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The effect of gender harassment in the workplace on job-related behaviors of working Japanese women, including organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) and organizational withdrawal behavior (OWB) was investigated through an on-line survey. Japanese women working in Japanese corporations (N = 500) participated in the study by responding to the survey. Results of hierarchical multiple regression analysis linking the frequency of experiencing gender harassment to job-related behaviors indicated that in working Japanese women (a) experiencing more frequent gender harassment at the workplace was associated with more frequent OWB and OCB; (b) higher evaluation of interactional justice at the workplace was associated with more frequent OCB; and (c) lower interactional justice at the workplace was associated with more frequent OWB under the commission model. Based on these findings in this study, we discuss the effect of gender harassment on job-related behaviors of Japanese women and future implications.
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The number of female employees in Japan has been increasing in recent years. In 1987, the ratio of female workers as a percentage of all employees in Japan accounted for only 36.8%, whereas in 2002, this ratio had increased to 41.2% (Mizunoya & Kasuya, 2006). However, the ratio of female managers as a percentage of all Japanese managerial workers has remained low, accounting for only 9.7% in private enterprises in Japan with over 100 employees. According to OECD report, Japanese women have great difficulty in rising to the top of corporations, with less than 5% of listed company board members in Japan being women, which is one of the lowest proportions of women among OECD countries (OECD, 2012).

It has been reported that employees in Japanese workplaces are often treated differently according to their gender, rather than according to their ability. For example, according to Ogasawara (1998), men are expected to have important roles in the Japanese workplace, whereas women are expected to have subordinate roles. The Japan Institute of Workers'
Evolution (1993) reported that working women in Japan have frequently been told for example that “Women cannot understand this work,” or that “You are good for a woman,” or “Behave in a womanly manner,” among others. Such unpleasant gender-related comments in their workplaces could decrease a women’s work motivation and trivialize their abilities. Nemoto (2010) suggested that since the Japanese workplace has traditionally been male-dominated, female workers are expected to be young and perform classical female gender roles. In addition, Nemoto (2010) reported that female Japanese workers were often involved in sexual interactions on and off the job in their workplaces.

Previous psychological studies on working Japanese women have reported that female employees have often been expected to serve refreshments, or to do chores for their male colleagues. It has also been suggested that women were not assigned important jobs, such as participating in business negotiations, because of their gender. According to the result of a survey conducted by the Japan Institute of Workers’ Evolution (1993), many female respondents answered “I hope that ordering women to do odd jobs in the office would stop” as a worry, dissatisfaction, or a request of their workplace.

The survey by the Japan Institute of Workers’ Evolution (2005) indicated that 55.5% of human management officials in Japan responded with “Somewhat Agree,” or “Quite Agree,” to the statement, “Fixed ideas about gender, such as ‘serving tea to office members, or cleaning the workplace are women’s jobs,’ still exist in our office.” Munekata (2001) regarded phrases such as, “Women cannot understand this work” as gender harassment, because such statements imply that women are not considered as equal partners, and cautioned that gender harassment discourages women’s motivation in the Japanese workplace. Kobayashi (2009) defined gender harassment as treating people differently based on their gender. These studies suggest that gender harassment involves conceiving women only as housekeepers, or babysitters, rather than as occupational workers, thereby devaluing a female worker’s value in the workplace.

Previous Studies about Gender Harassment in Japan

In the context of Japanese psychological research, gender harassment has been mainly mentioned in the context of sexual harassment research (e.g., Kakuyama, Matsui & Tsuzuki, 2003). Kakuyama et al. (2003) examined gender harassment data on female Japanese employees, by comparing Japanese with US data. According to the results of the study by Kakuyama et al. (2003), the incidence of gender harassment in the Japanese workplace was 5.83% to 27.95%, which was lower than that in the US (21.82% to 50.82%). Kakuyama et al. (2003) considered that this result might have been caused by culturally dependent items that were inappropriate for assessing the experiences of female Japanese workers regarding sexual harassment in the workplace. Sano and Munekata (1999) excluded the Quid-Pro-Quo workplace harassments that rarely occurred in Japanese organizations as research targets, by developing a gender harassment scale consisting of 9 items. Sano and Munekata (1999) conducted a large-scale survey targeting Japanese employees working in private corporations using this scale and reported that similar to the US, gender harassment occurred more frequently than sexual harassment in the Japanese workplace. On the basis of previous research discussed above, Kobayashi and Tanaka (2010)
developed the Japanese Measurement of Gender Harassment Scale, which was designed to assess work situations in Japan, and in a study using this scale, they reported that psychological health of female workers has declined because of gender harassment.

Definition of Gender Harassment

Traditional definitions of gender harassment. Fitzgerald, Gelfand, and Drasgow (1995) classified sexual harassment into three categories: gender harassment, unwanted sexual attention, and sexual coercion. They conceived of gender harassment as a sub-category of sexual harassment and defined it as “…a broad range of verbal and nonverbal behaviors not aimed at sexual cooperation but that convey insulting, hostile and degrading attitudes toward women” (p.430). Fitzgerald et al. (1995) referred to gender harassment as one of the milder types of sexual harassment.

