

OFFICE HOUSEWORK, THE BIG 5 PERSONALITY, AND WORK VALUES: A
CORRELATIONAL STUDY

By

Autumn L. Bourque

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 2023

Thesis Committee:

Dr. Judith Van Hein, Chair

Dr. Kimberly Ujcich Ward

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to extend my gratitude to my thesis committee for walking alongside me during the process of this research. Additionally, I would like to thank all the friends and family who have supported me. It takes a village, and I am truly appreciative of you all.

ABSTRACT

This research focused on the link between Office Housework, the Big 5, and Work Values. The limited research on Office Housework suggests that it is an important behavior category to pursue due to potential negative implications for individuals who engage in these behaviors, despite the reality that these behaviors are necessary to the maintain the status quo in a work environment. We tested correlations between Office Housework behaviors and each of the Big 5 personality traits, as well as correlations between Office Housework and a handful of relevant Work Values. For the Big 5 personality traits, we found a positive correlation between Office Housework and conscientiousness, openness, and extraversion. For the Work Values tested, we found a positive correlation between Office Housework and the Helping and Supporting, Enjoyment, and Rule Respecting Values. This research provides potential for a better understanding of the kind of individual who engages in Office Housework.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE.....	6
Office Housework.....	6
Occupational Citizenship Behavior.....	7
Big 5 Personality Traits.....	10
Work Values.....	15
CHAPTER II: METHODS.....	21
Participants.....	21
Procedures.....	22
Measures.....	24
Office Housework.....	24
Big 5 Personality.....	24
Work Values.....	25
Demographic Items.....	25
CHAPTER III: RESULTS.....	26
CHAPTER IV: DISCUSSION.....	31
Limitations and Future Research.....	33
Conclusion.....	35
REFERENCES.....	36
APPENDICES.....	42
Appendix A: Descriptive Statistics for Demographic Variable.....	43
Appendix B: IRB Approval Letter.....	44
Appendix C: Informed Consent.....	46
Appendix D: Online Survey.....	54

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Reliability Analysis for All Variables.....	26
Table 2. Descriptive Statistics for All Variables.....	27
Table 3. Correlation Matrix of All Variables.....	30

CHAPTER I: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Office Housework

Imagine you're someone so committed to your job that you go beyond your typical duties, volunteering for duties outside of those required of you. Ideally, your efforts will be recognized in some way. Maybe it will help you get a raise, or even a promotion. Those who go beyond the bare necessities are recognized, right? This seems like a logical case to make, but sometimes it is not the case. A widely cited popular media article suggests that women who engage in Office Housework (OHW) behaviors often suffer from hindered career advancement because of their focus on OHW behaviors (Williams, 2014). Other popular media has thrown around terms like "Glamour work" for this phenomenon (Williams & Multhaup, 2018). To conceptualize this, the limited research on this topic has stuck with the term "office housework" (Jang et al., 2021).

Office housework is operationally defined by two things: behaviors necessary for a business to run that are also not formally recognized. Jang et al. (2021) defined Office Housework as being "menial administrative tasks that keep an office running." Common behaviors associated with OHW are split into two main categories: social maintenance and object maintenance. Social maintenance includes party planning, getting cards for coworkers, and emotional support. Object maintenance includes fixing what is broken or moving heavy things (Jang et al., 2021). Current research has investigated possible new applications, specifically among faculty members taking part in committees, though

results suggested that while there is some disproportionate distribution of work in faculty among demographics, committee membership is not included (Porter, 2007). Research investigating the implications made by (Grant & Sandberg, 2015) found support for the idea that women engaged in more Office Housework than men do. They also found a positive relationship between Office Housework behaviors and promotion for men, but not for women. This suggests that men are likely to benefit from OHW, while women would not benefit or be hurt by OHW (Jang et al., 2021).

Occupational Citizenship Behavior

A commonly referenced concept within the Office Housework literature is that of Occupational Citizenship Behavior. To discuss this concept, there are a few prerequisites that must be addressed. In an organization, behavior is generally characterized by the value it brings to the organization to which the individual belongs. This idea is known as job performance (Motowidlo, 2003). Job performance has two ways it can be categorized: task performance and contextual performance. Task performance is known as actions that create the products the organization sells, including tasks that maintain the creation of goods (e.g., restocking raw materials, planning, and supervision, etc.). The second type of job performance, contextual performance, is actions that add to the effectiveness of the organization by influencing the humans doing the work. These behaviors affect individuals by increasing their own willingness to perform in a way that

is beneficial to the organization, and this willingness spreads to those around the person engaging in the contextual behaviors (Motowidlo, 2003).

Similar in definition to contextual behavior is Occupational Citizenship Behavior (OCB). The definition of OCB's has changed over the years. First coined by Organ (1988), OCB's were defined as, ". . . individual behavior that is discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system, and that in the aggregate promotes the effective functioning of the organization," (Organ, 1988, p. 4). Nearly ten years later, Organ (1997) defined them as ". . . contributions to the maintenance and enhancement of the social and psychological context that supports task performance." (p. 91). Motowidlo (2003) gave a more concise definition of OCB's, specifically that they are virtually identical to contextual performance (p. 47). Organ (1997) recognized this and suggested that OCB's not be thought of as going above and beyond and as being unrewarded . OCB's may also be linked to beliefs about job characteristics (Willaims & Anderson, 1991). Further research into OCB's has classified them into two major and distinct classes of behavior (Smith et al., 1983) and performance (Willaims & Anderson, 1991). The first class of OCB's is known as OCB-O, or Organizational Citizenship behaviors that benefit the organization. The second class of OCB's is known as OCB-I, or Organizational Citizenship behaviors that benefit individuals, indirectly benefitting the organization through the individuals (Willaims & Anderson, 1991). Further research found that extrinsic components of job cognitions predicted OCB-O performance, while

intrinsic components of job cognitions predicted OCB-I performance (Williams & Anderson, 1991).

Another facet of the literature on OCB's revolves around the outcomes of OCB's. OCB's enhance positive affect in the individual rating the performance of employees, thus having a positive influence on outcomes like evaluation ratings and recommendations for rewards. In fact, OCB enhances the predictive relationship between task performance and evaluation and reward recommendations beyond task performance alone (Allen & Rush, 1998). There is also research investigating gender differences in rewards for OCB behaviors. Heilman and Chen (2005) investigated outcomes for women participating in altruism and found that women, in comparison to men doing identical behaviors, do not reap rewards from behaving altruistically, and they are disciplined when they do not behave altruistically. Similarly, they also found that the same citizenship behaviors are considered to be within the scope of the job or out of the scope of the job depending on which sex is performing the behavior (Heilman & Chen, 2005). In other words, women are expected to engage in citizenship behaviors without rewards, but men are not expected to perform the same behaviors and are rewarded when they do.

