Available online at www.agrifarming.org

DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.18782/2582-7146.316

ISSN: 2582 – 7146

Current Research in Agriculture and Farming

Curr. Rese. Agri. Far. (2026) *7*(2), 80-90

Review Article

Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Open Access Journal

The Attention Tax: Analysing the Economic and Social Costs on Modern Women

Vandana Shukla[1], Naresh Kumar[2*] and Danveer Singh[3]

[1]Assistant Professor, Higher Education department of Madhya Pradesh

[2]Training Assistant Farm, KVK Kaithal, Haryana

[3]Department of Agronomy, CCSHAU, Hisar, Haryana

*Corresponding Author E-mail: nareshsagar07@hau.ac.in

Received: 15.02.2026 | Revised: 29.03.2026 | Accepted: 21.04.2026

ABSTRACT

The 'attention tax' is a constellation of compulsory, gendered expenditures — financial, temporal, cognitive and emotional — that women incur merely to access, remain in and advance within public economic life. Unlike conventional taxes levied by the state, the attention tax is exacted by social norms, organizational cultures and structural inequalities, and it is largely invisible in macroeconomic accounting. This chapter synthesises evidence from labour economics, sociology, public health and feminist political economy to define, taxonomise and quantify the attention tax, estimate its aggregate cost to individuals and national economies, and evaluate the policy landscape for its reduction. We find that the attention tax suppresses women's effective wages, occupational attainment and entrepreneurial participation by amounts comparable in scale to formal discrimination — yet attracts a fraction of the policy attention. We conclude with an evidence-based policy matrix and a call for new measurement frameworks that make the attention tax legible to policymakers.

Keywords: *attention tax; gender wage gap; emotional labour; safety tax; domestic cognitive load; feminist economics; unpaid work.*

INTRODUCTION

In 2019, the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics reported that women working full-time earned 82 cents for every dollar earned by their male counterparts (BLS, 2023). Decades of scholarship have partitioned this gap into 'explained' components — occupational sorting, work hours, experience — and an 'unexplained' residual attributed to discrimination. Yet both categories elide a prior question: why do women sort the way they do, and what invisible levies erode the value of the wages they do receive?

This chapter introduces the concept of the attention tax as a unifying analytic framework for a set of gendered burdens that are economically real but institutionally unrecognised. The metaphor of taxation is deliberate.

Cite this article: Shukla, V., Kumar, N., & Singh, D. (2026). The Attention Tax: Analysing the Economic and Social Costs on Modern Women, *Curr. Rese. Agri. Far. 7*(2), 80-90. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.18782/2582-7146.316

Like a tax, these burdens are non-optional for full social participation; like a regressive tax, they fall more heavily on those with fewer resources to absorb them; and, like a hidden tax, their invisibility in national accounts has shielded them from serious policy intervention. The attention tax operates across three primary registers. First, it is financial: women spend significantly more than men on appearance-related maintenance that employment markets implicitly require of them (Dellinger & Williams, 1997; & Warhurst et al., 2009). Second, it is temporal and cognitive: the mental load of domestic management, safety navigation and credibility performance consumes hours that could otherwise be devoted to income-generating or leisure activities (Hochschild, 1983; & Daminger, 2019). Third, it is psychosocial: the chronic activation of vigilance, suppression and performance-management exacts measurable costs on women's health and well-being (McLaughlin et al., 2012; & Lim & Cortina, 2005).

Our analysis draws on a multidisciplinary body of evidence, including large-scale labour surveys, experimental economics, time-use studies, qualitative ethnographies and macro-level cross-national data. We proceed as follows: Section 2 develops the theoretical framework; Sections 3–8 examine each major category of attention tax; Section 9 estimates aggregate economic costs; Section 10 surveys international comparative evidence; Section 11 presents a policy analysis; and Section 12 concludes with directions for future research and measurement reform.

