section consisted of a variety of biodata and work-related biodata questions. Task section I presented participants with the definition of a LAWT, requested that participants "check their understanding" of the definition via a quality assurance item, and then asked participants to rate a series of 74 tasks on a five-point Likert scale where 1 = "Not at all a LAWT" and 5= "Definitely a LAWT." Task section I was designed to answer Research Question 1 (Which tasks are considered to be Office Housework?) and Research Question 2 (Is there a hierarchy of more or less prototypical Office Housework tasks?). Task section II used the same 74 tasks from task section I and sought to answer Research Question 3 (How are Office Housework tasks allocated? Are they assigned or do those who complete Office Housework tasks volunteer for them?), Research Question 4 (Are tasks considered to be Office Housework highly visible tasks within the organization?), Research Question 5 (Do those who complete Office Housework tasks value the tasks?), and Research Question 6 (Do those who

complete Office Housework tasks enjoy the tasks?). A more detailed description of each section follows.

Participants first were asked to complete a demographics section, which included standard demographics items such as those inquiring about gender, race/ethnicity, age, highest education level reached, etc. as well as more work-focused items. Work-focused demographics included tenure in the workforce, tenure within the organization, and tenure within current role. Additional items inquired about participants' supervisory responsibilities and the size of their department and work group or team. The first task section followed the demographics section.

Task section 1 began with a definition of a LAWT. This definition read "Low Appreciation Workplace Tasks (LAWTs) are described as non-role-specific workplace tasks that: a) benefit the organization, b) do not directly benefit the worker in their work capacity, and c) are underappreciated and generally go unrecognized." Participants were then given the following prompt: "Check your understanding – which of the following characteristics describes a Low Appreciation Workplace Task (LAWT)?" with the following response options: 1) The task generally goes unappreciated or doesn't receive recognition; 2) The task hurts the organization; 3) The task benefits the worker in work-related ways; or 4) None of the above. This item called attention to the definition by requesting that participants carefully read the definition of a LAWT and answer an initial question. In addition, this item served as the first quality assurance item. Participants who incorrectly answered this item were excluded from analyses.

After the "check your understanding" item, participants again were presented the definition of a LAWT and were given the following prompt: "Based on the above definition, please rate the extent to which you believe that each of the following tasks should be considered a Low Appreciation Workplace Task (LAWT) ranging from 'Not at all a LAWT' to 'Definitely a LAWT.'" Participants were then presented with the 74 items from task section I. Two of the tasks listed, "Arriving to work on time" and "Responding promptly to emails" were designed to serve as quality assurance task items. Researchers previously decided that these items are not LAWTs but instead are tasks required of most (if not all) office roles. These were added should researchers need additional items for future discriminant validity and insufficient effort in responding analyses. After task section I, participants began task section II.

Task section II addressed specific tasks completed by participants. The first question of this section presented the same list of 74 tasks and asked participants the following prompt: "Which of the following tasks have you personally completed within the past 12 months?" Each task item was presented in a list format and participants could select all that applied. The next question was the first of the three explicit quality control questions. It stated, "For quality control purposes and to make sure the survey is properly registering your responses, please select. 'May or may not be a LAWT.'" This item allowed researchers to screen out participants who may not be providing sufficient effort. The third question of this section was an open-ended item that asked participants if they could think of any additional tasks that were not included in the initial list that should be considered LAWTs. This item may be used for future studies.

The tasks that the participant identified that they completed in the last 12 months were automatically carried forward into the fourth question. The survey software used (Qualtrics) has a feature called "piped text" that allows the selected items from previous questions to be automatically "piped" into future questions. For the purposes of this survey, piped questions are thus the follow-up questions that use tasks that participants had previously selected and were carried forward into new questions. For the fourth question, participants were presented with the list of tasks that they had previously selected and were asked to select the tasks that were **not** part of their assigned work duties. Tasks that are not part of participants' assigned work duties were the sole focus of the remaining questions (per the definition of LAWTs/Office Housework being "non-role-specific workplace tasks").

The fifth and sixth questions used piped text from previous items to generate a list of all the tasks that participants stated that they completed in the past 12 months and that were **not** part of their assigned work duties. Question five asked how often participants completed each task with a five-point response options ranging from 1 (*Once per month or less*) to 5 (*Every day*). Between questions five and six was the second explicit quality control question, which asked participants to select *Once Per Month or Less*.

The sixth question stated, "You previously stated that you engage in [piped task item]. Which of the following best describes why you complete this task? (Please selection all that apply.)" and was repeated for every task that participants said they completed in the past 12 months and was **not** part of their assigned duties. The question had 12 response options consisting of the following statements: "I'm the only one who

knows how to do the task," "I'm the only one willing to do the task," "I'm the only one who cares about doing the task," "Completing this task is important to me," "Completing this task will help me get promoted," "Completing this task is valuable to me," "Completing this task is beneficial to my career," "I'm the best one to do this task," "I happen to be here when the task needs to be done," "This task has been assigned to me," "I volunteered to complete this task once and have since been the only one to complete the task," and "I volunteer to complete this task regularly" plus two additional response options of "Other (Please describe)" and "Not Applicable."

Response options were developed from a variety of sources including items from Eccles and Wigfield's (1995) evaluation of the Eccles et al. (1983) Self and Task Perceptions Questionnaire (STPQ) Scale. The exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses completed on the original STPQ revealed six factors that supported the Eccles et al. (1983) model – Intrinsic Interest Value, Attainment Value/Importance, Extrinsic Utility Value, Ability/Expectancy, Task Difficulty, and Required Effort. Importance and value were included as sample options whereas interest (measured by enjoyment) was measured separately in question seven (Eccles & Wigfield, 1995, p. 224).

The seventh question asked participants, "To what extent do you enjoy completing this task?" with results ranging from 1 (*I never enjoy completing this task*) to 5 (*I always enjoy completing this task*) with a *Not Applicable* option. This question was followed by the final explicit quality control question, which instructed participants to select *Not Applicable* using the same scale as question seven.

The eighth and ninth questions consisted of task visibility items developed for this study. Both had five response options ranging from 1 (*Never*) to 5 (*Always*) with a *Not Applicable* option. The eighth question asked participants to indicate the degree to which the following statement was true for each of the piped tasks: "My direct supervisor notices when I complete this task." The ninth question asks participants to indicate the degree to which the following statement is true for each of the piped tasks: "My peers notice when I complete this task."

After all data had been collected, participants were directed to a debrief / thank-you page. Participants in the convenience sample were given the option to continue to another survey to input their contact information to enter in the random prize drawing. The optional contact information provided in the second survey was not tied to the primary data collection survey. This second survey was not required of participants and was only accessible by participants who completed the entire survey. Participants in the MTurk sample were not given an option to continue to a separate survey but were instead instructed how to collect their reward for completing the survey.

CHAPTER III: RESULTS

Sample Comparability

As previously described, this study collected data from two sources: a convenience sample and a sample from MTurk. Before any analyses could be undertaken, the two datasets needed to be compared to determine if they could be combined. Comparability was assessed using two methods – one for research questions one and two (using data from task section I), and one for research questions three through six (using data from task section II). To assess comparability for task section I, researchers used responses to the item asking participants to rate to what extent each of the presented tasks (74 total) is a LAWT (an Office Housework task). Using these data, 74 independent-samples t-tests (one for each task) were conducted to compare the ratings of tasks in the convenient sample and the MTurk sample.

Only three tasks were significantly different between samples: Task 40 – Watering office plants, Task 46 – Maintaining the company's social media accounts, and Task 54 – Attending optional meetings, convocations, or other similar events. With only three of the 74 tasks (4%) having significant rating differences between the two samples, the two samples were combined into a single sample for Research Question 1 and Research Question 2.

To assess comparability for Research Question 3, Research Question 4, Research Question 5, and Research Question 6 (which used data from task section II), researchers evaluated the number of tasks participants indicated that they had completed in the past 12 months that were not part of their assigned work duties across the two samples.

Researchers were concerned that the large number of women in the convenience sample would skew results of an analysis of variance between the two samples. As such, women in the convenience sample ($n = 47$) were compared to women in the MTurk sample ($n = 88$) and men in the convenient sample ($n = 5$) were compared to men in the MTurk sample ($n = 80$). An analysis of variance showed no significant differences between women in the convenient sample and women in the MTurk sample and no significant differences between men in the convenient sample and men in the MTurk sample. As such, the two samples could be combined into a single sample for further analyses.

The combined sample was also evaluated to identify any outliers. To investigate outliers in the combined sample, Mahalanobis distances were calculated and three participants were identified and removed from the sample (two from the convenient sample and one from the MTurk sample). These outliers were excluded from all future analyses.

Office Housework Tasks

To address Research Question 1, data from task section I were subjected to a mean cutoff score analysis. Participants were provided a definition of LAWTs (Office Housework) and were asked to what extent each of the listed tasks (74) is considered a LAWT on a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (*Not at all a LAWT*) to 5 (*Definitely a LAWT*). Of the 74 tasks, 56 tasks (76%) were considered LAWTs based on a mean cutoff score of 2.90. Of the 18 non-LAWTs / non-Office Housework tasks (accounting for 24% of the total tasks), four items were created as self-oriented tasks in juxtaposition for other-oriented tasks (e.g., Task 52 - Creating presentations for yourself compared to Task

51 - Creating presentations for others) and two items that were used for discriminant

validity (i.e., Task 73 - Arriving to work on time and Task 74 - Responding promptly to

emails). These six tasks were expected to be rated lowly as LAWTs / Office Housework

tasks and, as expected, these were among the lowest rated tasks in the 74-task list. See

Table 1 for the descriptive statistics for Office Housework Tasks and Table 2 for the

descriptive statistics for Non-Office Housework tasks. Task items that met the minimum

2.90-point threshold then were subjected to an Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) to

generate categories.

