Power-dependence in Regulated Social Enterprise:
Evidence from Human Resource Management Practices at Continuous Employment Support
Offices for People with Disabilities in Japan

Bita Puspitasari   Tomoki Sekiguchi

September, 2024

Power-dependence in Regulated Social Enterprise:
Evidence from Human Resource Management Practices at Continuous Employment Support Offices for People with Disabilities in Japan

ABSTRACT

This study examines human resource management (HRM) practices in Continuous Employment Support Offices, Japan's context of work integration social enterprise (WISE) which provides employment and training to people with disabilities (PwD). Investigation from an HRM perspective is relevant for the Offices' distinctive workforce while ensuring business profitability. Utilizing the constructivist grounded theory approach, interviews with 21 Offices across Japan were conducted. This study identifies key HRM practices: tasks/job design and assignment, sought specifications, recruitment, pay policy, and user mobility, which vary depending on the Office's classification as either Type A (employment provider) or Type B (training provider) organization. This finding elucidates power dynamics between the Offices, the government, and PwD within the context of welfare service provision. Drawing from power-dependence relations, the subsequent analysis suggests the Office as a less powerful actor within the dyadic relations between the government and PwD. Offices employ a balancing operations mechanism to reduce this power disadvantage by regaining control and minimizing risk. The study contributes to the understanding of WISE by intersecting HRM practices and power-dependence relations and offering insights into Japan's unique context.

Keywords:
human resource management, power-dependence relations, continuous employment support, work integration social enterprise, Japan

INTRODUCTION

Accepting the premise that social enterprises are fundamentally distinct from profit, non-profit, and public sector organizations (Royce, 2007), work integration social enterprise (WISE) aims to provide disadvantaged groups with stable employment and fair wages (Villotti et al., 2017). Amid the quest for sustainability, WISE employs individuals who benefit most from the employment rather than those who would most benefit the business (Peattie & Morley, 2008). In the Japanese context, one manifestation of WISE is the Continuous Employment Support Office for people with disabilities (shūrō keizoku shien jigyōsho), hereinafter the Office. Integrated within the national welfare system, the Office provides employment opportunities and training to enhance the knowledge and skills of people with disabilities who encounter difficulties entering the regular workforce. At the same time, the Office is an independent business entity responsible for its survival. The juxtaposition of social mission-business continuation embedded within the organization invites careful investigation of an appropriate human resource management (HRM) model for WISE to function. Studies that brought

HRM functions as a focal point (Napathorn, 2018b, 2018a; Royce, 2007) are mostly conducted within the general typology of social enterprise, often overlooking the distinct characteristics of WISE.

This study set to investigate, first, human resource management practices performed at the Continuous Employment Support Offices for people with disabilities in Japan. Specifically, we examine practices pertinent to managing people with disabilities ("the users"). Adhering to the inductive strategy and constructivist grounded theory approach (Charmaz, 2014), we based our analysis on semi-structured interview data from twenty-one (21) Offices across Japan. Our initial findings suggested that the relationship dynamics between the Office and either the Government or the users vary across different HRM practices. We then borrow the lens of power-dependence relations (Cook et al., 2006; Emerson, 1962), for it recognizes power as embedded in the enduring relationship between actors. In the subsequent investigation, we explore the power dynamics in the relationship between actors within the context of employment provision as a welfare service.

Our study reveals that task/job design and assignment, sought specifications, recruitment, pay policy, and user mobility are the HRM practices performed by the Office in managing their users. These practices further vary according to whether the Office is classified as a training provider (Type B) or an employment provider (Type A). This classification also reflects users' distinct characteristics in their respective Offices. Our study also suggests that the Office is bound to be the less powerful actor within the dyadic exchange relations between the government and the user. This situation explains how the Office chooses to exercise balancing operations, that is, the structural changes in power-dependence relations aiming to reduce power advantage (Emerson, 1962). Bearing the status of welfare provider, balancing operations manifests in regaining control and minimizing risk. The Office exercises stronger balancing operations whenever Type B users are involved and when mobility causes users to stay in the organization.

The contributions of this study to the theoretical domain are evident. Intersecting human resource management practices, work integration social enterprise, and power-dependence relations, this study answered calls for exploring theoretical frameworks and institutional context in understanding the hybrid characteristics of social enterprises (Dacin et al., 2011; Short et al., 2009; Smith et al., 2012). This study also clarifies previous attempts to conceptualize Japan's context of

work integration social enterprise (Laratta et al., 2011; Laratta & Nakagawa, 2016b) by revealing country-specific features (Gupta et al., 2020). Finally, within the literature on power and network exchange, we submitted empirical evidence of the much-sought yet less-studied balancing operations (Cook et al., 2006).

THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVES

Work integration social enterprise and its Japanese context

Social exclusion experienced by disadvantaged groups, such as the elderly, women, long-term unemployed, and people with disabilities, is one of the causes that constitute the establishment of social enterprise. Work integration social enterprise (WISE) responds to the risk of exclusion from labor markets by providing professional training to prepare disadvantaged groups to return to labor markets as well as permanent employment for the disadvantaged (A. N. W. Chan, 2015; Defourny & Nyssens, 2006, 2017; Vidal, 2005). Currently, there is no legal definition nor a dedicated form of social enterprise in Japan (Watanabe, 2016), which explains how previous studies have mostly attempted to build classification (e.g., Kaneko, 2013; Laratta & Nakagawa, 2016b; Tanimoto, 2008b). An explicit mention of WISE in Japan's context was brought up as one type of social enterprise that "offers transitional or permanent employment to the physically and mentally disabled and to persons who suffer from learning disabilities" (Laratta et al., 2011, p.57). In the subsequent studies, WISE is defined as an organization that provides employment opportunities to disadvantaged people, including PwD, in an effort to integrate PwD into society (Laratta & Nakagawa, 2016a, 2016b).

PwD employment in Japan can be approached through two different contexts. First, the employment of PwD at the regular workplace through the quota, grant, and levy system. The Act to Facilitate the Employment of Persons with Disabilities requires employers of the regular workplace, i.e., private corporations and Government bodies, to meet the minimum employment rate ("the quota") of employees with disabilities in their workforce (Act to Facilitate the Employment of Persons with Disabilities, 1960). The quota for private corporations was set to 2.3% in 2023, gradually raised to 2.5% in 2024 and 2.7% in 2026. The figure for national and local government is 3.0%, with the exception of 2.9% for the Board of Education (Ministry of Health Labour and Welfare, 2023). While failing to meet the quota will impose a levy on private corporations amounted JPY

50,000 per shortage headcount, depending on the total workforce, exceeding the quota will result in a grant amounted JPY 21,000 or JPY 29,000 per headcount (Nishida et al., 2023).

This study focuses on the second context: the provision of employment to PwD through the national welfare system performed by the Continuous Employment Support Office ("the Office"). The main legal footing for this scheme is the Services and Supports for Persons with Disabilities Act, which specifies support of continuous employment as part of welfare service for persons with disabilities, alongside other services such as medical care, rehabilitation service, group home, etc. The Act further defines support of continuous employment as follows:

> The term "support for continuous employment" as used in this Act means to provide persons with disabilities who have difficulties to be employed by ordinary places of business with opportunities for employment as well as necessary trainings for improving their necessary knowledge and skills to enter the workforce, and other benefit prescribed in Ordinances of the Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare, through offering opportunities for productive and other
> activities. (Services and Supports for Persons with Disabilities Act, 2005)

Taking the form of NPO, general corporation association, and even corporation, the Office conducts commercial activities in various industries. PwD is officially termed as the *user,* implying that PwD is the recipient of the provision of service. The Ministry of Health, Labor, and Welfare (MHLW), under whose jurisdiction the welfare system takes place, acknowledges two types of Offices. In the Type A office, employment contracts are formally concluded with the users. Depending on the practice of the Office, Type A users may be employed as either contract or full-time employees. Type B office, on the other hand, does not conclude employment contracts with the users as they are considered to join the Office to receive training. Hence, the Type A office is coined as the employment provider, while the Type B office is a training provider (Morimoto et al., 2022). Such classification also reflects the profile of users in each type of Office. Type A users are generally PwD who are able to be employed despite having no or little work experience, while Type B users are not due to them having relatively heavier disabilities (Iwane et al., 2013). Often missing from the picture is the fact that there are Offices with both Type A and Type B under one organization; the context we addressed in this study as Type Both office. To understand whether Offices with this structure portray

particular characteristics or behavior in managing their composition of users, we include Type Both offices in our analysis.

To settle with providing employment for PwD as a social mission to define WISE serves less scrutiny to the concept of the social enterprise itself, that is, how it is different from the commercial enterprise. In a similar vein, we question whether any organizations solving social problems through their business models are really social entrepreneurs; they could be commercial entrepreneurs with social missions embedded in their business models. This blurred boundary is evident in the previous studies. Laratta et al. (2011), for example, brought the discussion of the emergence of WISE but paired it with the Act to Facilitate the Employment of Persons with Disabilities as the legal standing. In a more recent study, PwD employment in regular workplaces is acknowledged as one manifestation of WISE (Laratta & Nakagawa, 2016a). Given that social enterprise could take any legal form, we agree that WISE may indeed take the form of a corporation. However, scrutiny should be exercised to determine whether PwD is employed at the corporation type of social enterprise instead of the corporation as referred to in the regular workplace.