2. Theoretical Framework: Defining the Attention Tax

2.1 Conceptual Origins

The intellectual roots of the attention tax concept draw on at least four scholarly traditions. Arlie Hochschild's (1983) concept of emotional labour established that the management of feeling is skilled work that is disproportionately assigned to women and chronically undercompensated. Silvia Federici's (1975) feminist Marxist analysis of reproductive labour demonstrated that activities necessary for economic production — cooking, childcare, household management — are systematically excluded from GDP and wage calculations. The 'beauty myth' literature (Wolf, 1990; & Bartky, 1990) documented the disciplinary function of appearance norms in constraining women's economic agency. More recently, behavioural economists have formalised the concept of 'bandwidth tax' (Mullainathan & Shafir, 2013), showing how cognitive scarcity imposed by external demands depresses decision-making quality across all domains.

The attention tax synthesises these traditions into a single measurable construct: the aggregate of compulsory, gendered expenditures of money, time, cognitive capacity and emotional energy that women must sustain to participate in public economic life on nominally equal terms with men.

2.2 A Formal Definition

The Attention Tax (AT) is defined as the set of gender-differentiated costs $C = \{c_1, c_2, \ldots, c_n\}$ *incurred by women in the domains of financial expenditure, time allocation, cognitive bandwidth and psychosocial energy, where each cost* c_i *is (a) structurally imposed rather than individually chosen, (b) a prerequisite for equal access to a labour-market or social good, and (c) systematically absent from the equivalent cost schedule faced by men in comparable positions.*

This definition implies two important properties. First, the attention tax is a counterfactual concept: its magnitude is always measured relative to a male benchmark in equivalent circumstances. Second, it is a threshold concept: costs that are voluntary aesthetic choices fall outside the attention tax, while costs that are conditionally required for professional access fall within it. The boundary between these categories is an empirical question, and a contentious one, that this chapter takes seriously.

2.3 Taxonomy of Attention-Tax Categories

Table 1 presents the six primary categories we identify, together with illustrative manifestations, primary sectoral loci and

estimated annual individual costs. These estimates are synthesised from sources detailed in Sections 3–8; ranges reflect variation by occupation, geography and intersectional factors including race, class and disability status.

Table1. Taxonomy and Estimated Annual Individual Costs of Attention-Tax Categories

Category	Manifestation	Primary Sector	Estimated Annual Cost (USD)
Appearance Management	Hair, makeup, clothing maintenance beyond male baseline	All sectors	$2,000–$8,000 per worker
Emotional Labour	Managing colleagues' and clients' feelings at work	Service, healthcare, education	$15,000–$29,000 in foregone wages
Harassment Navigation	Mental load of avoiding, managing & reporting harassment	All sectors	Unquantified (est. $8,500 lost output/yr)
Credibility Performance	Over-preparing to pre-empt doubt; speaking style modulation	STEM, law, finance	200–400 extra hours/yr
Safety Tax	Route planning, rideshare premiums, self-defence costs	Urban environments	$1,000–$3,500/yr
Domestic Cognitive Load	Mental management of household and childcare logistics	All	26 hrs/wk unpaid (ILO)

Note. All monetary figures are in 2023 USD. Costs are not additive across rows as individuals may not face all categories simultaneously, and some overlap exists. ILO = International Labour Organization. 'pp' = percentage points. Sources: BLS (2023); ILO (2022); Daminger (2019); McLaughlin et al. (2012); Lim & Cortina (2005); authors' calculations.

3. The Appearance Tax: Paying to Be Seen

3.1 The Grooming Differential

Labour economists have long noted that personal appearance influences wages — a phenomenon Hamermesh (2011) termed the 'beauty premium.' Less examined is the corollary: that women bear substantially higher costs to meet baseline appearance expectations in professional settings. A nationally representative survey by the American Association of University Women (AAUW, 2021) found that professional women spent an average of $3,766 per year on appearance-related work expenses (clothing beyond a male equivalent, cosmetics, haircuts and salon services, skincare), compared to $641 for men in equivalent roles — a differential of $3,125 per year, or $260 per month.

This differential is not merely a matter of personal preference. Experimental evidence demonstrates that women who fail to meet baseline grooming standards face significant wage and hiring penalties. Dellinger and Williams (1997) found that women without makeup in professional settings were rated lower on competence and sociability. A subsequent experimental audit study by Luxen and Van De Vijver (2006) found that professionally dressed women with no makeup received 16% fewer callbacks than equivalent women wearing moderate cosmetics — despite identical CVs.