Relationship between gender and sexual harassments. In the context of sexual harassment research, there is some debate on if gender harassment should be separated from sexual harassment. For example, Pryor and Fitzgerald (2002) suggested that gender harassment consists of sexist behaviors and behaviors such as attacking, or looking down on women, rather than behaviors based on a sexual intention. In the domain of applied psychology, gender harassment has been considered as a form of workplace bullying, i.e., gendered bullying. Jones (2006) suggested that regarding gendered bullying as one form of sexual harassment would be an obstacle to conducting research on workplace bullying and to developing a theoretical framework of sexual harassment. In Japan, Munekata (2001) proposed that gender harassment and sexual harassment should be treated as different concepts. Okuyama (1999), a lawyer, suggested that although both sexual and gender harassment refer to gender discrimination, these concepts could be defined such that the former referred to “the harassment caused by sexual concerns or demands,” whereas the latter included “the harassment caused by coercion of fixed gender roles.”

Kobayashi and Tanaka (2010) investigated whether gender harassment was independent of sexual harassment. The results showed that the correlation between gender harassment and sexual harassment was no stronger than the correlation between gender harassment and workplace incivility. These results indicate that in Japan, the concept of gender harassment should be viewed differently from the concept of sexual harassment and that each of these types of harassments would have different influences on working women.

Definition of gender harassment in this study. In contrast to Fitzgerald et al. (1995) who defined gender harassment as a sub-set of sexual harassment, Sano and Munekata (1999) proposed that gender harassment must be separated conceptually from sexual harassment, because they have different qualities. Lim and Cortina (2005) suggested that workplace incivility and sexual harassment were constructs related to gender harassment and bridging the two concepts. Hitlan, Pryor, Hesson-McInnis, and Olson (2009) indicated that gender harassment, unlike other forms of sexual harassment, is not aimed at gaining sexual access to women; but rather, that it is an expression of ridicule. In this study we distinguished between gender harassment that results from the social expectation that women should follow classical gender roles in the workplace, and sexual harassment that is the result of sexual interest. Therefore,
in this study, we defined gender harassment as *treating people differently based on their gender*.

According to this definition, it is assumed that both men and women could be harassers and harasses. However, gender harassment is shown to have more damaging effects on women than on men (Barling, Dekker, Loughlin, et al., 1996). In the case of men, such harassment has not been associated with over-performance demands, or psychological distress (Parker & Griffin, 2002). Therefore, in this study, we focused on gender harassment against women by men, as well as by other women.

Measurement of Gender Harassment

Piotrkowski (1998), one of the pioneers of gender harassment research, used one item for measuring the frequency of gender harassment. Brown, Campbell, and Fife-Shaw (1995) developed a five-item gender harassment scale as a subscale of a instrument for assessing sexual harassment. The items of this scale were designed to be appropriate for both male and female respondents. Fitzgerald et al. (1995) developed a gender harassment scale as a subscale of their Sexual Experience Questionnaire (SEQ). This scale was composed of 5 items, including “told suggestive stories,” and “made rude sexual remarks,” among others. Sano and Munekata (1999) constructed a gender harassment scale that took the actual working conditions of Japanese women into consideration, which consisted of 9 items, some of which were concerning comments about job performance, including “this job may be impossible for women,” and “a man would be good for this job,” whereas other items were concerning comments about a woman’s figure or appearance, including, “you have a full bust,” and “your hair is thinning,” among others. Kobayashi and Tanaka (2010) developed a measure for assessing gender harassment by other women, as well as by men for women in Japanese workplace, in which two dimensions of gender harassment were measured – *commission* and *omission*. The commission dimension refers to acts that are expected by gender roles; and the omission dimension refers to acts that are not expected by gender roles. Results of DIF analysis confirmed the reliability of the two-factor model of Kobayashi and Tanaka’s Gender Harassment Scale for male and female respondents (Tanaka, 2012).

Organizational Circumstances of Gender Harassment

It has been confirmed that gender harassment frequently occurs in male-dominated organizations (e.g., Parker & Griffin, 2002; Sano & Munekata, 1999). Parker and Griffin (2002) stated that gender harassment was likely to occur in traditionally male-dominated workplaces, or workplaces where female employees are a minority. In order to investigate effects that gender harassment has on work behaviors, Parker and Griffin (2002) studied women working in the British police force and found that gender harassment causes women victims to overcompensate in their performance, which led to an increase of psychological distress. Parker and Griffin (2002) developed the Over-Performance Demand (OPD) Scale that assesses attitudes, such as “I feel I have to work twice as hard as my colleagues,” and “I feel I am constantly trying to prove myself,” among others. Surprisingly, the authors found that many women in their study did not perceive gender harassment as being harmful to themselves, even though they were being victimized.
Consequences of Gender Harassment in the Workplace

Although the influence of sexual harassment on the victim’s job-related behaviors has been systematically examined (e.g., Glomb, Munson, Hulin, et al., 1999; Glomb, Richman, Hulin, et al., 1997), very few studies have investigated how the experience of gender harassment affected job performance. Previous studies have reported that female victims of gender harassment exhibited diminished psychological well-being, as well as a variety of psychological stress symptoms (e.g., O’Connell & Korabik, 2000; Piotrkowski, 1998; Woodzicka & LaFrance, 2005). Piotrkowski (1998) reported that suffering gender harassment heightened psychological distress and decreased job satisfaction among women in US organizations. Furthermore, Lim and Cortina (2005) reported that female victims of gender harassment had increased stress and decreased job satisfaction.