Through this study, we deem it necessary to clarify how the Office fits the concept of WISE. We turn to the primary characteristics of social enterprise, that is, profit acquisition to sustain the attainment of social mission rather than a mere financial gain (Zahra et al., 2009). When the profit allocation mechanism is unclear, and whether the social mission is an end purpose or merely a device, claiming one as a social entrepreneur is *"too ambiguous to be useful"* (Karnani, 2012, p. 100). As part of the national welfare system, the Office is entitled to a Government subsidy funding scheme. Termed as training benefits, the subsidy is reflected in a unit price attached to each user who is registered and comes to the Office every day. Unit price is determined by the Office's ability to provide service to the users, among others, by the wage paid to users sourced from revenue from business activities. The subsidy should not be used to provide wages to the users but can be used to run the Office (e.g., to pay rent, utility bills, and staff salaries). This profit allocation mechanism is clear evidence of social enterprise trait; the Office is responsible for increasing their business capabilities to improve users' wage situation and, in turn, receive higher incentives to keep the business running.

We also addressed the concern of excluding quasi-market organizations from the social enterprise map amid the increasing attention to social business, that is, social enterprise in corporation format (Sakurai & Hashimoto, 2009). The provision of welfare service should not be used as an excuse to exclude, and instead, be used to emphasize social enterprise's capability to solve social problems (Grimes et al., 2013). The Japanese context actually reflects the characteristics of regulated social enterprises, shown as having various funding schemes, close public scrutiny, and working closely through partnerships with private or government bodies (Paton, 2003, p.33). Funding schemes provided by the government may serve as a cushion at the risk of crumbling operations due to the pursuant of social mission (A. Chan et al., 2017).

Human resource management practices in work integration social enterprise

Human resource management (HRM) is concerned with managing people in an organizational context to achieve organizational goals (Dessler, 2017). It manifests in policy and practices in managing individuals and groups through planning, recruitment and selection, training and development, performance management, and compensation (Boxall et al., 2009; Malik, 2018). While each function seems segregated and stepwise, they should be seen holistically, for those functions are interrelated and affect each other (Dessler, 2017). In line with how social enterprise gained interest for its hybrid or dual-mission characteristics (Austin et al., 2006; Battilana et al., 2015), HRM scholars are asking whether and how this specific organization context exhibits distinct HRM practices and policies. Royce (2007), for instance, pointed out the need to secure candidates specifically with management and supervisory skills. Another focus is the unique workforce composition in social enterprise, i.e., the combination of the target group, professional staff, and volunteers, which has been shown to require differentiated HRM policies for each (Roumpi et al., 2020). Social enterprise employing PwD was also found to prioritize moral agency over formal HRM practices (Bartram et al., 2019).

Joining the investigation on HRM in social enterprise, we argue that WISE is a fruitful context to investigate HRM practices for the following rationale. Being consistent with the social mission, WISE has to accept a rather poorly qualified workforce due to a lack of training and employment experience (Ho & Chan, 2010; Peattie & Morley, 2008). Specifically with PwD, the

challenge is also inherent in the characteristics of the worker. To sustain its social mission, however, the survival of the organization must be secured. Acquiring and managing resources wisely, including human resources (Haugh, 2005) is then indispensable. Yet, we saw relatively scant studies in this particular area. Studies with HRM functions as the focal point (Napathorn, 2018b, 2018a; Zhang et al., 2018) were mostly conducted within the general typology of social enterprise, hence overlooking the unique composition of the workforce in WISE.

In the Japanese context, the notion of Offices as welfare providers and users as welfare recipients seems to be taken for granted. This explains how most of the previous studies conducted with the Office as context were approached from either welfare (Iwasa et al., 2022) or medical/rehabilitation (Iwane et al., 2013; Morimoto et al., 2022) points of view. Our first-hand experience with our respondents perfectly reflects this situation, as shown by responses such as "Why us?" or "Are you sure?" upon receiving our research briefs. Here lies the complexity of WISE: PwD is the worker and, at the same time, the customer (Battilana et al., 2015; Doherty et al., 2014). To complement previous attempts bearing customer perspective, an approach from the HRM standpoint that gives voice to the organization's point of view is thus appropriate.

Power-dependence relations

As the early theorization of social exchange theory, power-dependence relations acknowledge that the interaction between actors belonging to a certain social system is where power is embedded (Emerson, 1962). Power is reflected, inversely, in how dependent one actor is on another within the relationship (Molm, 1989). Power is thus *not* inherent in the actor, so one can not claim they are powerful/powerless unless it is specified toward whom. When one actor is in a disadvantaged position, i.e., higher dependency and less power toward other actors (s), the mechanism of reducing power advantage, termed as balancing operations, will be performed. The actor may choose between withdrawing from the relationship, seeking alternatives by extending the network, status-giving, or building a coalition (Cook, 1987; Emerson, 1962).

Operating within the national welfare system places the Office, the Government, and the users as interrelated actors. The existence of power and dependency within these enduring social relations (Cook et al., 2006) may explain how and why a particular actor behaves toward the other, including in

HRM practices. The avenue for extending this theory is placed on the balance operations mechanism (Cook et al., 2006). To the best of our knowledge, this study would be the first to approach the relationship dynamics in WISE from a power-dependence relations perspective.

METHODOLOGY

Inquiry and approach

Due to the study's exploratory nature, we submit to inductive inquiry and follow the constructivist grounded theory approach. Grounded theory is chosen for its capabilities to give voices to the entity under study, for the resulting theory is grounded in respondents' words and behaviors (Goulding, 2005). Grounded theory researchers are advised to enter the field without any preconceived concepts, protocols, and literature to ensure the emergence of theory from the data (Holton, 2007). However, a researcher is never a neutral observer nor value-free (Charmaz, 2014). In the view of constructivist grounded theory, the theory is not idle in the data to be discovered but rather is constructed through the interaction between respondents' accounts and the researcher's interpretations (Belgrave & Seide, 2019). In order to do so, the researcher should enter the field with open-mindedness rather than empty-headedness (Charmaz, 2014).

The above notions are evident in how we brought HRM as the starting point of the investigation and later incorporated power-dependence relations as our data suggested. With users being the main component of the Office's workforce, we understood that a careful investigation of HRM practices performed in this organization context is necessary. We found that the HRM practices pertinent to users performed at the Office include task design and assignment, sought specifications, recruitment, pay policy, and user mobility. With these HRM practices laid out, we recognized the dynamics in the relationships between the Office and the government, as well as between the Office and its users. We consulted the literature and were convinced that the dialogue on power and dependency, hence the power-dependence relations, is able to shed light on these dynamics. We treat existing theories and literature as indispensable parts of "…iterative, inductive and interactional process of data collection…", to which our data would build contributions upon the relevant ones (Goulding, 2005, p. 296).

Respondents and data collection

Grounded theory researchers purposively work with respondents from whom they can best gather information on the field under study (Morse, 2007), whose selection is continuously progressing throughout the data collection process, better known as theoretical sampling (Locke, 2001; Miles & Huberman, 1984). We selected Type A and Type B offices across Japan, whose business activities vary across industries and include Offices from various legal forms (see Table 1). We acquired contacts of prospective respondents from online directories and databases run by the Government and independent organizations[1], prioritizing Offices with their dedicated websites to ensure our access to additional data sources if necessary. Upon searching the directories and databases, we learned that some organizations have both Type A and Type B offices under the same roof ("Type Both"), which we then included as respondents. Initial contacts with all prospective respondents were made through phone calls by research assistants. Unless requested otherwise, the first author managed the follow-up contacts through emails.

Within the course of seven months, from December 2022 to June 2023, we conducted twenty-one (21) semi-structured interviews with the Management side of the Offices (president, director, or representative). Type B office taking NPO as a legal form made up the majority of prospective respondent pools and is reflected in the composition of our respondents. All respondents opted to be interviewed in Japanese, so we utilized professional Japanese-English interpreters. At one Office, the respondent has a hearing disability, hence the use of multiple interpreters (Japanese↔English and Japanese↔sign language). Each interview lasted two to three hours.

We asked questions about the story of establishments, business activities, the reason for choosing a certain type of Office, and an in-depth exploration of each HRM practice. In most cases, respondents naturally discussed the welfare system for PwD employment in Japan. All interviews were recorded, but only the parts spoken in English were transcribed. We utilized an AI-powered paid

---

[1] NPO directory run by Cabinet Office (https://www.npo-homepage.go.jp/), directory of nationwide employment support offices PwD run by an independent organization (https://shogaisha-shuro.com/), and directory of employment support office for PwD run by a local government (https://www.hatarakimahyo.jp/)

transcription service[2] to generate the transcript drafts, followed by manual checking. We conducted minor grammar editing of the quotations included in this paper without compromising their meaning.

