



저작자표시-비영리-변경금지 2.0 대한민국

이용자는 아래의 조건을 따르는 경우에 한하여 자유롭게

- 이 저작물을 복제, 배포, 전송, 전시, 공연 및 방송할 수 있습니다.

다음과 같은 조건을 따라야 합니다:



저작자표시. 귀하는 원저작자를 표시하여야 합니다.



비영리. 귀하는 이 저작물을 영리 목적으로 이용할 수 없습니다.



변경금지. 귀하는 이 저작물을 개작, 변형 또는 가공할 수 없습니다.

- 귀하는, 이 저작물의 재이용이나 배포의 경우, 이 저작물에 적용된 이용허락조건을 명확하게 나타내어야 합니다.
- 저작권자로부터 별도의 허가를 받으면 이러한 조건들은 적용되지 않습니다.

저작권법에 따른 이용자의 권리는 위의 내용에 의하여 영향을 받지 않습니다.

이것은 [이용허락규약\(Legal Code\)](#)을 이해하기 쉽게 요약한 것입니다.

[Disclaimer](#)

경영학석사 학위논문

Maternity protection policies in
organizations: The impact of
progressiveness on turnover,
productivity, and employee usage

진보적 모성보호제도가 조직결과에 미치는
영향에 대하여: 자발적 이직율, 생산성,
정책사용에 대한 연구

2018 년 8 월

서울대학교 대학원

경영학과 경영학 전공

유혜진

ABSTRACT

Maternity protection policies in organizations: The impact of progressiveness on turnover, productivity, and employee usage

Hyejin Yu

College of Business Administration

The Graduate School

Seoul National University

This study provides one of the first scholastic looks into maternity protection at work: policies that benefit women during stages of pregnancy, nursing, and child-rearing. Extending from prior work-family policy literature, I theorize organizations' initiative to cover maternity protection over legal regulation, what I term "progressiveness". Drawing from social exchange and signaling processes, I hypothesize that employees may respond positively to an

organization's progressiveness associated with maternity protection. The empirical results are based on longitudinal data from 1,905 Korean organizations from 2005 to 2013. This study indicates that organizations' initiative in embracing progressive maternity protection policies more than legal mandates has positive signaling effects on employees, thus encouraging more policy usage.

Keyword: maternity protection, HR practices, social exchange theory, signaling theory

Student Number: 2016-20595

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION	5
II. LITERATURE REVIEW	7
i. The History of Maternity Protection at Work	7
ii. Work-Family Policies as a HRM Practice	9
III. THEORY AND HYPOTHESES.....	13
i. Voluntary Turnover: Social Exchange Theory	13
ii. Employee Policy Use: Signaling Theory	19
IV. METHODS	24
i. Data and Sample	24
ii. Variables	25
V. ANALYSES AND RESULTS	28
VI. DISCUSSION.....	30
i. After study.....	31
ii. Future studies	34
iii. Limitations.....	37
VII. CONCLUSION.....	38
LIST OF TABLES	40
REFERENCES.....	47
ABSTRACT IN KOREAN	62

I. INTRODUCTION

Maternity protection at work—defined as “certain proposals with regards to women's employment, before and after childbirth, including the question of maternity benefit” was first introduced at the International Labour Organization (ILO) Maternity Protection Convention (No.3, 1919). The primary aim of maternity protection policies is to enhance the well-being of mothers and their children, combining productive and reproductive roles of women (Addati, Cassirer, & Gilchrist, 2014). Bearing its purposes to protect working mothers from discrimination and to support their motherhood and working right, ILO has urged member states the ratification of maternity protection policies. As a result, the Maternity Protection Convention (No.183, 2000) consisting of diverse benefits for working mothers has been globally enacted as the Labor Standards Act ("Ratifications of C183," 2018). Although the effect of maternity leave or work-family policies (e.g., childcare, flextime) has been studied, research on multiple maternity protection is surprisingly scarce in management despite its important position in the labor world and its close connection to female employees. Considering that pregnancy and

child support is one of the main causes of career disadvantage and turnover intention against women, we need to explore diverse maternity protection policies and see which type of policies may elicit the best outcomes for employees and organizations.

The purpose of my dissertation is two-fold. First, drawing upon 1,905 organizational-level data from 2005 to 2013, I aim to identify which types of maternity protection policies organizations have adopted. Second, based on the previous exploratory finding, I attempt to see the impact of progressive maternity protection policies on organizational outcomes. In work-family policy literature, the matter of ‘usability’ has been neglected by scholars and policy-makers (Mun & Brinton, 2015). The gap between policy adoption by organizations and policy use by employees may come from negative stigmatization toward women taking advantage of the practice. Employed mothers using related policies are often regarded as having low commitment or performance (Weeden, 2005) and fear for wage penalty or blocked advancement (Fried, 1998; Thompson, Beauvais, & Lyness, 1999). In this cultural context, active usage of maternity protection policies may imply that employees perceive highly supportive climate in using policies. As high use rates mean that many employees take benefits in

practice, it also represents enhanced employee well-being—the ultimate goal of work-family policies (Bloom, Kretschmer, & Van Reenen, 2011).

To sum up, I investigate voluntary turnover, productivity, policy usage—organizational outcomes capturing employee well-being, using Korean Workplace Panel Survey data. In the following section, I introduce the background of maternity protection and review the literature of work-family policies, which are highly related with maternity protection policies in respect that both aim to help employees balance work and family roles. The theoretical mechanism leading to my hypotheses comes next. Finally, explanation on data and methods will follow.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

i . The History of Maternity Protection at Work

Since its foundation in 1919, the ILO has progressively expanded the scope of maternity protection over several conferences (No. 3, 1919; No. 103, 1952; No. 183, 2000). The most recent one (No. 183, 2000) declares that maternity protection at work includes five key

compositions: *maternity leave* (leave periods more than 14 weeks before and after childbirth), *cash and medical benefits* (cash benefits during maternity leave and medical care before and after childbirth), *health protection at workplace* (restrict certain working conditions for the safety of pregnant employees), *employment protection and non-discrimination* (guarantee job security and the same position without any penalty after maternity leave), and *breastfeeding arrangements at work* (provide nursing breaks and facilities). ILO recently included *childcare after return to work* (provide childcare facilities and services after return to work) as one of the necessary elements in maternity protection (Addati et al., 2014). Even though every country has a difference in the degree of legislation, maternity protection conventions work as a global standard for each member state to legalize related policies. In Korea, the empirical setting of this study, most of the policies described above are also well-established by law—although organizations show variations in the extent to which maternity protection policies are adopted because they may resist legal regulations depending on their interests (DiMaggio, 1988; Oliver, 1991; Powell, 1991). Calling for active implementation of maternity protection policies in the workplace, ILO suggests that they should be

the essential part of comprehensive work-family policies (Addati et al., 2014).

ii. Work-Family Policies as a HRM Practice

Work-family policies (a.k.a. family-friendly policies, work-family support policies) consists of complementary policies that are mainly designed to deal with family responsibilities (Konrad & Mangel, 2000). There is no perfect consensus on what kinds of policies constitutes work-family programs, but frequently referred policies are flextime, telework, family leave, childcare and eldercare services (Beauregard & Henry, 2009; Lee & Hong, 2011; Ngo et al., 2009). Maternity protection policies share key elements with some of the work-family policies (e.g., maternity leave, childcare services) but have following distinctive features. First, while most of the work-family policies are voluntarily adopted by organizations and employer-supported (Glass & Finley, 2002; Lobel, 1999), most of the maternity protection policies are legal mandates, many of which are government-supported. Second, the primary purpose of maternity protection policies is to enhance the well-being of mothers and their children thereby having specific targets: mothers who are conceiving or rearing children. A work-family

program has a broader purpose and targets: work and life balance for all employees. Despite distinguishing characteristics of maternity protection policies, it is hard to separate them with work-family policies. Burgeoning interest toward both programs is based on recent workforce change, such as growing female employees, dual-earner couples, and single parents in the organization (Hammer, Neal, Newsom, Brockwood, & Colton, 2005). The major aim of maternity protection, combining productive and reproductive roles of women (Addati et al., 2014) cannot be detached from work-family balance. Thus, we need to track the history of work-family policies and review the various effects they have on employees and organizational outcomes.

