

**POSITIVE AND NEGATIVE PATHS FROM
WORK-LIFE BALANCE PRACTICE USE:
USING JAPANESE DATA OF FULLTIME
WORKER**

林有珍(イム・ユジン)
一橋大学大学院商学研究科特任講師

YOUJIN LIM

Graduate School of Commerce and Management

Hitotsubashi University

April 2013

No.171

POSITIVE AND NEGATIVE PATHS FROM WORK-LIFE BALANCE PRACTICE USE: USING JAPANESE DATA OF FULLTIME WORKER

要約

本論文は、育児休業施策と短時間勤務施策を利用する育児中の女性正社員を対象とし、それぞれの施策効果がいかなる状況で得られるのかについて検討することを目的とする。分析は、フルサンプル・育児休業施策利用者・短時間勤務施策利用者で行われ、それぞれのデータセットにおいて両立支援施策を利用することによるコスト意識と（ネガティブパス）組織からの支援（WPC、ポジティブパス）といった二つのメカニズムを探索的に検討した。分析結果、両立支援施策の利用によるコスト認識が組織支援によって解消される模様と度合いにおいて、育児休業者と短時間勤務者の間に明確な違いがあった。キャリア意識の高低を示す代理変数として施策利用状況を解釈できるとするならば、本論文はキャリア観の違いに応じた組織からの個別的な取り組みについて議論する必要性を支持するものである。

Abstract

While the academic attentions toward work-life balance (WLB) practice in Japan have been growing, there are not enough arguments using consensual theoretical framework. This paper depicts the both light and shadow effects attached in WLB practice use from the view of employees' perception. The results using data from interview and survey shows two unconventional findings. 1) WLB practice use can has negative impact on employee's perceived WLB and willingness to stay long for a standard Japanese fulltime worker, because of the cost perception which WLB practice use can draws losses of opportunities in internal labor market. 2) There is WLB domain-specific Psychological Contracts (WPC) and its fulfillment can has positive impact on employee outcomes. This study browse there is not the easy way from the introduction of WLB practice to employee outcomes, negative with positive paths coexisting practically and also theoretically.

Further study focusing how WLB implement at workplace fit to overall Human Resource functions each other, is needed.

INTRODUCTION

Even though women force recruiting rate as core human resource has been growing in Japan, in terms of actual rate of female fulltime worker has not been changed for last two decades since acted Equal Opportunity for Work between Men and Women Law in 1986. One of the reason in this

phenomena is that female fulltime worker is tend to quit after giving a birth for raring their child. One of the governmental reports revealed that 70% female fulltime workers is quitting after their first child-birth within 5 years (Takeishi, 2006).

This sex-based role fulfillment makes the big discrepancy of life income and opportunity for career development between men and women, due to few chances to be rehired as fulltime worker in Japanese workforce market, if one once exited from first employer (Akaoka, 1996; Yamaguch, 2009).

In HRM, employers invest to employees with a bundle of incentive functions such as development/appraisal/reward to draw employees' retention and high commitment toward organizational goal (Boxall, Purcell, and Wright, 2007). And one of the important theoretical purposes in HRM research is that identify and specify how HR practice can change employee's attitude and behavior in a both negative and positive way(Argyris, 1960, Delery and Shaw, 2001).

This paper identifies work-life balance (WLB) practice as one of HRM tools to improve employee's positive outcomes and to lower employee's negative outcomes, and also specify what kinds of negative and positive perception can be shaped in terms of using WLB practice use.

Before showing theoretical backgrounds and hypothesis, we need to look into some details about WLB practice in Japan and Japanese traditional HRM in brief.

The introduction of WLB practice and current concerns in Japan

From the law act of Equal Opportunity for Work between Men and Women in 1986, the societal needs for women force development has been growing in Japan. More female workers started to stay in organization even after their marriage(lowering rate of Kotobuki-Taisya, the old informal practice that female worker expected to quit for serving her husband and be a housewife), women with high education engaged more responsible jobs as men used to in organization. Yet, many female workers

ware quitting their career when it comes to child-birth even after the law act of Maternal Leave Act, employers learned the importance to invest to broad and substantial support for keeping high valued female human resource in organization with sustaining commitment level¹.

When the law of Basic in Gender Society has activated in 1999, potential employees including female students started to consider about company's engagement for gender equal opportunity in organization as a standard for healthy work environment (Nihon Keizai Shusyoku Navi, 2014). For recruiting better human resource, more employers motivated to engage in the introduction of various state-of-art practices and WLB practice was one of them.

There are more broaden engagement for the introduction to WLB practices in Japanese companies after the law act of Developmental Support for New Generations in 2002. Now, more than 98% of Japanese companies have introduced maternal leave and about 50% have introduced part-time work schedules. In addition, flexible time schedule (14%), teleworking (4%), on-site daycare (2.5%) is adopted.

Let's back to the recent report about 70% female fulltime workers' exit. Even though societal and legal arrangement is forced, there is no point if traditional HRM tactics or principle doesn't fit to new engagement for WLB. In fact, most of Japanese fulltime worker having a child, regardless of sexual differences, is expecting a "understanding and generous treatment" in work place for taking advantage of WLB practices without extreme decision such as exit. (Nihon Keizai Shinbun, 7th April, 2009).

Psychological contracts in Japan

Psychological contract is defined as an individual's beliefs regarding terms of an exchange

¹ For more details about history of WLB practice adoptaion in Japanese company, view MHLW(Ministry of Health, Labor, and Welfare, 2001; 2003) From random sample of Japanese company hiring more than 100 full-time employees. In this paper, WLB practice mainly means parental leave(maternal leave) and part-time arrangement from the high adoptation and utilizational rates.

agreement between the individual and the organization (Rousseau, 1995). After originally conceptualizing by Argyris (1960)'s term "psychological work contract" which stress implicit or informal practices in employment contracts, Rousseau (1989) stressed employees' view as the result of the nature of employment contracts. Because how employee perceives more matter than what organization does in Rousseau's point, psychological contracts get a huge attention of HRM researchers that concern more direct antecedent of employee's attitude and behavior.