Given that occupational citizenship behaviors and office housework share some similarities in nature, it is natural to wonder whether the two are different constructs. Some research has found that OHW is related to but not the same as OCB, while also suggesting that OHW should be conceptually considered a "low value" type of OCB

(Jang et al., 2021). Other research has determined that the two are conceptually different constructs (Mussleman, 2020).

Big 5 Personality Traits

Another facet of individuals featured in employment related research is personality traits. A popular measure is the Big 5 Personality Trait Inventory. The five traits included are: Openness, Conscientiousness, Extraversion, Agreeableness, and Neuroticism. (John et al., 2008). Openness to experience can be defined as including a broad and original approach to life. Individuals who exhibit this trait tend to have broad interests and are imaginative, original, and insightful. Conscientiousness can be defined as having control over impulses due to social pressures. Individuals who exhibit this trait tend to be organized, thorough, efficient, responsible, reliable, and engage in planning behaviors. Extraversion can be defined as having energy for socialization and the world in general. Individuals who exhibit this trait tend to be talkative, assertive, active, energetic, outgoing, and outspoken. Agreeableness can be defined as being likely to engage in prosocial behaviors typically oriented towards one's community. Individuals who exhibit this trait tend to be altruistic, sympathetic, kind, appreciative, affectionate, and soft-hearted. Neuroticism can be defined as having negative emotional tendencies. Individuals who exhibit this trait tend to be tense, anxious, nervous, moody, and sad.

To date, there is no research linking the Big 5 Personality traits to OHW. There is, however, a plethora of research linking the Big 5 to Occupational Citizenship Behaviors.

Assuming the two are distinct and separate constructs, there are still some similarities between the two, as demonstrated previously. Therefore, it is worth exploring possible relationships that OCB's have with personality traits because this may hint at some possible relationships between OHW and OCB. The general literature shows that personality has associations with contextual behaviors (Chiaburu et al., 2011) because of their influence on contextual knowledge, skills, and habits of individuals (Motowidlo et al., 1997), though it may also be worth considering the mediation of personal motive to better explain the relationship between personality traits and behavior (Carlo et al., 2005). Additionally, personality may better explain citizenship behaviors than task performance (e.g., Chiaburu et al., 2011; Motowidlo et al., 1997).

Conscientiousness

Conscientiousness has been found to be an excellent predictor of Organizational Citizenship Behaviors (Motowidlo et al., 1997). Consistent with conscientious individuals' tendencies to be motivated by achievement, conscientious individuals engage in OCB's, which will likely help them achieve the goals they have sought after (Chiaburu et al., 2011). Conscientiousness has better predictive evidence for compliance related OCB's (Heimann et al., 2021), IM-motivated OCB's (Bourdage et al., 2012), OCB's motivated by organizational concern (Bourdage et al., 2012), and OCB's motivated by prosocial values (Bourdage et al., 2012). Conscientiousness was also found to be positively related to generalized compliance and altruism (Organ & Ryan, 1995). It was

found to have similar magnitude relationships to citizenship and task performance (Chiaburu et al., 2011), with its relationship with task performance likely explained through its influence on task habits (Motowidlo et al., 1997). In sum, due to the links between conscientiousness and prosocial values, altruism, and citizenship performance, and overall OCB's, it is possible that there is a correlation between conscientiousness and OHW. The evidence above led us to our first hypothesis:

Hypothesis 1: Office Housework has a positive correlation with conscientiousness.

Agreeableness

The nature of being agreeable naturally coincides with OCB's, with characteristics of agreeableness being centered around kindness, being considerate, likeableness, cooperativeness, and helpfulness (Graziano & Eisenberg, 1997); people who are agreeable tend to extend their considerate behaviors beyond their peers by helping their organizations through extra role behavior (Bourdage et al., 2012). Agreeableness has a positive relationship with helping related OCB behaviors (Heimann et al., 2021) and organizational concern motivated OCB behaviors but was not positively related to motives surrounding prosocial behavior (Bourdage et al., 2012). Like extraversion, agreeableness has a strong relationship with volunteerism when compared to the other three personality traits (Carlo et al., 2005). Individuals who are agreeable and place value in prosocial behavior tend to obey requests of other individuals, which leads to the presence of volunteering behavior to help meet the needs of other individuals

(Carlo et al., 2005). In sum, the research supports links between agreeableness and OCB related behaviors such as helping and volunteering; it is plausible that there is a correlation between agreeableness and OHW due to the similarities between OHW and OCB's. Because of this evidence, we were led to our second hypothesis:

Hypothesis 2: Office Housework has a positive correlation with agreeableness.

The following Big 5 personality trait research pertaining to Occupational Citizenship Behavior and Office Housework are detailed below, though due to insufficient evidence to support a hypothesis, they were included as exploratory research questions.

Openness

Openness has had promising predictive evidence for initiative to engage in OCB behaviors (Heimann et al., 2021). It was also found to positively relate to OCB's that have prosocial motivations (Bourdage et al., 2012). It was also found to have a stronger relationship with citizenship behaviors than task performance. Though the research on openness and OCB's is limited, the results are encouraging. In sum, research on openness shows the possibility for open individuals to not only engage in OCB's but also be inclined towards prosocial/citizenship behaviors in general. Due to the similarities between OCB's and OHW, it is possible that there be some correlation between Openness and OHW. For this reason, the following research question was developed:

Research Question 1: Office Housework has a positive correlation with openness.

Extraversion

Extraversion has some links to OCB's. Individuals who are extraverted tend to engage in volunteering OCB behaviors, likely because of encouragement from peers to volunteer that serves as motivation (Carlo et al., 2005). Similar to conscientiousness, extraversion has relationships to both OCB's and task performance (Chiaburu et al., 2011). While the literature on this trait is lacking, it shows some promise. Due to the possible relationship found between OCB's and extraversion found in the limited research and because all other Big 5 factors are included in this study, we were led to include this factor as part of our measure. Based on the limited data connecting extraversion and OCB's, we created the following research question:

Research Question 2: Office Housework has a positive correlation with extraversion.

Neuroticism

Neuroticism has the least amount of presence in the literature among the other four traits as they related to OCB's. Similar to some of the other traits, the opposite side of neuroticism (i.e., emotional stability) has a similar magnitude relationship with OCB's and task performance (Chiaburu et al., 2011). Due to the lack of existence of any positive relationships between neuroticism and OCB's, it was difficult to create a plausible research question. As we are including the other four factors of the Big 5 in this research, we found value in including this factor as well in the event that any correlation might be found. Because the limited research shows positive associations between emotional

stability (i.e., no neuroticism) and OCB's, we thought it possible that there be a negative relationship between neuroticism and OHW due to the similarities between OCB's and OHW. This led us to develop the following research question:

Research Question 3: Office Housework has a negative correlation with neuroticism.