Research on work-family policies over the past 30 years has been mostly conducted with the following patterns: First, mostly in the beginning, the effect of a specific policy on employee outcomes has been studied. The most frequently researched areas among work-family policies are flextime (Bohen & Viveros-Long, 1981; Dalton & Mesch, 1990; Dunham, Pierce, & Castaneda, 1987; Krausz & Freibach, 1983; McGuire & Liro, 1987; Pierce & Newstrom, 1982, 1983; Rothausen, 1994; Scandura & Lankau, 1997) and childcare services (Goff, Mount,

& Jamison, 1990; Kossek & Nichol, 1992; Milkovich & Gomez, 1976; Mize & Freeman, 1989; Youngblood & Chambers-Cook, 1984).

Second, the most prevalent studies so far, is the effect of an work-family program, consisting of multiple and complementary policies, on individual-level outcomes— organizational commitment (Aryee, Luk, & Stone, 1998; Chiu & Ng, 1999; Grover & Crooker, 1995; Orthner & Pittman, 1986), job satisfaction (Ezra & Deckman, 1996; Judge, Boudreau, & Bretz, 1994; Saltzstein, Ting, & Saltzstein, 2001), turnover intention (Aryee et al., 1998; Grover & Crooker, 1995; Kim & Wiggins, 2011), and job performance (Moon & Roh, 2010). Last, which is recently emerging, is the impact of a work-family program on organization-level outcomes. Few research has investigated the outcomes of work-family programs at the organizational level (Lee & Hong, 2011; Perry-Smith & Blum, 2000). This type of research covers the relationship between work-family programs and organization-level outcomes such as productivity (Bae & Goodman, 2014; Beauregard & Henry, 2009; Bloom et al., 2011; Glass & Finley, 2002; Konrad & Mangel, 2000; Lee & Hong, 2011; Yamamoto & Matsuura, 2014), turnover rate (Bae & Goodman, 2014; Beauregard & Henry, 2009; Lee

& Hong, 2011; Ngo et al., 2009), and financial performance (Lau, 2000; Lau & May, 1998; Perry-Smith & Blum, 2000).

A major stream of previous literature is the impact of policy adoption. Those research mostly examine the extent to which organizations actively adopt a work-family program by counting the number of adopted policies. This one-by-one approach does not differentiate a variety of functions among policies, and thus, fails to fully address which policies are effective. The most important question is, “what do employees with family want?” (Glass & Finley, 2002). Organizations having a number of work-family policies that are out-of-date may not reflect employees’ preference anymore. In addition, organizations may not cover a variety of functions of work and family balance, leaning to one side. For example, organizations may have a number of flex-time related policies but do not have a leave policy. Both cases get a high family index score due to the many number of policies but does not satisfy diverse needs of employees. Therefore, organizations’ effort to incorporate diverse policies should be researched to better capture organizations’ proactiveness. Kelly et al. (2008) assert that future research on work-family policies should focus more on work-family initiatives, defined as “deliberate organizational

change”. They take examples of previous research: 1) “work-family initiatives”, measured as introducing new work-family policies (Arthur, 2003; Arthur & Cook, 2004) or 2) “comprehensiveness”, covering broad functions of a work-family program (Perry-Smith & Blum, 2000). Inspired by Perry-Smith & Blum’s (2000) work, my dissertation takes the second method to measure organizations’ initiative to adopt progressive policies of maternity protection—considering organizations’ voluntary policies over legal mandates.

III. THEORY AND HYPOTHESES

i. Voluntary Turnover: Social Exchange Theory

A work-family program, aiming to help employees balance work and personal life (Davis & Kalleberg, 2006; Glass & Finley, 2002), consists of complementary policies that are mainly designed to deal with family responsibilities (Konrad & Mangel, 2000). Beauregard and Henry (2009) assert that providing employees with work-family policies is regarded as favorable organization actions, and thus, employees repay their organization’s treatment with positive work attitudes—organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and organizational

citizenship behaviors. Along with this vein, social exchange theory (Blau, 1964) prescribes that employees feel obligated to reciprocate favors from their organizations with beneficial behaviors. Likewise, a maternity protection program, supporting women's reproductive and productive rights, will lead females to respond to organizations with cooperative behaviors commensurate with the organizations' interest. For example, women who receive job security after giving birth have higher organizational commitment and quickly return to work from maternity leave (Lyness, Thompson, Francesco, & Judiesch, 1999). Although many of maternity protection policies are targeted toward women, men are also likely to show positive attitudes if they perceive support from policies. One facet in which social exchange theory has manifested is perceived organizational support, emerging from exchanges between employees and organizations (Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchison, & Sowa, 1986; Graen & Scandura, 1987). Supportive HR practices can elicit desirable behaviors from employees by creating perceived organizational support even though all employees are not direct beneficiaries of particular practices.

According to social exchange theory (Blau, 1964), the differences between social exchange and economic exchange are: (1)

social exchange is based on trust while economic exchange relies on transaction, and (2) social exchange is characterized as unspecified obligations while economic exchange imposes recipients clear moments and forms of reciprocation. As a part of social exchange theory, Foa and Foa's (1974, 1980) resource theory identifies resources exchanged between two parties. Within organizations, the resources are categorized into two types: economic and socio-emotional exchanges (Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005). While economic outcomes meet individual financial needs and tend to be tangible, socioemotional outcomes satisfy the social and esteem needs of employees and are often symbolic. With socio-emotional resources, such as emotional support and affiliation (Armeli, Eisenberger, Fasolo, & Lynch, 1998), organizations send employees messages that they are valued and treated with dignity (Shore, Tetrick, Lynch, & Barksdale, 2001). One type of social exchange in the work setting is perceived organizational support (POS) described as "global beliefs concerning the extent to which the organization values their contributions and cares about their well-being" (Eisenberger et al., 1986: 501). Previous studies found that employees with greater POS reciprocate organizations with desirable work attitudes and behaviors. POS is related with higher affective

commitment (Settoon, Bennett, & Liden, 1996; Shore & Wayne, 1993; Wayne, Shore, & Liden, 1997), less intention to quit (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002; Wayne et al., 1997; Witt, 1991), more job involvement (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002), and better job performance (Eisenberger, Fasolo, & Davis-LaMastro, 1990).

A maternity protection program aiming to enhance the well-being of working mothers and their children is likely to encourage employees to develop a sense of support and thus reciprocate with supportive behaviors for employing organizations. The effects of maternity protection policies may reach beyond female workers. Male workers can directly receive benefits via certain policies that both men and women can avail (e.g., paternity leave, child-care facilities) or indirectly through their working spouses. Even employees who are not beneficiaries of the policies can develop POS if they agree with the intent of the adopted practices and share the supportive climate. For example, both men and women feel more attached to organizations that adopt female-friendly policies because it shows company efforts to embrace diversity (Williamson, Slay, Shapiro, & Shivers-Blackwell, 2008). In addition, women-specific practices indirectly benefit men by creating a diverse climate (Plaut, Thomas, & Goren, 2009). Likewise,

maternity protection policies will create POS regardless of gender if employees empathize with the value of the practices. Employees who gain a sense of POS from maternity protection policies are likely to reciprocate their organizations with greater commitment and loyalty.