Table 1
Descriptive Statistics for OHW Tasks

Task & Task Description	*n*	Mean	SD
Task 7 - Cleaning up after parties, meetings, or other gatherings	221	4.21	1.00
Task 9 - Cleaning-related tasks (wiping counters, washing dishes, cleaning coffee maker, cleaning office fridge, etc.)	221	4.17	0.99
Task 68 - Emptying the office trash	220	4.12	1.12
Task 11 - Stocking kitchen supplies (coffee, drinks, snacks, etc.)	221	4.12	1.03
Task 70 - Cleaning restrooms (unclogging toilets, cleaning messes, etc.)	221	4.11	1.18
Task 40 - Watering office plants	220	4.10	1.10
Task 13 - Fixing the coffee machine	220	4.02	1.13
Task 26 - Killing or removing pests (for example, spiders or other bugs)	221	4.01	1.17
Task 24 - Refilling the water cooler	221	4.00	1.13
Task 36 - Picking up laundry, groceries, medications, or other items for colleagues, supervisors, or clients	221	3.87	1.24
Task 18 - Refilling the paper or ink in printers, copiers, fax, etc.	219	3.87	1.15
Task 12 - Stocking office supplies (paper, pens, staples, etc.)	220	3.86	1.11
Task 30 - Setting out candy or office snacks for others	221	3.85	1.19
Task 8 - Removing recently printed documents from the printer and taking them to employees	221	3.84	1.12
Task 64 - Decorating the office for holidays	221	3.83	1.09
Task 50 - Making coffee	221	3.83	1.23
Task 21 - Buying or preparing food for the office	219	3.82	1.09
Task 31 - Repairing or assembling furniture	221	3.80	1.15

Table 1 cont.
Descriptive Statistics for OHW Tasks

Task & Task Description	*n*	Mean	SD
Task 20 - Buying or preparing food for office events or parties	220	3.77	1.20
Task 34 - Hanging wall items	220	3.75	1.23
Task 3 - Running errands for other employees (for example, driving them to pick up their car at the mechanic)	220	3.72	1.31
Task 23 - Purchasing cards and/or gifts for employee birthday, retirement, condolences, etc.	221	3.71	1.18
Task 37 - Picking up or taking colleagues, supervisors, clients/customers/etc. to the airport	219	3.67	1.11
Task 65 - Filing for others	219	3.67	1.11
Task 59 - Making copies for others	221	3.66	1.17
Task 22 - Organizing celebration parties for employees (retirement, baby showers, birthdays, etc.)	221	3.65	1.16
Task 28 - Ordering flowers for employees, clients, or others	221	3.62	1.13
Task 25 - Lifting or moving heavy objects	221	3.62	1.14
Task 10 - Scheduling office maintenance (for example, scheduling air conditioning, cleaning, garbage, etc.)	221	3.61	1.14
Task 56 - Filling out paperwork for others	219	3.59	1.22
Task 17 - Troubleshooting printer, fax, or copier issues	221	3.58	1.22
Task 39 - Ordering catering for the office	221	3.57	1.23
Task 38 - Making business lunch or dinner reservations	221	3.44	1.23
Task 72 - Handling incoming mail (sorting, signing for packages)	221	3.40	1.26
Task 32 - Giving directions to guests/visitors	218	3.37	1.26
Task 41 - Researching or booking travel for others	220	3.36	1.17
Task 19 - Planning office events, parties, conferences, etc.	221	3.35	1.19
Task 2 - Handling employee and employee family well-being communications (births, deaths, injuries, etc.)	221	3.34	1.30
Task 27 - Coordinating others' calendars	221	3.33	1.20
Task 5 - Listening to colleagues vent their frustrations	221	3.29	1.30
Task 61 - Shipping packages	220	3.29	1.24
Task 4 - Emotionally supporting upset colleagues	219	3.28	1.25
Task 71 - Setting up new employee offices / work stations	221	3.27	1.25
Task 63 - Setting up meeting spaces	219	3.26	1.26
Task 48 - Proof-reading emails for colleagues	221	3.24	1.25
Task 55 - Answering phones in the conference room	219	3.19	1.27
Task 14 - Setting up office hardware (computers, projectors, phones, etc.)	221	3.14	1.29
Task 29 - Supervising or monitoring office guests	221	3.10	1.25
Task 35 - Entertaining clients or other guests	219	3.10	1.24
Task 1 - Providing back-up for other employees when they are out	220	3.07	1.34
Task 49 - Printing, organizing, and/or preparing meeting materials	221	3.06	1.27
Task 51 - Creating presentations for others	221	3.05	1.23

Table 1 cont.
Descriptive Statistics for OHW Tasks

Task & Task Description	*n*	Mean	SD
Task 16 - Troubleshooting computer or software issues	221	3.02	1.24
Task 6 - Helping colleagues prepare for difficult conversations (ex: performance evaluations, disciplinary actions, etc.)	221	2.99	1.22
Task 15 - Setting up office software (email, word processors, business software, etc.)	221	2.99	1.25
Task 54 - Attending optional meetings, convocations, or other similar events	220	2.97	1.28
Task 46 - Maintaining the company's social media accounts	221	2.86	1.34
Task 58 - Mediating disagreements	221	2.84	1.21
Task 44 - Joining committees	219	2.76	1.19
Task 67 - Communicating bad news to the team, customers, etc.	221	2.74	1.23
Task 47 - Mentoring junior colleagues	219	2.71	1.27
Task 62 - Organizing or planning meetings	219	2.70	1.20
Task 53 - Taking notes in meetings	221	2.69	1.34
Task 45 - Maintaining the company's website	221	2.60	1.29
Task 33 - Responding to alarms or emergency calls	221	2.57	1.29
Task 69 - Training new hires	219	2.54	1.31
Task 43 - Writing reports	219	2.28	1.19
Task 60 - Making copies for yourself	221	2.23	1.43
Task 66 - Filing for yourself	218	2.22	1.36
Task 74 - Responding promptly to emails	220	2.21	1.38
Task 42 - Writing proposals	219	2.17	1.21
Task 73 - Arriving to work on time	218	2.06	1.33
Task 57 - Filling out paperwork for yourself	221	2.05	1.30
Task 52 - Creating presentations for yourself	221	1.95	1.21

Researchers also were interested to determine if there were gender differences in the ratings of Office Housework tasks. Only one task was rated significantly differently between men and women across all 74 tasks. Task 56 – Filling out paperwork for others was rated higher as an OHW task/LAWT by women ($M = 3.74$, $SD = 1.08$) than by men ($M = 3.38$, $SD = 1.40$), $t(143.82) = 2.01$, $p = .047$, $\eta^2 = .028$. The relative lack of significant differences in ratings between men and women across all 74 tasks (and the low effect size of the only statistically significant difference) indicates that men and

women seem to have consensus on which tasks should be considered OHW tasks / LAWTs and seem to rate tasks similarly, regardless of gender.

Office Housework Task Groupings

An exploratory factor analysis (EFA) was used to address Research Question 2. Per Brown's (2006) recommendations regarding sample size, this study's combined sample size of 224 participants was deemed to be an adequate size for EFA. Using the 56 tasks identified as LAWTs / OHW, preliminary analyses were conducted to determine factorability. Of the 56 items, 42 items correlated at least .30 with at least one other item. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy was .87, above the recommended .6, and Bartlett's test of sphericity was significant (χ^2 (1540) = 5995.55, p < .001), indicating that factor analysis would be an appropriate analysis. In addition, all diagonals in the anti-image correlation matrix were over .50 and all of the extracted communalities were above .30. Given these preliminary analyses, factor analysis was deemed to be suitable for all 56 items.

Researchers retained factors with eigenvalues equal to or greater than one in accordance with Kaiser (1958). The analyses indicated that a four-factor solution best fit the data with the four factors explaining 42.38% of the variance. Factor one had an extracted sum of squares loadings eigenvalue of 13.60 and explained 24.28% of the variance. Two tasks (Task 25 – Lifting or moving heavy objects and Task 36 – Picking up laundry, groceries, medications, or other items for colleagues) dropped out of the solution, thus reducing the total number of tasks loading on factors to 54. Factor one consisted largely of physical tasks like cleaning, restocking, and janitorial tasks. Factor

two had an extracted sum of squares loadings eigenvalue of 6.07 and explained 10.83%

of the variance. This factor consisted largely of technology-based tasks and tasks

considered to be office management and administrative support tasks. Factor three had an

extracted sum of squares loadings eigenvalue of 2.15 and explained 3.84% of the

variance. This factor consisted largely of emotional support tasks. Factor four had an

extracted sum of squares loadings eigenvalue of 1.55 and explained 2.76% of the

variance. This factor consisted largely of food-related and event-related tasks. In sum,

factor one consisted of the janitorial-type tasks, factor two consisted of the

administrative/office manager tasks, factor three consisted of the emotional support tasks,

and factor four consisted of the party-planner tasks.

All four factors were evaluated for internal consistency using Cronbach's alpha.

Factor 1 (janitorial-type tasks) had high internal consistency $\alpha = .91$ (17 tasks). Factor 2

(administrative/office manager tasks) also had high internal consistency $\alpha = .92$ (24 tasks).

Factor 3 (emotional support tasks) was found to have an alpha of .67 (4 tasks). Factor 4

(party-planner tasks) was found to have an alpha of .85 (9 tasks). The pattern matrix for

the four-factor solution is displayed in Table 3. Only tasks with factor loadings above .30

are shown. Please see Appendix A for the full list of reliabilities and loadings for factor

scale items.

Table 3
Pattern Matrix for OHW Tasks

Task & Task Description	Factor			
	1	2	3	4
Task 68 - Emptying the office trash	.74			
Task 40 - Watering office plants	.74			
Task 24 - Refilling the water cooler	.73			
Task 7 - Cleaning up after parties, meetings, or other gatherings	.66			
Task 9 - Cleaning-related tasks	.66			
Task 13 - Fixing the coffee machine	.62			
Task 18 - Refilling the paper or ink in printers, copiers, fax, etc.	.56	.36		
Task 30 - Setting out candy or office snacks for others	.53			
Task 34 - Hanging wall items	.53			
Task 11 - Stocking kitchen supplies	.51			
Task 26 - Killing or removing pests	.50			
Task 50 - Making coffee	.49			
Task 12 - Stocking office supplies	.49	.37		
Task 70 - Cleaning restrooms	.47			
Task 64 - Decorating the office for holidays	.41			
Task 31 - Repairing or assembling furniture	.38			
Task 8 - Removing recently printed documents from the printer and taking them to employees	.38			
Task 14 - Setting up office hardware		.67		
Task 15 - Setting up office software		.66		
Task 16 - Troubleshooting computer or software issues		.65		
Task 48 - Proof-reading emails for colleagues		.65		
Task 72 - Handling incoming mail		.64		
Task 71 - Setting up new employee offices / work stations		.62		
Task 55 - Answering phones in the conference room		.61		
Task 1 - Providing back-up for other employees when they are out		.60		
Task 63 - Setting up meeting spaces		.58		
Task 49 - Printing, organizing, and/or preparing meeting materials		.57		
Task 56 - Filling out paperwork for others		.57		
Task 29 - Supervising or monitoring office guests		.56		
Task 61 - Shipping packages		.56		
Task 6 - Helping colleagues prepare for difficult conversations		.51	.45	
Task 17 - Troubleshooting printer, fax, or copier issues		.49		
Task 27 - Coordinating others' calendars		.47		