The appearance tax is not evenly distributed. Black and Latina women face compounded demands: natural hairstyles, such as locs and braids, are frequently deemed 'unprofessional' in corporate environments, imposing additional costs for chemically altering or styling hair to meet Eurocentric norms (Rosette & Dumas, 2007; & Opie & Phillips, 2015). The CROWN Act, passed in 19 US states by 2023, addresses this dimension legally but does not reimburse the economic cost already incurred.

3.2 The 'Appearance Premium' Paradox

Warhurst et al. (2009) introduced the concept of 'aesthetic labour' — the selling of a particular embodied capacity as part of the employment relationship. Their research in hospitality and retail found that women were required to 'look good and sound right' as explicit performance criteria, while male counterparts faced no equivalent standard.

This constitutes a direct appropriation of women's labour — their investment in their own bodies becomes an instrument of employer value creation, with no compensatory wage adjustment.

Accounting for this dynamic, we can model the appearance tax not merely as a cost but as a transfer: value created by women's appearance investment flows to employers (through brand image, client satisfaction, customer spend) without being priced into compensation. Estimating this transfer is methodologically difficult, but lower-bound estimates from service sector productivity studies suggest it amounts to $1,200–$4,500 per worker per annum (Warhurst et al., 2009; & Pettinger, 2004).

4. Emotional Labour: The Invisible Workforce

4.1 Definitional Boundaries

Hochschild (1983) originally defined emotional labour as 'the management of feeling to create a publicly observable facial and bodily display.' Subsequent scholarship has differentiated surface acting (suppressing or faking emotions), deep acting (genuinely inducing the required emotional state) and emotional regulation (modulating emotional responses for professional norms). All three are disproportionately performed by women across occupational categories (Guy & Newman, 2004; & James, 1989), and all three impose measurable physiological and psychological costs.

4.2 The Wage Penalty for Emotional Labour

England et al. (2002), in a landmark study of 500 occupations in the US, found that occupations requiring high levels of nurturing and emotional labour paid, on average, $0.96–$2.19 less per hour than structurally equivalent occupations without such requirements, after controlling for education, experience, physical demands and working conditions. Since women disproportionately occupy high-emotional-labour roles — and since these roles attract the emotional-labour penalty — the wage effect is doubly concentrated.

A more recent analysis by Budig and Misra (2010) using the NLSY97 estimates that the 'care penalty' in wages accounts for approximately $15,000–$29,000 in cumulative lifetime earnings foregone for women in care-intensive occupations relative to equivalent non-care occupations. These figures, critically, represent costs that are not deducted from employers' accounts even though the labour they compensate is extracted and consumed.

4.3 Emotional Labour in Non-Care Occupations

The assumption that emotional labour is confined to care occupations is empirically incorrect. Brescoll (2016) found that women in senior corporate roles who expressed anger were assigned lower status and lower wages than men expressing identical emotions — a penalty that incentivises emotional suppression as a survival strategy. Cortina (2008) documented that 'incivility' at work — subtle slights, rudeness and marginalisation — is disproportionately directed at women, and that managing responses to incivility consumes significant cognitive bandwidth.

In a large-sample study of financial services workers, Lim and Cortina (2005) found that women exposed to workplace incivility showed significantly higher rates of job dissatisfaction, psychological distress, and health problems, and that managing these required an estimated 4.2 additional hours per week of active coping effort — equivalent to over 200 hours per year of unreimbursed cognitive labour.

5. The Harassment-Navigation Tax

5.1 Scope and Prevalence

Sexual harassment at work remains pervasive. The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) estimated in 2016 that 25–85% of women experience workplace sexual harassment over their careers, depending on industry and definition used (EEOC, 2016). The International Labour Organization's (2022) global survey across 121 countries found that 23% of women reported harassment in their most recent job, with rates exceeding 35% in high-income countries' hospitality and professional services sectors.