Kobayashi and Tanaka (2012) examined the negative influence of gender harassment suffered by female employees in Japanese workplaces and found that gender harassment had negative effects on the mental health of women, through OPD (Parker & Griffin, 2002). However, in Kobayashi and Tanaka’s study, the influence on OPD was different for the two dimensions of gender harassment: omission and commission. Their results suggested that in the model in which the commission dimension was an independent variable, perceiving gender harassment as unpleasant increased OPD, suggesting that in this model of gender harassment, perceived unpleasantness of gender harassment had indirect negative effects on the mental health of female employees. In the omission model, the frequency of experiencing gender harassment increased OPD regardless of whether participants perceived acts of gender harassment as unpleasant or not. Thus, in the omission model, the frequency of experiencing gender harassment had indirect negative effects on female employees’ mental health. However, we could not find previous research which examined the influence of gender harassment on the work behavior of female workers. In the present study, we confirmed that gender harassment negatively influenced the mental health of working women. Its negative influence should be also discussed from the viewpoint of organizational administration.

Organizational withdrawal behavior. Hanisch and Hulin (1991) defined organizational withdrawal behavior (OWB) as “a general construct composed of a variety of acts, or surrogate intentions, that reflect both the negativity of the precipitating job attitudes and the target of these negative attitudes” (p.111). OWB is composed of work withdrawal and job withdrawal (Hanisch & Hulin, 1990). Work withdrawal refers to behaviors that dissatisfied individuals use to avoid aspects of their specific work role, or minimize the time spent on their specific work tasks. Job withdrawal is defined as employees’ efforts to remove themselves from a specific organization and their work role.

Ogasawara (1998) reported that female Japanese workers who had experienced discrimination often avoid fulfilling their obligations to male workers and intentionally delay completing their work. Based on accounts of counseling conducted with female workers, Nakano (2008) suggested that discriminative treatment of female workers might be the cause of most job resignations by women in Japan. Nakano (2008) found that female Japanese workers who had experienced discrimination changed their opinions on the item, “I work less proportionally
to discrimination against me,” suggesting that female Japanese workers perceiving injustice due to gender discrimination might lower their performance as a form of resistance. The process of work “slow-downs” by female Japanese workers could be explained by equity theory (Adams, 1965). According to Adams (1965), equity is achieved when the ratio of a person’s inputs to outcomes is equal to the ratios of others. On the other hand, if the ratio of a person’s inputs to outcomes were not equal to others, there is inequity. Equity theory predicts that the more people feel inequity, the more they would be motivated to restore equity. Previous research has indicated that perceptions of inequity are related to employee theft (Greenberg, 1990, 1993), and organizational withdrawal behaviors (Banks, Patel & Moola, 2012). One of the features of gender harassment against female Japanese workers is to lower the self-worth of female workers in the workplace. Therefore, according to the equity theory, female workers might try to restore equity by lowering their job performance. Discrimination against female Japanese workers has resulted in women having restricted job roles that are often regarded as “non-essential,” compared with jobs performed by male workers (e.g., Kumazawa, 2000; Nakano, 2008). Women often take peripheral jobs and jobs with low responsibility; although, jobs such as forwarding customer’s messages to absent employees, or arranging material for office meetings, also serve useful functions in the workplace. According to the results of a survey conducted in 2008 by the Japan Institute for Labour Policy and Training (2009), 222 Japanese managers responded that 71.5% of employees engaged in ‘core jobs’ were males, whereas 41.7% of women and 32.7% of male employees were mainly engaged in general affairs in Japanese corporations. In general, the more female Japanese workers experience gender harassment, the more they could be expected to intentionally lower their job performance in order to demonstrate that their jobs are valuable. Based on the above reasoning, we proposed the following hypothesis:

_Hypothesis 1:_ The frequency of experiencing gender harassment would be positively related to OWB.

**Organizational citizenship behavior.**

Organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) is a type of spontaneous behavior of employee in the workplace. Organ, Podsakoff, and MacKenzie (2006) defined OCB as “individual behavior that is discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system, and in the aggregate promotes the efficient and effective functioning of the organization” (p.3). A meta-analysis of OCB studies has indicated that positive attitudes of employees regarding an organization, such as job satisfaction and perceived justice, promoted OCB and negative attitudes inhibited OCB (e.g., Spitzmuller, Van Dyne & Illies, 2008). What then would be the predicted effects of gender harassment on OCB? As discussed above, it is known that gender harassment lowers the self-worth of female workers in Japanese workplaces and increases their efforts to gain high performance evaluations. However, it would be difficult for many female Japanese workers to associate their efforts with high performance evaluations based on their official performance, because of their restricted job roles that are often regarded as non-essential (Kumazawa, 2000; Ogasawara, 1998). As a result, gender harassment might not underestimate the ability of each female worker, but would reduce job performance of
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women in general. Thus, if the jobs of female workers were adequately difficult and a requisite for their organizations, gender harassment would make people consider jobs that women do as being simple. Consequently, female workers would become aware that evaluations regarding their performance would never increase, unless they change their gender. Therefore, female workers would not choose to continue with the useless endeavors of their official jobs, but would try to do non-official work. Thus, it is possible that working Japanese women would work hard at informal and spontaneous jobs (i.e., OCB) for obtaining positive appraisals. Based on the above reasoning, we developed the following hypothesis:

Hypothesis 2: The frequency of experiencing gender harassment will be positively related to OCB.

