This article investigated the effect of various aspects of employees’ job involvement on their importance evaluation of organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) for an organization. Anonymous questionnaires were used to collect data from 131 professors and clerical workers at a private Japanese university. Results showed that while affective and behavioral involvement had a significantly positive effect on evaluation of some OCB dimensions, cognitive involvement negatively affected helping behavior, contrary to the initial hypothesis. The effect of affective job involvement was partially moderated by employees’ job category and gender. Professors valued OCB more than clerical workers when they were highly affectively job involved, although clerical workers were affectively job involved more than professors on average were.
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1. **INTRODUCTION**

Organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) has been one of the most popular topics in organizational behavior (Organ, Podsakoff & MacKenzie, 2006). Although initially, Western researchers began paying attention to the importance of OCB, many Asian researchers, particularly Chinese researchers, have also focused on the OCB of their countries’ employees. Compared to research in other Asian countries, Japanese researchers have unfortunately not shown great interest in OCB to date. Naturally, the boundary between formal job and extra job behaviors is ambiguous because Japanese tend to regard their organization as a quasi-family in a collectivistic context and do whatever an organization wants them to do as a formal job (Iwata, 1978; Yoshimura & Anderson, 1997). Japanese researchers might not consider it important to solely focus on and investigate the OCB of Japanese employees.

However, this ambiguity in the boundary between formal and extra jobs was seen in a Western context (Morrison, 1994). Moreover, regardless of what Japanese employees think of the range of their work, it is still important to focus on OCB-like behaviors of these employees because...
Japanese organizations are actually affected by the extensive range of behaviors (Yoshimura & Anderson, 1997).

This study investigated the effect of employees’ job involvement on their importance evaluation of OCB using data collected from a private Japanese university (a juridical person). Job involvement refers to employees’ attitudes toward their jobs and is one of the most specific factors relevant to work performance. Most Japanese organizations have a regular job rotation system that requires employees to change their jobs periodically to let them develop a comprehensive organizational perspective. Although this job rotation system is still functional in Japanese organizations, it might inhibit employees’ job involvement because those employees cannot stay at one job for a long time. Therefore, it is important to examine the importance of job involvement in Japanese organizations, particularly how Japanese employees’ job involvement influences their work-related positive behaviors or their evaluation of their behaviors.

Despite the important findings of this previous research, the evidence that attitude toward a formal job (job involvement) influenced behaviors beyond a formal job (OCB) was not self-evident. Stated simply, job involved employees should try to spend as much time as possible doing their job, and higher levels of OCB might produce higher levels of role overload, job stress, and work-family conflict (Organ & Ryan, 1995; Bolino & Turnley, 2005). Thus, some explanation for the fact that employees devote at least some of their time and energy to OCB is needed.

The discussions of many researchers were built upon two premises about job involved employees’ perceptions: Job involved employees develop an organizational personality to do anything they can for organization, and they believe that their OCB contributes to organizational effectiveness. Moreover, while these researchers have tried to persuade readers to accept the former, they have seemed to take the latter for granted. For example, when explaining the reason for the relationship between job involvement and OCB, Diefendorff et al. (2002) stated, “even though OCBs are not part of individuals’ assigned duties, they are still beneficial to the organization, its members and the employees themselves; therefore, highly job involved individuals should engage in these behaviors to a greater extent than less involved individuals” (p. 96). Dimitriades (2007) also stated the following:

Highly job involved individuals generally seem to be satisfied with their jobs, to be in characteristic positive moods at work and to be highly committed to their employing organizations, their careers, and their professions. Moreover, job involved individuals believe that personal and organizational goals are compatible. (p. 476)

Finally, Chen and Chiu (2009) also similarly suggested, “employees with a high degree of job involvement … are also more likely to increase their self-respect through successful job performance and display of organizational beneficial behaviors” (p. 477).

In fact, as shown by Lee, Carswell and Allen’s (2000) and Morrow’s (1983) arguments about and analysis of the hierarchical relations among work related attitudes, it can be concluded that
job involved employees are highly committed to their organizations based on their organizational personality. However, can we assume employees automatically believe their OCB is organizationally beneficial? Employees’ appreciation of OCB is actually important because they would not spend their limited time and energy performing OCB instead of their formal job unless they recognize the importance of OCB. Past research has also empirically confirmed that OCB had a significant positive effect on organizational performance (Organ et al., 2006). Even so, it cannot be necessarily considered that employees always recognize the importance of their OCB in an organization for the following reasons.