Table 3 cont.
Pattern Matrix for OHW Tasks

Task & Task Description	Factor			
	1	2	3	4
Task 10 - Scheduling office maintenance		.46		
Task 51 - Creating presentations for others		.45		
Task 32 - Giving directions to guests/visitors		.43		
Task 41 - Researching or booking travel for others		.42		
Task 35 - Entertaining clients or other guests		.40		-.32
Task 59 - Making copies for others		.38		
Task 65 - Filing for others		.34		
Task 54 - Attending optional meetings, convocations, or other similar events		.32		
Task 5 - Listening to colleagues vent their frustrations			.68	
Task 4 - Emotionally supporting upset colleagues			.60	
Task 3 - Running errands for other employees	.35		.39	
Task 2 - Handling employee and employee family well-being communications			.31	-.30
Task 39 - Ordering catering for the office				-.72
Task 20 - Buying or preparing food for office events or parties				-.67
Task 28 - Ordering flowers for employees, clients, or others				-.61
Task 22 - Organizing celebration parties for employees			.30	-.60
Task 21 - Buying or preparing food for the office	.30			-.53
Task 19 - Planning office events, parties, conferences, etc.				-.48
Task 23 - Purchasing cards and/or gifts for employee birthday, retirement, condolences, etc.				-.47
Task 38 - Making business lunch or dinner reservations				-.40
Task 37 - Picking up or taking colleagues, supervisors, clients/customers/etc. to the airport				-.35
Percentage of Variance	24.28	10.83	3.84	2.76
Eigenvalue	13.60	6.07	2.15	1.55
Cronbach's Alpha	.91	.92	.67	.85

Office Housework Task Allocation

In task section II, question six asked participants to select all the reasons why they complete the task that they indicated previously they have completed in the past year that was **not** part of their assigned work duties. The response options included 1) I'm the only one who knows how to do the task, 2) I'm the only one willing to do the task, 3) I'm the only one who cares about doing the task, 4) Completing this task is important to me, 5) Completing this task will help me get promoted, 6) Completing this task is valuable to me, 7) Completing this task is beneficial to my career, 8) I'm the best one to do this task, 9) I happen to be here when the task needed to be done, 10) This task has been assigned to me, 11) I volunteered to complete this task once and have since been the only one to complete the task, and 12) I volunteer to complete this task regularly. The last three response options were used to address Research Question 3.

Even though they could select multiple options, across all 54 tasks, participants selected only one of the three allocation response options approximately 93% of the time ($n = 609$). Approximately 7% of the responses contained a combination of any of three options ($n = 45$), as indicated in Table 4 below. In total (across individual and combined allocation responses), participants selected "This task has been assigned to me" 155 times, "I volunteered to complete this task once and have since been the only one to complete the task" 177 times, and "I volunteer to complete this task regularly" 322 times.

Table 4

Percentage of Allocation Methods for All Tasks

Allocation Method	n	% Responses
Only selected "Assigned to me"	155	21%
Only selected "Volunteered once"	177	23%
Only selected "Volunteer regularly"	322	48%
Selected any combination of the three	45	7%

The top items for each category are represented in Table 5 below. Task 20 - Buying or preparing food for office events or parties, Task 29 - Supervising or monitoring office guests, and Task 59 - Making copies for others were the top three Office Housework tasks that participants indicated were assigned to them. Task 50 - Making coffee, Task 65 - Filing for others, and Task 7 - Cleaning up after parties, meetings, or other gatherings were the top three tasks participants indicated that they volunteered for once and have since been the only ones to complete those tasks. Task 50 - Making coffee, Task 30 - Setting out candy or office snacks for others, and Task 21 - Buying or preparing food for the office are the top three tasks that participants indicated they volunteer to complete regularly. Of note, Task 21 – Buying or preparing food for the office and Task 50 – Making coffee were included in two different allocation method lists. Task 20 was described as being assigned to individuals and/or being a task that people regularly volunteer to complete. Task 50 was described as a task that participants volunteered for once and have since been the only one to complete the task and/or is a task that they regularly volunteer to complete.

Interestingly, the tasks that participants indicated were never assigned to them include a combination of emotional support tasks and basic communal support tasks. For

example, Task 4 - Emotionally supporting upset colleagues, Task 5 - Listening to

colleagues vent their frustrations, Task 6 - Helping colleagues prepare for difficult

conversations were not indicated to be assigned tasks. Similarly, no participants indicated

that the reason they complete each of the following tasks was because they were assigned

to do so: Task 13 - Fixing the coffee machine, Task 26 - Killing or removing pests, Task

28 - Ordering flowers for employees, clients, or others, Task 30 - Setting out candy or

office snacks for others, and Task 40 - Watering office plants. Another interesting finding

at the low end of the spectrum is for the "volunteered once" condition. Task 15 - Setting

up office software was the only task that no participants responded that they complete the

task because they did so once and were the only ones to complete the task since. For the

last allocation method evaluated (volunteer regularly), there were no tasks that

participants indicated that they completed and did not volunteer regularly to complete.

Please see Table 5 for the top tasks per allocation method and Appendix B for the full list

of all Office Housework tasks and allocation methods.

Table 5

Percentage of Allocation Methods for All Tasks

Allocation Method	n	% of Each Response
Assigned to me	**136**	
Task 20 - Buying or preparing food for office events or parties	9	7%
Task 29 - Supervising or monitoring office guests	9	7%
Task 59 - Making copies for others	8	6%
Task 21 - Buying or preparing food for the office	7	5%
Task 38 - Making business lunch or dinner reservations	7	5%
Volunteered once	**146**	
Task 50 - Making coffee	9	6%
Task 65 - Filing for others	9	6%
Task 7 - Cleaning up after parties, meetings, or other gatherings	7	5%
Volunteer regularly	**298**	
Task 50 - Making coffee	20	7%
Task 30 - Setting out candy or office snacks for others	16	5%
Task 21 - Buying or preparing food for the office	15	5%
Task 7 - Cleaning up after parties, meetings, or other gatherings	14	5%
Task 8 - Removing recently printed documents from the printer and taking them to employees	14	5%

Researchers were also interested to see how if there were any differences in allocation method between women and men. Using the same three options from the same "select all that apply" question, the percentage distribution for each task was calculated. However, because many tasks had fewer than 10 responses, all Office Housework task allocation percentages were averaged to determine the average percentage of responses from women and men. Across all Office Housework tasks, participants indicated that they completed a task because it was assigned to them 154 times. Of these, 102 selections were by women (62%) and 52 selections were by men (37%). Across all Office Housework tasks, participants indicated that they completed a task because they

volunteered once and have since been the only person to complete the task 177 times. Of

these, 123 selections were by women (70%) and 54 selections were by men (30%).

Across all Office Housework tasks, participants indicated that they completed a task

because they volunteer regularly 322 times. Of these, 228 selections were by women

(70%) and 94 selections were by men (30%). Please note that this study had far higher

percentage of women than men in the study itself, thus impacting any proportion of

selections and limiting generalizability and comparability.

Office Housework Task Visibility

Task visibility was measured with two different ratings – supervisor visibility and

peer visibility. Overall, peer visibility ratings were higher than supervisor ratings, with 11

of the 56 Office Housework tasks receiving ratings of 3.00 or greater on a 5-point

supervisor visibility scale and 35 tasks receiving ratings of 3.00 or greater on a 5-point

peer visibility scale. Based on these findings, it appears that Office Housework tasks are

not generally viewed to be highly visible to supervisors but may be moderately visible to

peers.

The tasks rated as most visible to supervisors are tasks that involve events and/or

food. The top three are Task 54 – Attending optional meetings, convocations, or other

similar events ($M = 3.50$, $SD = 1.33$), Task 19 – Planning office events, parties,

conferences, etc. ($M = 3.39$, $SD = 1.27$), and Task 39 – Ordering catering for the office

($M = 3.29$, $SD = 1.347$). The tasks rated lowest for supervisor visibility included Task 26

- Killing or removing pests, ($M = 1.89$, $SD = 1.23$), Task 12 - Stocking office supplies (M

= 1.91, *SD* = 1.06), Task 68 - Emptying the office trash (*M* = 1.96, *SD* = 1.15). Please see

Table 6 below for the complete list.

The tasks rated as most visible to peers also involve events and/or food but also

include more of the interpersonal tasks. The top three highest rated tasks for peer

visibility are Task 39 – Ordering catering for the office (*M* = 3.90, *SD* = 1.36), Task 64 –

Decorating the office for holidays (*M* = 3.90, *SD* = 1.18), and Task 19 – Planning office

events, parties, conferences, etc. (*M* = 3.87, *SD* = 1.14). The tasks rated lowest for peer

visibility include Task 70 - Cleaning restrooms (*M* = 1.74, *SD* = 0.93), Task 32 - Giving

directions to guests/visitors, (*M* = 2.35, *SD* = 1.08), and Task 68 - Emptying the office

trash (*M* = 2.41, *SD* = 1.00). Please see Table 6 below for the complete list.

Table 6
Descriptive Statistics for Visibility Ratings for Office Housework Tasks

| | Visibility Source | | | | | |
| | Supervisor Visibility | | | Peer Visibility | | |
Task	*n*	*M*	*SD*	*n*	*M*	*SD*
Task 1 - Providing back-up for other employees when they are out	28	3.04	1.20	28	3.79	1.00
Task 2 - Handling employee and employee family well-being communications	23	2.96	1.26	23	3.57	1.00
Task 3 - Running errands for other employees	38	2.63	1.24	38	3.58	1.35
Task 4 - Emotionally supporting upset colleagues	92	2.03	1.01	91	3.37	1.08
Task 5 - Listening to colleagues vent their frustrations	119	2.04	1.12	116	3.34	1.12
Task 6 - Helping colleagues prepare for difficult conversations	33	2.33	1.24	33	3.42	1.03
Task 7 - Cleaning up after parties, meetings, or other gatherings	65	2.26	1.04	64	2.98	1.00
Task 8 - Removing recently printed docs from the printer and taking them to employees	72	2.00	1.14	71	3.31	1.01
Task 9 - Cleaning-related tasks	62	2.02	1.08	62	2.68	1.20