Interactional justice. Interactional justice is the interpersonal aspect of psychological justice, including explanations, honesty, and interpersonally sensitive treatment (Bies & Moag, 1986). According to research, the more employees perceived that interactional justice was insufficient, the more frequently they engaged in organizational deviant behaviors (Ambrose, Seabright & Schminke, 2002; Skarlicki, Folger & Tesluk, 1999), and even stole from the organization (Greenberg, 1993). Moreover, some Japanese studies have indicated that employees receiving less interactional justice were likely to engage in work slow-downs (e.g., Tanaka, 2008). These results suggest that employees experiencing interpersonally unfair treatment would be apt to carry out retaliatory behaviors against their organizations. Ambrose et al. (2002) confirmed that the severity of employees’ retaliatory behaviors increased as a function of interactional unfairness that employees experienced, suggesting that the more employees experienced unfair treatment, the more severely would their retaliatory behaviors impact their organizations, whereas if interactional unfairness decreases, the likelihood of employees’ retaliations would also decrease. Therefore, even if employees experiencing frequent gender harassment were to conducted organizational withdrawal behaviors, such behaviors would be moderated through perceived interactional justice. Based on the above rational, we developed the following hypothesis:

Hypothesis 3: Interactional justice would moderate the effects of gender harassment on OWB, such that low interactional justice would result in a positive relationship between gender harassment and OWB, whereas high interactional justice would make this relationship less positive.

It has been demonstrated that the more interactional justice was perceived by employees, the more OCB they would perform (Moorman, 1991; Tanaka, Hayashi & Ohbuchi, 1998). Furthermore, Hypothesis 2 of the present study predicted that female Japanese workers would try to increase their self-worth in workplaces through working hard at OCB. Therefore, it is possible that both perceived interactional justice and the frequency of experiencing gender harassment would facilitate OCB. However, female workers that have suffered gender harassment would not have to work hard at OCB in order to increase the value of their work, if they perceived that they receive fair interactional treatment. Therefore, the more female employees perceive interactional justice in their workplaces, the more
moderate would be the influence of gender harassment on OCB. Based on the above reasoning, we developed the following hypothesis:

*Hypothesis 4:* Interactional justice would moderate the effects of gender harassment on OCB.

1 Method

1.1 Participants

Female employees in Japanese companies participated in this study ($N = 500$, Mean age 36.8 years, Age range 22 to 62 years, $SD = 8.69$; mean years of work experience = 8.69 years, $SD = 7.40$) Their education included high school education, 97 (19.4%); technical junior college or professional education, 69 (13.8%); junior college education, 108 (21.6%); university education, 207 (41.4%), and graduate education, 19 (3.8%). Occupational titles of participants included clerical workers, 435 (87%); business managers, 8 (1.6%); government or public workers, 30 (6.0%); and officers of public service corporations, 27 (5.4%). Employment status of participants included, general employees, 378 (75.6%); team leaders, 64 (12.8%); section managers, 23 (4.6%); section managers and assistant section managers, 14 (2.8%); assistant managers, 3 (0.6%); the head chief, 9 (1.8%); and executives, 9 (1.8%). Participants worked in the following occupations: office workers, 435 (87.0%); executive officers, 8 (1.6%); public officers, 30 (6.0%), and organizational staff, 27 (5.4%).

1.2 Procedure

The survey was conducted by a Japanese research company in August 2009. First, 1,500 female workers were extracted randomly from a sample of 60,000 women that was a part of 240,000 women registered in the company database. This random sample received an e-mail explaining the survey and 551 women agreed to respond to the questionnaire used in this study. Of these, 51 respondents were excluded, including men that had registered as women, housewives and students that had registered as office workers, as well as respondents that made outlying responses. Therefore, data of 500 employed women were used in the analysis.

1.3 Measures

**Gender harassment scale.** Kobayashi and Tanaka (2010) developed the Japanese Gender Harassment Scale, which was composed of two dimensions. The first dimension labeled *commission*, which is assessed by items such as, “I expect women to fulfill a comfort-providing role,” and “I evaluate characteristics of female workers as women, instead of their abilities,” among others. This dimension consisted of gender harassment activities resulting from traditional gender role expectations. The second dimension labeled *omission* was assessed by items such as, “I do not assign important jobs such as negotiations to women, because of their gender,” and “I do not expect women to be leaders, because they are women,” among others. This dimension consisted of gender harassment activities not resulting from expected gender roles.

The gender harassment scale contains 13 items of which 7 items are related to the omission dimension and 6 items to the commission dimension. In the present study, we assessed the frequency of experiencing gender harassment by converting active sentence items developed by Kobayashi and Tanaka (2010) to the passive form, “I was not expected to become a leader,” and “I was expected to fulfill a comfort
role” (see Appendix). These items are rated on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (Not at all) to 5 (Very frequently).

**OCB.** We adopted the supporting organizations and cleanliness subscales of Tanaka’s (2004) Japanese Measurement of Organizational Citizenship Behavior. In Japan, supporting an organization includes employees doing voluntary work at their workplaces during off duty hours. This subscale assesses such behavior using 8 items including “I assist the supervisor without being asked,” and “I deal with visitors who go to other sections of the company.” Cleanliness refers to employees voluntarily maintaining a clean office or workplace and it is assessed by 3 items including, “After using office equipment, or stationary in the office, I arrange them for the next user,” “I keep my work area clean and neat,” and “when I find litter, I pick it up and put it in a trash can.” These items are rated on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (Not at all) to 5 (Very frequently). Cronbach alpha-coefficient of supporting organizations score was .841, and that of the cleanliness score was .878, which are indicative of high reliability of these subscales (Table 1).