Work Values

A less researched but potentially valuable tool measuring personal traits are work values inventories. In general, work values have been studied extensively, though there are some conceptual issues in regard to creating a central operational definition (Dose, 1997). Some researchers consider work values as a way for individuals to judge what is right or wrong in their environments at work (Dose, 1997; Judge & Bretz, 1992). Others consider it to be a way to measure cultural dimensions and representation of characteristics that influence job behaviors (Matić, 2008). The difficulties in finding a central operational definition are highlighted by Dose (1997), who created a framework to conceptualize the differing directions that various work values-related inventories have taken. The framework consists of four quadrants, with the x-axis varying from personal to social consensus related values, and the y-axis varying from moral to preference related values. According to Dose (1997), there are two different issues within the work values literature. First, as demonstrated by the framework, the lack of definition has resulted in varying branches with narrow focus that do not all relate in a clear way. Second, the lack

of clear definition also leaves the debate of whether work values should be strictly preferential or whether researchers should also consider socially acceptable preferences.

As one would expect given the varying amounts of related inventories, there are a plethora of different genres or categories one could classify as a work value. Judge (1992) includes achievement, concern for others, honesty, and fairness. Chen and Choi (2008) took the four-quadrant framework approach, including dimensions in comfort and security, professional growth, personal growth, and work environment. Ryan (1992) included hard work and independence related dimensions. Others have focused on values that generalize cross-culturally, like Gomez-Mejia (1986) who included responsibility, autonomy, ability utilization, accomplishment, challenge, working conditions, company policy, company organization, and job security. The inventory of significance, however, is the Values at Work Scale, which was inspired by Schwartz's personal values questionnaire (Albrecht et al., 2020; Schwartz et al., 2012). It includes eleven factors: authority, ambition, enjoyment, variety, autonomy, social justice, environmental sustainability, helping and supporting, rule respecting, traditional values, and safety (Albrecht et al., 2020).

Work values can vary in their impact on an organization. They can impact decisions made by job seekers when they know information about the organization's value systems, including decisions related to job choice (Judge & Bretz, 1992). Work values can also be an important factor for management, with implications for employee

motivation and organizational communication (Matić, 2008). More specifically, most of the values included by Judge (1992) predicted whether or not an individual would accept a job under the conditions of a match between the value and the orientation towards that value of an individual.

Currently, there is no available research connecting work values to Office Housework. Relatedly, there is a very limited selection of research connecting OCB's and work values. The best research done in this area is on the Protestant Work Ethic inventory (PWE) by John (2002), who found encouraging evidence of dispositional motivation for engagement in OCB's (Ryan, 2002). More specifically, this inventory has two dimensions: a hard work dimension and an independence dimension. The hard work dimension had a significant positive relation to helping behavior and civic virtue. As mentioned by John (2002), this poses the possibility that people who place value in working hard tend to also value helping other people. Conversely, the independence dimension had a significant negative correlation with helping behaviors. Unfortunately, there is no research exploring relationships between the Values at Work Scale dimensions and OCB's. Because of this, educated guesses will be made to influence research questions in this area based on the characteristics of each Values at Work Scale dimensions. Of the 11 dimensions, 5 will be addressed in this research. Dimensions not addressed were determined to be unlikely to be related based on the characteristics associated with the value. The 5 dimensions determined to be of relevance are detailed below:

Helping and Supporting

The Helping and Supporting value involves helping and supporting others and making improvements in the lives of other people (Albrecht et al., 2020). Office housework behaviors typically involve either social maintenance or object maintenance (Jang et al., 2021), with the core behavior helping or contributing to the workplace in some way. Due to the similarities they share in providing some sort of help or support to others, particularly in the workplace, we suspect a possible correlation between the two, leading to the final hypothesis:

Hypothesis 3: Office Housework has a positive correlation with the Helping and Supporting value.

The following work values research pertaining to Office Housework are detailed below, though due to insufficient evidence to support a hypothesis, they were included as exploratory research questions.

Enjoyment

According to Albrecht et al. (2020), individuals who value enjoyment from their jobs seek pleasurable experiences, want enjoyment from their work, and want to experience fun at work. It is possible that people who engage in OHW behaviors do so because they enjoy them. For example, someone who enjoys connecting with others might find enjoyment in providing social support for a coworker. For this reason, we

think it is plausible to find a positive correlation between OHW and the Enjoyment Value, detailed in our research question

Research Question 4: Office Housework has a positive correlation with the Enjoyment value.

Rule respecting

The Rule Respecting value involves working where things are orderly, people believe in the importance of rules and support them even if nobody is watching, and where individuals can contribute to the respect of the workplace rules (Albrecht et al., 2020). It is possible that people who engage in Office Housework may perceive their actions as contributions to maintaining order in their workplace, or they may view it as a way of respecting rules of their workplace. For these reasons, we think it is plausible that there is a positive correlation between OHW and Rule Respecting, leading to the following research question:

Research Question 5: Office Housework has a positive correlation with the Rule Respecting value.

Variety

The Variety value involves getting a variety of work, tasks or challenges and a lack of repetition in work (Albrecht et al., 2020). It is possible that individuals might pick up Office Housework behaviors to gain more varied experiences in their work. For this

reason, we think it is plausible that there is a positive correlation between OHW and Variety, leading to the following research question:

Research Question 6: Office Housework has a positive correlation with the Variety value.

Ambition

The Ambition value involves advancing one's career, getting promoted, being ambitious and successful, and increasing earnings (Albrecht et al., 2020). Given that the general definition of Office Housework specifies that these behaviors are menial (Jang et al., 2021), it is possible that people looking to advance their careers and get promoted would not engage in OHW behaviors, or that people who do not place as much value in ambition would engage in OHW behaviors. For this reason, we think it is plausible that there is a negative correlation between OHW and Ambition, leading us to the following hypothesis:

Research Question 7: Office Housework has a negative correlation with the Ambition value.

CHAPTER II: METHOD

Participants

Our participants came from two sources. We recruited 150 participants through Prolific and recruited 15 through social media. Between the two recruitment methods, there were 165 participants in all. To be eligible, participants needed 18 years of age or older, currently working in the United States, fluent in reading, speaking, and writing in English, and have at least one year of work experience in an office (in person at least 50% of the time). If eligible, participants were able to complete the survey. Participants who participated through Prolific were paid an incentive to participate (\$ 3.33).