A progressive maternity protection program shows that organizations are willing to adopt a wide range of policies in accord with workforce changes in organizations. Moreover, progressive policies may send employees messages that organizations have a keen interest in working mothers' rights and sincerely care for their well-being. On the contrary, organizations only adopting minimal legal requirements or even avoiding those regulations are neither likely to satisfy females nor impress other employees. According to social exchange theory, recipients feel more grateful toward resources that are based on discretionary actions than on outcomes coming from external regulations beyond the donors' will. Voluntary resources from donors indicate that recipients are cared for and valued with respect (Blau, 1964; Eisenberger, Cotterell, & Marvel, 1987; Gouldner, 1960). Thus, regulatory policies complying with external circumstances may not effectively induce gratitude from employees as much as organization voluntary practices. Organization progressiveness in maternity

protection implies that organizations adopt related policies not because of external forces but because of a genuine interest in achieving the intended goal of maternity protection. This action may stimulate greater POS because progressive policies are linked to an organization's willingness to incorporate a variety of policies with discretion. If POS from progressive maternity protection policies fulfill employees' socio-emotional needs, employees will develop a sense of belonging and attachment toward their organization. This thought can raise the desire to remain thereby reducing voluntary turnover. In addition to the sense of affiliation and attachment, the norm of reciprocity may lead employees to engage in behaviors that benefit employing organizations. Employee behaviors that are consistent with the goal of the organization will contribute to enhancing employee productivity. Thus,

Hypothesis 1. Organizations with more progressive maternity protection policies will have a lower voluntary turnover.

Hypothesis 2. Organizations with more progressive maternity protection policies will have higher productivity.

ii. Employee Policy Use: Signaling Theory

Availability of HR practices does not necessarily lead to active use. In many cases, organizations adopt HR practices to gain legitimacy but fail to actually use them (Meyer & Rowan, 1977; Scott, 1995).

Especially, organizations introducing certain policies or practices due to normative or coercive pressures have a wide gap between policy availability and actual usage (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983).

Organizations often adopt work-family policies due to ceremonial purposes to gain legitimacy (Glass & Fujimoto, 1995; Osterman, 1995) and may “intentionally or unintentionally discourage employees from ever using these benefits” (Blair-Loy & Wharton, 2002: 816).

Employees using work-family policies frequently report fear for not being taken seriously (Crittenden, 2002), wage penalties, blocked mobility and low performance evaluation (Glass, 2004; Judiesch & Lyness, 1999; Kalleberg & Reskin, 1995). Those cases imply that deep-seated prejudice to a work-family program exist and employees perceive a barrier between available policies and policy use.

Each government legislating maternity protection policies requires organizations to adopt related policies, but organizations have shown the varying degree of responsiveness to regulatory obligations.

For example, not a few organizations still do not have a single related policy. On the other hand, there are organizations that progressively adopt a wide range of policies beyond institutional mandates.

Following minimal regulations is likely to be symbolic actions to signify that they involuntarily comply to legal pressures when conducting related policies (Dobbin & Sutton, 1998; Edelman, 1992; Kalev, Dobbin, & Kelly, 2006). In this case, employees are not likely to get messages that their organizations would be supportive of their policy use. On the other hand, organizations' proactive actions to widen the coverage of policies may signal that management has a genuine interest in achieving the intended goal of maternity protection. In such organizations, employees are likely to lessen the fear of using policies if they interpret a full-fledged maternity protection program as a signal of supportive organizational climate toward women and mothers facing maternity.

Within organizations, adopting HR practices is one of the discernable signals that organizations represent their hidden qualities (Nishii, Lepak, & Schneider, 2008). Via observable practices, organizations convey organizational climate (Guion, 1973; James & Jones, 1974), which is an invisible character of organizations. Previous

studies suggest that employees interpret work-family policies as symbolic gestures that organizations care about their family life (Casper & Harris, 2008; Grover & Crooker, 1995). In this way, employees raise family-supportive organization perceptions when work-family policies are visibly available (Butts, Casper, & Yang, 2013). Organizational climate described as employees' shared perceptions on policies or procedures that get supported in a certain environment (Schneider, 1990), encourages or discourages employees to use work-family policies (Drago et al., 2006; Gottfried & Hayashi-Kato, 1998; Thompson et al., 1999). Signaling theory (Spence, 1974; Spence, 1973) asserts that organizations send indications on their unobservable traits using observable practices. Classic signaling theory views signaling issues from the perspectives of employing organizations toward job applicants. In recent years, management researchers have expanded signaling theory to cover the view of diverse receivers, including both outsiders (e.g., investors, customers) and insiders (e.g., employees) of organizations (Hochwarter, Ferris, Zinko, Arnell, & James, 2007). This study focuses on the signaling process between organizations and employees, as the usage of available practices falls under the role of employees as the receiver of signals. Signaling theory mainly focuses

on the deliberate transmission of positive qualities of organizations. Once organizations send signals to targets, receivers interpret the signalers' messages and send back their responses (Connelly, Certo, Ireland, & Reutzel, 2011). Consistent with signaling theory, employees who perceive a family-supportive climate or gender-equal climate via a maternity protection programs may respond to organizations by actively availing extant policies.

Simply adopting a series of policies may not be a strong enough signal to encourage employees to use available practices. In effect, many organizations adopt HR practices to gain legitimacy but fail to use them (Meyer & Rowan, 1977; Scott, 1995). In particular, organizations introducing certain policies or practices due to normative or coercive pressures have a wide gap between policy availability and actual usage (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983). In practice, organizations often adopt work-family policies due to ceremonial purposes to gain legitimacy (Glass & Fujimoto, 1995; Osterman, 1995) and may “intentionally or unintentionally discourage employees from ever using these benefits” (Blair-Loy & Wharton, 2002: 816). Those cases suggest that employees perceive a barrier between available policies and their usage when organizations adopt certain practices due to external

regulations. Likewise, organizations may show different usage rates depending on their intent of adopting maternity protection policies. Following minimal mandates or even less than that are likely to be symbolic actions that organizations have work-family policies because of legal pressure (Dobbin & Sutton, 1998; Edelman, 1992; Kalev, Dobbin, & Kelly, 2006). Hence, employees in such organizations may not receive messages that management would be supportive of their policy use. On the contrary, a organization's proactive actions to keep widening the coverage of policies may transmit to employees their motive for achieving the original goal of maternity protection. Receiving signals and interpreting them as a supportive climate, female employees may no longer fear negative career outcomes or being stigmatized as less committed workers when they use policies. Therefore,

Hypothesis 3. Organizations with more progressive maternity protection policies will show higher employee policy use.

IV. METHODS

i. Data and Sample

I use panel data from the Korea Workplace Panel Survey (KWPS) over the period 2005 to 2013. 1,905 organizations starting from 2005 repeatedly participated in subsequent biyearly surveys although a few of them are missing and replaced in each survey year. Over five rounds of surveys, a total of 8,922 organization-level observations were collected. Each organization participated around four times from 2005 to 2013. Table 1 describes the number of participating organizations each year.