First, most OCB behaviors are so subtle and small that they can only be effective to an organization if they accumulate for a long time. As Organ (1988) argued, “(m)ost OCB actions, taken singly, would not make a dent in the overall performance of an organization. … It was a modest, some would even say trivial, occurrence” (p.6), how each of their behaviors actually works in an organization is unseen and is viewed with a sense of uncertainty, even by the performers. Second, employees sometimes misunderstand that OCB-like behaviors are done with the intention of impressing management. Employees’ behaviors led by self-interested motives are dysfunctional for organizations (Bolino, 1999; Schnake, 1991). Although Organ et al. (2006) criticized Bolino’s (1999) argument whereby it was assumed that true OCB cannot be discerned from impression management behaviors, Bolino’s argument also means there are some people who actually doubt the effectiveness of OCB-like behaviors in an organization even if Organ et al.’s criticism is accurate. It is highly possible that at least some employees also have similar doubts about the effectiveness of OCB.

Therefore, it should be examined whether or not employees’ job involvement would influence their appreciation of OCB for their organization, and not their attitude toward their organization. We asked employees to rate their importance evaluation of OCB for their workplace or organization in order to examine the reason for the positive relationship between job involvement and OCB.

This study also focused on the moderating effect of some demographic factors regarding the relationship between job involvement and evaluation of the importance of OCB. First, professional workers such as university professors might tend to have a sense of doing their professional job independently of colleagues. They are less concerned about creating and maintaining peaceful human relationships with colleagues than are clerical workers, who work together in a closed room. Therefore, when professors are job involved and exhibit OCB, they are more aware of the effect of OCB on their organization than are clerical workers. Second, several past researches have revealed that female employees have a stronger tendency to try to make friends and emphasize human relationships in an organization than do male employees. Therefore, highly involved female employees are less aware of the contribution of their OCB to an organization than are male employees.

2. HYPOTHESES

Job involvement has been considered to have several distinct dimensions, each of which has a different impact on behavioral performance. Kanungo (1982) noted that more than one
dimension would be necessary to represent the multiple concepts of job involvement. As discussed above, Diefendorff et al. (2002) separated work centrality from job involvement according to Paullay et al. (1994), and found these two factors had different effects on OCB. Recently Yoshimura (2007) developed a three-dimensional scale of job involvement using data collected from a Japanese sample: affective, cognitive, and behavioral job involvement. Her three dimensions would be appropriate for investigating the effect of job involvement in Japanese organizations. Affective job involvement is related to the degree to which an employee is interested in his/her job. Behavioral job involvement is referred to the degree to which an employee evaluates how positively he/she is doing something related to his/her job (e.g., taking time on a holiday to learn something to gain the knowledge necessary to improve his/her performance). Cognitive job involvement represented the degree to which an employee thinks his/her current job is important in his/her life. This cognitive job involvement is conceptually similar to work centrality (Diefendorff et al., 2002; Paullay et al., 1994).

First, affectively job involved employees tend to do their jobs more eagerly, and, through the job experience they are expected to become more aware of the importance of both the psychological context related to the job performance and the behaviors that improve that psychological context. Second, as will be noted in a concrete example of behavioral job involvement, many activities of behavioral job involvement are naturally exhibited in an off-the-job basis. In fact, those activities share characteristics in common with OCB. Therefore, we hypothesized about the effect of two aspects of job involvement on the importance evaluation of OCB.

Hypothesis I-1: Affective job involvement will have a positive effect on the importance evaluation of OCB for an organization.

Hypothesis I-2: Behavioral job involvement will have a positive effect on the importance evaluation of OCB for an organization.

In contrast, the effect of cognitive job involvement needs a different consideration. Cognitive job involvement can be affected by factors beyond a job. For example, an employee who has to support his/her entire family may have strong cognitive job involvement despite no interest in doing his/her job. In that case, they might do almost nothing beyond the formal job that is directly related to their compensation. They have no interest in the effect of OCB on their organization. Yoshimura (2007) found there was no effect of cognitive job involvement on job performance, and Diefendorff et al. (2002) found that work centrality had only a weak effect on only one of OCB forms. These results support the idea that cognitive job involved employees do not care about the importance of OCB. Therefore, we hypothesized the following:

Hypothesis I-3: Cognitive job involvement will NOT have a positive effect on the importance evaluation of OCB for an organization.