Psychological contract can be divided by two types: transactional/relational. Transactional psychological contract is drawn from the kind of market exchange, in specific extent of responsibility with relatively short period. In contrast, relational psychological contract is based more broad and unlimited responsibility with long term relationship (Rousseau, 1990, Millward and Hopkins, 1998).

Since it has been common for Japanese traditional employment management to hire employee for almost life time, Japanese employee internalize relational psychological contract in general (Morishima, 1996). Specifically, Japanese companies utilize human resource through strong inducements such as employment assurance until tenure from one year before the graduation of one's final educational institution, reward and promotion by experience. By reciprocity of organizational inducements, employee willingly accepts their unlimited commitment including random disposition of career in same organization, chronic additional overwork. The theoretical arguments about new or diverse psychological contract along with the changes around the organizational environment is arising (Choi, 2002; Hattori, 2011), but the characteristics from relational psychological contract is sustained even in those arguments.

Under this strong relational psychological contracts in Japanese companies, work-life balance practice use often collide with work moral and be shown as the declaration of low commitment(Matsubara, 2004).

THEORETICAL BACKGROUND AND HYPOTHESIS

Importance of perceptual process in WLB practice

There are bundles of previous researches in the relationship between work-life balance practices and employee outcomes. Previous research found WLB programs lower turnover rates, absenteeism, and promote higher work satisfaction, organizational commitment, organizational citizenship behavior, even organizational financial performance (Grover and Crooker, 1995; Konrad and Mangel, 2000; Lobel and Kossek, 1996; Greenhaus and Parasuraman, 1999; Scandura and Lankau, 1997; Lambert, 2000; Perry-Smith and Blum, 2000).

Yet, as a one of tools under general HRM functions and practices, formal WLB practice itself such as Maternal Leave or Part time Arrangement must have been interacted with general HRM functions and practices. In fact, previous researches took account in strategic intention, such as longer permission of maternal leave than legal restriction or in informal involvement such as perception of supervisor's carefulness. As Beauregard and Henry (2009) depicted, each WLB practice is inactivated by multi process including organizational and individual characteristic, and so was in Japanese dataset (Nissei Kiso Kenkyusyo, 2006, Takeishi, 2006). In particular, considering that the introduction of WLB practices in Japanese companies were partially forced societal/ legal enforcement, it is much more important to specify what kind of perception can be shaped and how it lead to employee outcomes in Japan than whether practice adopted or not.

The negative perceptual process from WLB practice use

There are some obstacles that business organization has to take for providing WLB practices in spite of its important roles for managing diverse needs and customers. Scandura and Lankau (1997) and OECD (2003) itemized the difficulties faced by companies in introducing and implementing these

policies: “Increased cost, problems with scheduling and work coordination, difficulties supervising all employees on flexible schedules and changes in organizational culture” (Scandura and Lankau, 1997: 378).

However, there are few literatures prove the consequences to employees who take advantage of WLB practices and how those consequences guide employees’ attitudes. Among these consequences, OECD (2002) includes reduced income, forfeited opportunities to get more responsible work, and difficulties of career development (ibid. pp.181). Although the types of WLB practices and their prevalence vary country to country, the consequences to employees are similar.

In Japan, even though such practices have been introduced widely in statistic, many employees quit working because of childbirth and childcare². Japan’s 21 Century Vocational Foundation (2008) explains this phenomenon:

“(Regarding Maternal Leave as an example of WLB practice) In a Human Resource Management that assumes long-term continuous employment and fulltime work, there are disadvantages for those who use WLB practices, and as a result it makes fulltime worker to be hesitant to take leave for family responsibility. If there are many users in the same company, it might difficult to allocate work to be back after a certain time and to find people to replace the job were left because of the one on leave. That is because the treatment of the practice users isn’t always clearly noticed, on the one hand. On the other hand, there is sort of anxiety from management that WLB practice use might lead a drop in productivity and also be an actual burden on the co-workers, mainly male worker who didn’t use WLB practices. Thus, these lack of understanding from supervisors and co-workers, make male fulltime workers to utilize WLB practice, and more difficult to be rooted in work-life balanced culture in Japanese company, even

² National Social Security and Demographic problem Lab.(2004)

for female fulltime worker. Too many diverse situations arise in every organization, and the major potential user of WLB practice, mainly female, has to risk to be shown as a less committed employee (pp.102, underlined by author).”

Fulltime worker who internalize and fulfill relational psychological contracts in traditional fashion, is “the ideal worker (Tienari, et al., 2002)” to be deserve higher inducements from organization. When it comes to WLB practice use, one has to be risk some extent of loss in career life as a rebound from fulfilling personal needs or family responsibility, which is fair in exchange theory. Still, it needs to be noted that “the treatment” as the rebound is not always clear, rather unwritten and implicit; nobody can measure what extent of career loss can be agreeable, or how long the “deserved” consequences from WLB practice use would be justified in long-term employment. When the result of behavior is unsure, certain human behavior rarely occurred. Also, in this insecure situation, people cannot be supportive to one who conducts the certain behavior. In the end, most of the fulltime female worker who highly educated has to risk all blurred career life in the future without any systematic support in traditional Japanese company, and risk without any information will be perceived as the considerable cost when the use behavior occurred.

H1: The degree to which employee perceive WLB practice use as cost in one’s career prospect has a negative impact on employee outcomes.

H1a: The more one perceives WLB practice use as cost, the less willingness of stay long gained.