Insert Table 1 about here

Thanks to the longitudinal panel-structured data, I examine the relationship between independent and dependent variables with 2-year time gap. The data include workplaces with 30 or more employees on a nationwide scale. Human resources managers who are above the senior managerial rank in each organization participated in the survey concerning HR information. While interviewers visited each

organization, respondents used the Computer Assisted Personal Interview (CAPI) system that automatically checks for errors. This advanced survey method enhanced the reliability of the survey process and results. The large-sized sample covers diverse organizational characteristics (e.g., industry, size, and age) that are representative of Korean organizations. As those traits are likely to affect the implementation of maternity protection policies by each organization, the sample reveals a wide of variations in the adoption of maternity protection policies. All in all, the data allows me to find relationships between organizations' progressiveness in maternity protection and organizational outcomes— voluntary turnover, productivity, and policy usage while controlling diverse organizational-level variables that may affect this study's dependent variables.

ii. Variables

Dependent variables. I use three dependent variables in this study— *productivity*, *voluntary turnover* and *employee policy use*. *Productivity* is calculated as the natural logarithm of sales per number of employees. *Voluntary turnover* is calculated as the natural logarithm of the number of voluntary resignation to the total employees in survey

year. For the second dependent variable, *employee policy use* is the number of maternity protection policies that employees actively use in practice. Among 16 maternity protection policies, HR managers coded each question as 1 if their organization actively uses the policy in practice and 0 if it does not.

Independent variables. Our independent variable is the *progressiveness* of maternity protection policies. According to ILO and later by Addati et al (2014), maternity protection policies include six key elements: maternity leave, cash and medical benefits, health protection at the workplace, breastfeeding arrangements at work, childcare upon return to work, and employment protection and non-discrimination. Even though the last item is missing, the first five elements are well-represented by the fifteen policies in our data: (1) maternity leave and (2) paternity leave (both representing ‘maternity leave’ element); (3) prenatal diagnosis leave, (4) miscarriage leave, (5) infertility treatment leave (three representing ‘cash and medical benefits’); (6) restriction of night duties, (7) restriction from work during holidays, (8) restriction of overtime work, (9) restriction of harmful job duties, (10) opportunity for work conversion, (11) restriction of harmful job duties until 1 year after childbirth (these six

representing ‘health protection at workplace’); (12) breastfeeding break and (13) breastfeeding facility (both representing ‘breastfeeding arrangement at work’); (14) on-site childcare and (15) childcare benefit (both representing ‘childcare upon return to work’).

The operationalization of the independent variable, *progressiveness* of maternity protection policies is the number of voluntary (i.e., non-mandatory) policies that organizations adopt in each survey year. I classify 16 maternity protection policies into voluntary/mandatory ones based on Korean Labor Standard Law. I assume that the more organizations adopt voluntary policies in the survey year, the more they are progressive in maternity protection. The type of maternity protection policies is listed in Table 2.

Insert Table 2 about here

Control variables. I included several control variables referring to prior studies on work-family policies. *Year* (2005,2007,2009,2011,2013) was controlled as a dummy variable as there may be unobservable year effects. Besides these, *organization age* (natural log of the survey year minus the founding year), *organization*

size (natural log of total employees), *Female ratio* (the percentage of female employees to total employees), *Union* (1= firms have union, 0= firms do not have one), *the proportion of old employees and young employees* were controlled. The list of variables and its operation is presented in table 3.

Insert Table 3 about here

V. ANALYSES AND RESULTS

Table 3 presents the mean, standard deviation, and correlation of each variable. Hypotheses 1–3 are tested by using fixed effects regression. Tables 4 present the results. The number of voluntary maternity protection policies that organizations adopt each survey year are entered as independent variables along with control variables. Voluntary turnover, labor productivity, and use ratio are entered as dependent variables.

Insert Table 4 about here

Insert Table 5 about here

I report fixed-effects models as the main result. The Hausman test suggests that firm-specific factors are correlated with predictor variables in the model. The results show strong support for Hypothesis 1, predicting that organizations with more progressive maternity protection policies will have a positive impact on employee policy use. Model 1 shows that the more organizations adopt progressive policies, the more employees use them ($b=0.57, p <.001$). However, Hypothesis 2 and 3 are both rejected. Model 2 did not significantly support the impact of progressive maternity protection policies on the voluntary turnover rate. In addition to adopted policies, employee policy usage did not predict low voluntary turnover rate either, as suggested in Model 3. Model 4 shows that organizations' progressive policies do not lead to higher productivity. Surprisingly, more progressive maternity protection policies significantly impact on lower productivity ($b=-0.02, p <.05$). Model 5 presents that employee policy usage does not affect organizations' productivity.

VI. DISCUSSION

This study finds that progressive maternity protection policies, especially to the extent beyond legal requirements, are positively related to employee policy usage. It confirms that the types and coverages of adopted policies may be a signal toward employees conveying organizational climate thereby enhancing employees' utilization of existing policies. This finding also supports the neo-institutional perspective that organizations that involuntarily follow external regulations have a huge gap between the organizational structure and their activity (Meyer & Rowan, 1977; Scott, 1995).

However, progressive policies did not lead to lower voluntary turnover and higher productivity at the organizational level. Prior studies on work-family policy and firm-level outcomes suggest that although family-friendly policies do not positively impact firms' profits, their ultimate goal is enhanced employee well-being (Bloom, Kretschmer, & Van Reenen, 2011). As high usage means that many employees take benefits in practice, it also represents that more progressive policies may lead to employee well-being. A study by Bloom et al (2011) also showed that the relationship between family-

friendly policies and firm productivity disappears when other quality management practices are controlled. Judging from these previous results, I assume that family-friendly policies per se may not impact organizational-level performance. Maternity protection as well may come along with other firm-specific traits (e.g., management practices) or in reverse, organizational level predictors determine the level of maternity protection policies.

i. After study

As an after study, I study the determinants of maternity protection policies to figure out which type of organizations adopt more progressive or mandated maternity protection policies. I now use a random-effect regression model because the fixed-effects model may not capture the impact of predictors whose variance is small over the years (Gujarati, 2009). The result is given in Table 6.

Insert Table 6 about here

Table 6 shows several organizational-level factors have a significant association with the provision of maternity protection

policies. Column (1) uses the number of progressive policies, while column (3) includes a total of maternity protection policies as a dependent variable. I find that although the level of coefficient decreases when the number of progressive policies is used as a dependent variable, coefficient consistently remains significant regardless of the measurement.

We can see from table 5 that (1) union, (2) salary, (3) organizational size, (4) proportion of female employees, and (5) proportion of young employees are positively affecting the adoption of maternity protection policies. As a high level of salary and organizational size may represent that organizations with ample of organizational resource adopt more maternity protection policies. In addition, the robust impact of female and young employees shows that organizations may try to maximize utilities of employees. However, this result also means that female/young employees in male-dominated or organizations may be marginalized when availing maternity protection policies despite most of them are legal mandates. In fact, the proportion of old employees in organizations negatively affect the adoption of maternity protection whether it is legal or not.

Besides determinants and consequences of maternity protection policies, the patterns and types that organizations take in maternity protection are notable. I conduct a factor analysis on 15 maternity protection policies based on organizations reply to which policies they are adopting, and see how they categorize those multiple policies. Table 6 presents the result of principal component factor analysis.