Next, we considered the moderating effect of employees’ job categories and gender on the relationship between affective job involvement and the importance evaluation of OCB. This study collected data from both professors and clerical workers at a private university. We
hypothesized that the effect of professors’ affective job involvement on their importance
evaluation of OCB was stronger than that of clerical workers’ job involvement for the following
reasons. First, it could be considered that OCB-like behaviors, which create and maintain
peaceful relationships with coworkers in an office, are natural for clerical workers. In contrast,
professors often work independently of other professors. Therefore, when professors exhibit
OCB, they are expected to be aware of the effects of OCB that are unusual to them. Second,
professors are not necessarily aware of the boundary between their formal job and extra formal
job. They are also expected to consider that whatever they are doing, including OCB-like
behaviors, can contribute their organization after all. Therefore, we hypothesized the following:

Hypothesis II: The relationship between affective job involvement and the importance
evaluation of OCB will be moderated by job category such that there will be a stronger positive
relationship for professors than for clerical workers.

As with the effect of job category, employees’ gender also has a mediating effect on the
relationship between job involvement and the importance evaluation of OCB. Past research
showed that female employees naturally emphasize relational identities (Gabriel & Gardner,
1999; Guimond, Chatard, Martinot, Crisp & Redersdorff, 2006). Female employees are less
conscious of the effect of their OCB on organizational effectiveness than are male employees,
even when female employees are affectively job involved. Therefore, the following hypothesis
was proposed:

Hypothesis III: The relationship between affective job involvement and the importance
evaluation of OCB will be moderated by gender such that there will be a stronger positive
relationship for male employees than female employees.

3. METHOD

3.1. Participants

The data were collected from employees at a private university (juridical person) in Tokyo,
Japan. The whole juridical person employs 221 clerical workers and 234 university professors
(and teachers of other schools). We distributed the questionnaires and asked professors and
clerical workers to answer them. The actual sample consisted of 132 employees (84 clerical
workers and 47 university professors). Of all the participants, 69 were male and 59 were female
(4 were of unknown gender). 48 respondents were less than 40 years old and 79 respondents
were 40 or more than 40 years old. Except for demographic variables, participants were asked
to rate each item using an ordinary Likert seven-point scale. All of the items originally written
in English were translated into Japanese by the authors, and then independent bilingual
professors confirmed the appropriateness of the translated sentences.

3.2. Measures

Job Involvement. Job Involvement was divided into three dimensions. All these measures were
developed by Yoshimura (2007) using samples from Japanese workers in various Japanese
work settings. Affective job involvement was measured using a three-item scale. Exemplary
Organizational Citizenship Behavior. Many OCB researchers have proposed different forms or measures of OCB (LePine, Erez, & Johnson, 2002; Organ et al., 2006; Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Paine, & Bachrach, 2000). Although OCB research in Asian countries should focus on different OCB forms compared to Western research, Japanese OCB research has just begun, and appropriate OCB forms related to Japanese employees have yet to be established. Therefore, in this study, OCB was originally collected using Podsakoff and MacKenzie’s (1994) 14 items which consisted of civic virtue (3 items), helping behaviors (7 items), and sportsmanship (4 items). Their items have been used and validated by many other researchers to date (Organ et al., 2006). In addition to these three different forms of OCB, we also constructed a composite OCB form by averaging all 14 items. We changed their original sentences to ask participants to rate the importance of OCBs for their workplace or organization.

Demography. Participants were also asked to answer questions regarding their job (professors = 1, clerical workers = 2), gender (male = 1, female = 2), and age (less than 40 = 1, and 40 or more than 40 = 2). These data will be controlled to discern the effect of the factors we are interested in. Age was also used in order to determine its moderating effect.

3.3. Analytic Strategy

For each category, all the responses to items were averaged to make a composite measure. Correlation and multiple regression analysis were used to test the hypotheses. In the regression analysis, demographic factors such as job, gender, and age were entered at Step 1 in order to control the effect of those variables. Next, job involvement and collectivism were entered at Step 2 to examine their unique contribution to predicting OCB. Finally, the product of collectivism and age was entered at Step 3 to confirm the moderating effect of age.