**OWB.** One of the authors selected four items relevant to OWB from a list of scales assessing anti-social organizational behavior compiled by Tanaka (2008) based on previous studies, which included the following items: “Even though it was an urgent job, I intentionally work slowly,” “When I noticed a mistake by a coworker, I did not tell him/her about it and kept silent,” as well as, “When I would be asked to do a certain job, I might answer ‘No, I can’t,’ even if I could do the job,” and “When I received a message for a coworker, I intentionally did not send it to him/her quickly.” These items are rated on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (Not at all) to 5 (Very frequently). The Cronbach alpha coefficient of OWB score was .812, which is indicative

| Table 1 Summary Statistics and Correlations among Variables (N=500) |
|------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|                  | Means (SD) | 1   | 2   | 3   | 4   | 5   | 6   | 7   | 8   |
| 1. Age           | 36.77 (8.69) |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| 2. Work experience | 8.69 (7.40) | .569** |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| 3. GH: Commission | 16.34 (5.70) | -109* | -19 | 848 |     |     |     |     |     |
| 4. GH: Omission  | 13.27 (6.07) | .083 | .109* | 614** | .928 |     |     |     |     |
| 5. OCB: Supporting the organization | 19.07 (6.20) | .009 | .075 | 381** | 235** | .841 |     |     |     |
| 6. OCB: Cleanliness | 11.05 (3.02) | -012 | -032 | 262** | 098* | 403** | .878 |     |     |
| 7. OWB           | 6.68 (2.58) | -069 | -052 | 126** | 208** | .012 | -233** | .812 |     |
| 8. Interactional justice | 21.95 (5.78) | .017 | .003 | 183** | 329** | 117** | 158** | -141** | .865 |

*Note.* Correlations appear below the diagonal, and coefficient alphas appear numeric numbers in parentheses along the diagonal.

GH = gender harassment; OCB = organizational citizenship behavior; OWB = organizational withdrawal behavior **; p<.01, *; p<.05
of its high reliability (Table 1).

**Interactional justice.** We assessed interactional justice using the Japanese version of Justice Measurement developed by Tanaka et al. (1998). This interactional justice scale is constructed of 7 items that ask respondents how appropriate judgments or decisions made by their supervisors were, and how fairly they were treated by their supervisors using items such as, “When my supervisor made a decision and practiced it, he tried to explain so that I could understand its contents,” and “My supervisor treated me with consideration.” These items are rated on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (Strongly disagree) to 5 (Strongly agree). The scores for items using negative phrasing were reverse coded (i.e., 1 being strong agreement, 5 strong disagreement). The Cronbach alpha-coefficient of the interactional justice score was .865, indicative its high reliability (Table 1).

2 Results

2.1 Factor Analysis of the Gender Harassment Scale

Exploratory factor analysis (EFA) using promax rotation indicated two factors accounting for 59.2% of the variance; however, there was one item with a factor loading of less than 0.40 in the two factors. The correlation coefficient between the two factors was .586. Thus, we again conducted an EFA on the remaining 12 items, by excluding the item with low factor loadings. Results indicated that factor loadings of items corresponding to each factor was more than .400, and that 6 items loaded on the first factor, which was termed “omission,” and 6 items loaded on the second factor, which was termed “commission” (see Appendix). The contents of each factor were very similar to the factor structure described by Kobayashi and Tanaka (2010).

Next, we conducted a confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) to determine whether the omission and commission dimensions were separate factors, by using structural equation modeling (SEM) with Amos 17.0. A CFA of the six omission items and the six commission items revealed that a two-factor solution showed a better fit to the data: the comparative fit index (CFI) =.959, Tucker-Lewis index (TLI) =.949, the root-mean-square error of approximation, (RMSEA =.075), than a single factor model (CFI=.914, TLI=.905, RMSEA=.124). The correlation coefficient of the two factors was .725.

2.2 Analysis of the Effects of Gender Harassment on Job-Related Behaviors

Because the correlation coefficient was high between the omission and commission scores as dependent variables (r=.614) compared to correlation coefficients between the omission and job-related behaviors (OWB; r=.208, supporting organizations; r=.235, cleanliness; r=.098) and between the commission and job-related behaviors (OWB; r=.126, supporting organizations; r=.381, cleanliness; r=.262), we conducted separate multiple regression analyses for each score.

Effects of gender harassment on OWB. To examine Hypothesis 1 and Hypothesis 3, we performed a hierarchical multiple-regression analysis on OWB as a dependent variable. The analysis of the commission model included age, and work experience as control variables in the first step. The commission and interactional justice were added as independent variables in the second step, and the interaction term of commission and interactional justice was added in the third step. First, results of the analysis indicated that VIF values ranged...
from 1.002 to 1.512 in all steps of the regression analysis, indicating no multicollinearity (Ho, 2013). Second, results showed that the difference of determination coefficients between Step 1 and Step 2 ($\Delta R^2 = .029$, $p < .01$), and beta-coefficients of commission ($\beta = .101$, $p < .01$) and interactional justice ($\beta = -.121$, $p < .01$) were significant (Table 2). However, the difference of determination coefficients between Step 2 and Step 3 ($\Delta R^2 = .017$) was not significant. A second analysis of the omission model that included age, and work experience as control variables in the first step was conducted, in which omission and interactional justice were added as independent variables in the second step, and the interaction term of the omission and interactional justice was added in the third step. First, results of the analysis indicated VIF values ranged from 1.044 to 1.487 in all steps of the regression analysis, indicative of no multicollinearity (Ho, 2013). Second, the results showed that the difference of determination coefficients between Step 1 and Step 2 ($\Delta R^2 = .052$, $p < .01$), and the beta coefficient of omission ($\beta = .192$, $p < .01$) were significant. However, the beta coefficient of interactional justice ($\beta = -.076$) was not significant (Table 2). Further, the difference in determination coefficients between Step 2 and Step 3 ($\Delta R^2 = .008$, $p < .05$) was also significant. Results of Step 3 showed that the beta coefficient of the interaction term for omission and interactional justice ($\beta = .093$, $p < .05$) were significant.