Of the 165 participants, 52 were male, 111 were female, and 2 indicated that neither of those categories described them. On average, participants were 37.87 years old ($SD = 10.81$), ranging from 23 to 85 years old. To summarize the race and ethnicity of our participants, 79.4% identified as white, 8.0% identified as black, 14% identified as Asian, 0% identified as American Indian or Alaska Native, 6.0% identified as mixed, and 6.0% identified as Latino and Hispanic. In terms of educational background, 7.3% reported having a high school diploma or less, 12.7% reported having some college, 7.9% reported having an Associate's degree, 49.1% reported having a Bachelor's degree, and 22.4% reported having a professional degree, Master's degree, or Doctorate. On average, participants indicated that they had been in their current job for 6.91 years ($SD = 5.47$),

ranging from 1 year to 27 years. See Appendix A for a more detailed view of demographic information.

Procedures

Our study was sent to, reviewed by, and approved by the Institutional Review Board at Middle Tennessee State University. Please see the approval letter in Appendix B for more information. A Qualtrics survey was used to gather data from participants. Participants were recruited for the study using a description of the study and the participation requirements along with an anonymous link to the Qualtrics study. The study was advertised with the title of this paper with one modification. Instead of mentioning Office Housework specifically, we changed it to instead advertise as “Office Tasks, The Big 5, and Work Values” in order to limit the probability of self-selection bias of participants who know and care more about Office Housework. Participants were recruited first through social media (Facebook and LinkedIn). After about a week of collecting participants through social media, the study was posted to Prolific to obtain the rest of the participants. Participants were selected through a standard sample of individuals meeting the prescreen requirements. Participants were prescreened with the following criteria through Prolific: fluent in English, United States nationality, participants who always work from a central place of work or those who sometimes work from a central place of work and sometimes remotely, those who are currently employed full-time, and participants from the following employment sectors: Business Management

& Administration, Finance, Government & Public Administration, Information Technology, Legal, Marketing and Sales, Science, Technology, Engineering, Mathematics, and Social Sciences. These criteria built into Prolific were selected to pull from a sample more likely to be working in an office at least 50% of the time, per our requirements, thus limiting the possibility of Prolific sending the study to individuals who did not meet the criteria.

Participants who clicked the link to the survey were prompted with informed consent and a brief description of the study, which can be found in Appendix C. Next, participants needed to verify that they met the criteria to participate in order to continue the survey, as well as a question asking if they consented to participate. Individuals who did not meet all of the criteria or who did not consent to participate were presented with a message notifying them of their ineligibility and thanking them for their time.

Participants who met the requirements and consented to the study were first presented with a general scale measuring Office Housework, followed by a scale measuring the Big 5 personality traits with two attention check questions imbedded, then a scale measuring five Work Values with an additional two attention check questions imbedded. Our criteria state that participants who failed to answer at least 3 attention check questions correctly should be removed from the study, but no participants missed more than two attention checks. Therefore, no participants were removed from the data for failing the attention check questions. Participants were then presented with

demographic questions asking them to input their gender, sex, ethnicity, level of education, and their number of years in their current job. At the end of the survey, participants were presented with a debriefing statement that included contact information of the researchers. Participants were then informed their response was recorded and thanked for their time.

Measures

Office Housework

Participants answered 10 questions designed to measure Office Housework behaviors in general, containing no subscales (Jang et al., 2021). The ten questions described different Office Housework behaviors. Participants were asked to rate the frequency they performed the behaviors described even if not part of their official job duties. To respond to each question, the participant answered a Likert scale from 1 (*Never*) to 5 (*Frequently*).

Big 5 Personality

Participants completed the Big Five Inventory (John et al., 2008). This questionnaire is a set of 44 questions aimed at measuring a person's openness, conscientiousness, extraversion, agreeableness, and neuroticism. To answer each question, participants were given a statement and asked to rate the extent to which they

felt the statement applied to them using a Likert scale from 1 (*Disagree Strongly*) to 5 (*Agree strongly*).

Work Values

Participants completed a modified version of the Values at Work Inventory (Albrecht et al., 2020). This questionnaire is a set of 25 statements (modified from the original inventory, which had 52 statements) designed to measure a person's work values (i.e., Enjoyment, Helping and Supporting, Rule Respecting, Variety, and Ambition). To answer each question, the participants rated the importance of each item on a Likert scale from 1 (*Extremely unimportant*) to 7 (*Extremely important*).

Demographic Items

Participants reported their gender, age, race/ethnicity, highest level of education they received, and how many years they have held their current job.

CHAPTER III: RESULTS

As a precaution, the reliability of the scales used was analyzed in order to eliminate any items that may threaten the overall reliability of the scale. The following variables were tested for reliability: Office Housework, Openness, Conscientiousness, Extraversion, Agreeableness, Neuroticism, Enjoyment, Helping and Supporting, Rule Respecting, Variety, and Ambition. The final coefficient alpha of each can be found in Table 1.

Cronbach's alpha for the 11 scales tested ranged from 0.81 to 0.94. As a result of the adequate reliability of each scale, no items were removed from any of the scales.

Descriptive statistics for all scales can be found in Table 2.

Table 1
Reliability Analysis for All Variables

Variable	Number of items	Cronbach's Alpha
Office Housework	10	.86
Openness	10	.81
Conscientiousness	9	.86
Extraversion	8	.91
Agreeableness	9	.85
Neuroticism	8	.90
Enjoyment	5	.92
Helping and supporting	5	.94
Rule Respecting	5	.89
Variety	5	.94
Ambition	5	.87

Table 2
Descriptive Statistics for All Variables

Variable	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Office Housework	165	2.43	0.76
Openness	165	3.68	0.66
Conscientiousness	165	4.16	0.67
Extraversion	165	2.99	1.03
Agreeableness	165	3.99	0.71
Neuroticism	165	2.42	0.95
Enjoyment	165	4.85	1.16
Helping and supporting	165	5.35	1.17
Rule Respecting	165	5.04	1.06
Variety	165	4.80	1.22
Ambition	165	5.31	0.76

Note. Scales for Office Housework, openness, conscientiousness, extraversion, agreeableness, and neuroticism use a 1 – 5 Likert rating scale. Scales for enjoyment, helping and supporting, rule respecting, variety, and ambition use a 1 – 7 Likert rating scale. Higher rating scores indicate more of the characteristic measured.

Hypothesis 1 posited that Office Housework would have a positive correlation with conscientiousness. Pearson's correlation ($\alpha = .05$) indicated Office Housework and conscientiousness were positively correlated, $r(165) = 0.16, p < 0.05$.

Hypothesis 2 posited that Office Housework would have a positive correlation with openness. Pearson's correlation ($\alpha = .05$) indicated Office Housework and conscientiousness were not positively correlated, $r(165) = 0.14, p > 0.05$.

Hypothesis 3 posited that Office Housework would have a positive correlation with the Helping and Supporting value. Pearson's correlation ($\alpha = .05$) indicated

Office Housework and conscientiousness were positively correlated, $r(165) = 0.34, p < 0.01$.