[Table 1 about here]

Analysis

Coding strategy

The first step of analysis is coding, i.e., breaking down data into smaller segments and attaching labels that depict the segments accordingly (Belgrave & Seide, 2019; Charmaz, 2014). Adhering to Charmaz's (2014) coding strategies for constructivist grounded theory, we conducted the initial coding process. Examining interview transcripts and notes, the strategy we followed was staying close to respondents' utterances, keeping the codes short, and identifying actions by coding in gerunds whenever possible. We then proceeded to the next phase of coding: comparing, selecting, and re-labeling our initial codes to ones with higher adequacy and conceptual strength, which are focused codes. We utilized the constant comparison strategy as operationalized by Holton (2007). We compared initial codes with other ones to determine unifying and varying properties. The (tentative) focused codes were also compared with more initial codes to ensure the saturation of the concept, resulting in focused codes. Coding procedures were conducted with Atlas.ti software.

Extending codes to categories and themes

With focused codes in hand, we brought the codes to a higher level of abstraction, constructing categories and themes that explain the studied phenomenon at a theoretical level. While this process is essential, inductive study faces one inherent challenge of "that there were not a lot of moves that illuminate how one goes from abstract codes to full-fledged theoretical models" (Pratt et al., 2022, p.233). Answering this challenge, we again turn to the constant comparison strategy while paying closer attention to the relevance of context (Holton, 2007). We found that all types of offices behave distinctly across different types of users and similarly toward certain types of users. Types of users become the relevant context in constructing themes and categories, and we later agreed to use the term *target user*. Concurrently, we exercised theoretical sensitivity, which combines the

---

[2] https://www.cockatoo.com/

researcher's prior skill and knowledge and the open-mindedness to embrace new theories. The latter is done by consulting the existing literature. The summary of our data structure of HRM practices, except for pay policy, is presented in Table 2.

[Table 2 about here]

FINDINGS

Human resource management (HRM) practices

The general premise is that Type A and Type B offices behave distinctly and specifically toward certain user groups in their respective HRM practices while sharing a certain degree of similarity. The distinct behaviors of each type of office are also reflected in the Type Both offices. The following section presents a detailed account of each HRM practice.

Tasks/jobs design and assignment

We identified *attributes* and *assignment criteria* as two main focuses in designing and assigning tasks/jobs. Regardless of the business activities performed at the Offices, the distinct attributes of tasks between Type A and Type B users were found. We first proposed the *significance* category. Type A users would perform core tasks related to main business activities. At R01, which produces and sells agricultural products, users are involved in planting, weeding, harvesting, and packing vegetables. Type B users, on the other hand, would perform peripheral tasks, submitting minor contributions by sharing the tasks with staff:

> It's not the main cooking job, but more like putting things into the box and making chopstick cases. The staff do the cooking (R06)

> If this is an amount of work the staff is responsible for, then a little portion of that task is given to users. At the end, the staff checks if the task is completed (R08)

It is now apparent that the biggest denomination of users' work activities in either type of office is the task instead of the job. Several tasks would be required to complete a whole job. Consequently, a task could also be broken down into smaller elements. The breakdown showed the difference in task/job attributes assigned to Type A and Type B users within the *components* category. Type A office would divide a job into smaller tasks, exhibiting task-level breakdown:

> We break the task [work] of the online store into chunks of labor, such as procurement, editing videos, taking photos, editing and processing the images, packaging, shipping, and [managing] SNS. (R11)

Considering the severity of Type B users' disability, Type B and Type Both offices went even further to divide Type B tasks into smaller and simpler elements. We labeled this particular Type B task/job attribute as the element-level breakdown:

> You have to break it down and make it easy for the users to understand. [...] For example, the direct mailing work. Once you have an envelope and you have four sheets, and this is the right order, or you have to fold it into three parts. They all have these easy steps that you can follow. (R16)

> For example, from three steps we make it into five steps. We divided the task even further up to the point that sometimes you might think, do staffs need to assign that job to each worker, because it is too simple. (R07)

Dividing tasks/jobs into chunks of tasks/elements also means several users would be required to perform them, hence the *coordination* category. Type A users perform the assigned task independently, yet those tasks are interdependent. In R21, for example, the work assigned to Type A users is gift-sets arrangement using the assembly line. Each user is responsible for placing cookies, fruits, and other food items. The speed and accuracy of each user would influence those next in line, hence the interdependency.

During interviews with Type B offices, we recognized the term *naishoku* as a type of work involving most Type B offices, though not necessarily the main business activities. It refers to sub-contracted work that involves the production or assembly of small parts of a bigger product/service performed inside the Office's premises. As each *naishoku* work is typically unrelated, performing this type of work does not require Type B users to be conscious about how their work affects others. Within the coordination category, we defined this attribute as segregation. Even in the context of non-*naishoku* work, segregation attribute was also apparent:

> Type B users usually do the pre-processed work, and usually they do all by themselves, not as a group. In Type B, one person complete one thing. (R21)

> It's true that we allocate five people for one job or one product, but they are not team actually. [...] All they have to do is to focus on their own work (R13)

Aside from the differences, we also found one attribute shared by Type A and Type B offices: designing jobs/tasks that are *suitable* for users. Suitability is mainly approached by designing a task/job which caters to users' abilities. Specifically, the task/job is characterized by not being complicated, can be performed by the users, and starts easy and gradually more challenging. As respondent R12 put it, "I'm going to create a job that you can do." Pursuing suitability also means that the task/job should cater to the nature of the users' disability, even when the particular activity is not profitable for the Office:

> But our goal is not to expand the number of balls we can fix. […] People with autism prefer to have work that has a clear beginning and end. For example, if it's cleaning, it's hard to tell where it starts and where it ends. This one is easier because you can tell that if it's broken, it's the start. And when it's fixed, that's it. (R18)

One particular attribute we observed at Type Both offices was *interaction*, which refers to users' contact with other stakeholders while performing certain jobs/tasks. Without specifically mentioning which type of office they correspond to, Type Both respondents voiced their effort to design jobs/tasks that enable users to interact with customers or society in general:

> Of course, the purpose of this activity is to create a job. But in addition, we want to have communication with our customers. There's a [baseball] league for the elementary school students. We work with the university students, or the kids who practice baseball. When we collect these balls, our users go there. Our users also deliver the finished item, the balls. Then they can communicate. That could create a place of contact and communication through the job. (R18)

> […] only doing pre-processed work is not enough as training. So that is the reason why we start the café […] To interact with the local people is very important because recently there is a trend that people with disabilities should not be segregated. They are a part of the society, and they can work like other ordinary people. So even though they have a handicap, different types of training are needed. Then, through this process, the users can learn what is important to them. […] by interacting with local residents, they can get the opportunity to take one step out of their shells. (R21)

With task/job attributes uncovered, we shifted our attention to the criteria under which the Office assigns certain tasks/jobs to their users. In line with the task/job attributes, we constructed several task/job assignment criteria categories: individual circumstances, interpersonal circumstances, and workload consideration. In the individual circumstances category, assigning work to users is conducted based on users' capability, nature of disability, preference, and personal characteristics. While Type A and Type B offices shared this same category, we identified different

premises. Type A office considered users' individual circumstances in a positive light, thus *embracing* sentiment. R03, for example, voiced how they consider users' strengths, or "sharp point" when assigning work.

> And I do not think that people should do something they're not really good at. If we think about aptitude graph, in this case people should have sharp point, rather than being able to do everything. I think it is okay to be able to do one thing, rather than being able to do many things but so-so (R03).

With the embracing sentiment, Type A office treated capability, nature of disability, preference, and personal characteristics as equal. This sentiment is distinct from what we found in the Type B office, particularly because Type B office considered capability as limited capability/incapability. Contrasting to embracing in Type A, we labeled the sentiment observed in Type B setting as *accommodating*.

> The original starting point was, everyone could not do the task. If our users are skilled enough, we can just simply tell them what the clients want us to do, and they can do that. (R07)

Even with the lingering negative sentiment on users' capability, users' preference over specific task/job was found to be the criteria most Type B offices used in assigning work. Asking for users' preferences was even made daily in R14, meaning that users may perform different tasks every day. R14 elaborated on the reason for such an arrangement to train the users to speak up and voice their opinions, sometimes that PwD rarely have a chance to:

> Every day, I will check with the person [users] what they want to do. For example, today, we have these types of work to do. If they can do it for the whole day, throughout the day, then it's fine. But if, for example, they would like to do this in the morning and in the afternoon change to that, this is also possible. (R14)

R08 voiced how treating capability and preference could be intricate and rather complicated. "Never decline their [users'] request" was said to be the guiding principle in task/job assignments, even though the offices also admitted their concern about whether the users would be able to perform. Given the various business activities conducted at R08, however, the office preferred to assign users to the tasks they're relatively good at performing. Yet, the main principle persisted:

> Again, we have to respect their decisions, each users' decisions. That's a difficult point. (R08)

Aside from individual circumstances, other task/job assignment criteria for Type A users included interpersonal circumstances and workload considerations. In interpersonal circumstances, the dynamic relationship between users becomes an important consideration when assigning certain tasks. Considering the interdependency of tasks in the Type A setting, these criteria should make sense. R10, for example, considered pairing users with different communication styles:

> I think we pay attention to the chemistry between users. If one person is quite talkative and straightforward, that straightforwardness sometimes could hurt others. And there's this not talkative and not straightforward person. We won't put them together (R10)

Consequently, since the tasks for Type B users were segregated, we found no mention of interpersonal circumstances as assignment criteria. Workload consideration was also applied only in Type A offices by assigning more users to the areas that require more labor:

> […] but only if the season making the business a little busy, it is also possible to bring users in to [different] teams and differently loaded under the supervision of staff members (R01)

Sought specifications

Exploring the profile of users the Office wishes to acquire, hence the sought specification, we first recognized the distinct general premise between Type A and Type B, which consequently brought distinct categories of each. Type A respondents mentioned *no special skill required* as a unified answer to the inquiry. Toward Type A users, we found three categories of sought specifications: work attitude, interpersonal skill, and work skill. To avoid confusion with *skill* in the general premise, work skill refers to the users' ability to fulfill the employment contract: minimum working hours and days per week. In most Type A offices, working hours were set to a minimum of four hours/day, with five working days/week. For Type Both offices, whether or not prospective users could fulfill minimum working hours was also used to assign Type A or Type B. The most sought specification for prospective Type A users was work attitude, specifically willingness to work. Prospective users were also expected to be receptive to instruction, for no specific training would be given, and daily operation relied on staff supervision and instructions. Type A offices also seek users whose work attitude reflects independence as well as communicative and cooperative in their interpersonal skills, conforming to the interdependencies of tasks/jobs performed in this type of office:

We want to hire somebody who everybody wants to work with. […] the workers [users] need to learn, somebody's teaching them how to work. Of course, they make mistakes, or do not have any knowledge. But at that time, when some staffs or other people pointed out, oh, that is not how you do it, if that person doesn't accept the instruction, they cannot improve. R11

But the most important thing is whether that person is willing to work. If that person is doing lazy, then we wouldn't ask them whether they'd like to join us (R10)

In Type B offices, the general premise of sought specifications was to accept *anyone,* complemented by *no skill required,* which were also shared with Type Both offices toward Type B prospective users. For Type B users, the categories of sought specifications included interpersonal skills, self-management, and work attitude. The emphasis was placed on interpersonal skills: being harmonious, not harming others, having a basic manner, and being attentive. Instead of helping users perform tasks efficiently, the interpersonal skills of Type B prospective users were expected to keep the working environment conducive:

Because the biggest trouble for us is that the new user causes trouble to other existing users. Whether they can work, or cannot work, it doesn't really matter. More important is the harmony with other users, the balance with other users, not causing trouble or stress to other users (R08)

Given the degree of Type B users' disability, prospective users with the ability to manage their mental condition and have a stable lifestyle were preferred, a category we labeled as self-management.

What I'm looking at users for type B is, I don't care about whether the person can do some work or not, or have certain skills or not. I don't care. But as person, whether they have stable basic lifestyle? Or doesn't do any harm to others. or listen to what others say, or not irritate all the time, or very strained because of stress. […] working means you come to the office, for example, 9 o'clock, and then work, and five minutes before you start working you need to prepare this kind of thing. Time management is very important and essential things to work. And not only here but everywhere. So the people who haven't established life rhythm cannot come to the office on that time (R21)

Work attitude also emerged as a category for Type B users. Yet, unlike that of Type A users, the work attitude of Type B users embodied as enthusiasm:

We are focus on whether they like their position or not, their love for the job. […] I'd like to let them think about fully utilize of what they like while gaining money (R13)

Recruitment

We identified *channels* and *processes* as emerging themes in recruitment practice. In utilizing the source to acquire prospective users, our interview data suggested two pathways based on the

Office's degree of involvement: active and passive. In the channels that require active involvement, offices made an effort to reach out to prospective users, for example, by visiting and releasing information about available positions. In contrast, Office could still acquire prospective users by behaving passively, that is, by receiving referrals.

Type A office was found to be proactive in tapping into the candidate pool, mainly through the public employment security office Hello Work. Type Both offices also shared this particular behavior when seeking Type A users. Adding to this situation was that as a welfare-provision body that concludes an employment contract with the users, only Type A offices were eligible to recruit through this channel. As R11 pointed out, Hello Work was already widely known to general job seekers in Japan, hence its wider reach:

> Even people without disabilities could find jobs through Hello Work. For most people who are looking for a job, their first choice is through Hello Work. This is like Japanese characteristics. (R11)

> So, we informed Hello Work what kind of jobs that we can offer, and what kind of people we want to employ even if they have disability. We usually submit a sheet paper for recruiting, with the description of job and conditions. And when the people with disabilities visit Hello Work, they [Hello Work] will introduce us. (R14)

Utilizing Hello Work was not without drawbacks. Respondents pointed out that this channel is not necessarily familiar to younger prospective users:

> Going to Hello Work is a standard. However, in recent years, especially younger people, their behavior or action patterns are different. Younger people, some people don't even know Hello Work. (R11)

With Hello Work being the main channel for recruiting Type A users, Type B offices relied more upon passive-involvement channels. School for special needs education (junior and or high school) was found to be Type B offices' main recruitment channel, and for Type Both offices to recruit Type B users. The system where senior students need to undergo hands-on working experiences at the Office eventually led students to join as users upon graduation:

> [….] and some other users would come through the special [needs] school. You know, there is a kind of system, the second grade or the third grade of the special [needs] school would receive the practical training. If they would like, they can keep working. (R21)

> We also accept a visit from special needs schools, and they have a chance to do a hands-on activity here to learn how to work. And if they find it's good to work here, then after they graduate from school, they come here to work. (R05)

Some high schools for special needs education had also established connections with Type B offices, especially when part of the school's curriculum matches the business activities of certain Type B offices:

> But there's a special needs school that now has woodwork department, so there are some users from that school. (R05)

However, Type B respondents also pointed out that receiving prospective users from special needs schools has been and may change due to the change in recent regulations. PwD with higher potential to be integrated into the regular workplace would be prioritized to do so, while Type B office was reserved for those otherwise:

> Until 3 or 4 years ago, quite a lot users coming from special needs school. But the program for the Type B has changed. Those new graduates from the special [needs] schools need to try to work at a regular company or at transition support [office] instead of directly going to the Type B office. Now, those people are required to check their potential and whether they can work in those workplaces. So, that's why the number entries [from special needs schools] are declining slightly. (R09)

One Type B office, R13, presented a different view of recruitment. Unlike the usual practices at Type B offices, R13 recruited users through job advertisements posted at job recruitment agency "I", sharing the recruitment platform with the regular workforce. R13 was specifically concerned with the passiveness from the users' side in the recruitment process that leads to mismatch. Prospective users may choose an Office that fits them by actively applying to certain Offices. We understand that to be able to choose this path, R13 tapped on certain niches of talent pools, talented and skilled PwD, to run their business in original T-shirt design and production:

> As you might know, usually how to find a job for users […] in case of other companies, not us, is hospital. Or a kind of advisory office will refer them [prospective users] to certain workplaces. It is like, kind of passive way to find a job. In some cases, Type B users are kind of forced to work at places they don't like. I don't think that would be a sustainable way for them to work. I don't want to do that kind of thing. That's why we decided to use "I" for everybody. So, people with disabilities can plan early or apply to our company by themselves. Not referred by other people. (R13)

Aside from differing main recruitment channels, both Type A and Type B offices utilized the same passive-involvement channels through referrals. Organization referrals include other welfare provision bodies (Consultation support office, group home, daycare) or government bodies (Welfare Department at local government office). The referral was chosen because the referees know the Office well so that they can convey trusted information to the prospective users:

> Then, for example, the differences between the hospital, daycare or some people, they know what we are doing. […] They know our strengths. So, people [prospective users] hear that and apply to us. That's the biggest difference. (R11)

Recruiting through the Consultation support office also provided an additional advantage. Prospective users specifically referred by the consultation support office had undergone an assessment process:

> If the candidate is introduced by the Consultation support office, it means the assessment of that person is completed already. And, the candidate already knows us, what kind of activity we do. (R15)

With the internet being part of daily life, it is unsurprising that Type A and Type B offices chose social media and websites to introduce their activities and build a presence. R20, a Type Both office, further stressed the importance of "to become visible" to users. With their understanding of users' behavior patterns, increasing presence would lead to a higher chance of prospective users reaching out and applying to the Office.:

> Yes, because we try to become visible. Because the users are not the type of people who look at one advertisement and say, okay, I'll go to get a job interview. […] They look at this, and that, and that. And gradually, by one millimeter, getting closer little by little, and then finally [they] make contact. (R20)

The recruitment process in the Offices mainly consisted of an office visit, an interview, and a trial period. The sequence of which varied across offices. The trial period was decisive for both the users and the Office, and it was done in different ways for Type A and Type B offices. Type A offices utilized a trial period to determine whether the prospective users could perform the available tasks. In Type B offices, the trial period was used to find whether the prospective users have certain preferences for any available tasks:

Before we make employment contract with the candidate will come for trial for one week. Then, both the candidate and us determine whether they can perform the task here. And then, interview. (R10, Type A)