H1b: The more one perceives WLB practice use as cost, the less Perceived WLB gained.

The positive perceptual process in WLB practice use

In arguments of psychological contract, there are two streams to be considered. One is variation and change of contents in psychological contract, the other is its fulfillment or violation as a proxy factor to attitude and behavior.

At first, there are plenty of evidences that concept of psychological contract is fluid and composed by various contents in domain-specific, and is changeable through work experiences such as change of status, tenure, life stage(e.g. Cavanaugh and Noe, 1999; Dick, 2006; Raja, Johns, and Ntalianis, 2004; Thomas, Au, and Ravlin, 2003). For example, there is a great possibility to form a different contents of psychological contracts when fulltime workers utilize the parental leave(leaving workplace at least for a year and not engaging the job they have been) or part-time arrangement(cutting their work hours including overwork which most of fulltime workers are engaging in Japanese company). And that means that the new contents of psychological contract has to capture the work life of fulltime workers with part-time working hours too, which rarely exist the western employment culture. That is why original versions of psychological contract in the past literature cannot cover it enough.

So, I assume there are WLB domain-specific psychological contract (WPC) also will exist, as delivery and child rearing is one of the most significant events in life.

Considering that WLB practices such as flexible time arrangement are embodied in the psychological contract (Scandura and Lankau, 1997) and that WLB itself is also the major part of organization-wide promises (Ho and Levesque, 2005), specific work experience in WLB domain might be shaped as a kind of psychological contract and perceived by practice user, further has an impact on employee's attitude and behavior.

Secondly, regardless of the contents itself, employees' evaluation whether it is fulfilled or violated is critical to predict employee outcomes such as OCB, Job satisfaction, turnover (e.g. Ho and Levesque, 2005; Robinson and Rousseau, 1994; Turnley and Feldman, 1999; Robinson and Morrison, 2000).

Regardless of the type of relational or transactional contracts, subsequent research into psychological contract typically seeks the relationship between psychological contracts and

employee outcomes by examining both employee and employer-centric obligation. Because organization commits to employee more, employee reciprocates back more in nature of employment relationship (Tsui, Pearce, Porter and Tripoli, 1997). Thus if employee perceive that organizational obligation fulfilled in WLB domain, or less violated, employee value it and lead more desirable outcomes in organization.

H2: The degree to which WPC is fulfilled has a positive impact on employee outcomes.

H2a: The more one evaluates WPC fulfillment high, the more Willingness to stay long gained.

H2b: The more one evaluates WPC fulfillment high, the more Perceived WLB gained.

METHODS

Procedures and Sample

I firstly conduct the interviews to describe the detailed items in WLB context in Japan under the cooperation from 3 Japanese companies. Each company leads their own industry (2 manufactures with different type of product, 1 service) and had been adopted WLB practice from strategic purpose such as high motivation and retention for nearly 20 years. I conducted interviews with the chiefs of WLB practice department and managers in workplace as an implementation of practice, and female fulltime workers who once utilized parental leave or part-time arrangement. From in-depth interviews, I created items of WLB-specific psychological contracts (WPC, Lim, 2012a), conducted a survey for measure all items in hypothesis in this paper. Lim (2012) found the WPC has independent effect on employee's outcomes even after controlled general psychological contracts from Rousseau (1990) and Millward and Hopkins (1998).

Samples from internet survey, 618 samples got gathered. All are fulltime worker with child under 16. 537 utilized parental leave, 257 utilized (or are utilizing) part-time arrangement. 30% of all

samples are working as a manager.

Measures

Cost perception

Considering literatures in Japan and interviews, there are 4 types of cost perception from WLB practice use. The questions was “What do you think about the result from utilizing the parental leave practice?” for only who actually utilized the parental leave, and “What do you think about the result from utilizing the part-time arrangement practice?” for only who actually utilized (currently are utilizing) the part-time arrangement. Each item has 4 aspects, which were the cost of promotion/development/network/overall career. All items were asked 5 likert (1=not at all to 5=very strongly agree). The average of these 4 items was “cost_parental_leave_ave” and “cost_parttime_ave” per se.

WLB (WLB-specific psychological contracts)

Lim (2012a, 2012b) explored WPC items (view appendix), which contains two sides from obligations of employer (12 items) and employee (11 items). In this paper, we use WPC fulfillment variables which were made in following Robinson (1996) and Hottori (2008). In specific, I asked the each obligation’s importance (0=not an obligation, 1=it is not the important obligation to 5=it is very important obligation) and its fulfillment (-1=not fulfilled, 1=fulfilled) according Robinson (1996), and the importance and its fulfillment was interacted. Finally, the average of employer’s is “WPC_organization” and the one of employee’ is “WPC_employee”, which describes how employer/employee herself fulfilled the important obligation.

Dependent variables: Willingness for stay long and Perceived WLB

Because many Japanese companies adopt and broaden WLB practice to improve employees’ motivation and retention rate, this paper also set the proximal variables. All details of items are shown in Table 1.

Controls

Not only the basic controls include education/tenure/wage/status/organizational size/industrial, but also whether various WLB practices utilized (being utilizing) or not, controlled.

-----**Table 1**-----

Table 2 shows the correlations between each variable in short. Any reader can obtain detailed correlations including each item of cost perception and WPC.

-----**Table 2**-----

RESULT

The results from hierarchical regression show in Table 3. Hypothesis above argued the independent effect of cost perception (H1) and WPC fulfillment (H2) on employee outcomes. It shows all hypotheses adopted.

There are clearly negative paths on employee outcomes in terms of fulltime female worker who has family responsibility. If one who utilized the practice such as parental leave or part-time arrangement (the main WLB practice adopted by employers and utilized by employees) and perceive high cost from it, she would have hard time for gaining perceived WLB and hesitate to stay long at current organization.