As for our research questions, we found support for some, but not all. We found support for our first research question, which posited that Office Housework would have a positive correlation with openness, $r(165) = 0.18, p < 0.05$. We also found support for our second research question, which posited that Office Housework would have a positive correlation with extraversion, $r(165) = 0.2, p < 0.01$. We did not find support for our third research question, suggesting that there is no significant correlation between Office Housework and neuroticism. We found support for our fourth research question, which posited that Office Housework would have a positive correlation with the enjoyment value, $r(165) = 0.22, p < 0.01$. We also found support for our fifth research question, which posited that Office Housework would have a positive correlation with the rule respecting value, $r(165) = 0.25, p < 0.01$. We did not find support for our sixth and seventh research questions, suggesting that Office housework does not have a significant correlation with the variety or ambition values. See Table 3 for the full correlation matrix.

Out of interest in the possibility of gender playing a role in our results, we ran basic descriptives, correlations, and t-tests split by gender. Overall, we found some differences in correlations between some of our variables and Office Housework between men and women. Men and women each had personality variables that correlated with Office Housework, though the variables that correlated were different. Women had

correlations between Office Housework and both openness and extraversion, while men had correlations with Office Housework and both conscientiousness and agreeableness. While less drastic, women had a correlation with Office Housework and the enjoyment value when men did not. Means between the two groups on these variables do not appear to have any major differences, and t-tests run by the researchers indicated no significant differences between the two groups on any of the problematic variables. These results, while puzzling, may be of significance for future research.

Table 1
Correlation Matrix of All Variables

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
1. Office Housework	-										
2. Openness	.18*	-									
3. Conscientious- ness	.16*	.36**	-								
4. Extraversion	.22**	.36**	.32**	-							
5. Agreeableness	.14	.18*	.38**	.42**	-						
6. Neuroticism	-.09	-.22**	-.54**	-.44**	-.54**	-					
7. Enjoyment	.22**	.16*	.10	.29**	.41**	-.16*	-				
8. Helping and supporting	.34**	.36**	.31**	.24**	.46**	-.12	.53**	-			
9. Rule Respecting	.25**	.24**	.34**	.08	.29**	-.02	.34**	.71**	-		
10. Variety	.11	.36**	.18*	.29**	.19*	-.17*	.52**	.49**	.37**	-	
11. Ambition	.15	.19*	.23**	.19*	.25**	-.03	.45**	.35**	.36**	.30*	-

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ ($n=165$)

CHAPTER IV: DISCUSSION

Two of our three hypotheses centered around connecting Office Housework to the Big 5, conscientiousness and agreeableness to be specific. Of the two, only our hypothesis positively correlating conscientiousness to Office Housework was supported. This suggests that conscientious individuals might be more likely to engage in Office Housework behaviors, potentially mirroring the strong research connecting conscientiousness to Occupational Citizenship Behaviors. It is surprising that our hypotheses surrounding agreeableness and Office Housework was not supported, given the amount of research linking agreeableness to Occupational Citizenship behaviors. Perhaps agreeableness does not correlate with Office Housework because agreeableness does not play a role in what causes an individual to engage in Office Housework behaviors. The rest of the Big 5 traits were explored as part of our research questions. We found support for our research questions suggesting positive correlations between Office Housework and both openness and extraversion. The positive correlation between Office Housework and Openness suggests that openness might play a role in what causes an individual to engage in Office Housework behaviors, mirroring results of research linking openness to Occupational Citizenship Behaviors. Interestingly, our research question suggesting a positive correlation between Office Housework and extraversion was also supported. Perhaps this suggests that individuals who are extraverted might be more likely to engage in Office Housework behaviors. This is interesting, given the lack of research between extraversion and Occupational Citizenship Behaviors, though perhaps

the differences between Office Housework and Occupational Citizenship behaviors may explain this difference. Our final research question investigating a negative correlation between Office Housework and neuroticism was not supported, suggesting that neuroticism does not play a role in whether an individual engages in Office Housework behavior or not. This is unsurprising, given the general lack of research connecting neuroticism to Organizational Citizenship Behaviors. Summing our findings on the links between Office Housework and the Big 5, we found correlational links between Office Housework and conscientiousness, openness, and extraversion, suggesting individuals who have those traits might be more likely to engage in Office Housework behaviors than those who are not.

As for our results pertaining to Work Values, our final hypothesis suggested a positive correlation between Office Housework and the Helping and Supporting value. We found support for this hypothesis, suggesting that individuals who place value in helping and supporting others are likely to engage in Office Housework behaviors, which involve behaviors that help others within an individual's work environment. We found support for two of our research questions pertaining to Work values: Enjoyment and Rule Respecting. We found support for a positive correlation between Office Housework and the Enjoyment value, suggesting that individuals who engage in Office Housework may do so because they seek out enjoyable experiences at work, alluding that individuals may find Office Housework inherently enjoyable. Additionally, we found support for a positive correlation between Office Housework and the Rule Respecting value,

suggesting that individuals who engage in Office Housework behaviors may do so because they value order and rule following in the workplace. Our final two research questions proposing links between Office Housework and Work Values were not supported. We did not find a correlation between Office Housework and the Variety value, suggesting that individuals who value variety of experiences in their workplaces may not necessarily engage in Office Housework behaviors as a means of gaining variety of experience. Similarly, we did not find a correlation between Office Housework and the Ambition value, suggesting that there may not be reason to suspect that ambitious individuals would or would not engage in Office Housework to advance their careers. Our overall findings on Work Values show correlational links between Office Housework and the Helping and Supporting, Enjoyment, and Rule Respecting values.

Given the plausibility of the likelihood of women to engage in Office Housework behaviors more so than men, we ran some additional analyses to see if gender played a role in our results. We found some puzzling results, with some variables correlating significantly with Office Housework for one gender, but not the other. The researchers looked for clues among the descriptive statistics and using t-tests, however no clear reason for these differences was found, suggesting a possible avenue for future research.

Limitations and Future Research

There were several limitations to this research. First, Office Housework is a new and under-researched topic overall. There was no previous research connecting Office

Housework to both the Big 5 and Work Values. Thus, much of the research leading to our hypotheses and research questions was pulled from the Occupational Citizenship Behavior research, which, while similar, is not the same concept as Office Housework. This may explain some of the lack of support for our research questions and hypotheses. Additionally, given that this research was conducted post-COVID 19, there are fewer and fewer individuals who work in office settings, with a large amount of workers working remotely or hybrid. This may have limited the sample for our research and may limit the possibility of research on Office Housework as it is known now in the future. As for our sample, it was majority female. When running analyses to test for any potential impact gender may have had on our results, we found that there were a few variables where one gender had a significant correlation with Office Housework, while the other did not. This poses the possibility that gender might have had an impact on our results. Our sample sizes for both genders were not equal, so a more balanced sample could have further supported this possibility.