We're trying to identify what they're good at and what they're not good at. But more importantly, we try to see whether they like the task or not. We can tell that simply by observing their attitude, like if they're starting to scratch their head, or they are working really slow. In that case we can tell that they don't like the task. (R07, Type B)

In a similar vein, prospective users might use the trial period to check whether they like the working environment, including the staff and colleagues:

They come and check the atmosphere. They check what kind of staff members are there, what kind of users are there, and what kind of work is going on (R06)

It is also worth noting that recruitment would only proceed when the prospective users were interested in doing so:

One is the person come here, visit us, then I explain using the powerpoint. If the person is interested in what we are doing, they come to our place to work as a trial for a few days. If the person thinks I want to work here, they go to interview process, the job interview process. (R11)

Through the recruitment practices, we arrived at one uniformly mentioned statement: that the Office is, in principle and by Government rule, not allowed to reject any users' applications. Regardless of the Office's assessment or opinion during recruitment, the recruitment decision largely depended on whether prospective users wanted to join one particular Office. As a service provider, the situation was prominent in Type B offices:

That's true. Unlike in regular job, we cannot decline. Because we are not making employment contract with the users. It's like we are providing the services. Just like if you go to shop and then the shop says, no, I cannot sell you, that's not allowed, of course. That's the case, like ours. We're service provider, to give them skills so the users can go to the next step (R09)

As such, several conditions enabled Office to decline users' joining the Office. We labeled one category as *rejection by exceptions*. The unavailability of the Office to cater to the users' condition or needs was the main premise of such exceptions: when users' condition or disabilities required special medical attention, when the Office's capacity was at maximum, and when the users'

residential area was beyond Office's service area. The third reason only applied to the Office offering pick-up/drop-off services:

> According to the government policy, actually, I can't reject any application. There are only three reasons stated as reasons for rejection. If those reasons do not apply, then I can't actually say no to them. […] The first one is that when the capacity is full. If we are not able to accept more due to the limited capacity of the staff members, then we can reject. And also, if the area where the people are living is very far away from this place. It is not possible to pick them up and bring them back home. Then, if it is necessary to provide this person with some kind of medical care, they need to be provided with oxygen on a regular basis, for example. That is also one of the reasons when can say no (R14)

Type A offices, on the other hand, had different standing. When deciding not to accept users' application, type A offices exercised *discretion*, a category of reasons corresponding to the sought specifications. The lack of sought specifications, for example, unwillingness to work (hence, the lack of work attitude), then became the basis for Office not to accept certain users. Other reasons included the lack of interpersonal skills (i.e., not communicative, not harmonious, and harming others) and lack of work skills (i.e., unable to fulfill employment contract):

> Some people actually don't want to work at all. They just want to be here, and actually they can't do any work. For those people, unfortunately, we have to say no (R06)

> Only when they're not able to communicate well, or creating trouble..only in this case we decline application we just accepted. (R01)

When Offices found certain prospective users unsuitable for their Office, they must be ready to introduce other Offices. Persuading prospective users to apply to different Office was also a common practice to "reject" applications:

> But I use different ways of persuading people. Because sometimes I feel, maybe this person doesn't fit our place, but we cannot reject them and it would hurt them. So, I, at the time, there are many Type A entities in Kyoto, so I recommend them, why don't you visit other companies. (R12)

Pay policy

As an employment provider formally hired users, the wage for Type A users followed the labor standard, thus set at the prefecture's minimum hourly rate. The situation at Type B offices was contrasting in several ways. Categorized as a training provider and not formally hiring users as employees, the monetary payment from Type B office to their users was termed as labor cost (*kōchin*) instead of wage. The term labor cost was loosely defined and is operationalized differently by Type B

offices: by hourly rate, by piecework, or by daily flat amount. The hourly rate of labor costs ranged

from 100 yen to 400 yen/hour, with working hours for Type B users typically set to 4 to 5 hours/day

and five working days/week. As for piecework rate, i.e., the amount or volume completed/produced

products, Type B offices were less open to sharing the nominal. Instead, they provided the average

monthly payments, which can be accessed through their website. Paying by piecework rate was more

complicated in mechanism, as different products might require different calculations, hence the

different rates:

> Basically, it is based on the work volume. But if the person is involved in a difficult and more complicated task, we pay extra. Or, if the work requires standing for many hours, we pay extra. Or if the job is delicate and you need to be focused, then we also pay extra (R07)

The issue with the piecework rate also lies in that it corresponded to users' productivity, an inherent

issue with Type B users' profiles. As R21 expressed, even if Type B users worked long hours,

producing the intended output level was challenging and hindered Type B users from acquiring decent

income. Thus, R21 provided users a minimum guaranteed daily rate of 1,000 yen. The term

"minimum" implies that users might receive more payment should they produced higher output.

> For example, if you complete this one [product], I can give you 1 yen. So, if you complete 500 of this, you can get 500 yen. But, you know, from 10 to 4 o'clock, it's very difficult to keep working. Sometimes they can earn only 200 yen. However, we set a minimum guaranteed fee of 1,000 yen. So even though they cannot reach that amount, we can provide 1,000 yen (R21)

R13 provided another example of a guaranteed daily rate. Users registered with the Office were

mostly those with mental disorders, whose conditions fluctuated even within a span of a day.

Considering users' conditions, we understand that the guaranteed rate provides multifold advantages

for users and the Office. Users would be able to receive income without necessarily burdening their

condition. The rate also enabled the Office to manage the risk of workforce shortage:

> We calculate the daily wage. So even if, let's say, they work only for 2 hours, the daily wage is the same. […] We don't apply hourly wage. Because if we do, some people who feel bad will hesitate to say they want to leave early. And if they work too hard, maybe they will be absent for another two days or three days. That's why we apply daily wage, not hourly wage. And we guarantee a certain amount (R13)

Both Type A and Type B offices acknowledged that nominal-wise, users' payment rates are inadequate. Type B users affiliated with our respondents would receive around 20,000 yen/month in income. Type A users were relatively advantaged by receiving the prefecture's minimum wage. However, paying users with minimum wage was perceived as a challenge by the respective offices:

> *(laughs)* Thinking about how we have to pay the minimum wage of K prefecture, it is difficult to do business with profit. It is not enough. It is unprofitable (R02)

> I always tell my employees [users] that it is difficult to pay you higher than the minimum wage of K prefecture (R03)

The issue of minimum wage brought Type A offices to several measures. R03, for example, allowed its users to do side jobs and even encouraged the exchange of job opportunities between users. R11 tweaked with users' working hours first before increasing the hourly rates:

> If I find certain people who can do better than the other, or if that person can increase the number of work they can do, we extend the working hours to 5 hours gradually. […] And if they come to certain working hours, and cannot be extended any further, then we increase the hourly payment (R11)

As we previously explored, government subsidies are to be utilized to run the Office and pay wages/salaries to the staff. Monetary payments to users should be sourced from the Office's business activities instead of the said subsidies. While most of our respondents acknowledged this rule and acted accordingly, the practice of providing payments to users using the subsidy existed. The case happened in our Type A respondent:

> As a rule, it is basically prohibited to use this money as a source of remuneration or salary [to users]. But we actually do. (R03)

We elaborated on this issue during our interview with R15, whose business comprises consultation services for employment support offices. We confirmed that paying users using the government's training subsidy does not necessarily violate any law or regulation. The consequences, however, are rather indirect. One of the metrics used in the Office's evaluation is the ratio between "production activity income minus expenses" and "total amount of wages paid to users." If the wages paid to users are high due to using another source of funds (i.e., government training subsidy), yet the income from production activity figure is not highly proportionate, the score for this particular evaluation metric

will be lower. The Office should expect a lower total score and potentially reduced government training subsidy.

User mobility

The last HRM practice we observed in the Office concerned the management of users' mobility. The classification of Type A and Type B office hinted that such mobility was embedded within the welfare system, indicated by the term "step-up" we captured throughout the interviews. As the name implies, step-up refers to the movement or mobility of users from one type of office to a higher one, from training provider (Type B) to employment provider (Type A, employment transition support office) or regular workplace. This single term undermined several aspects of this particular HRM practice. First, the variation, for we identified eight distinct user mobility paths combining movement across/within Office, across/within an organization[3], and the change in users' status (see Table 3). The definition of each mobility path is provided as follows:

1. **Stay** (User maintains either Type A or Type B status at the same Office)

2. **Internal shift AB** (User mobility from Type A office to Type B office within the same organization, only observed in Type Both office)

3. **Internal shift BA** (User mobility from Type B office to Type A office within the same organization, only observed in Type Both office)

4. **Internal step-up** (Mobility of either Type A or Type B user to become staff at the same Office)

5. **Shift BA** (User mobility from Type B office to Type A office across organizations)

6. **Step-up** (Mobility of either Type A or Type B user to become staff at regular workplace)

7. **Move** (User maintains either Type A or Type B status but changes affiliation to another Office)

8. **Leave** (User unregister from one Office, unclear path afterward)

[Table 3 about here]

We then shifted our focus to discovering under what conditions, i.e., criteria, each type of mobility occurred. The following categories of criteria were uncovered from our interview data: user's preference, user's status, interpersonal skill, work attitude, work skill, perceived ability, self-

---

[3] We use the term *organization* to define Office as an entity

management, user's decision, and Office's discretion. Some of those criteria were grouped with others, constructing varying sets of *necessary criteria* and *sufficient criteria* for each type of mobility (see Table 2). Necessary criteria refer to condition(s) that enable the outcome, while sufficient criteria determine them (Dul, 2016).