Insert Table 7 about here

As we can see in Table 6, policies are classified as (1) leave policies, (2) workload-relief policies, and (3) family-care policies. Most of the former two categories are regulatory and partially government-supported while (3) family-care policies are voluntarily adopted and employer-supported ones in the current research context. It is not surprising that majority of samples (83 % of all samples) neglect maternity protection policies beyond legal mandates, implying a high-threshold exist when it comes to adopting non-regulatory policies. From another point of view, most policies classified as (3) family-care policies are targeted at parents who return to work after their maternity or paternity leave. Given that a majority of organizations only adopt

leave (i.e., targeting after child-birth period) and workload-relief policies (i.e., targeting pregnancy period), organizations seem to overlook the stage of after-leave periods in maternity. The after-study finding implicates that organizations need to design a comprehensive maternity protection program by taking into account various stages of maternity, especially including the phase of “after-leave”.

ii. Future studies

As maternity protection research is beginning to emerge in the management field, numerous areas can be explored. Extending our after-study, the antecedent of organizations’ progressiveness deserves more attention. According to the institutional point of view, the responsiveness to work-family policies is related to the components of institutional pressures, such as organizational size and industry trends that organizations belong (Goodstein, 1994; Ingram & Simons, 1995). In addition to this, corporate internal resources, including both tangible (e.g., financial reserves) and intangible (e.g., corporate culture) resources (Grant, 1991), may be responsible for the adoption of maternity protection. With regard to the latter category of internal resources, family-supportive organization perceptions (i.e., the extent to

which employees perceive family-supportive work environments) is found to be related to more adoption of work-family policies and their usage rates (Allen, Shore, & Griffeth, 2003). Referring to those previous studies, future studies need to find out the role of external environments and internal resources on the level of organizations' progressiveness in maternity protection.

Although our study finds that progressive maternity protection has overall effects on organizational level outcomes, future studies should also investigate idiosyncratic results depending on employees' gender and life stages. Considering that most of the maternity protection policies are targeted at limited employees (i.e., women who fall under the before-and after-childbirth periods), their effects are likely to be maximized to particular targets while they may backfire to certain individuals, possibly to male employees. In relation to these distinctive effects, specific types and functions of policies may be more effective for certain employees. For example, male employees may have resistance to maternity leave but may appreciate child-care facilities. With regard to possible differences among policies, maternity protection for fathers, such as paternity leave, have rarely been studied and the effect of related avenues would be interesting topics.

Consistent with Perry-Smith and Blum (2000)'s suggestion, more refined measurement on the depth of maternity protection or work-family policies are required. Along with the use ratio of policies, the extent to which maternity protection is fully embedded in the organization may be delivered via micro-level research, such as employees' perception of maternity protection. Going beyond the effect of progressive adoption, the depth of maternity protection may have effects on organizational outcomes. From previous studies regarding the effect of family-supportive supervisors on policy use and family-supportive work environments (Shellenbarger, 1992; Thomas & Ganster, 1995), we assume that supervisor support will play a significant role constructing the depth of maternity protection. Regarding supervisor support, understanding the trait of supervisors, whether a demographic feature (e.g., gender) or psychological characteristics (e.g., gender sensitivity), may be helpful to assess the depth of maternity protection.

In addition, more consideration of the cross-cultural context is needed. Considering that different standards and legal regulations exist in each country, maternity protection policies can be categorized differently in other cultural settings. For example, countries that have a

well-developed and highly regulated maternity protection may have a different composition of policies defining progressiveness with the countries that have a dearth of legal regulations. Together with the level of ratification, each country has a different level of femininity and masculinity in cultural dimensions (Hofstede, 1984). Therefore, investigating the firms' patterns in policy adoption, according to the level of legislation or cultural dimensions in each country, will reveal the boundary condition of our framework, progressiveness, and enhance external validity.

iii. Limitations

The findings I present in this study suggest a lot of agendas for future research, but we have several limitations to keep in mind. One limitation is that we only use firm-level variables for this study. Certain HR practices are only effective to the extent that they influence employee attitudes and behaviors. Wright and Nishii (2007) maintain that an individual level study should be conducted on human resources management “to develop comprehensive theories that integrate across levels of analysis” (p. 20). Although we used social exchange and signaling perspectives as theoretical backgrounds to understand how

maternity protection is related with organizational outcomes, this study did not examine the mediating variables measuring the perception of employees. Another issue is common method bias. According to common method bias, the same data source in both independent and dependent variable can be problematic. In this study, HR managers in each firm replied the adoption and usage of maternity protection policies, thereby both variables in hypotheses 3 (progressiveness in policy adoption — employee policy usage) are answered by the same source. However, for hypotheses 1 and 2, each dependent variable (voluntary turnover and productivity) are reported by finance and employee-related managers. Moreover, the use of objective data in all variables alleviates the potential threat to validity.

VII. CONCLUSION

Although we have limitations described above, the findings of our study expand the literature of work-family policies by incorporating maternity protection policies and showing the robust relationship between progressive bundles and firm-level outcomes. Revealing the

gap between 1) legislated policies by government and adopted policies in organization, and 2) available policies in organizations and used policies by employees, is another contribution of our study. Measuring organizations' progressiveness by considering regulatory and voluntary aspects of each policy is a fresh perspective. In addition, the finding that employees are affected by the types and coverages of policies when it comes to policy use is noteworthy. The rigorousness of our model including many control variables and the representativeness of KWPS data covering a variety of samples also enhance the value of our study. In conclusion, this study suggests that the functions and characteristics of each policy need to be considered to maximize its effects on employees. Perhaps the most important thing to make better results for firms and employees, along with progressive policies, is corporate culture, the communication, and consensus on the value of maternity protection.

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1.

The Number of Participating Organizations over Survey Periods

Year	2005	2007	2009	2011	2013
New org.	1,905	320	508	238	226
Existing org.		1,415	1,229	1,532	1,549

The average number of participation by organizations: 3.99

Table 2.
Types of maternity protection policies

Types	Voluntary policies	Mandatory policies
	Breastfeeding facilities	Maternity leave
	Infertility treatment leave	Restriction from work during holidays
	Childcare facilities	Restriction of night duties
	Childcare expenses	Restriction of overtime work
	Prenatal-care leave	Restriction of harmful job duties
	Spouse delivery leave	Restriction of harmful job duties until 1 year after childbirth
		Opportunity for work conversion
		Breastfeeding break
		Menstruation leave
		Miscarriage leave

Note. Prenatal-care leave and spouse delivery leave turn mandatory since 2008.

Table 3.
Variable definitions

Dependent variables	
<i>Voluntary turnover</i>	(natural) logarithm of sales per number of employees
<i>Productivity</i>	(natural) logarithm of the number of voluntary resignation to the total employees in survey year
<i>Employee policy usage</i>	the number of maternity protection policies that employees actively use in practice
Independent variables	
<i>Progressiveness</i>	the number of voluntary (i.e., non-mandatory) policies that organizations adopt in each survey year.
Control variables	
<i>Year</i>	2005-2013
<i>Organizational age</i>	(natural) log of the survey year minus the founding year
<i>Organizational size</i>	(natural) log of total employees
<i>Female ratio</i>	the percentage of female employees to total employees
<i>Union</i>	1 if organizations have a union while 0 if not
<i>old employees</i>	(natural) log of the percentage of employees over the age of 50 to total employees
<i>Young employees</i>	(natural) log of the percentage of employees less the age of 30 to total employees

Table 4.
Descriptive statistics

Variable	Mean	s.d	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
Dependent variables															
1. Voluntary turnover	2.30	1.20													
2. Productivity	5.50	1.22	-.28*												
3. Policy usage	4.71	4.28	-.17*	.13*											
Independent variables															
4. Progressive policies	.87	1.16	-.22*	.09*	.49*										
Control variables															
5. Female (%)	2.92	1.09	.30*	-.19*	.16*	.06*									
6. Young (%)	-1.91	1.04	.24*	.10*	.10*	.09*	.28*								
7. Old (%)	-2.21	1.12	-.09*	-.16*	-.16*	-.15*	-.16*	-.44*							
8. Union	.75	.43	-.22*	.02	.08*	.22*	-.11*	.00	-.07*						
9. Manufacturing	.64	.48	-.01*	.29*	-.15*	-.14*	-.29*	-.08*	.02	-.02					
10. Finance	.04	.21	.06*	-.19*	.06*	.09*	.11*	.04	-.08*	.00	-.32*				
11. Salary	7.78	7.78	-.37*	.13*	.26*	.21*	-.14*	.00	-.07*	-.07*	-.03*	.18*			
12. Firm size	5.08	5.08	-.34*	.13*	.33*	.35*	-.07*	.01	-.11*	.26*	-.15*	.11*	.39*		
13. Firm age	2.88	2.88	-.22*	.18*	.08*	.04*	-.13*	-.14*	.23*	.02	.06*	.04*	.25*	.29*	

Note. N = 5,363. Two-tailed test.