There are clearly positive paths, too. If one who is trying to balance between the responsibility from work and life, and she evaluate organization fulfilled its obligation for supporting WLB, She would motivated more, wants to stay long at current organization. And the positive path shows not only employer's WPC fulfillment, but also employee's. That means the one who is trying to fulfilled their own obligation under the assumption of employer's expectations for her, can be more likely perceived WLB and willing to stay long at current organization.

-----**Table 3**-----

DISCUSSION

There are two views about the effect from WLB practice on employee outcomes. One is work-family conflict (WFC, Greenhaus and Beutell, 1985; Edward and Rothbard, 2002) and many studies in Japan revealed WLB practice can lower WFC (e.g. Fujimoto and Yoshida, 1999). The other is innovation management (Osterman, 1998) and it also was known a strong explanation for adaptation of WLB practice, including extended diversity, high commitment and motivation in Japan (Nissei Kiso Kenkyusyo, 2003).

Yet little study with a view of human resource management is conducted so far. Even though Scandura and Lankau (1997) argue that WLB is one of the psychological contract and they set the hypothesis under that assumption, they didn't actually adopt the psychological contract variables. And there are many arguments about domain-specific version of psychological contract but there is no study about exploring WLB-specific psychological contract.

This paper strictly limited the context on WLB practice, its implements at workplace and employee's evaluation of it through the lens of WLB-specific psychological contract as a positive path. And as OECD (2003) pointed out, this paper also considers and measures the negative path from cost perception from WLB practice use. The result is shown that both positive and negative path can exist in WLB context in terms of effectiveness from WLB practice use.

In sum, this paper shows the possibility of the new theoretical framework with psychological contract for seeking the mechanism between WLB practice and employee outcomes.

Then, what can we see the practical merit? I added the two cost perception variables to H2a model in Table 3 for checking the mediation effect of WPC. Even though each cost perception effect directly on Willingness to stay long before considering WPC variable ($\beta = -.169$, $p < 0.01$; $\beta = -.153$, $p < 0.05$), the effects became insignificant when WPC considered ($\beta = -.031$, $\beta = -.024$). On perceived

WLB, cost from parental leave use still significant ($\beta = -.174, p < 0.1$), but the effect from part-time arrangement became insignificant when WPC considered. This might shows that WPC fulfillment can be critical factor for improving the WLB practice effect on employee outcomes. Leaving workplace for family responsibility and lower commitment during part-time arrangement can naturally lead some extent of cost in competition under internal labor market. But the fulfillment perception that employer and employee themselves are trying their best in the specific life stage, still lead the motivation to retention.

For more practical merit and further research, I conducted the additional analysis with split dataset, limited by parental leave user and part-time arrangement user (Table 4 for parental leave user N=537, Table 5 for part-time arrangement user N=257). 97% of part-time arrangement user had utilized parental leave.

-----Table 4-----

From the result from Table 4, we can see that all detailed cost perception from parental leave can be fully mediated by WPC fulfillment on Willingness to stay long, sustained the negative path from development loss ($\beta = -.187, p < 0.01$) on perceived WLB. On both outcome variables, WPC fulfillment seems curtail. It means that high commitment from organization and employee themselves have independently effective on desirable outcomes.

-----Table 5-----

In the limited dataset for part-time arrangement user, however, the result differs. The negative effect of cost in network are fully mediated by WPC fulfillment, negative effect of cost in development and positive effect of cost in promotion activated significantly after considering WPC on Willingness of stay long. And also WPC from employer is only significant on stay. Considering WPC items contain implemental and cultural support for WLB in the organization, it might matters whether

organization commit to part-time user for retention. Fulltime female worker who utilizing part-time arrangement experiences negative effect from various cost perceptions and it makes them harder to obtain perceived WLB and Willingness to stay long at current organization. For them, cost in promotion even directly has the positive effect on retention and perceived WLB because their choice to cut down their working hours, which is often considered as lack of commitment in Japan, lead the relational balance to pay the cost in promotion, in terms of social exchange . The difficult part is that their retentions are solely dependent on WPC employers' fulfillment, not employees'. Unless subsequent support is provided, part-time user just settles down the lower status with dissatisfaction in developmental loss and overall career loss.

REFERENCE

- Akaoka, I. (1996) "Seeking Elegant Human Resource Management; Management of high economic effectiveness and humanism," *Organizational Science in Japan*, Vol. 29, No. 3, pp. 4-14. (Japanese)
- Argyris, C. (1960) *Understanding Organizational Behavior*, Tavistock Publications, London.
- Beauregard, T. Alexandra and Henry, Lesley C. (2009) "Making the Link between Work-Life Balance Practices and Organizational Performance," *Human resource management review*, Vol. 19, pp. 9-22.
- Boxall, P., Purcell, J., and Wright, P. (2007) *The Oxford Handbook of Human Resource Management*, Oxford University Press.
- Cavanaugh, M.A., and Noe, R.A. (1999) "Antecedents and Consequences of Relational Components of the New Psychological Contract," *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, Vol. 20, No. 3, pp. 323-340.
- Choi, I. (2002) "Psychological Contract Violation and Innovative Strategy in Human Resource Management System," *Organizational Science in Japan*, Vol. 35, No. 3, pp. 73-82. (Japanese)
- Delery and Shaw (2001) "The Strategic Management of People in Work Organizations: Reviews, synthesis and extension," *Research in Personnel and Human Resource Management*, Vol. 20, pp.165-197.
- Dick, P. (2006) "The psychological contract and the transition from full to part-time police work," *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, Vol. 27, No. 1, pp. 37-58.
- Edward, J.R. and Rothbard, N.P. (2002) "Mechanisms Linking Work And Family: Clarifying the