Delving into various sets of necessary and sufficient criteria across types of mobility, we would like to highlight several findings. We found that user preference may appear as the sole necessary criterion only in any mobilities involving Type A users across types of offices and organizations. In Type Both offices, for example, Internal step-up and Step-up mobility paths applied only to Type A users interested in doing so. Even in Step-up mobility, which allowed users to enter the regular workplace, the process would be initiated only when Type A users desired:

> If somebody wants to leave and work at another company, sometimes I feel, okay, of course, it is your decision (R11)

The same goes for Internal step-up mobility, upon which Type A users were recruited as support staff at the same Office they used to register as users:

> Number one priority is whether they want to be a supporter [staff]. If it's not their preferences, we won't ask them whether they want to be or not. (R10)

> The first thing is what the person wants to do, wants to be a user or provider of support [staff]. […] But if the person wants to be a provider, not the user, we should respect them. (R11)

> And then when the person cleared a certain level, we always offer them whether you want to keep working at this company or not. We showed that we highly recognize you and that you can work as a full-time worker (R20)

With user preference being the necessary criteria, sufficient criteria for Type A users' mobility included interpersonal skills (communicative, attentive) and work skills (able to fulfill minimum work requirements and skilled at certain tasks/jobs). Bringing back our findings from the previous part, we noticed that the categories of sufficient criteria were consistent with the sought specifications for Type A users (see Table 2). The mobility paths involving Type B users did not regard user preference as the necessary criterion, let alone a sole one. Type B users' profiles, which often include those with heavier disabilities, could be the underlying reason:

Type A and Type B are very different worlds. For Type A, they have to at least have the minimum requirement to receive minimum wage. People who can met this minimum requirement is very limited. In a way, they're very skilled. But most of the users who come to us have heavier disability, and their disability ranges widely. So we can't really just say, why don't you go to the Type A? That never happens. (R16)

We also discovered that all mobility paths involving Type B users considered necessary criteria identical to sufficient criteria. In other words, necessary criteria would interact with sufficient criteria to enable any mobility of Type B users. Among several categories, work skills (skilled at certain tasks/jobs, able to fulfill minimum work requirements, able to provide instructions) appear to be one category that is always present. Able to provide instructions specifically applied to internal step-up mobility, implying that this skill will be required as a support staff member. However, acquiring the skill is deemed challenging for Type B users.

Varying by types of mobility, work skills then interacted with one or more of the following categories: interpersonal skills (communicative, cooperative, attentive), work attitude (have staff mindset), perceived ability (feels ready for Type A task/job), and self-management (able to manage physical/mental condition, independent). As we previously mentioned, Internal step-up mobility required Type B users to be ready to perform as support staff, which explains how "have staff mindset" was present as a work attitude. On the other hand, Step-up mobility required Type B users to be ready for the regular workplace. With the wider probability of work variation being assigned, we observed more criteria required for Type B users to embark on Step-up mobility: work skills, interpersonal skills, and self-management.

While Internal shift-BA mobility required work skills, self-management, and perceived ability as the criteria, Shift BA only involved work skills. Both mobilities were similar in retaining users' status but differed regarding users' affiliation post-mobility. As users would remain in the same organization in the Internal shift-BA, the Office would exert more effort to ensure mobility worked as intended. Shift BA mobility would send user outside their organization; hence, the Office did not have to exert more effort.

Specific only to Step-up mobility, we discovered that Offices provided *pre-mobility assistance* and *post-mobility assistance*. In pre-mobility assistance, both Type A and Type B users

were provided training catered to their specific needs and were connected with prospective employers or employment support-related organizations, such as Regional Employment Centers for PwD (chiiki shōgaisha shokugyō sentā) or Hello Work. After step-up, Type B offices would keep *monitoring* their (ex) users, even solving issues with the new employer:

> And once they get a job, it doesn't mean goodbye. We also support them in a way that they can retain the job for a long time. Sometimes, once they get hired by the company, they face difficulties. At that time, we go with them to the company and try to solve the issues. (R06)

We would like to highlight another post-mobility assistance, which is *re-admittance*. Applied to both Type A and Type B users, this assistance allowed users who had stepped up to return to their Office. The sentiment, however, was rather negative. Ex-users who returned to the Office were usually those who found it challenging to work at a regular workplace:

> Of course, they can go and try. And if it didn't work, they can come back here again. So that's also their choice. (R14)

> There is this case in the past. They decided to work at another company […], but they decided, oh, it is not my place. Then they came back. (R11)

Such challenging, negative sentiment was also apparent in Shift-BA, Leave, and Move mobility paths. User's decision dominated necessary and sufficient criteria, which involved worsening conditions and inability to keep up with work.

We also would like to focus on how Type A offices treated the Leave mobility path. In contrast to how user preference precedes most Type A users' mobility, dismissing users was solely based on *Office discretion*.

> Although I mentioned that, basically I will not fire people, there are certain cases in which I have to ask them to leave. For example, there are people who cannot get in touch, or their contact is lost. Or people who do not work at all, even to submit daily reports. At the end of the month, they just write down something and get a salary. In that sense, I have to say, I do not think you can work here (R03)

Step-up as a blanket term to define user mobility also underscored the discrepancy between the government's opinion and the Office's opinion toward the classification of Office. As R16 elucidated, with step-up often regarded as a goal, the government implies a hierarchy between Type A office, Type B office, and eventually, the regular workplace. Conversely, the Offices agreed that Type

A and Type B offices were equal; each fits different users' profiles. Allowing users to keep their current status and affiliation in Stay mobility, for example, was a testament to this sentiment.

Power-dependence in HRM practices

With the HRM practices laid out, we then examined the underlying situation that led the Office to behave in a particular way. Each HRM practice revealed power (P) and dependency (D) between the actors: Government (g), Office (o), and User (u). The government came into the picture as the relationship between the three actors falls under the definition of generalized exchange. In generalized exchange, one actor gives resources to another, yet resources are reciprocated not by the recipient but rather by a third party/actor (Cook et al., 2006). This relationship, for example, explains the government subsidy scheme and its connection with users' pay policy.

In any relationship with two other actors, the Office generally exhibited a higher degree of dependency and thus less power (i.e., $D_{ou} > D_{uo}$ and $P_{ou} < P_{uo}$; $D_{og} < D_{ug}$ and $P_{og} < P_{go}$). The general premise in recruitment was an obvious example, stating that Offices were not allowed to reject users' applications except for the reasons set by the Government. In task/job design and assignment, we discussed that users' individual circumstances were found to be the main assignment criteria. Even for Type B users who were generally less skilled, their preference for certain tasks/jobs was the main factor determining the assignment. We also discussed that though Offices had certain specifications they sought from prospective users, the reasons for not accepting users' applications had nothing to do with the lack of those specifications, except in the Type A setting. In user mobility, regardless of government encouraging users to *step up* to the regular workplace, any mobility would not be possible if users were not willing to.

The power disadvantage further explained how the Office chose to exercise balancing operations**,** that is, the structural changes in power-dependence relations aiming to reduce power advantage (Emerson, 1962). We identified several practices that represent balancing operations mechanisms. Rejection by discretion performed by Type A offices was one example, which also corresponded to the fact that office discretion was the sole criterion for Leave mobility targeting Type A users. We also found that balancing operations was more apparent in user mobilities. The provision of pre-mobility and post-mobility assistance for Step-up mobility was one piece of evidence. The

classification of necessary and sufficient criteria for Type A and Type B users also submitted to this notion; preference would enable Type A users to start working on mobility schemes, while Type B users needed interpersonal skills, work skills, and self-management. There were more necessary and sufficient criteria for mobilities involving Type B users and retaining their affiliation in the Office than when Type B users changed their affiliations. Of all those mechanisms, we proposed that the Office performed balancing operations by regaining control and minimizing risk. We also argue that Office exercised stronger balancing operations when users maintained affiliation with the organization and when Type B users were involved.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

This study aims to discover human resource management practices performed by Continuous Employment Support Offices for people with disabilities in Japan toward their distinct group in their workforce, that is, the users. We argue through a general premise that HRM practices performed at the Offices are designed to accommodate the given candidate pool. Simple and sometimes repetitive tasks, tandem working with the staff, and simple instructions are several instances of working arrangements for workers with disabilities (Signoretti & Sacchetti, 2020). In a general sense, adjustments are needed to enable users to perform their tasks (Villotti et al., 2017). However, as PwD constitutes the main workforce composition and takes charge of main business activities, such adjustments should be manifested in the system.