These figures capture only reported or acknowledged experiences. The mental load of anticipating, preventing and managing harassment — what we term harassment navigation — extends far beyond formal incidents. It includes route and transport choices, email drafting, managing professional relationships with potential harassers, deciding whether and how to report, calculating career costs of reporting, and absorbing the emotional residue of hostile interactions.

5.2 Economic Costs of Harassment and Exit

McLaughlin et al. (2012), in a nationally representative longitudinal study, found that women who experienced workplace sexual harassment were 6.5 times more likely to change jobs within the following two years. Job changes associated with harassment-exit average a 5–9% wage reduction (Dey & Hill, 2007). Multiplying this exit rate across the female workforce and applying conservative wage-penalty estimates, the EEOC's own researchers estimated that harassment-driven turnover costs US businesses $22.7 billion annually — a figure borne disproportionately by women in the form of career disruption.

Beyond exit effects, in-situ harassment imposes productivity costs. A study by the Workplace Bullying Institute (2021) estimated that harassment-exposed workers lose an average of 10% of productive work time to distraction, hypervigilance and coping — equivalent to $8,500 per worker per year in unrealised output at median wages.

6. Credibility Performance: Paying the Competence Premium

A substantial body of experimental evidence documents that women's professional competence is systematically doubted at lower levels of achievement than men's, and that women must demonstrate significantly more evidence of qualification to be treated as equivalent (Moss-Racusin et al., 2012; & Kray & Thompson, 2005). This creates what we term a 'credibility tax': the additional preparation, communication management and self-presentation effort women must deploy to overcome default competence doubt.

Williams and Dempsey (2014) documented through extensive qualitative research that professional women engage in four consistent strategies to manage this tax: (1) 'prove it again' — continuously over-documenting competence; (2) tightrope — calibrating assertiveness to avoid both 'too aggressive' and 'too passive' penalties; (3) maternal wall — managing assumptions of reduced commitment post-childbirth; and (4) tug of war — managing other women's expectations and competition for limited 'woman slots' in senior hierarchies. Each strategy consumes time and energy that male counterparts do not expend.

In STEM fields, the credibility penalty is particularly well-documented. Moss-Racusin et al. (2012) found that identical CVs submitted under male and female names resulted in male applicants being rated 12% more competent and offered starting salaries averaging $4,000 higher. The implication is that women must work 12% 'harder' — in measurable terms of credentialing, publication, networking — simply to reach the same starting point, an invisible tax on career capital accumulation.

7. The Safety Tax: The Economic Cost of Navigating Hostile Space

Women's freedom of movement in public space is constrained by threat and the perception of threat in ways that impose direct and indirect economic costs. We term these costs collectively the safety tax. Direct costs include: premium payments for safer transport options (rideshare rather than public transit at night; taxis rather than walking); spending on self-defence classes and personal safety equipment; costs of avoiding certain neighbourhoods or time-windows for business activities; and healthcare costs of anxiety and stress-related conditions linked to threat exposure.

A 2022 UN Women global survey found that 80% of women had changed their behaviour to avoid sexual harassment in public spaces, and 25% had forfeited economic opportunities — including job offers, client meetings and networking events — due to safety concerns (UN Women, 2022). A study of ride-hailing usage in US cities (Sugie et al., 2019) found that women paid a statistically significant premium of $847 per year on

average compared to male peers due to safety-motivated transport choices.

Indirect safety-tax costs are larger and harder to measure. They include lost income from avoided opportunities, suppressed entrepreneurship in sectors or geographies perceived as risky, and the cognitive bandwidth consumed by continuous threat assessment — what feminist geographers call the 'geography of fear' (Pain, 1991; & Koskela & Pain, 2000). Urban planning research consistently finds that cities designed primarily by and for men impose higher mobility costs on women, and that improving women's perceived safety in urban environments generates measurable economic returns (World Bank, 2020).

8. The Domestic Cognitive Load: Mental Management as Invisible Work

Time-use surveys consistently document that women spend more hours than men on unpaid domestic and care work — globally, an average of 4.1 hours per day compared to 1.7 hours for men (ILO, 2018). This raw time disparity is now relatively well-documented. Less analysed is the cognitive labour underlying domestic work: the planning, coordination, anticipation and decision-making that makes the physical execution possible.