- relationship between work and family constructs,” *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 25, No. 1, pp. 178-199.
- Fujimoto, T. and Yoshida, S. (1999) “Work-Life Conflicts; Two flows of study and problem in business organization,” *Organizational Science in Japan*, Vol. 33, No. 2, pp. 66-78.(Japanese)
- Greenhaus, J.H., and Beutell, N.J. (1985) “Sources of conflict between work and family roles,” *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 10, No. 1, pp. 76-88.
- Greenhaus, J.H., and Parasuraman, S. (1999) “Research on Work, Family, and Gender: Current status and future directions,” in G.N. Powel(Ed.). *Handbook of Gender and Work* (pp. 391-412). Thousand Oaks, Sage.
- Grover, S. and Crooker, K. (1995) “Who Appreciates Family-Responsive Human Resource Policies: The impact of family-friendly policies on the organizational attachment of parents and nonparents,” *Personnel Psychology*, Vol. 48, pp. 271-288.
- Hattori, Y. (2008) “Exploring Psychological Contract in Japanese; Contents, fulfillment, effects on trust,” *Organizational Science in Japan*, Vol. 42, No. 2, pp. 75-88.
- , (2011) *Psychological Contracts in Japanese Companies : Understanding Invisible Promise between Organizations and Employees*, Hakutou Publication.(Japanese)
- Ho, V.T., and Levesque, L.L. (2005) “With A Little Help from My Friends: Social referents and influence in psychological contract fulfillment,” *Organization Science*, Vol. 16, No. 3, pp. 275-289.
- Konrad, A.M., and Mangel, R. (2000) “The Impact of Work-Life Programs on Firm Productivity,” *Strategic Management Journal*, Vol. 21, No. 12, pp. 1225–1237.
- Lambert, S.J. (2000) “Added Benefits: The link between work-life benefits and organizational citizenship behavior,” *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol.43, No. 5, pp.801-815.
- Lim (2012a) “WLB-Specific Psychological Contract and its antecedents,” *The 15th Annual Convention of Japanese Association of Administrative Science Report*, pp.413-418.(Japanese)
- , (2012b) “The perception of cost for WLB practice use and employee outcomes: Exploring WLB version of psychological contracts in Japan,” *Asia Academy of Management Conference*.
- Lobel, S. A., & Kossek, E. E. (1996) “Human resource strategies to support diversity in work and personal lifestyles: Beyond the “family friendly” organization,” in E. E. Kossek & S. A. Lobel (Eds.), *Managing diversity: Human resource strategies for transforming the workplace* (pp. 221–243). Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.
- Matsubara, M. (2004) “Possibilities of Fulltime Worker with Part-Time Working Hours; Interviews from the part-time arrangement practice user with family responsibilities,” *Journal of Japanese Labor Studies*, No. 528, pp. 69-79.(Japanese)
- Millward, L.J. and Hopkins, L.J. (1998) “Psychological Contracts, Organizational and Job Commitment,” *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, Vol. 28, No. 16, pp. 1530-1556.
- Ministry of Health, Labor, and Welfare (2001) Panel analysis of child born in 21 century(the 1st

year).(Japanese)

—, (2003) The Basic Survey of Female Workforce; the report about current WLB practice. (Japanese)

Morishima, M. (1996) "Renegotiating psychological contracts: Japanese Style," *Trends in Organizational Behavior*, Vol. 3, pp. 139-158.

Nihon Keizai Shusyoku Navi 2014(Webpage of Japanese recruiting information)
<https://job.nikkei.co.jp>

Nihon Keizai Shinbun, 7th April, 2009(Japanese)

Nissei Kiso Kenkyusyo(2006) Report about the Relationship between Work-Life Balance Practice and Corporate Performance.(Japanese)

21seiki Shokugyo Zaidan(Japan's 21 Century Vocational Foundation, 2008) The Case Set of Work-Life Balance Initiatives in Japanese Companies.(Japanese)

OECD (2002; 2003; 2004) *Babies and Bosses*.

Osterman, P. (1995) "Work/Family Programs and the Employment Relationship," *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 40, No. 4, pp. 681-700.

Perry-Smith, J.E., and Blum, T.C. (2000) "Work-Family Human Resource Bundles and Perceived Organizational Performance," *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 43, pp. 1107-1117.

Raja, U., Johns, G., and Ntalianis, F. (2004) "The Impact of Personality on Psychological Contracts," *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 47, No. 3, pp. 350-367.

Robinson, S.L. (1996) "Trust and Breach of the psychological contract," *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 41, pp. 574-599.

Robinson, S. L., Kraatz, M. S., and Rousseau, D.M. (1994) "Changing Obligations and the Psychological Contract: A longitudinal study," *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 37, No. 1, pp. 137-152.

Robinson, S. and Morrison, E.W. (2000) "The development of psychological contract breach and violation: A longitudinal study," *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, Vol. 21, No. 5, pp. 525-546.

Rousseau, D.M.(1989) "Psychological and implied contracts in organizations,"
Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal, Vol. 2, pp. 121-139.

—, (1990) "New hire perceptions of their own and their employer's obligations: A study of psychological contracts," *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, Vol. 11, pp.389-400.

—, (1995) *Psychological contracts in organizations*, Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Scandura, T.A. and Lankau, M.J. (1997) "Relationships of Gender, Family Responsibility and Flexible Work Hours to Organizational Commitment and Job Satisfaction," *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, Vol. 18, No. 4, pp.377-391.