The above premise contradicts the accepted principle of HRM practices in the for-profit, in which the candidate pool is a product of (certain) HRM practices and, thus, sought after (Dessler, 2017; Malik, 2018) instead of given. Curiously, our premise also reflects the notion of best fit, which argues that "HR strategy will be more effective when it is appropriately integrated with its specific organizational and environmental context (Boxall & Purcell, 2000, p.186). The calls for exploring HRM practices that work for social enterprise have been long advocated (Newman et al., 2018; Roumpi et al., 2020; Zhang et al., 2018). Our study contributes to this stream of studies by exhibiting HRM practices that reflect the particularity of the work integration social enterprise characteristics in Japan.

Drawing from the empirical findings of HRM practices, we extend our aims to understand power-dependence relations that shape the exchange between actors within Japan's national welfare system. While the power-dependence relations concept acknowledges withdrawal, alternatives-seeking, status-giving, or coalition-building as balancing operations mechanisms (Cook, 1987; Emerson, 1962), our data proposed that Offices approach it by regaining control and minimizing risk. This finding also implies that balancing operations are conducted within the existing network system. We argue that the Office's status as a welfare provision body operating within a regulated environment may lead to this situation. As a regulated social enterprise, the Office would face close public scrutiny through ".. some combination of supervision regarding professional standards, managerial arrangements, client or citizen involvement" (Paton, 2003, p.33), which makes it challenging to seek alternatives outside the system. The nature of the system with the enduring relationship between actors, instead of transactions, is also self-explanatory; Offices may have to resort to alternatives within their scope.

To conclude, this study examined HRM practices at the Continuous Employment Support Offices for people with disabilities in Japan. We submitted our empirical evidence that HRM practices performed in the context of work integration social enterprise were portrayed by accommodating the characteristics of the target group, that is, people with disabilities. This finding prompted an investigation of power-dependence relations. As part of the national welfare system, Continuous Employment Support Offices were found to be more dependent and less powerful toward both the government and the target group. The efforts to reduce the power disadvantage were then performed within the existing system.

Our attempt to give voice to the studied organization, hence the interviews with the Management side as the sole data source, eventually resulted in the limitation of the study. Thus, interpreting the findings should be done carefully considering the Office's point of view. Future studies may consider the government's viewpoint when examining power-dependence relations. We also invite future studies examining whether the power-dependence/balancing operations extend to general management operations and when it translates to challenges (i.e., tensions).

REFERENCES

Act to Facilitate the Employment of Persons with Disabilities, Pub. L. No. 123 (1960).

Austin, J., Stevenson, H., & Wei-Skillern, J. (2006). Social and Commercial Entrepreneurship: Same, Different, or Both? *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, *30*(1), 1–22. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6520.2006.00107.x

Bartram, T., Cavanagh, J., Sim, S., Pariona-Cabrera, P., & Meacham, H. (2019). Going the Extra Mile: Managers and Supervisors as Moral Agents for Workers with Disability at Two Social Enterprises. *Relations Industrielles / Industrial Relations*, *73*(4), 728–752. https://doi.org/10.7202/1056975ar

Battilana, J., Sengul, M., Pache, A. C., & Model, J. (2015). Harnessing productive tensions in hybrid organizations: The case of work integration social enterprises. *Academy of Management Journal*, *58*(6), 1658–1685. https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2013.0903

Belgrave, L. L., & Seide, K. (2019). Coding for Grounded Theory. In A. Bryant & K. Charmaz (Eds.), *The SAGE Handbook of Current Developments in Grounded Theory* (pp. 167–185). SAGE Publications Ltd. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781526485656.n10

Boxall, P., & Purcell, J. (2000). Strategic human resource management: Where have we come from and where should we be going? *International Journal of Management Reviews*, *2*(2), 183–203. https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2370.00037

Boxall, P., Purcell, J., & Wright, P. M. (Eds.). (2009). *The Oxford Handbook of Human Resource Management* (Vol. 1). Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199547029.001.0001

Chan, A. N. W. (2015). Social support for improved work integration. *Social Enterprise Journal*, *11*(1), 47–68. https://doi.org/10.1108/sej-07-2014-0033

Chan, A., Ryan, S., & Quarter, J. (2017). Supported Social Enterprise: A Modified Social Welfare Organization. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, *46*(2), 261–279. https://doi.org/10.1177/0899764016655620

Charmaz, K. (2014). *Constructing Grounded Theory* (2nd Ed.). SAGE.

Cook, K. S. (1987). Emerson's Contributions to Social Exchange Theory. In K. S. Cook (Ed.), *Social Exchange Theory* (pp. 209–222). SAGE Publications. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003141372-14

Cook, K. S., Cheshire, C., & Gerbasi, A. (2006). Power, Dependence, and Social Exchange. In *Contemporary Social Psychological Theories* (pp. 194–215). Stanford Social Sciences.

Dacin, M. T., Dacin, P. A., & Tracey, P. (2011). Social Entrepreneurship: A Critique and Future Directions. *Organization Science*, *22*(5), 1203–1213. https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.1100.0620

Defourny, J., & Nyssens, M. (2006). Defining Social Enterprise. In M. Nyssens (Ed.), *Social Enterprise: At the Crossroads of Market, Public Policies, and Civil Society* (pp. 3–26). Routledge.

Defourny, J., & Nyssens, M. (2017). Fundamentals for an International Typology of Social Enterprise Models. *Voluntas*, *28*(6), 2469–2497. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11266-017-9884-7

Dessler, G. (2017). *Human Resource Management* (15th Ed.). Pearson.

Doherty, B., Haugh, H., & Lyon, F. (2014). Social enterprises as hybrid organizations: A review and research agenda. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, *16*(4), 417–436. https://doi.org/10.1111/ijmr.12028

Dul, J. (2016). Necessary Condition Analysis (NCA): Logic and Methodology of "Necessary but Not Sufficient" Causality. *Organizational Research Methods*, *19*(1), 10–52. https://doi.org/10.1177/1094428115584005

Emerson, R. M. (1962). Power-Dependence Relations. *American Sociological Review*, *27*(1), 31–41. https://doi.org/10.2307/2089716

Goulding, C. (2005). Grounded theory, ethnography and phenomenology: A comparative analysis of three qualitative strategies for marketing research. *European Journal of Marketing*, *39*(3/4), 294–308. https://doi.org/10.1108/03090560510581782

Grimes, M. G., McMullen, J. S., Vogus, T. J., & Miller, T. L. (2013). Studying the origins of social entrepreneurship: Compassion and the role of embedded agency. *Academy of Management Review*, *38*(3), 460–463. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2012.0429

Gupta, P., Chauhan, S., Paul, J., & Jaiswal, M. P. (2020). Social entrepreneurship research: A review and future research agenda. *Journal of Business Research*, *113*, 209–229. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2020.03.032

Haugh, H. (2005). A Research Agenda for Social Entrepreneurship. *Social Enterprise Journal*, *1*(1), 1–12.

Ho, A. P. ying, & Chan, K. tong. (2010). The social impact of work-integration social enterprise in Hong Kong. *International Social Work*, *53*(1), 33–45. https://doi.org/10.1177/0020872809348950

Holton, J. A. (2007). The Coding Process and Its Challenges. In A. Bryant & K. Charmaz (Eds.), *The SAGE Handbook of Grounded Theory*. SAGE. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781848607941

Iwane, T., Yoshida, A., Kono, M., Hashimoto, H., & Yamamoto, S. (2013). Work support for persons with mental disabilities in Japan. *Work*, *45*(2), 253–260. https://doi.org/10.3233/WOR-131591

Iwasa, M., Nozawa, N., & Eito, H. (2022). *Survey on part-time employment with less than 20 hours per week for persons with disabilities* (Issue No. 165). National Institute of Vocational Rehabilitation.

Kaneko, I. (2013). Social Entrepreneurship in Japan: A Historical Perspective on Current Trends. *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship*, *4*(3), 256–276. https://doi.org/10.1080/19420676.2013.799085

Karnani, A. G. (2012). Social Entrepreneurship: Beyond the Hype. *Innovations: Technology, Governance, Globalization*, *6*(2), 99–116. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.1592991

Laratta, R., & Nakagawa, S. (2016a). Shedding Light on the Japanese Social Enterprise Sector: Concepts, Policies and Models. *Psychosociological Issues in Human Resource Management*, *4*(1), 115. https://doi.org/10.22381/pihrm4120166

Laratta, R., & Nakagawa, S. (2016b). Work Integration Social Enterprises for People with Disabilities in Japan. *Nonprofit Policy Forum*, *7*(4), 487–507. https://doi.org/10.1515/npf-2016-0006

Laratta, R., Nakagawa, S., & Sakurai, M. (2011). Japanese social enterprises: major contemporary issues and key challenges. *Social Enterprise Journal*, *7*(1), 50–68. https://doi.org/10.1108/17508611111130158

Locke, K. (2001). *Using Grounded Theory in Management Research*. SAGE.