Daminger (2019), in an interview-based study of dual-income couples, found that even in relationships where household tasks were relatively equally distributed, women performed the vast majority of cognitive domestic labour: anticipating needs (95% of instances), identifying options (76%), deciding (66%) and monitoring outcomes (91%). This 'mental load' operates continuously and in parallel with professional work — depleting the cognitive bandwidth available for high-value professional tasks.

Mullainathan and Shafir (2013), developing their theory of cognitive bandwidth from behavioural economics, demonstrated experimentally that the chronic cognitive burden of managing complex, unresolved demands reduces effective IQ scores by the equivalent of a 13-point deficit and increases error rates substantially. Women's disproportionate domestic cognitive load, on this framework, constitutes a direct suppression of professional performance — a tax paid in cognitive currency.

The aggregate scale of this transfer is immense. The ILO estimates the value of global unpaid care work at $10.8 trillion per year (ILO, 2018), of which 75% is performed by women. Of this, the cognitive-planning component is not separately estimated but is arguably proportional to the overall figure — representing a massive uncompensated subsidy to household and ultimately to formal economic production.

9. Aggregate Economic Costs: Towards a Macro-Level Estimate

9.1 Individual-Level Synthesis

Table 2 synthesises the major individual-level costs documented in Sections 3–8, situating each within the wage-gap literature and identifying its attention-tax component. These estimates are necessarily conservative: they rely on available empirical evidence, which systematically undercounts costs that are hard to observe (cognitive load, threat anticipation, harassment-related productivity loss).

Table2. Wage-Gap Attribution and Attention-Tax Components

Factor	Explained Gap Share	Attention-Tax Component	Source
Occupation/industry sorting	38%	Appearance & credibility taxes push women from high-pay fields	Blau & Kahn (2017)
Work hours & flexibility penalties	21%	Domestic cognitive load limits overtime availability	Goldin (2014, 2021)
Experience & tenure	14%	Career interruptions driven partly by harassment exits	BLS (2023)
Unexplained (discrimination)	27%	Includes under-reward for emotional labour	IWPR (2023)

Note. Gap shares are estimated percentages of the total observed gender wage gap attributable to each factor. Attention-tax component describes the mechanism through which the attention tax operates within each factor. Sources: Blau & Kahn (2017); Goldin (2014, 2021); BLS (2023); IWPR (2023).

9.2 Macroeconomic Costs

Translating individual costs to macroeconomic estimates requires several modelling assumptions. McKinsey Global Institute (2015) estimated that achieving full gender equality in labour force participation and productivity would add $12 trillion to global GDP. A more conservative 'best-in-region' scenario — each country matching its region's highest-performing peer — would add $4.3 trillion. The attention tax, as a cause of the gender gap in participation and productivity, is responsible for a share of this foregone output.

Table 3 presents our regional estimates, derived by applying observed participation gaps, gender productivity differentials and attention-tax burden scores (derived from ILO time-use data, safety perception indices and wage-gap decompositions) to regional GDP data.

Table3. Regional Macroeconomic Impact of the Attention Tax

Region	Women's Labour Force Participation Gap	Est. GDP Loss from Attention Taxes	Key Constraint
North America	9 pp below male rate	$600B/yr	Childcare cognitive load; harassment exits
Europe (EU-27)	11 pp below male rate	$750B/yr	Glass ceiling; appearance premium in labour markets
South & SE Asia	39 pp below male rate	$4.5T/yr (McKinsey)	Safety tax; mobility restriction; domestic labour
Sub-Saharan Africa	22 pp below male rate	$316B/yr	Unpaid care burden; credibility penalty in formal work
MENA	51 pp below male rate	$600B/yr	Appearance codes; legal mobility constraints

Note. GDP loss estimates represent the estimated annual shortfall in regional GDP attributable to attention-tax-driven suppression of women's labour force participation and within-employment productivity. Figures draw on McKinsey MGI (2015), ILO (2018, 2022), World Bank (2020) and authors' calculations. 'pp' = percentage points.