Shakai Hosyo To Jinko Mondai Kenkyusyo (National Social Security and Demographic problem Lab., 2004) (Japanese)

- Takeishi, E. (2006) "The Meaningfulness of WLB Practice from Employer's View; The studies and discussions about effectiveness from WLB practices," *Journal of Japanese Labor Studies*, No. 553, pp. 19-33.(Japanese)
- Thomas, D.C., Au, K.,and Ravlin, E.C. (2003) "Cultural Variation and the Psychological Contract," *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, Vol. 24, No. 5, pp. 451-471.
- Tienari, J., Quack, S.and Theobald, H. (2002) "Organizational Reforms, 'Ideal Workers' and Gender Orders: A cross-societal comparison," *Organizational Studies*, Vol. 23, No. 2, pp. 249-279.
- Tsui, A.S., Pearce, J.L., Porter, L.W., and Tripoli, A.M. (1997) "Alternative Approaches to the Employee-Organization Relationship: Does investment in employees pay off?" *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 40, No. 5, pp. 1089-1121.
- Tunley, W.H. and Feldman, D.C. (1999) "The Impact of Psychological Contract Violations on Exit, Voice, Loyalty, and Neglect," *Human Relations*, Vol. 52, No. 7, pp. 895-922.
- Yamaguch, K. (2009) *Work Life Balance*, Nihon Keizai Shinbun Syuppansha.(Japanese)

Appendix. WLB-specific Psychological Contracts under Japanese Human Resource Management^{a,b,c,d}

	discription of each item	Factor 1	Factor 2	fulfilled	not fulfilled	min.	max.	mean	s.d
WPC_ fulfillment_employer 12 items ($\alpha=0.886$)	A broad range of WLB practices	.793	.032	328	290	-4.00	4.00	.2282	2.77603
	Career consultation before WLB practice use	.795	.055	197	421	-4.00	4.00	-.7864	2.42348
	Early notification of the employee's assignment following parental leave	.789	.104	263	355	-4.00	4.00	-.4272	2.68172
	Care for reinstatement in the same workplace after parental leave	.669	.116	436	182	-4.00	4.00	1.0307	2.43036
	Assesments focused on outcomes during the period of part-time arrangement	.773	.121	235	383	-4.00	4.00	-.5728	2.53060
	Transfer to family-friendly workplace	.756	.097	267	351	-4.00	4.00	-.3592	2.66201
	Cultivation of awareness for improving communication within the workplace	.803	.085	245	373	-4.00	4.00	-.4417	2.54821
	Elimination of occupational categories for men and women	.730	.060	282	336	-4.00	4.00	-.1942	2.64382
	Affirmative action for women to managerial position	.727	.111	293	325	-4.00	4.00	-.0890	2.56017
	Cutivation of management's awareness in relation to employees in WLB practice use	.770	.107	223	395	-4.00	4.00	-.6974	2.56027
	Review of administrative efficiency in organizational level	.779	.126	267	351	-4.00	4.00	-.3883	2.75845
	Internal networks fo promoting for Work-Life balance users	.781	.128	203	415	-4.00	4.00	-.7767	2.47751
WPC_ fulfillment_employee 11 items ($\alpha=0.782$)	To be cheerful	.241	.668	528	90	-4.00	4.00	1.1699	1.57120
	To clearly express opinions	.258	.633	443	175	-4.00	4.00	.1294	1.32892
	To be considerate of others	.249	.670	520	98	-3.00	4.00	1.4401	1.51934
	To be autonomous in designing one's career	.090	.745	295	323	-4.00	4.00	-.0761	1.52421
	Not to quit the employment after parental leave	.145	.553	561	57	-4.00	4.00	.5194	1.91144
	To accept the disposition of job	.068	.523	505	113	-4.00	4.00	.5874	1.45253
	To use WLB practices to the minimal extent	-.084	.656	300	318	-4.00	4.00	.2589	1.31108
	To minimize discussion of childcare issues at work	-.081	.583	276	342	-4.00	4.00	.2362	1.78482
	To be appreciated to the company	-.010	.729	370	248	-4.00	4.00	1.5049	1.76150
	To aim at becoming a manager	.079	.718	227	391	-4.00	4.00	.9838	1.93820
	Not to let childcare affect work	.120	.666	373	245	-4.00	4.00	1.4854	1.63053

N=618, Lim(2012a;2012b)

- a. all items from in-depth interview in 3 Japanese companies(each company cooperated to introduce HRM officers, managers in workplace, employee using WLB practices),
 b. factor1 and factor 2 was confirmed by factor analysis with varimax rotation, all items of factor 1 indicate organizational obligation in WLB, factor 2 for employee obligations per se,
 c. further information whether respondent's evaluations to each obligation in 'fulfilled' and 'not fulfilled',
 d. sample descriptions(min., max., mean, s.d.) is from WPC_fulfillment variables which considered how important each obligation is and whether it is fulfilled or not(Robinson, 1996).