* $p < .05$.

Table 5.
Results from Fixed Effects Regression

Variable s	Employee usage (USE)	Voluntary turnover (VTURN)		Productivity	
	Model 2: PRO → USE	Model 3: PRO → VTURN	Model 4: USE → VTRUN	Model 5: PRO → PRODU CTI	Model 6: USE → PRODUC TI
PRO	.57***	.02	.02	-.02*	-.02*
LEG	.67***	-.00	.00	.00	.00
Union	-.03	.01	.01	.04	.04
Salary	.68*	-.06	-.06	-.01	-.01
Org. size	-.10	-.11**	-.11**	-.06**	-.06**
Org. age	-.51*	-.22**	-.22**	.12***	.12***
Female (%)	-.04	.06	.06	-.02	-.02
Old (%)	-.04	.02	.02	.00	.00
Young (%)	-.09	.14***	.14***	.02	.02
USE			.00		.00
Year- fixed effects	Included	Included	Included	Included	Included
Number of observat ions	7,136	6,531	6,531	5,773	5,773
Number of organiza tions	2,621	2,533	2,533	2,208	2,208
R²					
Within org.	.46	.03	.03	.15	.15
Betwe en org.	.62	.19	.19	.00	.00
Total	.58	.17	.17	.02	.02

Note. PRO = Progressive policies; LEG = Legalized policies; USE = Employee policy usage; VTURN = Voluntary turnover rate.

Unstandardized coefficients are reported.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$. Two-tailed tests.

Table 6.
Determinants of maternity protection policies

Dependent Variable	PRO	LEG	MAT
Union	.12**	.37**	.48**
Salary	.69***	1.81***	2.48***
Org. size	.23***	.78***	1.00***
Org. age	.03	.03	.07
Female (%)	.12***	.62***	.73***
Old (%)	-.03*	-.25***	-.28***
Young (%)	.01	.14**	.14**
Year-fixed effects	Included	Included	Included
Number of observations	7,136	7,136	7,136
Number of organizations	2,621	2,621	2,621
R²			
Within org.	.12	.04	.02
Between org.	.31	.26	.29
Total	.23	.18	.19

Note. PRO = Progressive policies; LEG = Legalized policies; MAT = Maternity protection policies in total. Unstandardized coefficients are reported. * $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$. Two-tailed tests.

Table 7.
Results from Principal Component Factor Analysis

Factor	Item	Item Loadings		
		Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3
Leave policies	Maternity leave	.76	.16	.05
	Spouse delivery leave	.70	.15	.18
Workload-relief policies	Restriction from work during holidays	.12	.91	.13
	Restriction of night duties	.13	.91	.12
	Restriction of overtime work	.13	.91	.12
	Restriction of harmful job duties	.10	.85	.14
	Restriction of harmful job duties until 1 year after childbirth	.12	.76	.25
	Opportunity for work conversion	.10	.74	.24
Family-care policies	Breastfeeding facility	-.06	.29	.74
	Breastfeeding break	-.04	.39	.66
	Childcare facilities	.09	-.01	.60
	Childcare expenses	.24	-.03	.55
	Prenatal-care leave	.15	.32	.54
	Infertility treatment leave	.05	.13	.53
% of variance	60.00	8.85	33.81	17.34

Note. Rotation converged in 5 iterations.

REFERENCES

- Addati, L., Cassirer, N., & Gilchrist, K. 2014. *Maternity and paternity at work: Law and practice across the world*: International Labour Office.
- Ali, M. 2016. Impact of gender-focused human resource management on performance: The mediating effects of gender diversity. *Australian Journal of Management*, 41(2): 376-397.
- Armeli, S., Eisenberger, R., Fasolo, P., & Lynch, P. 1998. Perceived organizational support and police performance: the moderating influence of socioemotional needs. *Journal of applied psychology*, 83(2): 288.
- Arthur, M. M. 2003. Share price reactions to work-family initiatives: An institutional perspective. *Academy of Management Journal*, 46(4): 497-505.
- Arthur, M. M., & Cook, A. 2004. Taking stock of work-family initiatives: How announcements of “family-friendly” human resource decisions affect shareholder value. *ILR Review*, 57(4): 599-613.
- Aryee, S., Luk, V., & Stone, R. 1998. Family-responsive variables and retention-relevant outcomes among employed parents. *Human Relations*, 51(1): 73-87.

- Bae, K. B., & Goodman, D. 2014. The influence of family-friendly policies on turnover and performance in South Korea. *Public Personnel Management*, 43(4): 520-542.
- Beauregard, T. A., & Henry, L. C. 2009. Making the link between work-life balance practices and organizational performance. *Human resource management review*, 19(1): 9-22.
- Blair-Loy, M., & Wharton, A. S. 2002. Employees' use of work-family policies and the workplace social context. *Social Forces*, 80(3): 813-845.
- Blau, P. M. 1964. *Exchange and power in social life*: Transaction Publishers.
- Bloom, N., Kretschmer, T., & Van Reenen, J. 2011. Are family-friendly workplace practices a valuable organization resource? *Strategic Management Journal*, 32(4): 343-367.
- Bohen, H. H., & Viveros-Long, A. 1981. *Balancing jobs and family life*: Temple University Press.
- Butts, M. M., Casper, W. J., & Yang, T. S. 2013. How important are work-family support policies? A meta-analytic investigation of their effects on employee outcomes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 98(1): 1-25.
- Chiu, W. C., & Ng, C. W. 1999. Women-friendly HRM and organizational commitment: A study among women and men of organizations in

- Hong Kong. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 72(4): 485-502.
- Connelly, B. L., Certo, S. T., Ireland, R. D., & Reutzel, C. R. 2011. Signaling theory: A review and assessment. *Journal of Management*, 37(1): 39-67.
- Crittenden, A. 2002. *The price of motherhood: Why the most important job in the world is still the least valued*: Macmillan.
- Dalton, D. R., & Mesch, D. J. 1990. The impact of flexible scheduling on employee attendance and turnover. *Administrative Science Quarterly*: 370-387.
- Davis, A. E., & Kalleberg, A. L. 2006. Family-friendly organizations? Work and family programs in the 1990s. *Work and occupations*, 33(2): 191-223.
- DiMaggio, P., & Powell, W. W. 1983. The iron cage revisited: Collective rationality and institutional isomorphism in organizational fields. *American Sociological Review*, 48(2): 147-160.
- Dobbin, F., & Sutton, J. R. 1998. The strength of a weak state: The rights revolution and the rise of human resources management divisions 1. *American journal of sociology*, 104(2): 441-476.
- Drago, R., Colbeck, C. L., Stauffer, K. D., Pirretti, A., Burkum, K., Fazioli, J., Lazzaro, G., & Habasevich, T. 2006. The avoidance of bias