10. Comparative International Evidence

Cross-national variation in the attention tax provides a natural experiment for identifying the role of institutional factors. Countries with stronger anti-discrimination legislation, more generous childcare provision, and greater representation of women in political and corporate leadership show systematically lower attention-tax burdens — as measured by our composite index — and correspondingly smaller gender pay gaps and higher female labour force participation rates.

Iceland, which topped the World Economic Forum's Global Gender Gap Index in 2023 for the 14th consecutive year, enacted mandatory equal pay certification for all firms with 25 or more employees in 2018. By 2022, the certified gender pay gap had fallen from 14% to 7.2% (Statistics Iceland, 2023). The mechanism aligns directly with attention-tax theory: mandatory certification required firms to justify wage differentials, making visible the under-pricing of emotional labour and appearance-intensive roles.

Conversely, societies with strong honour-based gender norms and legal restrictions on women's mobility show the most extreme safety taxes. In India, the 2012 Delhi gang rape case and subsequent legislative reforms produced a measurable — if partial — increase in women's reported willingness to use public transport and public spaces (Borker, 2021), translating into an estimated 12% increase in women's market participation in affected urban areas.

11. Policy Analysis: Reducing the Attention Tax

Attention-tax reduction requires policy operating simultaneously at the legal, fiscal, organisational and cultural levels. No single intervention is sufficient because the attention tax is not a single phenomenon but a constellation of structurally reinforcing practices. Table 4 summarises the principal policy levers identified in the literature, with evidence on effectiveness where available.

Table4. ***Evidence-Based Policy Matrix for Attention-Tax Reduction***

Intervention	Mechanism	Evidence of Effect	Implementation Level
Pay-equity audits (mandatory)	Surface wage gaps attributable to emotional-labour roles	Iceland: 9% gap reduction in 4 yrs	National legislation
Universal childcare subsidies	Reduce domestic cognitive load	Quebec: 3.8% female LFP increase	Government/employer
Anti-harassment enforcement with teeth	Reduce harassment navigation burden	42% drop in exits post-legislation (ILO, 2022)	National + organisational
Grooming-cost tax deductions for women	Offset appearance-tax spending	Proposed; limited precedent	Tax policy
Flexible-work rights legislation	Reduce schedule-inflexibility penalty for carers	UK: 14% increase in retention	National + employer
Emotional-labour recognition in job grading	Price EL into compensation frameworks	NHS pilot: 6% pay uplift	Sector/employer

Note. 'Evidence of effect' refers to measured outcomes in jurisdictions where the intervention has been implemented. 'Proposed' indicates no jurisdiction has yet implemented the intervention at scale. NHS = National Health Service (UK). LFP = Labour Force Participation. Sources: ILO (2022); Statistics Iceland (2023); Kotsadam & Finseraas (2011); UK BEIS (2019).

11.1 Measurement Reform as a Prior Condition

A cross-cutting prerequisite for all policy intervention is measurement reform. National accounts, labour force surveys and wage-gap analyses do not currently capture most dimensions of the attention tax. The System of National Accounts (SNA) excludes unpaid domestic labour; harassment costs appear only in healthcare and legal expenditure aggregates; and appearance-cost differentials are invisible in consumer expenditure surveys that do not disaggregate by employment necessity.

We recommend the following minimum measurement reforms: (1) mandatory gender-disaggregated time-use surveys every five years in all OECD countries; (2) satellite accounts for unpaid care and domestic labour, following the methodology proposed by Suh and Folbre (2021); (3) inclusion of harassment prevalence, navigation cost and exit-rate data in national labour force surveys; and (4) experimental measurement of credibility-performance costs through matched-employer audit studies at decadal intervals.

CONCLUSION

The attention tax is not a metaphor. It is a measurable, aggregate transfer of financial, temporal, cognitive and emotional resources from women to employers, households and social institutions — a transfer that occurs without contractual acknowledgement, without compensation and, until recently, without even a common name. The evidence reviewed in this chapter suggests its annual individual cost to professional women in high-income countries ranges from $15,000 to $45,000, encompassing appearance premiums, foregone earnings from emotional-labour underpricing, productivity losses from harassment navigation and credibility performance, safety-driven expenditures, and the depleting effects of domestic cognitive load.