Table 6 cont.
Descriptive Statistics for Visibility Ratings for Office Housework Tasks

| | Visibility Source | | | | | |
| | Supervisor Visibility | | | Peer Visibility | | |
Task	*n*	*M*	*SD*	*n*	*M*	*SD*
Task 10 - Scheduling office maintenance	21	2.95	1.24	21	2.71	1.27
Task 11 - Stocking kitchen supplies	37	2.27	1.12	36	3.08	1.20
Task 12 - Stocking office supplies	34	1.91	1.06	34	2.56	1.05
Task 13 - Fixing the coffee machine	22	2.50	1.50	22	2.59	1.22
Task 14 - Setting up office hardware	30	3.00	1.20	30	3.17	1.29
Task 15 - Setting up office software	24	2.67	1.27	24	3.00	1.35
Task 16 - Troubleshooting computer or software issues	57	2.75	1.26	56	3.29	1.25
Task 17 - Troubleshooting printer, fax, or copier issues	75	2.37	1.09	75	3.21	1.09
Task 18 - Refilling the paper or ink in printers, copiers, fax, etc.	63	2.10	1.15	63	2.68	1.20
Task 19 - Planning office events, parties, conferences, etc.	23	3.39	1.27	23	3.87	1.14
Task 20 - Buying or preparing food for office events or parties	46	3.15	1.28	45	3.76	1.05
Task 21 - Buying or preparing food for the office	50	3.06	1.43	49	3.69	1.16
Task 22 - Organizing celebration parties for employees	28	3.07	1.15	28	3.86	1.11
Task 23 - Purchasing cards, gifts for employee birthday, retirement, condolences, etc.	46	2.76	1.12	46	3.59	1.17
Task 24 - Refilling the water cooler	31	2.13	1.18	30	3.23	1.52
Task 25 - Lifting or moving heavy objects	49	2.33	1.28	49	2.82	1.27
Task 26 - Killing or removing pests	38	1.89	1.23	38	2.89	1.18
Task 27 - Coordinating others' calendars	13	2.92	1.55	14	3.14	1.03
Task 28 - Ordering flowers for employees, clients, or others	12	2.75	0.97	12	3.42	1.38
Task 29 - Supervising or monitoring office guests	22	2.77	1.41	22	2.86	1.49
Task 30 - Setting out candy or office snacks for others	53	2.66	1.16	53	3.75	1.21
Task 31 - Repairing or assembling furniture	20	2.25	1.37	20	3.50	1.32
Task 32 - Giving directions to guests/visitors	49	2.02	0.99	48	2.35	1.08
Task 34 - Hanging wall items	30	2.33	1.61	30	2.93	1.34
Task 35 - Entertaining clients or other guests	26	2.85	1.49	26	2.85	1.41

Table 6 cont.
Descriptive Statistics for Visibility Ratings for Office Housework Tasks

Task		Supervisor Visibility			Peer Visibility	
	n	*M*	*SD*	*n*	*M*	*SD*
Task 36 - Picking up laundry, groceries, medications, or other items for colleagues, supervisors, or clients	8	2.25	1.04	8	3.50	1.07
Task 37 - Picking up or taking colleagues, supervisors, clients/customers/etc. to the airport	12	3.00	1.13	12	3.67	1.23
Task 38 - Making business lunch or dinner reservations	20	2.85	1.35	20	2.70	1.42
Task 39 - Ordering catering for the office	21	3.29	1.35	21	3.90	1.14
Task 40 - Watering office plants	31	2.10	1.35	31	2.68	1.54
Task 41 - Researching or booking travel for others	12	2.67	1.23	12	3.33	0.89
Task 48 - Proof-reading emails for colleagues	56	2.21	1.30	56	3.41	1.13
Task 49 - Printing, organizing, and/or preparing meeting materials	14	2.43	1.28	14	2.79	0.98
Task 50 - Making coffee	64	2.47	1.45	63	3.25	1.26
Task 51 - Creating presentations for others	10	2.90	1.10	10	3.70	1.16
Task 54 - Attending optional meetings, convocations, or other similar events	42	3.50	1.33	42	3.14	1.30
Task 55 - Answering phones in the conference room	18	2.06	1.00	18	2.50	1.15
Task 56 - Filling out paperwork for others	31	2.26	1.26	31	2.94	1.18
Task 59 - Making copies for others	56	2.18	1.13	56	3.29	1.04
Task 61 - Shipping packages	21	2.48	1.17	21	3.05	0.97
Task 63 - Setting up meeting spaces	23	3.22	1.17	23	3.09	1.31
Task 64 - Decorating the office for holidays	29	3.14	1.22	29	3.90	1.18
Task 65 - Filing for others	34	2.18	1.09	35	2.74	0.95
Task 68 - Emptying the office trash	51	1.96	1.15	49	2.41	1.00
Task 70 - Cleaning restrooms	19	2.00	1.16	19	1.74	0.93
Task 71 - Setting up new employee offices / work stations	23	2.91	1.35	23	3.35	1.30
Task 72 - Handling incoming mail	22	2.00	0.87	22	2.73	1.16

Researchers were also interested to determine if there were gender differences in the task visibility ratings of Office Housework tasks. Using independent samples t-test, researchers identified four Office Housework tasks that were rated significantly differently for supervisor visibility between men and women and one task rated significantly differently for peer visibility between men and women. Please note that the sample sizes for these items are incredibly low. To respond to these items, participants had to first indicate that they had completed the task in the past 12 months and that the task was **not** part of their regular work duties. For these analyses, researchers set a minimum required sample size of five participants per group (men vs. women). The t-tests described below were conducted with the understanding that far greater sample sizes are necessary to robustly determine significance. For supervisor visibility, Tasks 1, 8, 18, and 27 were rated significantly differently between men and women – please see Table 7 below for more information.

Table 7

Results of t-test and Descriptive Statistics for Supervisor Visibility of Office Housework Tasks by Gender

	Gender								
	Women			Men					
Task	*n*	*M*	*SD*	*n*	*M*	*SD*	*t*	*df*	η^2
Task 1 – Providing back-up for other employees when they are out	18	2.67	1.19	10	3.70	0.95	2.34*	22	.176
Task 8 – Removing recently printed documents from the printer and taking them to employees	51	1.76	0.95	21	2.57	1.36	2.47*	23	.105
Task 18 – Refilling the paper or ink in printers, copiers, fax, etc.	36	1.83	0.91	27	2.44	1.34	2.04*	43	.071
Task 27 – Coordinating others' calendars	8	2.00	1.07	5	4.40	0.89	4.36*	10	.613

* Significant at the p<.05 level.

For peer visibility, only one task was rated significantly differently between men and women (Task 2 – Handling employee and employee family well-being communications) but responses to this task did not meet the minimum threshold of five participants per group.

Office Housework Task Value

To answer Research Question 5, one of the response options for survey question six was used. As you recall, question six asked participants to select all the reasons *why* they completed each of the tasks that they previously indicated they had completed in the past year that were **not** part of their assigned work duties. The response option, "Completing this task is valuable to me" was used to address Research Question 5.

Participants could select multiple response options for survey question six. As such, to determine if those who complete Office Housework tasks value the tasks,

researchers had to first parse out the proportion of responses that included "Completing this task is valuable to me." Across all of the tasks, participants selected this option 330 times out of a total of 2,278 responses. Breaking this down further, for Office Housework tasks, respondents indicated that they completed the task because it was valuable to them 13% of the time ($n = 285$). For non-Office Housework tasks, respondents only selected this item 2% of the time ($n = 45$).

When evaluating the Office Housework tasks alone, we find that many of the tasks rated as valuable could be classified as emotional support tasks. The tasks that participants indicated they complete because the tasks are valuable to them are Task 4 - Emotionally supporting upset colleagues ($n = 30$ participants), Task 5 - Listening to colleagues vent their frustrations ($n = 23$ participants), and Task 54 - Attending optional meetings, convocations, or other similar events ($n = 15$ participants). The tasks that no participants indicated that they completed because the tasks were valuable to them included Task 28 - Ordering flowers for employees, clients, or others and Task 55 - Answering phones in the conference room.

Researchers were also interested to see if there were any differences in the number of times that women indicated that they completed a task because it was valuable to them compared to the number of times men selected the same option. Across all Office Housework tasks, women indicated that they completed a task because it was valuable to them 203 times and men selected this option 82 times. Proportionally, this means women accounted for 68% of the total selections of the response "Completing this task is valuable to me" and men account for 32%. Please note that this proportion is directly

impacted by the imbalance in the number of men and women in the study. This study had far higher percentage of women than men in the study itself, thus impacting any proportion of selections and limiting generalizability and comparability.

Office Housework Task Enjoyment

Question seven asked participants to rate to what extend they enjoy completing each task that they indicated they have completed in the past year that was **not** part of their assigned work duties. Tasks were coded as either "Office Housework" or "Non-Office Housework" based on the analyses from Research Question 1. Of the 74 initial tasks, 56 surpassed the mean cutoff score of 2.9 and thus were categorized as Office Housework tasks. The remaining 18 tasks were categorized as Non-Office Housework tasks. Each task that the participant indicated that they completed in the past 12 months that were **not** part of their assigned work duties was piped into a question asking the participant how much they enjoyed the task on a 5-point scale. Across the 56 Office Housework tasks, participants rated 24 tasks at or above 3.00 on a 5-point Likert scale assessing task enjoyment. This indicates that approximately 43% of the tasks were viewed to be enjoyable.

When looking specifically at Office Housework tasks, the tasks rated highest for enjoyment included Task 64 - Decorating the office for holidays ($M = 4.28$, $SD = 1.07$), Task 22 - Organizing celebration parties for employees ($M = 4.18$, $SD = 0.67$), and Task 28 - Ordering flowers for employees, clients, or others ($M = 4.17$, $SD = 1.03$). The Office Housework tasks rated lowest for enjoyment are Task 70 - Cleaning restrooms (M = 1.37, SD = 0.68), Task 26 - Killing or removing pests ($M = 1.66$, $SD = 1.32$), and Task 68 -

Emptying the office trash ($M = 1.86$, $SD = 1.08$). Thus, the tasks with the highest

enjoyment appear to be tasks involving celebrations or events whereas the lowest rated

tasks appear to be janitorial / cleaning tasks.

Researchers were also interested to determine if there were gender differences in

the enjoyment ratings of Office Housework tasks. Sample sizes for these task items were

low because, to respond to these items, participants had to first indicate that they had

completed the task in the past 12 months and that the task was **not** part of their regular

work duties. To be considered for analysis, the task must have been responded to by a

minimum of five women and five men. Using independent samples t-test, researchers

identified four Office Housework tasks that were rated significantly differently in

enjoyment between men and women. The t-tests described below were conducted with

the understanding that far greater sample sizes are necessary to robustly determine

significance. See Table 8 below.

Table 8
Results of t-test and Descriptive Statistics for Enjoyment of Office Housework Tasks by Gender

	Gender								
	Women			Men					
Allocation Type	n	M	SD	n	M	SD	t	df	η^2
Task 19 – Planning office events, parties, conferences, etc.	18	3.83	0.86	5	2.80	0.84	2.43*	7	.215
Task 26 – Killing or removing pests	25	1.32	1.11	13	2.31	1.49	2.10*	19	.129
Task 56 – Filling out paperwork for others	21	2.71	1.06	10	1.80	0.63	3.00*	27	.179
Task 59 – Making copies for others	39	3.05	0.97	17	2.24	1.09	2.66*	28	.125

* Significant at the p<.05 level.

Office Housework & Gender

After addressing the research questions, researchers wanted to evaluate how many Office Housework tasks participants complete and if there are any significant differences in the number of Office Housework tasks women complete versus the number that men complete. For these analyses, the 56 tasks determined to be Office Housework tasks from Research Question 1 were used. Overall, the 222 participants indicated that they performed an average of 9.48 Office Housework tasks ($SD = 7.15$). There was a high degree of variability with the minimum report number of tasks being 0 and the maximum number of tasks reported being 35. Overall, women completed more Office Housework tasks ($M = 10.46$, $SD = 7.05$) than men completed ($M = 8.00$, $SD = 7.10$), $t(177.83) = 2.51$, $p = .013$, $\eta^2 = .032$.