4. RESULTS

Correlations, means, standard deviations, and internal consistency reliabilities (Cronbach’s alpha) are reported in Table 1. Job category was positively related to all job involvement dimensions, suggesting that clerical workers were generally more involved in their job than professors. Gender had only a significantly negative relationship with cognitive job involvement, and age had a significantly positive relationship with affective and behavioral job involvement. The fact that female employees had weaker cognitive job involvement than male employees is understandable if it is considered that most of them and their husbands are dual-earners. Older employees had higher job involvement than younger ones, most likely due to their higher positions in the organization.
### Table 1: Means, Standard Deviations, Reliabilities, and Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Means</th>
<th>Std Dev</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Category</td>
<td>1.356</td>
<td>0.481</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>1.417</td>
<td>0.500</td>
<td>0.301**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>1.594</td>
<td>0.492</td>
<td>0.087</td>
<td>-0.239**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective JI</td>
<td>5.351</td>
<td>1.408</td>
<td>0.491**</td>
<td>-0.147</td>
<td>0.174*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral JI</td>
<td>3.673</td>
<td>1.566</td>
<td>0.397**</td>
<td>-0.172</td>
<td>0.207*</td>
<td>0.592**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive JI</td>
<td>4.677</td>
<td>1.366</td>
<td>0.293**</td>
<td>-0.205*</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
<td>0.545**</td>
<td>0.478**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic Virtue</td>
<td>4.814</td>
<td>1.084</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>-0.019</td>
<td>-0.022</td>
<td>0.335**</td>
<td>0.260**</td>
<td>0.469**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping Behavior</td>
<td>5.169</td>
<td>0.721</td>
<td>-0.166</td>
<td>0.214*</td>
<td>-0.002</td>
<td>0.189*</td>
<td>-0.025</td>
<td>0.235**</td>
<td>0.487**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sportsmanship</td>
<td>4.994</td>
<td>1.008</td>
<td>0.185*</td>
<td>-0.067</td>
<td>0.232**</td>
<td>0.436*</td>
<td>0.311**</td>
<td>0.163</td>
<td>0.230**</td>
<td>0.263**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB</td>
<td>5.048</td>
<td>0.659</td>
<td>-0.018</td>
<td>0.105</td>
<td>0.105</td>
<td>0.403*</td>
<td>0.195*</td>
<td>0.349**</td>
<td>0.719**</td>
<td>0.835**</td>
<td>0.66**</td>
<td>(0.82)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: JI—job involvement, N = 131, *—p < .05, **—p < .01. Coefficient Alphas are reported along the diagonal.

### Table 2: Result of Hierarchical Regression Analyses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Civic Virtue</th>
<th>Helping Behavior</th>
<th>Sportsmanship</th>
<th>OCB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>β</td>
<td>ΔF</td>
<td>ΔR²</td>
<td>β</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Job</td>
<td>0.024</td>
<td>-0.117</td>
<td>0.167</td>
<td>0.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-0.025</td>
<td>0.086</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-0.034</td>
<td>0.057</td>
<td>0.227**</td>
<td>0.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Job</td>
<td>-0.186</td>
<td>-0.250**</td>
<td>-0.062</td>
<td>-0.329**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td>0.221**</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.152*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-0.037</td>
<td>0.072</td>
<td>0.133</td>
<td>0.107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Affective JI</td>
<td>0.165</td>
<td>0.299**</td>
<td>0.473***</td>
<td>0.427***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Behavioral JI</td>
<td>0.428***</td>
<td>14.850***</td>
<td>0.272</td>
<td>0.205***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cognitive JI</td>
<td>0.058</td>
<td>-0.219**</td>
<td>0.086</td>
<td>-0.087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Job</td>
<td>-0.078</td>
<td>-0.173*</td>
<td>-0.053</td>
<td>-0.148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>0.021</td>
<td>0.188**</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-0.011</td>
<td>0.086</td>
<td>0.135</td>
<td>0.126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Affective JI</td>
<td>0.068</td>
<td>0.265**</td>
<td>0.459***</td>
<td>0.375***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Behavioral JI</td>
<td>0.464***</td>
<td>14.850***</td>
<td>0.272</td>
<td>0.205***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cognitive JI</td>
<td>0.065</td>
<td>4.498**</td>
<td>0.052</td>
<td>-0.257***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Job * Affective JI</td>
<td>-0.268***</td>
<td>-0.271***</td>
<td>-0.011</td>
<td>-0.245**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gender * Affective JI</td>
<td>-0.101</td>
<td>-0.279***</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>-0.197**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: JI—job involvement, N = 131, *—p < .1, **—p < .05, ***—p < .001
Table 1 also demonstrates the relationship between job involvement and the importance evaluation of OCB. Except for the relationships between behavioral job involvement and the importance evaluation of helping behavior and between cognitive job involvement and that of sportsmanship, all of the relationships were significantly positive, as expected.