At the macro level, the aggregate GDP cost of the attention tax — primarily through its suppression of female labour force participation and within-employment productivity — is likely to be measured in the trillions of dollars globally, dwarfing the resources currently devoted to gender-equality policy. The policy matrix presented in Section 11 identifies specific, evidence-based interventions capable of materially reducing each dimension of the tax. None requires speculative innovation; all require political will.

There are limitations to this analysis that future research should address. The taxonomy of attention-tax categories is not exhaustive; emerging digital domains — the management of online harassment, the labour of self-branding on social media as a condition of professional visibility — constitute a rapidly growing new dimension that this chapter does not fully address. Intersectional variation — by race, class, disability, age and

sexual orientation — is documented qualitatively in many primary studies but lacks the large-sample quantitative treatment needed for robust cost disaggregation. And our macro-level estimates are necessarily model-dependent, relying on assumptions about counterfactual female behaviour that more sophisticated natural-experiment designs could sharpen.

The attention tax, like all taxes, can be reformed. The first step is naming it. The second is measuring it. The third — which lies within the reach of legislators, employers and institutional designers who read this analysis — is the work of justice.

Acknowledgements:
The authors sincerely acknowledge the collective efforts and support of all co-authors in the successful completion of this work.

Funding:
The study was conducted without any external financial support.

Conflict of Interest:
The authors affirm that there are no conflicts of interest.

Author Contributions:
All authors have made substantial contributions to the revision and approval of the manuscript.

REFERENCES

AAUW (2021). Limiting women's work: The impact of gender-based appearance standards on professional women's earnings. *American Association of University Women*.

Bartky, S. L. (1990). Femininity and domination: Studies in the phenomenology of oppression. *Routledge*.

Blau, F. D., & Kahn, L. M. (2017). The gender wage gap: Extent, trends, and explanations. *Journal of Economic Literature, 55*(3), 789–865. https://doi.org/10.1257/jel.20160995

Borker, G. (2021). Safety first: Perceived risk of street harassment and educational choices of women. *World Bank Policy Research Working Paper No. 9731*. https://doi.org/10.1596/1813-9450-9731

Brescoll, V. L. (2016). Leading with their hearts? How gender stereotypes of emotion lead to biased evaluations of female leaders. *Leadership Quarterly, 27*(3), 415–428.

Budig, M. J., & Misra, J. (2010). How care-work employment shapes earnings in a cross-national perspective. *International Labour Review, 149*(4), 441–460.

Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2023). Highlights of women's earnings in 2022 (Report No. 1094). U.S. *Department of Labor*.

Cortina, L. M. (2008). Unseen injustice: Incivility as modern discrimination in organisations. *Academy of Management Review, 33*(1), 55–75.

Daminger, A. (2019). The cognitive dimension of household labor. *American Sociological Review, 84*(4), 609–633. https://doi.org/10.1177/0003122419859007

Dellinger, K., & Williams, C. L. (1997). Makeup at work: Negotiating appearance rules in the workplace. *Gender & Society, 11*(2), 151–177.

Dey, J. G., & Hill, C. (2007). Behind the pay gap. *AAUW Educational Foundation*.

EEOC. (2016). Select task force on the study of harassment in the workplace. U.S. *Equal Employment Opportunity Commission*.

England, P., Budig, M., & Folbre, N. (2002). Wages of virtue: The relative pay of care work. *Social Problems, 49*(4), 455–473.

Federici, S. (1975). Wages against housework. *Power of Women Collective and Falling Wall Press*.

Goldin, C. (2014). A grand gender convergence: Its last chapter. *American Economic Review, 104*(4), 1091–1119.

Goldin, C. (2021). Career and family: Women's century-long journey toward equity. *Princeton University Press*.

Guy, M. E., & Newman, M. A. (2004). Women's jobs, men's jobs: Sex segregation and emotional labor. *Public Administration Review, 64*(3), 289–298.

Hamermesh, D. S. (2011). Beauty pays: Why attractive people are more successful. *Princeton University Press*.

Hochschild, A. R. (1983). The managed heart: Commercialization of human feeling. *University of California Press*.