- against caregiving: The case of academic faculty. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 49(9): 1222-1247.
- Dunham, R. B., Pierce, J. L., & Castaneda, M. B. 1987. Alternative work schedules: Two field quasi-experiments. *Personnel Psychology*, 40(2): 215-242.
- Dyer, L., & Reeves, T. 1995. Human resource strategies and organization performance: what do we know and where do we need to go? *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 6(3): 656-670.
- Edelman, L. B. 1992. Legal ambiguity and symbolic structures: Organizational mediation of civil rights law. *American Journal of Sociology*, 97(6): 1531-1576.
- EDWARD III, M. S., Clifton, T. J., & Kruse, D. 1996. Flexible work hours and productivity: Some evidence from the pharmaceutical industry. *Industrial Relations: A Journal of Economy and Society*, 35(1): 123-139.
- Eisenberger, R., Cotterell, N., & Marvel, J. 1987. Reciprocation ideology. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 53(4): 743.
- Eisenberger, R., Fasolo, P., & Davis-LaMastro, V. 1990. Perceived organizational support and employee diligence, commitment, and innovation. *Journal of applied psychology*, 75(1): 51.

- Eisenberger, R., Huntington, R., Hutchison, S., & Sowa, D. 1986.
PERCEIVED ORGANIZATIONAL SUPPORT. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71(3): 500-507.
- Ezra, M., & Deckman, M. 1996. Balancing work and family responsibilities: Flextime and child care in the federal government. *Public Administration Review*: 174-179.
- Foa, E. B., & Foa, U. G. 1980. Resource theory, *Social exchange*: 77-94: Springer.
- Foa, U. G., & Foa, E. B. 1974. *Societal structures of the mind*: Charles C Thomas.
- Fried, M. 1998. *Taking time: Parental leave policy and corporate culture*: Temple University Press.
- Glass, J. 2004. Blessing or curse? Work-family policies and mother's wage growth over time. *Work and Occupations*, 31(3): 367-394.
- Glass, J., & Fujimoto, T. 1995. Employer characteristics and the provision of family responsive policies. *Work and Occupations*, 22(4): 380-411.
- Glass, J. L., & Finley, A. 2002. Coverage and effectiveness of family-responsive workplace policies. *Human Resource Management Review*, 12(3): 313-337.

- Goff, S. J., Mount, M. K., & Jamison, R. L. 1990. Employer supported child care, work/family conflict, and absenteeism: A field study. *Personnel psychology*, 43(4): 793-809.
- Gottfried, H., & Hayashi-Kato, N. 1998. Gendering work: deconstructing the narrative of the Japanese economic miracle. *Work, employment and society*, 12(1): 25-46.
- Gouldner, A. W. 1960. The norm of reciprocity: A preliminary statement. *American sociological review*: 161-178.
- Grover, S. L., & Crooker, K. J. 1995. Who appreciates family-responsive human resource policies: The impact of family-friendly policies on the organizational attachment of parents and non-parents. *Personnel psychology*, 48(2): 271-288.
- Guion, R. M. 1973. A note on organizational climate. *Organizational behavior and human performance*, 9(1): 120-125.
- Guthrie, J. P. 2001. High-involvement work practices, turnover, and productivity: Evidence from New Zealand. *Academy of Management Journal*, 44(1): 180-190.
- Hammer, L. B., Neal, M. B., Newsom, J. T., Brockwood, K. J., & Colton, C. L. 2005. A longitudinal study of the effects of dual-earner couples' utilization of family-friendly workplace supports on work and family outcomes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90(4): 799-810.

- Heywood, J. S., & Jirjahn, U. 2002. Payment schemes and gender in Germany. *ILR Review*, 56(1): 44-64.
- Highhouse, S., Thornbury, E. E., & Little, I. S. 2007. Social-identity functions of attraction to organizations. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 103(1): 134-146.
- Hochwarter, W. A., Ferris, G. R., Zinko, R., Arnell, B., & James, M. 2007. Reputation as a moderator of political behavior-work outcomes relationships: a two-study investigation with convergent results. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(2): 567.
- Huselid, M. A. 1995. The impact of human resource management practices on turnover, productivity, and corporate financial performance. *Academy of management journal*, 38(3): 635-672.
- James, L. R., & Jones, A. P. 1974. Organizational climate: A review of theory and research. *Psychological bulletin*, 81(12): 1096.
- Judge, T. A., Boudreau, J. W., & Bretz, R. D. 1994. Job and life attitudes of male executives. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 79(5): 767.
- Judiesch, M. K., & Lyness, K. S. 1999. Left behind? The impact of leaves of absence on managers' career success. *Academy of management journal*, 42(6): 641-651.
- Kalev, A., Dobbin, F., & Kelly, E. 2006. Best practices or best guesses? Assessing the efficacy of corporate affirmative action and diversity policies. *American sociological review*, 71(4): 589-617.

- Kalleberg, A. L., & Reskin, B. F. 1995. Gender differences in promotion in the United States and Norway. *Research in Social Stratification and Mobility*, 14: 237-264.
- Kelly, E. L., Kossek, E. E., Hammer, L. B., Durham, M., Bray, J., Chermack, K., Murphy, L. A., & Kaskubar, D. 2008. 7 Getting There from Here: Research on the Effects of Work–Family Initiatives on Work–Family Conflict and Business Outcomes. *Academy of Management annals*, 2(1): 305-349.
- Kim, J., & Wiggins, M. E. 2011. Family-Friendly Human Resource Policy: Is It Still Working in the Public Sector? *Public Administration Review*, 71(5): 728-739.
- Konrad, A. M., & Mangel, R. 2000. Research notes and commentaries the impact of work-life programs on organization productivity. *Strategic Management Journal*, 21(12): 1225-1237.
- Kossek, E. E., & Nichol, V. 1992. The effects of on-site child care on employee attitudes and performance. *Personnel psychology*, 45(3): 485-509.
- Krausz, M., & Freibach, N. 1983. Effects of flexible working time for employed women upon satisfaction, strains, and absenteeism. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 56(2): 155-159.
- Lau, R. S. 2000. Quality of work life and performance—An ad hoc investigation of two key elements in the service profit chain model.

International Journal of Service Industry Management, 11(5):
422-437.

Lau, R. S., & May, B. E. 1998. A win-win paradigm for quality of work life and business performance. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 9(3): 211-226.

Lee, B. H., & Kim, J. S. 2010. Is Family-friendly Management Good for Organizations? The Diffusion and Performance of Family-friendly Workplaces in South Korea. *Journal of Industrial Relations*, 52(4): 459-475.

Lee, S. Y., & Hong, J. H. 2011. Does Family-Friendly Policy Matter? Testing Its Impact on Turnover and Performance. *Public Administration Review*, 71(6): 870-879.

Lobel, S. A. 1999. *Impacts of diversity and work-life initiatives in organizations*: Sage Publications, Inc.

Lyness, K. S., Thompson, C. A., Francesco, A. M., & Judiesch, M. K. 1999. Work and pregnancy: Individual and organizational factors influencing organizational commitment, timing of maternity leave, and return to work. *Sex roles*, 41(7-8): 485-508.

McGuire, J. B., & Liro, J. R. 1987. Absenteeism and flexible work schedules. *Public Personnel Management*, 16(1): 47-59.