### 4.1. Test of hypotheses

The results of hierarchical regression analysis are summarized in Table 2. According to Step 3 in Table 2, affective job involvement positively influenced the importance evaluation of helping behavior ($\beta = 0.265$, $p < 0.05$), sportsmanship ($\beta = 0.459$, $p < 0.01$), and composite OCB ($\beta = 0.375$, $p < 0.01$), but not civic virtue ($\beta = 0.068$, n.s.) after controlling demography variables, therefore, Hypothesis I-1 is partially supported. Behavioral job involvement had significantly positive relationships with the importance evaluation of civic virtue ($\beta = 0.464$, $p < 0.01$), helping behavior ($\beta = 0.325$, $p < 0.01$) and composite OCB ($\beta = 0.282$, $p < 0.01$), but not sportsmanship ($\beta = -0.139$, n.s.). That result indicated Hypothesis I-2 was partially supported.

In contrast, the effect of cognitive job involvement was contrary to our expectations. Although cognitive job involvement had no significant relationship with two of the importance evaluation of OCB forms and composite OCB according to Hypothesis I-3, it had a significantly negative relationship with the importance evaluation of helping behavior ($\beta = -0.257$, $p < 0.05$). This negative relationship is contrary to Hypothesis I-3, which requires an explanation that will be given in a later section.

Hypotheses II and III proposed the moderating effect of job category and gender on the relationship between affective job involvement and OCB. These hypotheses were tested at Step 3 by examining the significance of the product of affective job involvement and job category or gender. First, the product of job category and affective job involvement has a significantly negative effect on the importance evaluation of civic virtue ($\beta = -0.268$, $p < 0.01$), helping behavior ($\beta = -0.271$, $p < 0.01$) and composite OCB ($\beta = -0.245$, $p < 0.01$), but not sportsmanship ($\beta = -0.011$, n.s.), suggesting that Hypothesis II was partially supported. This result indicated that the effect of affective job involvement on the importance evaluation of civic virtue and helping behavior were stronger for professors than for clerical workers.

Regarding the moderating effect of gender, the product of affective job involvement and gender had a significantly negative relationship with the importance evaluation of helping behavior ($\beta = -0.279$, $p < 0.01$), and composite OCB ($\beta = -0.197$, $p < 0.05$). This result indicated that affective job involvement more strongly influenced the importance evaluation of helping behavior when employees were male than when they were female. Although this result supports Hypothesis III, no other significant relationships were found.

### 5. DISCUSSION

This research contributes to the OCB literature in several ways. First, although other research revealed the positive effect of job involvement on OCB, this study focused on job involved employees’ importance evaluation of OCB. Empirical study showed job involved employees
generally emphasized OCB in their workplace and organization more than less involved employees. Second, Japan lags behind other Asian countries in conducting research on OCB, and this research proves it is still important and necessary to focus on OCB in spite of the ambiguous boundary between a formal job and extra formal job based on Japanese collectivistic environment.

The results of this study showed that different dimensions of job involvement had different effects on the importance evaluation of each OCB. Interestingly, while affectively job involved employees evaluated the importance of helping behavior and sportsmanship, behavioral job involved employees considered civic virtue and helping behavior as being more important to an organization. Helping behavior can be considered as the most universal OCB (Organ et al., 2006). Sportsmanship seems to be considered as a gentle behavior that makes a peaceful world in Japanese society. In contrast, behaviors belonging to civic virtue might sometimes be considered by Japanese to be aggressive and rude, or even destroy traditional human relationships because some civic virtue behaviors seem to be motivated by a feeling of superiority. Therefore, this study revealed affectively job involved employees emphasized behaviors that facilitate good human relationships for their organization. Because behavioral job involved employees are interested in personal development, they positively accepted the value of civic virtue and negated gentle behaviors like sportsmanship.

This study also indicated the relationship between job involvement and the importance evaluation of OCB, and particularly helping behavior, was different depending on employees’ job and gender. Helping behavior is sometimes considered as a conventional requirement in a collectivistic society. Therefore, although it is generally seen to be important for an organization, the actual level of emphasizing this kind of behavior is influenced to some degree by demographic factors.