CHAPTER IV: DISCUSSION

The goals of this study were to determine which tasks are considered Office Housework and better understand why workers complete these tasks. This study operationally defined Office Housework, developed a list of Office Housework tasks using participant ratings, assessed the factor structure of tasks rated to be Office Housework tasks, and evaluated the tasks' allocation method (assigned, volunteered once, or volunteered regularly) visibility (peer and supervisor), value, and enjoyment. Researchers elected to use the term "Low Appreciation Workplace Tasks" or "LAWTs" in place of the term "Office Housework." Although this was done to avoid potential gender bias, it may have had unintended side effects, as will be discussed later.

Many of the tasks most highly rated as being Office Housework tasks are cleaning and janitorial-type tasks or administrative tasks. The top tasks include cleaning-related tasks (including cleaning up after parties and cleaning the restroom), taking out the trash, restocking kitchen supplies, watering the office plants, maintaining communal kitchen tools (such as coffee machines and water coolers), and killing or removing pests. These tasks could be directly translated into traditional housework tasks of cleaning and maintaining the home. This aligns with anecdotal evidence and the only study that has researched this topic (Jang et al., 2018). The five tasks used by Jang et al. were "1) I organize office parties and gatherings, 2) I bring food for others to the office, 3) I buy cards for coworkers to sign for celebrations or condolences, 4) I comfort colleagues when there is bad news, and 5) I mediate office disagreements" (2018). Although their research and the present study were running largely concurrently, the two studies both contain a

version of these five items. The present research found support for four of the five items

used by Jang et al. (2018). The only item not supported by the present research was item

5, mediating office disagreements. The present study's version of this item (Task 58 –

Mediating disagreements) fell just short of meeting the minimum requirements. Despite

this, there appears to be alignment between the two studies, reinforcing that, while the

research in this topic is still in early stages of development, the construct can be defined

and further refined.

   In the current study, researchers were able to identify four different groups of

Office Housework tasks. The first consisted of janitorial-type and cleaning tasks, the

second consisted of administrative/office manager tasks, the third consisted of emotional

support tasks, and the fourth consisted of food-related and party-planning tasks. The first

two task groups (janitorial and administrative tasks) were the strongest factors, followed

closely by the fourth task group (party-planner tasks). This aligns well with the anecdotal

evidence as many tasks described by popular press sources fall into these categories.

However, many of these sources also describe the role that emotional support tasks play

in Office Housework. This study found this group to be the weakest factor, which could

be because many of the tasks that would likely be classified as emotional support tasks

were not rated to be Office Housework. Indeed, mediating disagreements,

communicating bad news to the team, customers, etc., and mentoring junior colleagues

all were rated below the minimum 2.90 cutoff. This is an interesting preliminary finding

given the preponderance of anecdotal support for these tasks being considered Office

Housework. Although this study approached Office Housework tasks with no a

priori hypotheses, much of the data supports anecdotal evidence; this is one of the few strong divergences. It could be that participants genuinely did not feel that these tasks met the definition of a LAWT (which is the same definition of an Office Housework task) or it could be that the term "Low Appreciation Workplace Task" carried a different connotation than "Office Housework" would have, even though the definitions were the same.

In regards to task allocation, visibility, value, and enjoyment, the findings moderately supported anecdotal evidence. Findings indicate that many individuals who complete these tasks volunteer for them regularly as opposed to being assigned to complete them. Many popular press articles suggest that individuals who complete these tasks are assigned to them or "voluntold" to complete them. However, the fact that respondents indicated they regularly complete the tasks more than twice as often as they indicated that they were assigned the task indicates that there are many Office Housework tasks that workers complete of their own volition.

The results of the task visibility items indicate that Office Housework tasks are generally viewed as being more visible to peers than to supervisors. This makes sense given that Office Housework tasks generally benefit the workgroups/teams and those in it instead of the individual employee's job performance. Supervisors may be more likely to focus on tasks that directly impact an employee's work performance. Two tasks were rated highly for task visibility for both peers and supervisors: ordering catering for the office and planning office events, parties, conferences, etc. It is not surprising that planning office parties or coordinating catering were rated higher on task visibility. These

are both tasks that involve coordinating with others and have an impact on many others. An interesting follow-up question could have asked participants if they perceived the task visibility of these tasks to be positive or negative. On a different note, it surprised researchers to find that decorating the office for holidays was rated highest for peer task visibility. This task supports the office community and, this study shows, may be more visible than initially expected. It would be interesting to see if future studies include this task and, if so, if they relate it to other organizational factors such as perceived altruism, communal support, or even promotion.

Further diving into the findings, there were a surprising lack of gender differences in terms of task visibility. This could be as a result of the low sample size, but researchers only identified four tasks overall that could withstand minimal rigor. Men viewed providing back-up for other employees, removing recently printed documents from the printer and taken them to other employees, refilling the paper or ink in printers, copiers, fax, etc., and coordinating others' calendars much higher than the women in this study. The most distinct and stark difference is for the last task – coordinating others' calendars. Men rated this task over twice as visible to their supervisors than did women. This could be similar to the results of Heilman and Chen's 2005 study which found that, when men completed an altruistic behavior, they were rewarded with higher favorability ratings, but when women completed the same behavior, it was expected and they received no increase in favorability. It could be that women are expected to coordinate others' calendars and thus it is not a high visibility task for them. However, when men complete the same task, their supervisors take notice.

Task value was also a factor that researchers evaluated. Because of the structure of these questions, task value was not rated on a scale but was instead part of a "select all that apply" question that asked participants why they completed the tasks that they did. The top two tasks for which participants selected this option (this task is valuable to me) were both emotional support tasks: Task 4 – Emotionally supporting upset colleagues and Task 5 – Listening to colleagues vent their frustrations. The next highest was Task 54 – Attending optional meetings, convocations, or other similar events. These results seem to indicate that there may be different value propositions at play. It could be that emotional support tasks are valued for more interpersonal reasons whereas attending optional meetings could help one move ahead in their career. Future research could parse out exactly what value workers place on Office Housework tasks and why they find it valuable.

Task enjoyment was the final factor researchers investigated for this study. Participants indicated that they enjoyed decorating the office for holidays, organizing parties, and ordering flowers the most. These are all tasks that could be considered communal-based tasks. These are also tasks that, overall, participants indicated that they volunteered to complete regularly. It stands to reason that participants who enjoy completing certain tasks would volunteer to complete them regularly or that they regularly volunteer to complete tasks that they enjoy.

Task enjoyment was also evaluated by gender. Only four tasks were rated significantly differently between women and men. Women provided higher enjoyment ratings for planning office events, parties, conferences, and similar events; filling out

paperwork for others; and making copies for others than men provided for the same tasks. However, men provided higher enjoyment ratings for killing or removing pests than women did. Please note that the last task and two before it were all near or below an average rating of 3.00 on a 5-point scale, thus indicating that, while perhaps these tasks are not beloved tasks, there are differences between men and women as to which group enjoys the task *least*. The only task where one group indicated that they (on average) enjoyed a task while the other group indicated that they did not enjoy a task was the first task – planning office events, parties, conferences, etc. with women reporting a mean rating of 3.83 and men reporting a mean rating of 2.80.

Further research into this task (planning office events, parties, conferences, etc.) indicates that women are over twice as likely to complete this task than men (14% of all women surveyed indicated completing this task, compared to 6% of the men surveyed), women view the task as more enjoyable, both groups view it as being moderately visible for peers and supervisors (all ratings consistent between genders and averaging between 3.00 and 4.00 for supervisor and peer visibility), and there were no consistent patterns in task allocation (women and men reported being assigned to complete this task, volunteering once and getting stuck with the task, and volunteering regularly). While there this study's low sample size and low proportion of male participants limits generalizability, these findings may indicate a relationship between enjoyment of the task and willingness to complete the task. Further research is need to evaluate this further (and with greater robustness), but the findings of this preliminary study should lay the groundwork for future studies on this topic.

In addition to the research questions, researchers also wanted to evaluate if women complete more Office Housework tasks than men, as suggested by the anecdotal evidence and supported by Jang et al. (2018). Findings from the present study supported the anecdotal evidence and Jang et al. (2018), suggesting that women complete more Office Housework tasks than do men. One key distinction between the Jang et al. (2018) research and the present research is the whether Office Housework should be considered a form of OCB. Jang et al. (2018) classified Office Housework as a type of OCB but the present study did not explicitly link the two constructs.

OCBs have been defined in a variety of ways but one of the most comprehensive definitions comes from Bolino et al. (2015). They described OCBs as "employee behavior that is more discretionary, is less likely to be formally linked with organizational rewards, and contributes to the organization by promoting a positive social and psychological climate" (2015, p. 56). This study operationalized Office Housework tasks as non-role-specific work that a) benefits the organization, b) does not directly benefit the worker in their work capacity, and c) is underappreciated and generally goes unrecognized. At face value, this definition does not differ much from the Bolino et al. definition of OCBs (2015). Office Housework tasks are those tasks outside one's in-role responsibilities that support the organization but are not tied to rewards. The key distinction is that the present study's definition of Office Housework indicates that the completion of Office Housework tasks does not benefit the employee in their work capacity and that completion of the tasks is underappreciated and generally goes unrecognized. These may seem to be slight distinctions but these distinctions could have

major ramifications. Office Housework tasks, unlike OCBs, are generally thought to be

underappreciated if they are even noticed at all. OCBs have been linked to several

individual performance related outcomes including higher job performance ratings,

pay/reward recommendations, decreased turnover and absenteeism, and more (Podsakoff,

Whiting, Podsakoff, & Blume, 2009). Thus, the definition of Office Housework provided

in this study conflict with the definition of OCBs.

Indeed, in the Jang et al. (2018) study evaluating Office Housework, they define

Office Housework as "workplace behaviors that are not directly task-related but that

facilitate the social functioning of the organization" (2018). This definition closely aligns

with definitions of OCB because Jang et al. consider Office Housework to be a form of

OCB (2018). Even so, Jang et al. also describe the differences between Office

Housework and OCBs in that Office Housework is less job-relevant (not tied to one's

actual job duties), is less likely to be directly related to organizational performance

indicators, and is more closely tied to *social* functioning of the organization (2018).

Though the present study and Jang et al.'s study were running largely

concurrently, these were some the same reasons that researchers of the present study

elected **not** to characterize Office Housework as a form of OCB. Further research is

needed to further refine the definition of Office Housework. The present definition was

formulated using a combination of popular press definitions, research on task-related

topics (see Babcock et al., 2017 for more information), and other adjacent research

topics. If the present definition is valid and Office Housework tasks truly do not benefit

individuals in their work capacity and are generally underappreciated and unrecognized,

Office Housework should not be considered an OCB. However, if tasks considered to be

Office Housework tasks do yield organizational benefits for those who complete them or

are found to be highly appreciated or often recognized, the present definition must be

refined and thus, Office Housework could conceivably be considered a form of OCB. As

will be discussed shortly, further research is needed to define and develop the construct.