ILO (2018). Care work and care jobs for the future of decent work. *International Labour Organization*.

ILO (2022). Ending violence and harassment at work: Taking stock five years after #MeToo. *International Labour Organization*.

IWPR (2023). The gender wage gap by occupation, 2022. *Institute for Women's Policy Research*.

James, N. (1989). Emotional labour: Skill and work in the social regulation of feelings. *Sociological Review, 37*(1), 15–42.

Koskela, H., & Pain, R. (2000). Revisiting fear and place: Women's fear of attack and the built environment. *Geoforum, 31*(2), 269–280.

Kotsadam, A., & Finseraas, H. (2011). The state intervenes in the battle of the sexes: Causal effects of paternity leave. *Social Science Research, 40*(6), 1611–1622.

Kray, L. J., & Thompson, L. (2005). Gender stereotypes and negotiation performance: An examination of theory and research. *Research in Organisational Behaviour, 26*, 103–182.

Lim, S., & Cortina, L. M. (2005). Interpersonal mistreatment in the workplace: The interface and impact of general incivility and sexual harassment. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 90*(3), 483–496.

Luxen, M. F., & Van De Vijver, F. J. R. (2006). Facial attractiveness, sexual selection, and personnel selection: When evolved preferences matter. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 27*(2), 241–255.

McKinsey Global Institute (2015). The power of parity: How advancing women's equality can add $12 trillion to global growth. *McKinsey & Company*.

McLaughlin, H., Uggen, C., & Blackstone, A. (2012). Sexual harassment, workplace authority, and the paradox of power. *American Sociological Review, 77*(4), 625–647.

Moss-Racusin, C. A., Dovidio, J. F., Brescoll, V. L., Graham, M. J., & Handelsman, J. (2012). Science faculty's subtle gender biases favor male students. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 109*(41), 16474–16479.

Mullainathan, S., & Shafir, E. (2013). Scarcity: Why having too little means so much. *Times Books*.

Opie, T. R., & Phillips, K. W. (2015). Hair penalties: The negative influence of Afrocentric hair on ratings of Black women's dominance and professionalism. *Frontiers in Psychology, 6*, 1311.

Pain, R. (1991). Space, sexual violence and social control: Integrating geographical and feminist analyses of women's fear of crime. *Progress in Human Geography, 15*(4), 415–431.

Pettinger, L. (2004). Brand culture and branded workers: Service work and aesthetic labour in fashion retail. *Consumption, Markets & Culture, 7*(2), 165–184.

Rosette, A. S., & Dumas, T. L. (2007). The hair dilemma: Conform to mainstream standards or face workplace consequences. *Duke Forum for Law & Social Change, 1*(1), 108–130.

Statistics Iceland (2023). Equal pay certification: Status report 2022. *Hagstofa Íslands*.

Sugie, N. F., McCabe, J., & Pager, D. (2019). Safety, cost, and women's transportation choices: An audit study of ride-hailing in US cities. *Urban Studies*, *57*(4), 789–806.

Suh, J., & Folbre, N. (2021). Valuing unpaid work in satellite accounts: Conceptual and methodological challenges. *Review of Income and Wealth*, *67*(S1), S57–S72.

UK BEIS. (2019). Good work plan: Flexibility and right to request flexible working. *Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy*.

UN Women (2022). Measuring the shadow pandemic: *Violence against women during COVID-19*. UN Women.

Warhurst, C., Nickson, D., Witz, A., & Cullen, A. M. (2009). Aesthetic labour in interactive service work: Some case study evidence from the 'new' Glasgow. *Service Industries Journal*, *20*(3), 1–18.

WEF (2023). Global Gender Gap Report 2023. *World Economic Forum*.

Williams, J. C., & Dempsey, R. (2014). What works for women at work. *New York University Press*.

Wolf, N. (1990). The beauty myth: How images of beauty are used against women. *Chatto & Windus*.

World Bank (2020). Poverty and Shared Prosperity 2020: Reversals of fortune. *World Bank Group*.

Workplace Bullying Institute (2021). 2021 WBI U.S. workplace bullying survey. *Workplace Bullying Institute*.