Table 1. variable description

	Name of Variables	N	min.	max.	mean	s.d.	Details of Items
dependent variables	Perceived WLB ($\alpha=0.757$)	618	1.000	5.000	3.426	0.763	There is a good balance between work and childcare Work requirements make providing good childcare impossible (Reversed) Childcare requirements make performing good work impossible (Reversed)
	Desire to Stay ($\alpha=0.749$)	618	1.000	5.000	3.333	0.907	I want to work at the present company until mandatory retirement(approximately until 65 year-old) I don't think I would leave this organization because of its supporting culture Within few years, I would find a new employer(Reversed)
independent variables	cost_parental_leave_ave($\alpha=0.866$)	537	1.000	5.000	3.053	0.982	average of below four items
	cost_promotion(parental leave)	537	1.000	5.000	3.182	1.223	Parental leave practice use impares promotion possibilities.
	cost_development(parental leave)	537	1.000	5.000	2.972	1.151	Parental leave practice use hinders skill development.
	cost_network(parental leave)	537	1.000	5.000	2.834	1.113	Parental leave practice use narrows informantion exchange with other workers and the development of social networks in office.
	cost_overall_career(parental leave)	537	1.000	5.000	3.223	1.163	The longer I use Parental leave practice, the more adverse is the career impact.
	cost_parttime_ave($\alpha=0.891$)	256	1.000	5.000	3.304	0.977	average of below four items
	cost_promotion(part-time)	256	1.000	5.000	3.469	1.137	Part-time arrangement practice use impares promotion possibilities.
	cost_development(part-time)	256	1.000	5.000	3.336	1.146	Part-time arrangement practice use hinders skill development.
	cost_network(part-time)	256	1.000	5.000	3.016	1.088	Part-time arrangement practice use narrows informantion exchange with other workers and the development of social networks in office.
	cost_overall_career(part-time)	256	1.000	5.000	3.395	1.126	The longer I use part-time arrangement practice, the more adverse is the career impact.
	WPC_employer($\alpha=0.886$)	618	-4.000	4.000	-0.290	1.724	view appendix for details
	WPC_employee($\alpha=0.782$)	618	-2.727	3.000	0.749	0.911	
control variables	education_univ	618	0.000	1.000	0.500	0.500	dummy variable(1=university and more)
	tenure_year	618	3.000	26.000	10.366	4.875	years since employeed
	status_manager	618	0.000	1.000	0.167	0.373	dummy variable(1=operational manager and more)
	wage	618	2.301	3.000	2.518	0.144	log10(wage:ten thousand yen)
	organization_size	618	0.000	1.000	0.547	0.498	dummy variable(1=employing 300 full-time worker and more)
	industry_manufacture	618	0.000	1.000	0.270	0.444	dummy variable(1=organization in manufacturing industry)
	industry_retail	618	0.000	1.000	0.112	0.315	dummy variable(1=organization in retail industry)
	use_fertility_leave	618	0.000	1.000	0.942	0.234	dummy variables(1=use)
	use_pregnancy_care	618	0.000	1.000	0.228	0.420	dummy variables(1=use)
	use_parental_leave	618	0.000	1.000	0.869	0.338	dummy variables(1=use)
	use_parttime	618	0.000	1.000	0.414	0.493	dummy variables(1=use)
	use_daycare_in_office	618	0.000	1.000	0.045	0.208	dummy variables(1=use)
	use_telecommuting	618	0.000	1.000	0.023	0.149	dummy variables(1=use)
	use_flextime	618	0.000	1.000	0.121	0.327	dummy variables(1=use)
	use_monetary_support	618	0.000	1.000	0.019	0.138	dummy variables(1=use)
use_leave_for_nursing_child	618	0.000	1.000	0.121	0.327	dummy variables(1=use)	

Table 2. Correlation

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21
1 Willingness to stay long	1																				
2 Perceived WLB	.357**	1																			
3 cost_parental leave(aver.)	.150**	.191**	1																		
4 cost_parttime(aver.)	-.144*	-.128*	.757**	1																	
5 WPC_organization	.341**	.234**	.273**	.233**	1																
6 WPC_employee	.253**	.226**	-.010	.060	.337**	1															
7 fertility leave_use	.005	-.024	-.052	.027	.002	-.037	1														
8 arrangements for pregnancy_use	.067	.028	.007	.038	.119**	.005	.119**	1													
9 parental leave_use	.032	-.026		-.015	.060	-.003	.415**	.120**	1												
10 childcare in office_use	-.063	.025	.129**	-.106	.093*	.038	.021	-.007	.038	1											
11 working at home_use	.072	.086*	-.051	-.091	.126**	.072	.038	.150**	.059	.071	1										
12 flexible working hours_use	.044	.065	.026	.011	.148**	.133**	.050	.117**	.042	.014	.243**	1									
13 monetary support_use	-.035	.080*	-.036	-.084	.061	.014	.035	.035	-.015	.082*	.136**	.055	1								
14 leave for nursing child_use	.087*	.083*	.041	-.034	.051	.001	.050	.152**	.100*	-.009	.110**	.150**	.127**	1							
15 education_univ	-.035	-.055	.126**	.055	.030	.045	.041	.143**	.101*	-.078	.087*	.104**	-.023	.084*	1						
16 tenure_year	.088*	.154**	.103*	.073	-.009	-.024	-.038	-.040	-.045	-.058	.058	.096*	-.030	.077	.211**	1					
17 status_manager	.013	.016	.009	-.100	.067	.060	-.093*	.005	-.096*	.028	.019	.060	.031	.007	.074	.101*	1				
18 wage	.089*	.099*	.038	-.024	.178**	.177**	-.021	.149**	.001	.081*	.131**	.265**	.150**	.153**	.230**	.140**	.254**	1			
19 organization_size	-.031	.003	.115**	.192**	.125**	.142**	.037	.100*	.099*	.042	.051	.199**	.010	.159**	.176**	.123**	.006	.268**	1		
20 industry_manufacture	.082*	-.015	.072	.160*	-.039	.011	-.035	.043	-.001	-.062	.005	.164**	-.059	.042	.055	.074	-.067	-.008	.107**	1	
21 industry_retail	-.026	.035	.048	.003	-.061	.019	-.087*	-.070	-.045	-.077	-.054	-.069	-.013	-.037	-.026	.043	.034	-.060	-.070	-.216**	1