- Meyer, J. W., & Rowan, B. 1977. Institutionalized organizations: Formal structure as myth and ceremony. *American journal of sociology*: 340-363.
- Milkovich, G. T., & Gomez, L. R. 1976. Day care and selected employee work behaviors. *Academy of Management Journal*, 19(1): 111-115.
- Mize, J., & Freeman, L. C. 1989. *Employer-supported child care: Assessing the need and potential support*. Paper presented at the Child and Youth Care Forum.
- Moon, S. Y., & Roh, J. 2010. Balancing work and family in South Korea's public organizations: Focusing on family-friendly policies in elementary school organizations. *Public Personnel Management*, 39(2): 117-131.
- Mun, E., & Brinton, M. C. 2015. Workplace matters: The use of parental leave policy in Japan. *Work and Occupations*, 42(3): 335-369.
- Ngo, H. Y., Foley, S., & Loi, R. 2009. Family friendly work practices, organizational climate, and organization performance: A study of multinational corporations in Hong Kong. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 30(5): 665-680.
- Nishii, L. H., Lepak, D. P., & Schneider, B. 2008. Employee attributions of the “why” of HR practices: Their effects on employee attitudes and behaviors, and customer satisfaction. *Personnel psychology*, 61(3): 503-545.

- Orthner, D. K., & Pittman, J. F. 1986. Family contributions to work commitment. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*: 573-581.
- Osterman, P. 1995. Work/family programs and the employment relationship. *Administrative science quarterly*: 681-700.
- Perry-Smith, J. E., & Blum, T. C. 2000. Work-family human resource bundles and perceived organizational performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 43(5): 1107-1117.
- Pierce, J. L., & Newstrom, J. W. 1982. Employee responses to flexible work schedules: An inter-organization, inter-system comparison. *Journal of Management*, 8(1): 9-25.
- Pierce, J. L., & Newstrom, J. W. 1983. The design of flexible work schedules and employee responses: Relationships and process. *Journal of Occupational Behaviour*: 247-262.
- Plaut, V. C., Thomas, K. M., & Goren, M. J. 2009. Is multiculturalism or color blindness better for minorities? *Psychological Science*, 20(4): 444-446.
- Rhoades, L., & Eisenberger, R. 2002. Perceived organizational support: a review of the literature: American Psychological Association.
- Ridgeway, C. L. 2011. *Framed by gender: How gender inequality persists in the modern world*: Oxford University Press.

- Rothausen, T. J. 1994. Job satisfaction and the parent worker: The role of flexibility and rewards. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 44(3): 317-336.
- Rousseau, D. M. 1989. Psychological and implied contracts in organizations. *Employee responsibilities and rights journal*, 2(2): 121-139.
- Ryan, A. M., Sacco, J. M., McFarland, L. A., & Kriska, S. D. 2000. Applicant self-selection: Correlates of withdrawal from a multiple hurdle process. *Journal of applied psychology*, 85(2): 163.
- Saltzstein, A. L., Ting, Y., & Saltzstein, G. H. 2001. Work-family balance and job satisfaction: The impact of family-friendly policies on attitudes of federal government employees. *Public administration review*, 61(4): 452-467.
- Scandura, T. A., & Lankau, M. J. 1997. Relationships of gender, family responsibility and flexible work hours to organizational commitment and job satisfaction. *Journal of organizational Behavior*: 377-391.
- Schneider, B. 1990. The climate for service: An application of the climate construct. *Organizational climate and culture*, 1: 383-412.
- Scott, W. R. 1995. Institutions and organizations. Foundations for organizational science. *London: A Sage Publication Series*.

- Selden, S. C., & Moynihan, D. P. 2000. A Model of Voluntary Turnover in State Government. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 20(2): 63-74.
- Settoon, R. P., Bennett, N., & Liden, R. C. 1996. Social exchange in organizations: Perceived organizational support, leader–member exchange, and employee reciprocity. *Journal of applied psychology*, 81(3): 219.
- Shore, L., Tetrick, L., Lynch, P., & Barksdale, K. 2001. Social and economic exchanges as mediators between commitment and performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*.
- Shore, L. M., & Wayne, S. J. 1993. Commitment and employee behavior: comparison of affective commitment and continuance commitment with perceived organizational support. *Journal of applied psychology*, 78(5): 774.
- Spence, A. M. 1974. *Market signaling: Informational transfer in hiring and related screening processes*: Harvard Univ Pr.
- Spence, M. 1973. Job market signaling. *The quarterly journal of Economics*, 87(3): 355-374.
- Thompson, C. A., Beauvais, L. L., & Lyness, K. S. 1999. When work–family benefits are not enough: The influence of work–family culture on benefit utilization, organizational attachment, and work–family conflict. *Journal of Vocational behavior*, 54(3): 392-415.

- Wayne, S. J., Shore, L. M., & Liden, R. C. 1997. Perceived organizational support and leader-member exchange: A social exchange perspective. *Academy of Management journal*, 40(1): 82-111.
- Weeden, K. A. 2005. Is there a flexiglass ceiling? Flexible work arrangements and wages in the United States. *Social Science Research*, 34(2): 454-482.
- Williams, M. L., & Bauer, T. N. 1994. The effect of a managing diversity policy on organizational attractiveness. *Group & Organization Management*, 19(3): 295-308.
- Williamson, I. O., Slay, H. S., Shapiro, D. L., & Shivers-Blackwell, S. L. 2008. The effect of explanations on prospective applicants reactions to organization diversity practices. *Human resource management*, 47(2): 311-330.
- Witt, L. A. 1991. Exchange Ideology as a Moderator of Job Attitudes-Organizational Citizenship Behaviors Relationships1. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 21(18): 1490-1501.
- Wright, P. M., & Boswell, W. R. 2002. Desegregating HRM: A review and synthesis of micro and macro human resource management research. *Journal of management*, 28(3): 247-276.
- Yamamoto, I., & Matsuura, T. 2014. Effect of Work-Life Balance Practices on Organization Productivity: Evidence from Japanese Organization-

Level Panel Data. *B E Journal of Economic Analysis & Policy*,
14(4).

Youngblood, S. A., & Chambers-Cook, K. 1984. Child care assistance can
improve employee attitudes and behavior. *Personnel Administrator*,
29(2): 45-46.

ABSTRACT IN KOREAN

진보적 모성보호제도가 조직결과에 미치는 영향에 대하여: 자발적 이직율, 생산성, 정책사용에 대한 연구

서울대학교 대학원

경영학과 경영학 전공

유혜진

본 학위 논문은 기존 경영학 분야에서 잘 다루어지지 않았던 조직 내 ‘모성보호제도’ 를 심층적으로 연구한다. 사내 모성보호제도는 임신, 출산 및 육아와 관련하여, 근로자의 권익을 보호하고 복지를 증진함을 목표로 한다. 저자는 법률이 제정한 범위를 넘어서 모성보호제도를 채택하는 조직의 주도적인 움직임을 “진보성” 이라고 명명하였다. 저자는 사회적 교환이론 및 신호 이론을 근거 삼아, 근로자는 진보적인 모성보호정책에 긍정적으로 반응할 것이라고 주장하였고 2005 년 부터 2013 년까지 1,905 개의 한국조직을 대상으로 진행된 종단적 연구결과를 분석하여 결과를 도출하였다. 본 논문은 조직이 진보적으로 모성보호제도를

채택함으로써 근로자에게 긍정적인 신호를 전달하고, 그 결과 근로자의
활발한 정책 사용을 도모함을 밝혀내었다.

주요어: 모성보호제도, 인사조직, 사회적 교환이론, 신호 이론

학번: 2016-20595