In contrast to Hypothesis I-3, cognitive involvement was negatively related to helping behavior. This means that when employees perceived the importance of their job in their life, they tended to place less importance on helping behavior for the organization. It is difficult to explain the reason for this result, but it can be inferred that OCB seemed bothersome to cognitive job involved employees who want to concentrate on doing the formal job that is important in their life. In fact, extreme awareness of human relationships sometimes increases barefaced, impudent employees and creates a somewhat uncomfortable environment that results in deterioration of organizational effectiveness. Furthermore, the results of Step 3 showed this tendency was stronger for male employees than for female employees. Actually, when data was analyzed by gender, only the male sample produced a significant effect of cognitive job involvement on the importance evaluation of helping behavior ($\beta = -0.417, p < 0.05$ for male, $\beta = -0.078, n. s.$ for female). Male employees might like a competitive environment more than female employees when they are cognitively job involved.

The findings of this study have important implications for both researchers and practitioners. Academically, this study demonstrated that the significantly positive relationship between job involvement and OCB that has been found in other empirical research is at least partially attributable to the effect of job involvement on appreciation of OCB. Furthermore, this study
could induce practical managers to consider the effect of a job rotation system that is introduced in an organization. Job rotation is effective to help employees to gain a wider, more balanced organizational perspective, but it may also have an effect on job involvement. Managers should be careful of the effects of the system currently adopted in their organization regarding employees’ job involvement and their cognition about their behaviors for the organization.

Despite these important implications, some drawbacks from this study should be addressed in future studies. First, this study asked employees to rate the importance of each OCB item for their workplace or organization. We used one commonly used Japanese word that can be widely interpreted to mean a worker’s job site, office, or entire organization because we wanted the respondents to easily understand it. However, this method prevented us from understanding whether respondents rated the importance of OCB items for either their job site or for their whole organization.

This distinction becomes important when behaviors and perceptions of Asian employees are analyzed. Thus, it is possible that highly involved Asian employees recognize the effect of OCB only on the psychological context of their job site with little consideration of the effect on the entire organization (Motowidlo & Van Scotter, 1994; Van Scotter & Motowidlo, 1996). For example, Japanese employees are generally sensitive to human relationships with accessible coworkers. Furthermore, they form a team with a supervisor and coworkers to do their jobs together. They perform OCB to develop and maintain peaceful human relationships with those team members because the positive human relationships are crucial to the execution of their involved formal job; however, because of this they might not necessarily consider their OCB ultimately contributes to organizational effectiveness. This is related to Hui, Lee, and Rousseau’s (2004) suggestion, “traditional Chinese people tend to approach organizations ‘thinking interpersonally,’ in contrast to the Western view of the employment relationship that is based upon ‘thinking organizationally’” (p. 233). Therefore, in the future it would be useful to determine what employees consider OCB is contributive to, and how these perceptions relate to their attitude and behaviors.

Second, this study collected data from only one private university. Although a university also has basic requirements as an organization, its characteristics are quite different from business organizations. In particular, in many cases a Japanese university does not have a severe performance appraisal system and gives their employees some room to judge appropriate behaviors on their own. This atmosphere in a Japanese university may have some impact on employees’ discretionary behaviors and their rating of those behaviors. This might not be a drawback to this study, but future studies should investigate Japanese OCB in different work environments such as a business or hospital in order to reveal the unique features of OCB in each different type of organization. Furthermore, this study collected data from only 131 employees. This number is relatively small compared to other OCB studies. Thus, further investigation is needed in the near future.

Finally, future studies should provide materials by which to judge an appropriate definition of OCB by investigating how Japanese employees think about their jobs. This study intentionally did not treat the problem with an appropriate definition of OCB. In a Japanese working
environment, the distinction between intra-role and extra-role behaviors is quite ambiguous, and the definition of OCB should meet this unique situation. Above all, much Chinese or Taiwanese OCB research has adopted the Chinese OCB dimensions established by Farh, Earley, and Lin (1997) and Farh, Zhong, and Organ (2004). Although we are able to adopt their items without modification, these dimensions reflect Chinese-type collectivism, and, as discussed by Alston (1991), Japanese-type collectivism is different in some ways. Therefore, examination of the effectiveness of these dimensions to measure Japanese OCB, and, if necessary, establishing new Japanese OCB dimensions would be useful for future study.
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