Future research in the Office Housework area can go many different directions, given the overwhelming lack of research on the topic. Given differences in the locations many workers are working post-pandemic, it might be worth exploring what Office Housework looks like in a remote or hybrid environment. Similarly, it may be interesting to explore similar types of behaviors beyond the office environment, such as in hospital or educational settings. Perhaps more research investigating the profile of an individual likely to engage in Office Housework could be done using more extensive personality

inventories like the HEXACO. Additionally, it would be worth investigating what impacts, if any, might arise on an individual's career from engaging in Office Housework behaviors, potentially controlling for gender differences. Lastly, given our puzzling findings in differences in variables correlated with Office Housework for men and women, future research may seek to explain why these differences exist.

Conclusion

This study sought to obtain a glimpse into the type of individual who engages in Office Housework behavior by looking into possible correlations between both Office Housework and the Big 5 and a handful of relevant Work Values. For the Big 5, we found support for positive correlations between Office Housework and conscientiousness, openness, and extraversion. This suggests that these three Big 5 traits may be useful in identifying the kind of individual who is likely to engage in Office Housework. We found no correlations between Office Housework and the agreeableness and neuroticism traits. For Work Values, we found support for positive correlations between Office Housework and the Helping and Supporting, Enjoyment, and Rule Respecting values. This suggests that these three values may be useful in determining the kind of individual likely to engage in Office Housework. We found no correlations between Office Housework and the variety and ambition values.

References

- Albrecht, S., Marty, A., & Brandon-Jones, N. J. (2020). Measuring values at work: Extending existing frameworks to the context of work. *Journal of Career Assessment*, 28(4), 531–550. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1069072720901604>
- Allen, T. D., & Rush, M. C. (1998). The effects of organizational citizenship behavior on performance judgments: A field study and a laboratory experiment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 83(2), 247-260. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.83.2.247>
- Bourdage, J. S., Lee, K., Lee, J. H., & Shin, K. H. (2012). Motives for organizational citizenship behavior: Personality correlates and coworker ratings of OCB. *Human Performance*, 25(3), 179–200. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08959285.2012.683904>
- Carlo, G., Okun, M. A., Knight, G. P., & de Guzman, M. R. T. (2005). The interplay of traits and motives on volunteering: Agreeableness, extraversion and prosocial value motivation. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 38(6), 1293–1305. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2004.08.012>
- Chen, P. J., & Choi, Y. (2008). Generational differences in work values: A study of hospitality management. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 20(6), 595–615. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09596110810892182>

- Chiaburu, D. S., Oh, I. S., Berry, C. M., Li, N., & Gardner, R. G. (2011). The five-factor model of personality traits and organizational citizenship behaviors: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 96*(6), 1140–1166.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/a0024004>
- Dose, J. J. (1997). Work values: An integrative framework and illustrative application to organizational socialization. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 70*, 219–240. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8325.1997.tb00645.x>
- Gomez-Mejia, L. R. (1986). The cross-cultural structure of task-related and contextual constructs. *The Journal of Psychology: Interdisciplinary and Applied, 120*(1), 5–19. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00223980.1986.9712611>
- Grant, A., & Sandberg, S. (2015, February 6). Madam c.e.o., get me a coffee. *The New York Times*. <https://www.nytimes.com/2015/02/08/opinion/sunday/sheryl-sandberg-and-adam-grant-on-women-doing-office-housework.html>^{1/2}<https://www.nytimes.com/2015/02/08/opinion/sunday/sheryl>
- Graziano, W. G., & Eisenberg, N. (1997). Agreeableness: A dimension of personality. In R. Hogan, J. A. Johnson, & S. R. Briggs (Eds.), *Handbook of personality psychology* (pp. 795–824). Academic Press. <https://doi-org.ezproxy.mtsu.edu/10.1016/B978-012134645-4/50031-7>

- 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. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.90.3.431>
- Heimann, A. L., Ingold, P. V, Debus, M. E., & Kleinmann, M. (2021). Who will go the extra mile? Selecting organizational citizens with a personality-based structured job interview. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 36*(985), 985–1007. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-020-09716-1/Published>
- Jang, S., Allen, T. D., & Regina, J. (2021). Office housework, burnout, and promotion: Does gender matter? *Journal of Business and Psychology, 36*(5), 793–805. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-020-09703-6>
- John, O. P., Naumann, L. P., & Soto, C. J. (2008). Paradigm shift to the integrative Big Five trait taxonomy: History, measurement, and conceptual issues. In O. P. John, R. W. Robins, & L. A. Pervin (Eds.), *Handbook of personality: Theory and research* (pp. 114–158). The Guilford Press.
- Judge, T. A., & Bretz, R. D. (1992). Ethics of work values on job choice decisions. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 77*(3), 261–271. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.77.3.261>
- Matić, J. L. (2008). Cultural differences in employee work values and their implications for management. *Management, 13*(2), 93–104.

- Motowidlo, S. J. (2003). Job performance. In W. C. Borman, D. R. Ilgen, & R. J. Klimoski (Eds.), *Handbook Psychology: Industrial and organizational psychology*, (Vol. 12, pp. 39–53). John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Motowidlo, S. J., Borman, W. C., & Schmit, M. J. (1997). A theory of individual differences in task and contextual performance. *Human Performance*, 10(2), 71–83. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327043hup1002_1
- Mussleman, M. E. (2020). *Is office housework an organizational citizenship behavior?* [Unpublished master's thesis]. Middle Tennessee State University.
- Organ, D. W. (1988). *Organizational citizenship behavior: The good soldier syndrome*. Lexington Books.
- Organ, D. W. (1997). Organizational citizenship behavior: It's construct clean-up time. *Human Performance*, 10(2), 85–97. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327043hup1002_2
- Organ, D. W., & Ryan, K. (1995). A meta-analytic review of attitudinal and dispositional predictors of organizational citizenship behavior. *Personnel Psychology*, 48(4), 775–802. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.1995.tb01781.x>
- Porter, S. R. (2007). A closer look at faculty service: What affects participation on committees? *The Journal of Higher Education*, 78(5), 523–541. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00221546.2007.11772328>

- Ryan, J. J. (2002). Work values and organizational citizenship behaviors: Values that work for employees and organizations. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 17(1), 123–132. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1016246103190>
- Schwartz, S. H., Cieciuch, J., Vecchione, M., Davidov, E., Fischer, R., Beierlein, C., Ramos, A., Verkasalo, M., Lönnqvist, J. E., Demirutku, K., Dirilen-Gumus, O., & Konty, M. (2012). Refining the theory of basic individual values. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 103(4), 663–688. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0029393>
- Smith, C. A., Organ, D. W., & Near, J. P. (1983). Organizational citizenship behavior: Its nature and antecedents. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 68(4), 653–663. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.68.4.653>
- Williams, L. J., & Anderson, S. E. (1991). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment as predictors of organizational citizenship and in-role behaviors. *Journal of Management*, 17(3), 601–617. <https://doi.org/10.1177/014920639101700305>
- Williams, J. C. (2014, April 16). Sticking women with the office housework. *The Washington Post*. <https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/on-leadership/wp/2014/04/16/sticking-women-with-the-office-housework/>

Williams, J. C., & Multhaup, M. (2018, March 5). For women and minorities to get ahead, managers must assign work fairly. *Harvard Business Review*.