**p<0.01, *p<0.05.

Table 3. Regression

	Willingness for stay long				Perceived WLB			
	H1a		H2a		H1b		H2b	
	**	**	***	***	***	***	***	***
education_univ	-0.067	-0.047	-0.044	-0.047	-0.044	-0.033	-0.023	-0.030
tenure_year	.052	.034	.053	.081 **	.133 ***	.159 ***	.266 ***	.155 ***
status_manager	-0.001	-0.025	.061	-0.019	-0.023	-0.073 *	-0.040	-0.035
wage	.113 **	.107 **	-0.030	.052	.074	.090 *	-0.057	.028
organization_size	-0.089 **	-0.019	-0.002	-.125 ***	-0.042	.006	.062	-0.070 *
industry_manufacture	.078 *	.108 **	.093	.095 **	-0.015	.006	-0.036	-0.006
industry_retail	-0.10	.010	.044	-0.003	.036	.044	.096	.037
use_fertility_leave	-0.006	-0.025	.013	.013	-0.017	-0.006	.053	-0.004
use_pregnancy_care	.043	.045	.064	.027	.018	.015	-0.035	.011
use_parental_leave	.031		.008	.018	-0.019		-0.054	-0.027
use_parttime	.038	.026		.002	.013	-0.002		-0.013
use_daycare_in_office	-0.065	-0.059	.023	-0.086 **	.020	.016	.056	.007
use_telecommuting	.060	.055	.087	.032	.054	.042	.009	.034
use_flextime	-0.012	-0.011	.000	-0.051	.025	.037	.103	-0.003
use_monetary_support	-0.062	-0.069	-0.107	-0.061	.054	.052	.102	.056
use_leave_for_nursing_child	.069	.073	.109 *	.082	.055	.069	.108 *	.066
cost_parental leave(aver.)		-0.169 ***				-0.208 ***		
cost_parttime(aver.)			-0.153 **				-0.141 **	
WPC_organization				.303 ***				.176 ***
WPC_employee				.172 ***				.176 ***
N	618	537	256	618	618	537	256	618
R ²	.048	.069	.077	.189	.049	.101	.150	.123
adjusted R ²	.022	.040	.016	.165	.023	.074	.093	.097
F	1.879 **	2.411 ***	1.255	7.750 ***	1.922 **	3.663 ***	2.638 ***	4.673 ***

***p<0.01, **p<0.05, *p<0.1.

Table 4. Regression(limited sample, use_parental_leave=1)

	Willingness to stay long			Perceived WLB		
	***	***	***	***	***	***
education_univ	-.048	-.046	-.030	-.038	-.039	-.025
tenure_year	.034	.080 *	.058	.156 ***	.162 ***	.175 ***
status_manager	-.025	-.020	-.046	-.069	-.088 **	-.084 **
wage	.100 **	.051	.041	.080	.041	.036
organization_size	-.021	-.124 ***	-.069	.004	-.048	-.031
industry_manufacture	.102 **	.095 **	.109 ***	.002	.003	.006
industry_retail	.010	-.002	.005	.037	.031	.032
use_fertility_leave	-.028	.020	-.037	-.011	-.003	-.016
use_pregnancy_care	.045	.027	.028	.011	.001	.002
use_parttime	.027	.004	-.010	.000	-.030	-.027
use_daycare_in_office	-.057	-.085 **	-.078 *	.023	.015	.008
use_telecommuting	.051	.033	.028	.047	.032	.030
use_flextime	-.006	-.051	-.040	.042	.010	.018
use_monetary_support	-.070	-.062	-.064	.051	.057	.056
use_leave_for_nursing_child	.070	.083 **	.082 *	.056	.076 *	.066
cost_promotion(paretal leave)	-.042		-.034	.104		.106
cost_development(parental leave)	-.071		-.031	-.212 ***		-.187 ***
cost_network(parental leave)	-.110 *		-.077	-.086		-.057
cost_overall career(parental leave)	.023		.031	-.046		-.045
WPC_organization		.304 ***	.272 ***		.215 ***	.167 ***
WPC_employee		.172 ***	.192 ***		.169 ***	.175 ***
N		537	537	537	537	537
R ²	.073	0.189	.199	.115	.150	.183
adjusted R ²	.039	0.166	.166	.083	.122	.150
F	2.153 ***	8.205 ***	6.074 ***	3.549 ***	5.389 ***	5.496 ***

***p<0.01, **p<0.05, *p<0.1.

Table 5. Regression(limited sample, use parttime=1)

	Willingness to stay long			Perceived WLB		
	***	***	***	***	***	***
education_univ	-.072	-.040	-.062	-.054	-.025	-.047
tenure_year	.041	.066	.063	.254 ***	.284 ***	.286 ***
status_manager	.048	.066	.045	-.059	-.034	-.064
wage	-.028	-.077	-.076	-.058	-.102	-.106
organization_size	-.005	-.074	-.063	.054	-.007	.004
industry_manufacture	.095	.116	.127 **	-.030	-.030	-.010
industry_retail	.047	.054	.058	.093	.097	.094
use_fertility_leave	.000	-.001	-.014	.025	.054	.030
use_pregnancy_care	.080	.049	.073	-.011	-.043	-.008
use_parental_leave	.037	.013	.039	-.016	-.064	-.032
use_daycare_in_office	.020	-.007	-.015	.047	.032	.015
use_telecommuting	.085	.041	.034	.011	-.025	-.032
use_flextime	.000	-.010	-.007	.106	.089	.095
use_monetary_support	-.093	-.086	-.068	.142 **	.131 **	.177 ***
use_leave_for_nursing_child	.077	.141 **	.102	.068	.133 **	.085
cost_promotion(parttime)	.204		.256 *	.370 ***		.406 ***
cost_development(parttime)	-.208		-.212 *	-.273 **		-.293 **
cost_network(parttime)	-.137 *		-.097	-.063		-.024
cost_overall_career(parttime)	-.051		-.066	-.194		-.230 **
WPC_organization		.309 ***	.287 ***		.145 **	.114 *
WPC_employee		.095	.106		.225 ***	.251 ***
N	256	256	256	256	256	256
R ²	.097	.169	.197	.182	.217	.268
adjusted R ²	.025	.109	.125	.117	.161	.203
F	1.340	2.842 ***	2.732 ***	2.771 ***	3.888 ***	4.086 ***

***p<0.01, **p<0.05, *p<0.1.