These results indicate that the more female workers suffered gender harassment, the more they were apt to conduct OWB. Therefore, Hypothesis 1 was empirically supported. In contrast, Hypothesis 3 was only partially supported. The predicted interaction of gender harassment and interactional justice was significant for omission × interactional justice, but it was not significant for commission × interactional justice ($\beta = .017$). These results suggested that a buffering effect of interactional justice was observed in the relationship between the omission and OWB, but not in the relationship between commission and OWB.

Effects of gender harassment on OCB.

To examine Hypothesis 2, we performed separate hierarchical multiple regression analyses on each of the two dimensions of OCB, with

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Commission model</th>
<th>Omission model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\Delta R^2$</td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td>.029**</td>
<td>.52**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.101*</td>
<td>.192**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.121**</td>
<td>-.076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 3</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.008*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>.093*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total $R^2$</td>
<td>.034**</td>
<td>.065**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *: Control variables included age and work experience.

*: $p < .05$, **: $p < .01$
each dimension of supporting organizations and cleanliness serving as a dependent variable in the analysis (Table 3). In this analysis, age, and work experience were included as control variables in the first step; commission and interactional justice were added in the second step; and the interaction term of commission and interactional justice was added in the third step. First, results of the analysis indicated that VIF values ranged from 1.022 to 1.510 in all steps of the regression analysis, indicating no multicollinearity (Ho, 2013). Second, the results showed a difference in determination coefficients between Step 1 and Step 2 (Supporting organizations; \( \Delta R^2 = .178 \), \( \beta = .417 \), \( p < .01 \), Cleanliness; \( \Delta R^2 = .115 \), \( \beta = .309 \), \( p < .01 \) and \( \Delta R^2 = .193 \), \( \beta = .214 \), \( p < .01 \)) were significant (Table 3), which were similar in the regression models of supporting the organization and cleanliness. However, the differences in determination coefficients between Step 2 and Step 3 (Supporting organizations; \( \Delta R^2 = .0003 \), Cleanliness; \( \Delta R^2 = .006 \)) were not significant in any of the models of the two OCB dimensions.

The above analyses, which used the commission dimension of gender harassment, were repeated for the omission dimension (Table 4). In the analysis of the omission dimension, age, and work experience were included as control variables in the first step; omission and interactional justice were added as independent variables in the second step; and the interaction term of omission and interactional justice was added in the third step. Results of the analysis indicated that the difference of determination coefficients between Step 1 and Step 2 (Supporting organizations; \( \Delta R^2 = .095 \), \( p < .01 \), Cleanliness; \( \Delta R^2 = .052 \), \( p < .01 \) and \( \Delta R^2 = .218 \), \( p < .01 \)) were significant (Table 4). These results indicated that the more female workers reported experiencing gender harassment, the more they were apt to conduct OCB. Therefore, Hypothesis 2 was empirically supported. According to the difference of determination coefficients between Step 2 and Step 3, the results were different between the two dimensions of OCB; that is, although the difference of determination coefficients in the

### Table 3 Hierarchical Multiple-regression Analyses Predicting Hypothesized Relationships of OCB (Commission Model)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Supporting organizations</th>
<th>Cleanliness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td>∆( R^2 )</td>
<td>( \beta )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control variables</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td>.178**</td>
<td>.115**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commission</td>
<td>.417**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactional justice</td>
<td>.193**</td>
<td>.214**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 3</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commission × Interactional justice</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>.078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total ( R^2 )</td>
<td>.186**</td>
<td>.122**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. * Control variables included age and work experience.

*: \( p < .05 \), **: \( p < .01 \)

---

The above analyses, which used the commission dimension of gender harassment, were repeated for the omission dimension (Table 4). In the analysis of the omission dimension, age, and work experience were included as control variables in the first step; omission and interactional justice were added as independent variables in the second step; and the interaction term of omission and interactional justice was added in the third step. Results of the analysis indicated that the difference of determination coefficients between Step 1 and Step 2 (Supporting organizations; \( \Delta R^2 = .095 \), \( p < .01 \), Cleanliness; \( \Delta R^2 = .052 \), \( p < .01 \) and \( \Delta R^2 = .218 \), \( p < .01 \)) were significant (Table 4). These results indicated that the more female workers reported experiencing gender harassment, the more they were apt to conduct OCB. Therefore, Hypothesis 2 was empirically supported. According to the difference of determination coefficients between Step 2 and Step 3, the results were different between the two dimensions of OCB; that is, although the difference of determination coefficients in the
model of Supporting organizations ($\Delta R^2 = .0004$) was not significant, the difference of determination coefficients in the Cleanliness model ($\Delta R^2 = .012$, $p < .05$) as an independent variable was significant and the beta-coefficient of omission $\times$ interactional justice interaction indicated a significant negative value ($\beta = -.112$, $p < .05$). These results suggested that the buffering effect of interactional justice was observed only in the relationship between omission and cleanliness.

Buffering effects of interactional justice on the relationship between gender harassment and OWB. To examine Hypothesis 3, we examined the form of the interaction effect by testing the relationship between interactional justice and omission at high (one standard deviation above mean) and low (one standard deviation below mean) values (Aiken & West, 1991). A simple slope analysis indicated that the relationship between omission and OWB was stronger when interactional justice was high ($b = .117$, $p < .001$) than when interactional justice was low ($b = .053$, $p < .05$). The plot of the interaction is shown in Figure 1, which indicates that even if interactional justice were high, OWB would not decrease, but increase when omission was high. This result did not support Hypothesis 3.