Strengths

This study was an exploration into a topic that had not yet been operationally

defined. In the early stages of this study, no single empirical study had been conducted on

Office Housework. Through the course of the study, researchers at the University of

South Florida published a poster at the 2018 Society for Industrial and Organizational

Psychology conference which described their operational definition and early findings on

who completes Office Housework tasks and how those tasks relate to other variables such

as promotion and burnout (Jang et al., 2018). As such, one of the greatest strengths of this

research is that it is helping pioneer a new area of research that has been oft described in

the popular press but has had little empirical research support.

Another strength of this study was the development of groups of Office

Housework tasks that can be used in future studies. Researchers found four distinct

groups of Office Housework tasks (janitorial, administrative, food- and event-related, and

emotional support tasks). Each of these factors can be used as a subscale or as a

comprehensive task list. Finally, another major strength of the present research is that it

lends support to anecdotal claims and the single published study's findings that women

complete more Office Housework tasks than do men. This study helps further the newly

developing literature and provide empirical support for a widely-made anecdotal claim.

Limitations

Although there are several strengths to this study, there are also limitations. First

is in regards to the samples and sample sizes. This study used two distinct samples of

varying sample sizes. One sample was a convenient sample that was comprised

predominantly of women. The second sample was attained through MTurk and had a

much more balanced distribution of men and women. Although both samples were

analyzed for comparability and found to be comparable in terms of age of participants

and relative lack of racial diversity (both samples were above college-age and were

predominantly white) and also comparable in terms of the Office Housework task rating

and number of tasks completed, ideally, participants would come from a single,

representative sample. Further, even when combined, the sample size for these analyses

was low. All of these factors indicate that results from the present study may not be very

generalizable. Future studies should aim for much greater sample sizes.

In addition to sampling weaknesses, this study suffered from several procedural

weaknesses. First, the survey itself was long. The average participant spent 26 minutes

completing the survey and answering the same questions about each task they indicated

that they had completed. Researchers had the foresight to include several quality

assurance checks, which, combined with other data cleaning methodology reduced the

sample size from 299 combined to 224. In addition to being long and seemingly

redundant, some of the survey items were not the best suited for the intended analyses.

Several items were combined into a single item in order to minimize survey completion time. While these measures were used intentionally in order to reduce survey time, it did cause the results to be limited in their analytical depth and generalizability. Future studies should consider the tradeoff between survey time completion and analyzability.

Additionally, the use of "Low Appreciation Workplace Tasks" (LAWTs) in place of the term "Office Housework" has introduced uncertainty in the present study. Researchers were concerned that the use of the term "Office Housework" would potentially bias participants as a result of the potential gender associations with the term. In early phases of the survey development, researchers received feedback that men may be less willing to take a survey about Office Housework than they would a more gender-neutral topic. Thus, researchers elected to create a new term, "Low Appreciation Workplace Tasks," as a stand-in term to replace "Office Housework." The operational definition for LAWTs was the same as for Office Housework but researchers found that several items commonly considered to be Office Housework tasks were not rated as such when the term "Low Appreciation Workplace Task" was used instead. As a result of the use of a different term, researchers cannot say whether these tasks would have been rated differently had the term "Office Housework" been used instead.

Future Research

Future studies should consider whether the term "Office Housework" would introduce too much bias in prospective participants and, should they decide to use another term, create a study design to evaluate and statistically control for the use of the term. Furthermore, future studies should use more targeted item lists and only have participants

evaluate tasks relevant to the present study. This study could best be described as two studies in one. The first task section was used to determine which tasks were Office Housework tasks while the second task section was used to evaluate antecedents and other variables of interest. Ideally, these would have been separate studies such that participants only had to answer survey items related to Office Housework tasks in study two. However, because this study was completed in fulfillment of thesis requirements, both studies were compressed into a single study. As a result, non-Office Housework tasks were evaluated alongside Office Housework tasks. Although future studies could potentially use this data for ad hoc analyses, these data are less beneficial to the present study. Finally, answering Research Questions 3-6 required much more data than the present study collected. Researchers set a minimum N cutoff at 5 participants per category but even this is far too low for statistical robustness. As such, some of the analyses reported in this study would collapse under further scrutiny but were reported nonetheless for exploratory purposes. Future analyses should aim for greater sample sizes and use more targeted study designs.

There are many options for future research as this is a new topic in empirical research. Future studies should help confirm and/or refine the operational definition, create more robust scales, and evaluate the relationship between Office Housework and a variety of variables including Organizational Citizenship Behaviors, salary, promotability, likability, personality and individual differences variables, and more. There have been recent press articles about the intersection of race and Office Housework. A recent Harvard Business Review article cites anecdotal evidence and

research from the Center for Worklife Law describing how women of color complete more Office Housework than their white, male counterparts (Tulshyan, 2018; Williams & Multhaup, 2018). Future research could evaluate these preliminary findings and determine who completes Office Housework within an organization and if protected classes (such as women, minorities, or those with disabilities) are tasked with a higher burden of these tasks.

Other research could replicate and build upon the Jang et al. study and evaluate individual career outcomes such as promotion and burnout as well as individual salary, team performance ratings, individual performance ratings, and more (2018). Office Housework could also be evaluated in terms of perceived justice and fairness or in terms of task selection. If given the choice between a job-related task and an Office Housework task, which task would participants choose and why? Longitudinal studies would also help researchers better understand Office Housework. Researchers could conduct a long-term study evaluating members within an organization and track their Office Housework completion and compare it to any of the previously mentioned variables or other individual or organizational performance indicators. Another potentially interesting study would be to conduct an organizational intervention that trained managers on what Office Housework is and how to better allocate tasks fairly within the organization. Pre- and post-ratings of various factors such as workplace satisfaction, perceived fairness, productivity, and more could help identify whether bringing attention to this bias could help reduce the occurrence.

Before any of these research studies, however, ideally the next studies would help solidify the operational definitions proposed by the present study and by Jang et al. (2018) and create and validate better Office Housework scales. The present study helped lay the foundation for this new research area but there is still much to be done in terms of defining the construct and evaluating related constructs. For one, researchers have yet to come to consensus on whether Office Housework is a form of Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB). Future research should evaluate the two constructs and assess for convergent and discriminant validity.

Conclusion

Office Housework is a construct under development. This topic has been defined and evaluated in the popular press but has yet to be published in any empirical journals. This is a trending topic that has caught many researchers' eye (as evidenced by the 2018 SIOP conference) and likely will continue to be a topic of interest for the coming years. The present study sought to define the construct and identify the tasks considered to be Office Housework and make strides towards creating Office Housework scales and sub-types. To sum the present research findings, Office Housework tasks are most likely to be janitorial, administrative, food- or event-related, or emotional support tasks, are more likely to be completed by women than by men, are most likely to be completed by those who volunteer regularly to complete the task, are generally not highly visible in the organization but are more visible to peers than to supervisors, and may be considered valuable or enjoyable by the workers who complete the tasks.

REFERENCES

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), 714-47. doi: 10.1257/aer.20141734.

Battle A., & Wigfield, A. (2003). College women's value orientations toward family,

career, and graduate school. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 62*(1), 56-75.

doi:10.1016/S0001-8791(02)00037-4

Blair, S.L. (2013) The division of household labor. In: Peterson G., & Bush K. (Eds.),

Handbook of Marriage and the Family (613-635). Boston, MA: Springer.

Blair, S. L., & Lichter, D. T. (1991). Measuring the division of household labor: Gender

segregation of housework among American couples. *Journal of Family Issues, 12*,

91-113.

Bolino, M. C., Hsiung, H., Harvey, J., & LePine, J. A. (2015). "Well, I'm tired of tryin'!"

Organizational citizenship behavior and citizenship fatigue. *Journal of Applied

Psychology, 100*(1), 56-74. doi:10.1037/a0037583

Brown, T. A. (2006). *Confirmatory factor analysis for applied research*. New York, NY,

US: Guilford Press.

Burgess, D., & Borgida, E. (1999). Who women are, who women should be: Descriptive

and prescriptive gender stereotyping in sex discrimination. *Psychology, Public

Policy, and Law, 5,* 665–692.

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.

Chiaburu, D. S., Sawyer, K., Smith, T. A., Brown, N., & Harris, T. B. (2014). When civic virtue isn't seen as virtuous: The effect of gender stereotyping on civic virtue expectations for women. *Sex Roles, 70*, 183-194.

De Pater, I. E., Van Vianen, A. M., Fischer, A. H., & Van Ginkel, W. P. (2009a). Challenging experiences: Gender differences in task choice. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 24*, 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.

De Pater, I. E., Van Vianen, A. E. M., & Bechtoldt, M. N. (2010). Gender differences in job challenge: A matter of task allocation. *Gender, Work and Organization, 17*(4), 433-453.

Don't be the Office Angel (2018, January). *Cosmopolitan, 264*(1), 122-123.

Eagly, A. H. (2009). The his and hers of prosocial behavior: An examination of the social psychology of gender. *American Psychologist, 64*, 644-658.

Eagly, A. H. & Crowley, M. (1986). Gender and helping behavior: A meta-analytic review of the social psychological literature. *Psychological Bulletin, 100*(3), 283-308.

Eagly, A. H. & Johnson, B. T. (1990). Gender and leadership style: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin, 108*(2), 233-256.

Eccles, J. S. (2009). Who am I and what am I going to do with my life? Personal and collective identities as motivators of action. *Educational Psychologist, 44*, 78-89. doi:10.1080/00461520902832368.

Eccles, J. S. (2011), Understanding educational and occupational choices. *Journal of Social Issues, 67,* 644-648. doi:10.1111/j.1540-4560.2011.01718.x.

Eccles (Parsons), J., Adler T. F., Futterman R., Goff S. B., Kaczala C. M., et al. (1983). Expectancies, values, and academic behaviors. In Spence, J. T. (Ed.), *Achievement and Achievement Motivation*, 75–146. San Francisco, CA: Freeman.

Eccles, J. S., Barber, B., & Jozefowicz, D. (1999). Linking gender to education, occupation, and recreational choices: Applying the Eccles et al. model of achievement-related choices. In W. B. Swann, J. H. Langlois, & L. A. Gilbert (Eds.), *Sexism and stereotypes in modern society: The gender science of Janet Taylor Spence* (pp. 153-192). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Eccles, J. S., & Wigfield, A. (1995). In the mind of the achiever: The structure of adolescents' academic achievement related-beliefs and self-perceptions. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 21*, 215–225.

Elliott, M. (2016, October 27). Office Housework: 4 ways doing work chores hurts your

    career. *Money & Career CheatSheet.* Retrieved from

    https://www.cheatsheet.com/money-career/office-housework-work-chores-hurts-

    career.html/?a=viewall

Feingold, A. (1994). Gender differences in personality: A meta-analysis. *Psychological*

    Bulletin, 116(3), 429-459.