<https://hbr.org/2018/03/for-women-and-minorities-to-get-ahead-managers-must-assign-work-fairly>

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Descriptive Statistics for Demographic Variables

Variable	Frequency (<i>n</i>)	Percent (%)
Gender		
Male	52	31.5
Female	111	67.3
Neither of these describe me	2	1.2
Race		
White	131	79.4
Black	8	4.8
Asian	14	8.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0
Mixed	6	3.6
Latino and Hispanic	6	3.6
Highest Education Level		
High school diploma or less	12	7.3
Some college	21	12.7
Associate's degree	13	7.9
Bachelor's degree	81	49.1
Professional degree, Master's degree, or Doctorate	37	22.4

Variable	Mean	SD
Age	37.87	10.81
Years in current job	6.9	5.47

Appendix B: IRB Approval Letter



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

Date: July 4, 2023
PI: Autumn Bourque
Department: Middle Tennessee State University, Psychology
Re: Initial - IRB-FY2023-214
Office Housework, the Big 5, and Work Values: A Correlational Study

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

Decision: Exempt

Category: Category 2.(i). Research that only includes interactions involving educational tests (cognitive, diagnostic, aptitude, achievement), survey procedures, interview procedures, or observation of public behavior (including visual or auditory recording) if at least one of the following criteria is met:

The information obtained is recorded by the investigator in such a manner that the identity of the human subjects cannot readily be ascertained, directly or through identifiers linked to the subjects;

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

1. Any modifications to the approved study must be submitted for review through Cayuse IRB.
2. Any unanticipated harms to participants or adverse events must be reported immediately to the Office of Compliance, and relevant changes to the protocol must be submitted to the IRB for approval before implementing this change.
3. According to MTSU Policy, a researcher is defined as anyone who works with data or has contact with participants. Anyone meeting this definition needs to be listed on the protocol and needs to complete the required training. If you add researchers to an approved project, please add the researchers to the project within Cayuse IRB **before** they begin to work on the project.
4. All research materials must be retained by the PI or faculty advisor (if the PI is a student) for at least three (3) years after study completion and then destroyed in a manner that maintains confidentiality and anonymity.

5. You must submit an end-of-project form to the Office of Compliance in Cayuse IRB upon completion of your research. Completed research means that you have finished collecting data.
6. All approval letters and study documents are located within the Study Details in Cayuse IRB.

We wish you a successful research project,
Middle Tennessee State University Institutional Review Board

Appendix C: Informed Consent

Social Media Informed Consent:

The following information is provided to inform you about the research project in which you have been invited to participate. Please read this disclosure and feel free to ask any questions. The investigators must answer all of your questions and please save this page as a PDF for future reference.

Your participation in this research study is voluntary.

You are also free to withdraw from this study at any time.

For additional information on your rights as a participant in this study, please contact the Middle Tennessee State University (MTSU) Office of Compliance (Telephone: 615-494-8918, email: irb_information@mtsu.edu, or website: <http://www.mtsu.edu/irb>). Please read the following and respond to the consent questions in the bottom if you wish to enroll in this study.

IRB Approval Details Protocol Title: Office Tasks, the Big 5, and Work Values: A Correlational Study

Investigator: Autumn Bourque

Department & College: Psychology – College of Behavioral and Health Sciences

Faculty Advisor (if PI is a student): Judith Van Hein, Ph.D.

Protocol ID: IRB-FY2023-214

Approval Date: 7/4/2023

Expiration Date: 9/30/2023

Purpose of the study: The study objective is to determine which Big 5 personality characteristics and Work Values correlate with specific office task behaviors.

Description of procedures: For this study, you will first be asked questions that measure specific office task behaviors. Next, you will be asked questions that measure the Big 5 personality traits. Then, you will be asked questions that measure specific Work Values. Next, you will be asked to answer several demographic questions about yourself. Finally, you will be asked a few demographic questions.

Duration: The study should take approximately 10-15 minutes to complete.

Here are your rights as a participant:

Your participation in this research is voluntary. You may skip any item you do not want to answer, and you may stop the survey at any time (see the note below). If you leave an item blank by either not clicking or entering a response, you may be warned that you missed one, just in case it was an accident. You can continue the study without entering a response if you didn't want to answer any questions.

Risks & Discomforts:

There are no known risks associated with participating in this study.

Benefits:

Benefits to you: There are no direct benefits to you.

Benefits to the field of science or to the community: This research will provide valuable information in identifying personality traits and work values associated with specific

office task behaviors.

Identifiable Information:

You will NOT be asked to provide identifiable personal information.

Compensation for participation:

There is no compensation for participation.

Participation Requirements:

The qualifications to participate in this research are:

You must be fluent in English, at least 18 years old, must work in the US, and must have been employed in office work full time (50% in person minimum) for at least 1 year. If you do not meet these qualifications, you will not be included in the research. Please do not participate in this research more than once.

Confidentiality:

All efforts, within reason, will be made to keep your personal information private but total privacy cannot be promised. Your information may be shared with MTSU or the government, such as the Middle Tennessee State University Institutional Review Board, Federal Government Office for Human Research Protections, if you or someone else is in danger or if we are required to do so by law.

Contact Information:

If you should have any questions about this research study or possibly injury, please feel free to contact Autumn Bourque by email at alb2dv@mtmail.mtsu.edu OR my faculty

advisor, Dr. Judith Van Hein, by email at judith.vanhein@mtsu.edu. You can also contact the MTSU Office of compliance via telephone 615-494-8918 or by email (compliance@mtsu.edu). This contact information will be presented again at the end of the experiment.

You are not required to do anything further if you decide not to enroll in this study. Just quit your browser. Please complete the response section below if you wish to learn more or you wish to part take in this study.

By signing below and continuing with this survey, you are also acknowledging that you have read and understand this consent form, you are at least 18 years of age, you are fluent in English, and you willingly agree to participate in this study under the terms described.