Buffering effects of interactional justice on the relationship between gender harassment and OCB. To investigate Hypothesis 4, we examined the form of the interaction effect by testing the relationship between interactional justice and omission at high (one standard deviation above mean) and low (one standard deviation below mean) values (Aiken & West, 1991). A simple slope analysis indicated that the relationship between omission and Cleanliness (OCB) was weaker

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Supporting organizations</th>
<th></th>
<th>Cleanliness</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\Delta R^2$</td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td>$\Delta R^2$</td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.012*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control variables *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td>.095**</td>
<td>.052**</td>
<td>.304**</td>
<td>.175**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.218**</td>
<td>.216**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactional justice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 3</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.012*</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>-.112*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omission $\times$ Interactional justice</td>
<td>.102**</td>
<td>.065**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total $R^2$</td>
<td>.102**</td>
<td>.065**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. * Control variables included age and work experience.
  *; $p < .05$, **; $p < .01$

Figure 1 The Interaction between Interactional Justice and Omission on OWB

Note. IJ: Interactional justice
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when interactional justice was high \((b=.025, \text{ ns})\) than when interactional justice was low \((b=.120, p<.001)\). The plotted interaction is shown in Figure 2, which suggest that OCB would increase when interactional justice was low and omission was high, which is contrary to the hypothetical prediction and therefore Hypothesis 4 was not supported.

3 Discussion

3.1 Effect of Gender Harassment on OWB and OCB

This study was designed to examine the effect of gender harassment directed at female Japanese workers on job-related behaviors, such as OCB and OWB. Results of the hierarchical multiple regression analysis examining the association between the frequency of experiencing gender harassment and job-related behaviors indicated that the more frequently female Japanese workers experienced gender harassment, the more they performed both OWB and OCB.

As discussed above, in Japan, many female workers, compared to male workers have restricted, peripheral job roles. Therefore, it is difficult for women that suffer gender harassment to obtain high evaluations for job performance because their jobs are considered non-essential. As a result, the present study suggests that working Japanese women would work hard at informal and spontaneous jobs (i.e., OCB) in order to receive positive appraisals. Furthermore, our results indicated that female Japanese workers would try to increase the value of their work by working slowly, or passively, in the peripheral jobs assigned to them (Ogasawara, 1998). However, if they continue to perform OWB and OCB simultaneously to improve the value of their jobs, they would place themselves in a dilemma, because working slowly could be considered an indication of low job competence that would lower their job performance appraisals. In addition, OCB does not always result in positive outcomes for employees and organizations, but occasionally result in negative outcomes (Bolino & Turnley, 2005), because employees might neglect their assigned jobs and concentrate on OCB. Nevertheless, understandably, female Japanese workers who have suffered gender harassment are apt to perform OCB and OWB (Bolino & Turnley, 2005). In this study, all the coefficients of determinants in the multiple regression analysis were significant, however, their values were low, with the coefficient of determinant for OWB being especially low, possible because organizational factors, personality factors, wages, and managerial positions, might have confounded OWB. It is suggested that future studies should be designed to control for variables that influence OWB and examine the psychological and/or psychosomatic impact of performing both OWB and OCB by female Japanese workers in response to gender harassment directed against them.
3.2 Effect of Interational Justice on OCB and OWB

The results of this study indicated the higher female workers evaluated interactional justice, the more OCB they performed under both commission and omission models. This result confirms the finding of previous studies (e.g., Moorman, 1991) in which high perceived interactional justice enhanced OCB. On the contrary, results also indicated that under the commission model, the lower female workers evaluated interactional justice, the more frequently they would perform OWB, which was not the case under the omission model. These conclusions are based on finding that the correlation between omission and interactional justice ($r=-.329$) was larger than that between interactional justice and OWB ($r=-.141$), suggesting that the beta-coefficient of interactional justice was suppressed, because of the rather high correlation between the two independent variables. It is also possible that there could be a strong negative correlation between omission and interactional justice, which should be explored further in future studies.

3.3 Buffering Effects of Interactional Justice

The results of the simple slope analysis did not support Hypotheses 3, or 4 and did not confirm the buffering effect of interactional justice on the relationship between gender harassment and OWB, or OCB. Even if female workers perceived that they were treated fairly in interactional situations, women that had experienced gender harassment always engaged in OWB and/or OCB, suggesting that perceived interactional justice did not reduce the influence of experiencing gender harassment on OWB, or OCB. In addition, female workers that experienced less omission type of gender harassment and perceived interactional justice as being low, did not frequently perform cleaning OCB. In the Japanese workplace, it is still considered customary for female office workers to clean the office and female workers in the present study cleaned their office as a part of their official work, even if they had frequently experienced omission type of gender harassment, only if they were guaranteed interactional justice. These results suggest that omission type of gender harassment does not always have a negative influence on the job performance of female workers and that it might even have a positive effect on job performance under certain situations.