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. (2001). Description and prescription: How gender stereotypes prevent

    women's ascent up the organizational ladder. *Journal of Social Issues, 57*, 657–

    674.

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.

Heilman, M. E., & Okimoto, T. G. (2007). Why are women penalized for success at male

    tasks?: The implied communality deficit. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 92*(1),

    81-92.

Heilman, M. E., Rivero, J. C., & Brett, J. F. (1991). Skirting the competence issue:

    Effects of sex-based preferential selection on task choices of women and men.

    Journal of Applied Psychology, 76(1), 99-105.

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.

Kaiser, H.F. (1958). The varimax criterion for analytic rotation in factor analysis. *Psychometrika, 23*(3), 187-200. doi:10.1007/BF02289233.

Kidder, D. L. (2002). The influence of gender on the performance of organizational citizenship behaviors. *Journal of Management, 28*(5), 629-648.

Kidder, D. L., & Parks, J. M. (2001). The good soldier: Who is s(he)?. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *22*(8), 939-959.

Kolb, D. M. & Porter, J. L. (2015). "Office Housework" gets in women's way. *Harvard Business Review.* Retrieved from https://hbr.org/2015/04/office-housework-gets-in-womens-way

Kosovich, J. J., Flake, J. K., & Hulleman, C. S. (2017). Short-term motivation trajectories: A parallel process model of expectancy-value. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, *49,* 130-139. doi:10.1016/j.cedpsych.2017.01.004.

Liden, R. C., Wayne, S. J., Jaworski, R. A., & Bennett, N. (2004). Social loafing: A field investigation. *Journal of Management, 30*(2), 285-304. doi:10.1016/j.jm.2003.02.002.

MacDonald, S. K., Williams, L.M., Lazowski, R.A., Horst, S.J., & Barron, K.E. (2014). Faculty attitudes toward general education assessment: A qualitative study about their motivation. *Research and Practice in Assessment, 9*, 74-90.

Organ, D. W. (1994). Personality and organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Management, 20*, 465-478

Organ, D. W. (1997). Organizational citizenship behavior: It's construct clean-up time. *Human Performance, 10*(2), 85-97.

Organ, D.W., Podsakoff, P.M., & Podsakoff, N.P. (2011). Expanding the criterion domain to include organizational citizenship behavior (OCB): Implications for employee selection. In S. Zedeck (Ed.), *APA handbook of industrial and organizational psychology.* Washington, DC: APA.

Podsakoff, P.M., MacKenzie, S.B., Paine, J. & Bachrach, D.G. (2000). Organizational citizenship behaviors: A critical review of the theoretical and empirical literature and suggestions for future research. *Journal of Management 2000 Yearly Review*, 26, 513- 563.

Podsakoff, N., Whiting, S., Podsakoff, P., & Blume, B. (2009). Individual- and organizational-level consequences of organizational citizenship behaviors: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 94*(1), 122-141.

Tips for managers (n.d.). *LeanIn.Org*. [Blog], Retrieved from https://leanin.org/tips/managers

Tulshyan, R. (2018, April 6). Women of color get asked to do more "Office Housework." Here's how they can say no. *Harvard Business Review.* Retrieved from https://hbr.org/2018/04/women-of-color-get-asked-to-do-more-office-housework-heres-how-they-can-say-no

Vieira, E. T., & Grantham, S. (2011). University students setting goals in the context of autonomy, self-efficacy and important goal-related task engagement. *Educational Psychology, 31,* 141-156. doi:10.1080/01443410.2010.536508.

Wigfield, A., & Eccles, J. S. (1992). The development of achievement task values: A theoretical analysis. *Developmental Review, 12,* 265-310.

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

Williams, J. C., & Multhaup, M. (2018, March 5). For women and minorities to get ahead, managers must assign work fairly. *Harvard Business Review*. Retrieved from https://hbr.org/2018/03/for-women-and-minorities-to-get-ahead-managers-must-assign-work-fairly

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: RELIABILITIES FOR FACTOR SCALE ITEMS

Reliabilities for Factor Scale Items

Construct / Items	N	Mean	SD	Loadings	α
Factor 1 – Janitorial tasks					**.91**
Task 68 - Emptying the office trash	214	4.11	1.13	.74	
Task 40 - Watering office plants	214	4.11	1.09	.74	
Task 24 - Refilling the water cooler	214	4.01	1.12	.73	
Task 7 - Cleaning up after parties, meetings, or other gatherings	214	4.19	1.00	.66	
Task 9 - Cleaning-related tasks	214	4.17	0.98	.66	
Task 13 - Fixing the coffee machine	214	4.02	1.13	.62	
Task 18 - Refilling the paper or ink in printers, copiers, fax, etc.	214	3.87	1.15	.56	
Task 30 - Setting out candy or office snacks for others	214	3.85	1.19	.53	
Task 34 - Hanging wall items	214	3.75	1.21	.53	
Task 11 - Stocking kitchen supplies	214	4.10	1.04	.51	
Task 26 - Killing or removing pests	214	4.00	1.18	.50	
Task 50 - Making coffee	214	3.84	1.23	.49	
Task 12 - Stocking office supplies	214	3.86	1.10	.49	
Task 70 - Cleaning restrooms	214	4.09	1.19	.47	
Task 64 - Decorating the office for holidays	214	3.85	1.08	.41	
Task 31 - Repairing or assembling furniture	214	3.80	1.14	.38	
Task 8 - Removing recently printed documents from the printer and taking them to employees	214	3.84	1.11	.38	
Factor 2 – Administrative/office mgr. tasks					**.92**
Task 14 - Setting up office hardware	207	3.14	1.27	.67	
Task 15 - Setting up office software	207	3.01	1.25	.66	
Task 16 - Troubleshooting computer or software issues	207	3.03	1.24	.65	
Task 48 - Proof-reading emails for colleagues	207	3.21	1.25	.65	
Task 72 - Handling incoming mail	207	3.40	1.27	.64	
Task 71 - Setting up new employee offices / work stations	207	3.25	1.24	.62	
Task 55 - Answering phones in the conference room	207	3.20	1.27	.61	
Task 1 - Providing back-up for other employees when they are out	207	3.05	1.33	.60	
Task 63 - Setting up meeting spaces	207	3.26	1.25	.58	
Task 49 - Printing, organizing, and/or preparing meeting materials	207	3.05	1.27	.57	
Task 56 - Filling out paperwork for others	207	3.59	1.20	.57	

Reliabilities for Factor Scale Items cont.

Construct / Items	N	Mean	SD	Loadings	α
Task 29 - Supervising or monitoring office guests	207	3.10	1.24	.56	
Task 61 - Shipping packages	207	3.30	1.23	.56	
Task 6 - Helping colleagues prepare for difficult conversations	207	2.99	1.23	.51	
Task 17 - Troubleshooting printer, fax, or copier issues	207	3.57	1.22	.49	
Task 27 - Coordinating others' calendars	207	3.34	1.20	.47	
Task 10 - Scheduling office maintenance	207	3.64	1.11	.46	
Task 51 - Creating presentations for others	207	3.07	1.24	.45	
Task 32 - Giving directions to guests/visitors	207	3.39	1.26	.43	
Task 41 - Researching or booking travel for others	207	3.37	1.18	.42	
Task 35 - Entertaining clients or other guests	207	3.07	1.24	.40	
Task 59 - Making copies for others	207	3.65	1.16	.38	
Task 65 - Filing for others	207	3.65	1.10	.34	
Task 54 - Attending optional meetings, convocations, or other similar events	207	2.98	1.26	.32	
Factor 3 – Emotional support tasks					**.67**
Task 5 - Listening to colleagues vent their frustrations	219	3.28	1.30	.68	
Task 4 - Emotionally supporting upset colleagues	219	3.28	1.25	.60	
Task 3 - Running errands for other employees	219	3.72	1.32	.39	
Task 2 - Handling employee and employee family well-being communications	219	3.35	1.29	.31	
Factor 4 – Party-planner tasks					**.85**
Task 39 - Ordering catering for the office	216	3.56	1.23	.72	
Task 20 - Buying or preparing food for office events or parties	216	3.77	1.20	.67	
Task 28 - Ordering flowers for employees, clients, or others	216	3.62	1.13	.61	
Task 22 - Organizing celebration parties for employees	216	3.64	1.15	.60	
Task 21 - Buying or preparing food for the office	216	3.82	1.08	.53	
Task 19 - Planning office events, parties, conferences, etc.	216	3.35	1.20	.48	
Task 23 - Purchasing cards and/or gifts for employee birthday, retirement, condolences, etc.	216	3.72	1.17	.47	

Reliabilities for Factor Scale Items cont.

Construct / Items	N	Mean	SD	Loadings	α
Task 38 - Making business lunch or dinner reservations	216	3.44	1.23	.40	
Task 37 - Picking up or taking colleagues, supervisors, clients/customers/etc. to the airport	216	3.66	1.11	.35	

APPENDIX B: ALLOCATION METHODS FOR OFFICE HOUSEWORK TASKS

Allocation Methods for Office Housework Tasks

| | Allocation Method | | | | | |
| | Assigned to me | | Volunteered Once | | Volunteer Regularly | |
Task	*n*	%	*n*	%	*n*	%
Task 1 - Providing back-up for other employees when they are out	1	1%	5	3%	5	2%
Task 2 - Handling employee and employee family well-being communications	1	1%	2	1%	3	1%
Task 3 - Running errands for other employees	3	2%	3	2%	6	2%
Task 4 - Emotionally supporting upset colleagues	0	0%	6	4%	12	4%
Task 5 - Listening to colleagues vent their frustrations	0	0%	5	3%	11	4%
Task 6 - Helping colleagues prepare for difficult conversations	0	0%	2	1%	4	1%
Task 7 - Cleaning up after parties, meetings, or other gatherings	2	1%	7	5%	14	5%
Task 8 - Removing recently printed documents from the printer and taking them to employees	1	1%	4	3%	14	5%
Task 9 - Cleaning-related tasks	3	2%	6	4%	13	4%
Task 10 - Scheduling office maintenance	2	1%	1	1%	3	1%
Task 11 - Stocking kitchen supplies	4	3%	5	3%	10	3%
Task 12 - Stocking office supplies	2	1%	4	3%	8	3%
Task 13 - Fixing the coffee machine	0	0%	1	1%	4	1%
Task 14 - Setting up office hardware	2	1%	1	1%	6	2%
Task 15 - Setting up office software	1	1%	0	0%	4	1%
Task 16 - Troubleshooting computer or software issues	2	1%	3	2%	7	2%
Task 17 - Troubleshooting printer, fax, or copier issues	1	1%	5	3%	7	2%
Task 18 - Refilling the paper or ink in printers, copiers, fax, etc.	1	1%	2	1%	7	2%
Task 19 - Planning office events, parties, conferences, etc.	5	4%	5	3%	3	1%
Task 20 - Buying or preparing food for office events or parties	9	7%	3	2%	9	3%

Allocation Methods for Office Housework Tasks cont.