Participant Signature: _____

Prolific Informed Consent:

The following information is provided to inform you about the research project in which you have been invited to participate. Please read this disclosure and feel free to ask any questions. The investigators must answer all of your questions and please save this page as a PDF for future reference.

Your participation in this research study is voluntary.

You are also free to withdraw from this study at any time without loss of any

benefits.

For additional information on your rights as a participant in this study, please contact the Middle Tennessee State University (MTSU) Office of Compliance (Telephone: 615-494-8918, email: irb_information@mtsu.edu, or website: <http://www.mtsu.edu/irb>). Please read the following and respond to the consent questions in the bottom if you wish to enroll in this study.

IRB Approval Details Protocol Title: Office Tasks, the Big 5, and Work Values: A Correlational Study

Investigator: Autumn Bourque

Department & College: Psychology – College of Behavioral and Health Sciences

Faculty Advisor (if PI is a student): Judith Van Hein, Ph.D.

Protocol ID: IRB-FY2023-214

Approval Date: 7/4/2023

Expiration Date: 9/30/2023

Purpose of the study: The study objective is to determine which Big 5 personality characteristics and Work Values correlate with engagement in certain office tasks.

Description of procedures: For this study, you will first be asked questions that measure your engagement in specific office tasks. Next, you will be asked questions that measure the Big 5 personality traits. Then, you will be asked questions that measure specific Work Values. Next, you will be asked to answer several demographic questions about yourself. Finally, you will be asked a few demographic questions.

Duration: The study should take approximately 10-15 minutes to complete.

Here are your rights as a participant:

Your participation in this research is voluntary. You may skip any item you do not want to answer, and you may stop the survey at any time (see the note below). If you leave an item blank by either not clicking or entering a response, you may be warned that you missed one, just in case it was an accident. You can continue the study without entering a response if you didn't want to answer any questions.

Risks & Discomforts:

There are no known risks associated with participating in this study.

Benefits:

Benefits to you: There are no direct benefits to you.

Benefits to the field of science or to the community: This research will provide valuable information in identifying personality traits and work values associated with specific office task behaviors.

Identifiable Information:

You will NOT be asked to provide identifiable personal information.

Compensation for participation:

You will be compensated \$2.00 via ProlificAcademic if you meet the following requirements.

Compensation Requirements:

The qualifications to participate in this research are:

You must be fluent in English, at least 18 years old, must work in the US, and must have been employed full time for at least 1 year. If you do not meet these qualifications, you will not be included in the research and you will not be compensated. Please do not participate in this research more than once. Multiple attempts to participate will not be compensated.

Confidentiality:

All efforts, within reason, will be made to keep your personal information private but total privacy cannot be promised. Your information may be shared with MTSU or the government, such as the Middle Tennessee State University Institutional Review Board, Federal Government Office for Human Research Protections, if you or someone else is in danger or if we are required to do so by law.

Contact Information:

If you should have any questions about this research study or possibly injury, please feel free to contact Autumn Bourque by email at alb2dv@mtmail.mtsu.edu OR my faculty advisor, Dr. Judith Van Hein, by email at judith.vanhein@mtsu.edu. You can also contact the MTSU Office of compliance via telephone 615-494-8918 or by email (compliance@mtsu.edu). This contact information will be presented again at the end of the experiment.

You are not required to do anything further if you decide not to enroll in this study.

Just quit your browser. Please complete the response section below if you wish to

learn more or you wish to part take in this study.

By signing below and continuing with this survey, you are also acknowledging that you have read and understand this consent form, you are at least 18 years of age, you are fluent in English, and you willingly agree to participate in this study under the terms described.

Participant Signature: _____

Appendix D: Online Survey

Screening Questions

Are you at least 18 years old?

1. Yes
2. No

Are you fluent in reading, speaking, and writing in English?

1. Yes
2. No

Do you currently work in the United States?

1. Yes
2. No

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

1. Yes
2. No

Do you consent to participating in this research?

1. Yes, I consent to participate
2. No, I decline to participate

Office Housework

Question: How often do you engage in the following behaviors, even though they are ***not*** part of your official duties?

	Never	Rarely	Occasionally	Frequently	Very Frequently
1. I organize office parties and gatherings	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2. I cover office phone calls for others.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3. I bring food for others to the office	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4. I clean up communal spaces or facilities (e.g., office fridge, kitchen, recycling bins).	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
5. I make copies for others for meetings.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
6. I buy cards for coworkers to sign for celebrations or condolence.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
7. I comfort colleagues when there is bad news.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
8. I fix broken office machines, furniture, or electrical	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

equipment.					
9. I move heavy or large objects for the office.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
10. I set up new office machines, furniture, or electrical equipment.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Big 5

Question: I see myself as someone who...

	Disagree Strongly	Disagree a little	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree a little	Agree strongly
1. Is talkative	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2. Tends to find fault with others	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3. Does a thorough job	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4. Is depressed, blue	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
5. Is original, comes up with new ideas	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
6. Is reserved	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
7. Is helpful and	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

unselfish with others	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
8. Can be somewhat careless	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
9. Is relaxed, handles stress well	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
10. Is curious about many different things	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
11. Is full of energy	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
12. Starts quarrels with others	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
13. Is a reliable worker	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
14. Can be tense	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
15. Is ingenious, a deep thinker	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
16. Please select "Disagree a little" for this question	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
17. Generates a lot of enthusiasm	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
18. Has a forgiving nature	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
19. Tends to be disorganized	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
20. Worries a lot	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
21. Has an active imagination	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
22. Tends to be quiet	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
23. Is generally trusting	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
24. Tends to be lazy	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
25. Is emotionally stable, not easily upset	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
26. Is inventive	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
27. Has an assertive personality	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
28. Can be cold and aloof	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
29. Perseveres until the task is finished	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
30. Can be moody	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
31. Values artistic, aesthetic experiences	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
32. Is sometimes shy, inhibited	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
33. Is considerate and kind to almost everyone	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
34. Does things efficiently	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
35. Remains calm in tense situations	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
36. Prefers work that is routine	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
37. Is outgoing, sociable	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
38. Is sometimes rude to others	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
39. Please select "Agree a little" for this question	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
40. Makes plans and follows through with them	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
41. Gets nervous easily	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

42. Likes to reflect, play with ideas	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
43. Has few artistic interests	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
44. Likes to cooperate with others	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
45. Is easily distracted	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
46. Is sophisticated in art, music, or literature	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Demographic Items

Please indicate your gender

1. Male
2. Female
3. Neither of these describe me

What is your age?

What is your race/ethnicity?

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

What is the highest level of education you have received?

1. High school diploma or less
2. Some college
3. Associate's degree
4. Bachelor's degree
5. Professional degree, Master's degree, or Doctorate

How many years have you held your current job?