3.4 Suggestions for Administrative Policy in Japanese Workplaces

Kobayashi and Tanaka (2012) reported that gender harassment had a negative influence on the mental health of working Japanese women. The present study formulated the impact of gender harassment from the perspective of organizational administration, and examined the influence of gender harassment on two aspects of organizational citizenship behavior and work slow-down by employees. Results indicated that gender harassment had a negative impact on work behaviors, suggesting that the effect of gender harassment on organizational efficiency cannot be neglected, and that gender harassment in the workplace should be curtailed. Kobayashi and Tanaka (2013) suggested that workshops on gender harassment could change employees’ perceptions regarding such workplace behaviors. It is suggested that personnel managers should implement similar measures to prevent gender harassment in the workplace.
3.5 Limitations and Future Implications of This Study

In the present study, we used two subscales of the Japanese OCB Scale, developed by Tanaka (2004): supporting organizations and cleanliness subscales, as dependent variables. However, there are three other subscales: concentration on the job, interpersonal help, and conscientiousness in this measure of OCB. Therefore, we would also need to examine the effects of the other three subscales in order to confirm the association between gender harassment and Japanese OCB.

In this study, we did not take respondents employment type: regular employment, temporary employment, or part-time employment, or their working hours into consideration in examining the impact of gender harassment on OCB and OWB. These factors are related to whether the respondent’s jobs are important, or only consist of peripheral work. It is possible that Japanese women in temporary employment desire higher job performance assessments. Therefore, female Japanese employees’ orientation to obtain better jobs should be taken into consideration when investigating whether women that had experienced more gender harassment tended to conduct OCB.

Another limitation of this study was that all participants were women, which limits the power of our findings regarding gender harassment on organizational behaviors of female workers. Comparing a sample consisting of men and women would facilitate a more persuasive demonstration of the negative influence of gender harassment on organizational behaviors of women.

The results of this study are also limited by cultural considerations. The Japanese Gender Harassment Scale used in the study is an instrument that was developed by Kobayashi and Tanaka (2010) on the basis of interviews conducted with Japanese workers. Moreover, the data of this study were restricted to workplaces in Japan. It is suggested that future studies should examine the cross-cultural validity of the Gender Harassment Scale. Moreover, the cross-cultural validity of the finding of this study, that gender harassment facilitates both OCB and OWB should be examined with samples of women in other countries in Asia, North America, and Europe.

Finally, a research company conducted the survey via its website, and the sample of participants was drawn from individuals that had registered at this research company. The on-line survey was conducted using a research company website for two reasons: The first was that many “conservative” Japanese corporations and public organizations were unwilling to collaborate with this survey, because the questionnaire had items that could have negative implications for human resource management, and the second reason was to ensure respondents’ anonymity in order to get their cooperation in responding to questions regarding unpleasant workplace experiences. However, several studies have reported that web surveys conducted on recruited monitors have peculiar response biases (e.g., Higuchi, Nakai & Minato, 2012). Therefore, it is suggested that multiple survey methods be used to examine the relationship between gender harassment, OCB and OWB.

Notes

1 Sexism has not always been treated as the level of behaviors, as Ui (2008) mentioned sexism as an attitude, belief or behavior that gives the unequal status between female and male. Based on the items of sexism scale that has been used in psychological studies, Swim, Aikin, Hall and Hunter
Impact of gender harassment on job-related behaviors in the Japanese workplace

(1995) reported that men held higher levels of old-fashioned and modern sexist belief than women. On the other hand, the gender harassment scale we used in this paper was based on the level of behaviors and the frequency of gender harassment which they experienced.
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## Appendix  Gender Harassment Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Omission</th>
<th>Japanese version</th>
<th>Factor loadings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I was not expected to have been a leader, because I am a woman.</td>
<td>私は、女性はリーダーに向かないという理由から、指導的役割を期待されなかった。</td>
<td>.986 -.095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was not assigned important jobs, such as negotiation, because of my gender.</td>
<td>重要な仕事や交渉ごとは女性には無理だという理由から、私は重要な仕事や交渉に割り当てられなかった。</td>
<td>.954 -.049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was told that it was natural for women to have limitations on their job.</td>
<td>女性は研修や仕事の機会が限られるのは当然だと言われた。</td>
<td>.866 -.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was treated lightly compared with my male counterparts.</td>
<td>私は、同じくらいの年齢・地位の男性よりも、低く扱われた。</td>
<td>.746 -.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was perceived as emotional or sentimental during times of criticism or rebuttal.</td>
<td>私が反論や批判をしたとき、女性だから感情的なのだと言われた。</td>
<td>.742 .069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was mistreated or verbally abused because of a disability.</td>
<td>私は、いざというときに当てにならないお荷物的存在だと言われた。</td>
<td>.699 .087</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commission</th>
<th>Japanese version</th>
<th>Factor loadings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I was expected to fulfill a role of comfort.</td>
<td>私は、戦場の花としての役割を期待された。</td>
<td>-.097 .916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was told that women make for a sociable atmosphere.</td>
<td>女性がいると職場が和むと言われた。</td>
<td>-.093 .836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was flirted with or flattered.</td>
<td>私は何かと声をかけられ、かまわれる。</td>
<td>-.030 .653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was assigned a humble job as compared with men.</td>
<td>男性にくらべて、非労動的な細かい仕事を割り当てられた。</td>
<td>.291 .537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was evaluated on my properties as a woman instead of my abilities.</td>
<td>男性の同僚へのお茶くみや雑用をする役割を期待された。</td>
<td>.293 .498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was expected to serve refreshments or to do chores for my male colleagues.</td>
<td>男性の同僚へのお茶くみや雑用をする役割を期待された。</td>
<td>.286 .407</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. The item “I was addressed differently due to marriage, pregnancy or age stage. (婚姻や出産、年齢によって、私は呼び方が変わった。)” was excluded from the analysis.*