	Allocation Method					
	Assigned to me		Volunteered Once		Volunteer Regularly	
Task	*n*	%	*n*	%	*n*	%
Task 21 - Buying or preparing food for the office	7	5%	5	3%	15	5%
Task 22 - Organizing celebration parties for employees	1	1%	3	2%	4	1%
Task 23 - Purchasing cards and/or gifts for employee birthday, retirement, condolences, etc.	2	1%	6	4%	6	2%
Task 24 - Refilling the water cooler	3	2%	1	1%	2	1%
Task 25 - Lifting or moving heavy objects	4	3%	3	2%	2	1%
Task 26 - Killing or removing pests	0	0%	5	3%	3	1%
Task 27 - Coordinating others' calendars	3	2%	4	3%	1	0%
Task 28 - Ordering flowers for employees, clients, or others	0	0%	3	2%	2	1%
Task 29 - Supervising or monitoring office guests	9	7%	1	1%	3	1%
Task 30 - Setting out candy or office snacks for others	0	0%	6	4%	16	5%
Task 31 - Repairing or assembling furniture	2	1%	2	1%	2	1%
Task 32 - Giving directions to guests/visitors	2	1%	1	1%	3	1%
Task 34 - Hanging wall items	2	1%	4	3%	3	1%
Task 35 - Entertaining clients or other guests	5	4%	1	1%	2	1%
Task 36 - Picking up laundry, groceries, medications, or other items for colleagues, supervisors, or clients	3	2%	2	1%	2	1%
Task 37 - Picking up or taking colleagues, supervisors, clients/customers/etc. to the airport	2	1%	1	1%	2	1%
Task 38 - Making business lunch or dinner reservations	7	5%	2	1%	2	1%
Task 39 - Ordering catering for the office	5	4%	2	1%	3	1%
Task 40 - Watering office plants	0	0%	1	1%	4	1%
Task 41 - Researching or booking travel for others	2	1%	3	2%	2	1%

Allocation Methods for Office Housework Tasks cont.

| | Allocation Method | | | | | |
| | Assigned to me | | Volunteered Once | | Volunteer Regularly | |
Task	*n*	%	*n*	%	*n*	%
Task 48 - Proof-reading emails for colleagues	4	3%	5	3%	9	3%
Task 49 - Printing, organizing, and/or preparing meeting materials	6	4%	1	1%	1	0%
Task 50 - Making coffee	6	4%	9	6%	20	7%
Task 51 - Creating presentations for others	2	1%	1	1%	1	0%
Task 54 - Attending optional meetings, convocations, or other similar events	2	1%	2	1%	3	1%
Task 55 - Answering phones in the conference room	2	1%	1	1%	2	1%
Task 56 - Filling out paperwork for others	6	4%	4	3%	4	1%
Task 59 - Making copies for others	8	6%	3	2%	13	4%
Task 61 - Shipping packages	3	2%	1	1%	4	1%
Task 63 - Setting up meeting spaces	7	5%	2	1%	2	1%
Task 64 - Decorating the office for holidays	3	2%	6	4%	8	3%
Task 65 - Filing for others	3	2%	9	6%	4	1%
Task 68 - Emptying the office trash	2	1%	6	4%	4	1%
Task 70 - Cleaning restrooms	1	1%	2	1%	2	1%
Task 71 - Setting up new employee offices / work stations	5	4%	1	1%	4	1%
Task 72 - Handling incoming mail	3	2%	3	2%	1	0%

Enjoyment of Office Housework Tasks

Task	n	M	SD
Task 64 - Decorating the office for holidays	29	4.28	1.07
Task 22 - Organizing celebration parties for employees	28	4.18	0.67
Task 28 - Ordering flowers for employees, clients, or others	12	4.17	1.03
Task 40 - Watering office plants	31	3.68	1.25
Task 30 - Setting out candy or office snacks for others	53	3.66	0.98
Task 19 - Planning office events, parties, conferences, etc.	23	3.61	0.94
Task 23 - Purchasing cards and/or gifts for employee birthday, retirement, condolences, etc.	46	3.54	1.21
Task 2 - Handling employee and employee family well-being communications	24	3.54	1.06
Task 37 - Picking up or taking colleagues, supervisors, clients/customers/etc. to the airport	12	3.50	1.31
Task 41 - Researching or booking travel for others	12	3.50	1.45
Task 54 - Attending optional meetings, convocations, or other similar events	42	3.48	1.23
Task 21 - Buying or preparing food for the office	51	3.43	1.40
Task 6 - Helping colleagues prepare for difficult conversations	33	3.42	0.97
Task 20 - Buying or preparing food for office events or parties	46	3.41	1.13
Task 50 - Making coffee	65	3.37	1.31
Task 35 - Entertaining clients or other guests	26	3.35	1.29
Task 48 - Proof-reading emails for colleagues	56	3.32	1.05
Task 4 - Emotionally supporting upset colleagues	93	3.26	1.03
Task 38 - Making business lunch or dinner reservations	20	3.25	1.29
Task 51 - Creating presentations for others	10	3.20	1.03
Task 3 - Running errands for other employees	38	3.16	1.03
Task 32 - Giving directions to guests/visitors	49	3.14	0.96
Task 39 - Ordering catering for the office	21	3.14	1.28
Task 34 - Hanging wall items	30	3.00	1.46
Task 14 - Setting up office hardware	30	2.97	0.93
Task 71 - Setting up new employee offices / work stations	23	2.91	1.16
Task 5 - Listening to colleagues vent their frustrations	120	2.89	1.06
Task 15 - Setting up office software	24	2.88	1.36
Task 31 - Repairing or assembling furniture	20	2.85	1.39
Task 11 - Stocking kitchen supplies	37	2.84	1.12

Enjoyment of Office Housework Tasks cont.

Task	*n*	*M*	*SD*
Task 8 - Removing recently printed documents from the printer and taking them to employees	72	2.81	1.07
Task 59 - Making copies for others	56	2.80	1.07
Task 29 - Supervising or monitoring office guests	22	2.77	1.48
Task 72 - Handling incoming mail	22	2.77	1.23
Task 36 - Picking up laundry, groceries, medications, or other items for colleagues, supervisors, or clients	8	2.75	1.16
Task 13 - Fixing the coffee machine	22	2.73	1.16
Task 55 - Answering phones in the conference room	18	2.72	1.18
Task 16 - Troubleshooting computer or software issues	57	2.67	1.24
Task 61 - Shipping packages	21	2.62	1.02
Task 49 - Printing, organizing, and/or preparing meeting materials	14	2.57	1.22
Task 1 - Providing back-up for other employees when they are out	28	2.54	1.00
Task 12 - Stocking office supplies	34	2.53	1.08
Task 63 - Setting up meeting spaces	23	2.48	1.16
Task 56 - Filling out paperwork for others	31	2.42	1.03
Task 17 - Troubleshooting printer, fax, or copier issues	75	2.37	1.09
Task 65 - Filing for others	35	2.37	1.14
Task 9 - Cleaning-related tasks	62	2.35	1.15
Task 18 - Refilling the paper or ink in printers, copiers, fax, etc.	63	2.32	1.03
Task 27 - Coordinating others' calendars	14	2.21	1.19
Task 24 - Refilling the water cooler	31	2.16	1.32
Task 10 - Scheduling office maintenance	21	2.10	0.89
Task 25 - Lifting or moving heavy objects	49	1.98	1.01
Task 7 - Cleaning up after parties, meetings, or other gatherings	66	1.95	0.97
Task 68 - Emptying the office trash	51	1.86	1.08
Task 26 - Killing or removing pests	38	1.66	1.32
Task 70 - Cleaning restrooms	19	1.37	0.68

APPENDIX D: IRB APPROVAL

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

MIDDLE TENNESSEE STATE UNIVERSITY

IRBN007 – EXEMPTION DETERMINATION NOTICE

Friday, February 16, 2018

Investigator(s):	Elizabeth Adams; Judith Van Hein, Kimberly Ujcich Ward, Richard Moffett
Investigator(s') Email(s):	era2v@mtmail.mtsu.edu; Judith.VanHein@mtsu.edu
Department:	Psychology
Study Title:	Operationalizing Office Housework: What is it, who does it, and why?
Protocol ID:	**18-1156**

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	EXEMPT from furhter IRB review***	
Date of expiration	**NOT APPLICABLE**	
Participant Size	100 [One Hundred]	
Participant Pool	**Adults 18+**	
Mandatory Restrictions	1. Informed consent must be obtained	
	2. Participants must be age 18+	
	3. Identifiable information may not be collected	
Additional Restrictions	**None at this time**	
Comments	None at this time	
Amendments	**Date**	**Post-Approval Amendments**
		None at this time

***This exemption determination only allows above defined protocol from further IRB review such as continuing review. However, the following post-approval requirements still apply:
- Addition/removal of subject population should not be implemented without IRB approval
- Change in investigators must be notified and approved
- Modifications to procedures must be clearly articulated in an addendum request and the proposed changes must not be incorporated without an approval
- Be advised that the proposed change must comply within the requirements for exemption
- Changes to the research location must be approved – appropriate permission letter(s) from external institutions must accompany the addendum request form
- Changes to funding source must be notified via email (irb_submissions@mtsu.edu)

Institutional Review Board   Office of Compliance   Middle Tennessee State University

- The exemption does not expire as long as the protocol is in good standing
- Project completion must be reported via email (irb_submissions@mtsu.edu)
- Research-related injuries to the participants and other events must be reported within 48 hours of such events to compliance@mtsu.edu

The current MTSU IRB policies allow the investigators to make the following types of changes to this protocol without the need to report to the Office of Compliance, as long as the proposed changes do not result in the cancellation of the protocols eligibility for exemption:
- Editorial and minor administrative revisions to the consent form or other study documents
- Increasing/decreasing the participant size

The investigator(s) indicated in this notification should read and abide by all applicable post-approval conditions imposed with this approval. Refer to the post-approval guidelines posted in the MTSU IRB's website. Any unanticipated harms to participants or adverse events must be reported to the Office of Compliance at (615) 494-8918 within 48 hours of the incident.

All of the research-related records, which include signed consent forms, current & past investigator information, training certificates, survey instruments and other documents related to the study, must be retained by the PI or the faculty advisor (if the PI is a student) at the sacure location mentioned in the protocol application. The data storage must be maintained for at least three (3) years after study completion. Subsequently, the researcher may destroy the data in a manner that maintains confidentiality and anonymity. IRB reserves the right to modify, change or cancel the terms of this letter without prior 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:
> Click here for a detailed list of the post-approval responsibilities.
> More information on exmpt procedures can be found here.