Malik, A. (2018). *Strategic Human Resource Management and Employment Relations An International Perspective* (A. Malik (Ed.)). Springer. http://www.springer.com/series/10099

Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1984). Drawing Valid Meaning from Qualitative Data: Toward a Shared Craft. *Educational Researcher*, *13*(5), 20–30. https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X013005020

Ministry of Health Labour and Welfare. (2023). *Employment Rates for People with Disabilities from Fiscal Year 2023*. https://www.mhlw.go.jp/content/11704000/001039344.pdf

Molm, L. D. (1989). Punishment Power: A Balancing Process in Power-Dependence Relations. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, *94*(6), 1392–1418.

Morimoto, K., Hoshii, J., Masuda, C., Endo, K., Sahira, A., Yotsumoto, K., & Hashimoto, T. (2022). Impact of COVID-19 on the Employment of and Employment Support for People with Disabilities. *Journal of Disaster Research*, *17*(1), 103–112. https://doi.org/10.20965/jdr.2022.p0103

Morse, J. M. (2007). Sampling in Grounded Theory. In A. Bryant & K. Charmaz (Eds.), *The SAGE Handbook of Grounded Theory*. SAGE.

Napathorn, C. (2018a). How do social enterprises recruit workers? The case of social enterprises in Thailand. *Journal of Asia Business Studies*, *12*(4), 508–532. https://doi.org/10.1108/JABS-02-2017-0019

Napathorn, C. (2018b). Which HR Bundles are Utilized in Social Enterprises? The Case of Social Enterprises in Thailand. *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship*, *9*(2), 110–131. https://doi.org/10.1080/19420676.2018.1452282

Newman, A., Mayson, S., Teicher, J., & Barrett, R. (2018). Recruiting, managing and rewarding workers in social enterprises. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, *29*(20), 2851–2860. https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2018.1498368

Nishida, R., Narusawa, K., & Shinde, S. K. (2023). Exploring Employment for Persons with Disabilities in Japan: Ryohin-Keikaku's Approach. *Tsukuba Journal of Law and Politics*, *90*, 1–

13.

Paton, R. (2003). *Managing and Measuring Social Enterprises*. SAGE.

Peattie, K., & Morley, A. (2008). Eight paradoxes of the social enterprise research agenda. *Social Enterprise Journal*, *4*(2), 91–107. https://doi.org/10.1108/17508610810901995

Pratt, M. G., Sonenshein, S., & Feldman, M. S. (2022). Moving Beyond Templates: A Bricolage Approach to Conducting Trustworthy Qualitative Research. *Organizational Research Methods*, *25*(2), 211–238. https://doi.org/10.1177/1094428120927466

Roumpi, D., Magrizos, S., & Nicolopoulou, K. (2020). Virtuous circle: Human capital and human resource management in social enterprises. *Human Resource Management*, *59*(5), 401–421. https://doi.org/10.1002/hrm.22002

Royce, M. (2007). Using human resource management tools to support social enterprise: emerging themes from the sector. *Social Enterprise Journal*, *3*(1), 10–19. https://doi.org/10.1108/17508610780000718

Sakurai, M., & Hashimoto, S. (2009). Exploring the Distinctive Feature of Social Enterprise in Japan. *2nd EMES International Conference on Social Enterprise*.

Services and Supports for Persons with Disabilities Act, Pub. L. No. 123 (2005).

Short, J. C., Moss, T. W., & Lumpkin, G. T. (2009). Research in social entrepreneurship: past contributions and future opportunities. *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal*, *3*(2), 161–194. https://doi.org/10.1002/sej.69

Signoretti, A., & Sacchetti, S. (2020). Lean HRM practices in work integration social enterprises: Moving towards social lean production. Evidence from Italian case studies*. *Annals of Public and Cooperative Economics*, *91*(4), 545–563. https://doi.org/10.1111/apce.12283

Smith, W. K., Besharov, M. L., Wessels, A. K., & Chertok, M. (2012). A paradoxical leadership model for social entrepreneurs: Challenges, leadership skills, and pedagogical tools for managing social and commercial demands. *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, *11*(3), 463–478. https://doi.org/10.5465/amle.2011.0021

Tanimoto, K. (2008). The Emergence of Social Entrepreneurship and its Strategy in Japan. *Corporate Responsibility Research Conference 2008*, *September*, 1–22. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/242741806_The_Emergence_of_Social_Entrepreneurship_and_its_Strategy_in_Japan

Vidal, I. (2005). Social enterprise and social inclusion: Social enterprises in the sphere of work integration. *International Journal of Public Administration*, *28*(9–10), 807–825. https://doi.org/10.1081/PAD-200067347

Villotti, P., Corbière, M., Fossey, E., Fraccaroli, F., Lecomte, T., & Harvey, C. (2017). Work Accommodations and Natural Supports for Employees with Severe Mental Illness in Social Businesses: An International Comparison. *Community Mental Health Journal*, *53*(7), 864–870. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10597-016-0068-5

Watanabe, T. (2016). *Study of Social Entrepreneurship and Innovation Ecosystems in South East and East Asian Countries, Country Analysis: Japan* (Issue October). The Japan Research Institute.

Zahra, S. A., Gedajlovic, E., Neubaum, D. O., & Shulman, J. M. (2009). A typology of social entrepreneurs: Motives, search processes and ethical challenges. *Journal of Business Venturing*, *24*(5), 519–532. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusvent.2008.04.007

Zhang, L., Zhang, Y., Dallas, M., Xu, S., & Hu, J. (2018). How perceived empowerment HR practices influence work engagement in social enterprises–a moderated mediation model. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, *29*(20), 2971–2999. https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2018.1479874

Table 1
Profile of Respondents

Respondent code	Business activities	Office type	Legal form
R01	Production and sales of agricultural products	Type A	NPO/General incorporation
R02	Vegetable bagging (outsource), box-folding (light works)		
R03	Production of digital content, website, handcrafts		
R04	Production and sales of agricultural products	Type B	
R05	Production and sales of woodworking products, sewing, nail art, café operations		
R06	Sales of used clothes, production and sales of lunchboxes, various light works		
R07	Various light works (main), production of handcrafts from recycled paper		
R08	Sales of clothing, desktop publishing works, production and sales of handcraft, various light works		
R09	Printing, desktop publishing, video creation		
R10	Vegetable bagging (outsource)	Type A	Co., Ltd.
R11	Design works, e-commerce		
R12	Sales and production of side-dish, confectioneries, and accessories, house reform/repair, various light works		
R13	Design and production of original t-shirt	Type B	
R14	Vegetable shop, cleaning service		
R15	Production of digital content and website, Government commissioned works, cleaning service, consulting business for welfare facilities	Type Both	NPO/General incorporation
R16	Printing (main), various light works		
R17	Cleaning service (main), various light works		
R18	Cleaning service, repair works of sports equipment		
R19	Sales of used clothes, off-facility works, data input (light works)	Type Both	Co., Ltd.
R20	Data entry and social media management (outsource), digital content production, cleaning service, assembly work (off-facility), consulting works for welfare facility		
R21	Assembly work, various light works, café operations.		

Table 2
Summary of Data Structure

HRM Practices	Theme	Target user	Category	Focused code	Initial code	Quotation samples
Task/job design and assignment	Attributes/ characteristics	Type A	Significance	Core tasks	Not office/desk/administrative work	Not particularly other than farming at the moment, but they have opportunity to do some paperwork like to do daily report, for example how many products they ship for example. So this kind of documentation they have the chance to do. Daily.
					User works in main business	They are actually doing a lot of things from packing, peelings the green onion, planting strawberries, cleaning the farmland, and taking out unnecessary weeds..
			Component	Task-level breakdown	Job is divided into smaller tasks	We break the task of the net shop into chunks of labor, such as procurement, editing videos, taking photos, editing and processing the images, packaging, shipping, and SNS.
			Coordination	Interdependent	To be completed by several users	We work together, we break the work into smaller pieces. We need to work together with other people, so personalities is very important
					User works their part independently	Type A users work in assembly line Type A users, basically they can do many things by themselves
			Suitability	Cater to ability	Can be performed by user	We cannot give the job that cannot be done in term of skills of the person, but I try to give them… the jobs that if they trying hard to do they can do that. Maybe this people are not good at doing cooking, but they can do the box folding.
					Start easy, gradually more difficult	First they started working here, we let them do the easiest process of working. After they could deal with that kind of working, they can change..to more difficult?
					Tasks are not complicated	Because apparently, the task is not really complicated.
			Productivity	High productivity	More productive, high value-added	And then that means that the options of works are which more productivity is required as well as higher value added points. Those kind of jobs are offered to Type A people

Table 2
Summary of Data Structure (continued)

HRM Practices	Theme	Target user	Category	Focused code	Initial code	Quotation samples
Task/job design and assignment	Attributes/ characteristics	Type B	Significance	Peripheral tasks	Peripheral/minor contribution	..but more like putting things in to the box, and making chopstick cases. The staffs do the cooking
						If this is an amount of work the staff is responsible for, and then a little portion of that task is given to users. 80% staff + 20% users, or 90% users + 10% users.
					Gradually bigger contribution	And as the level of the users improves, then they can take more portions or they try to achieve the levels of their staff.
			Component	Element-level breakdown	Tasks are divided into smaller elements	For example, from five steps we make it into three five steps. We divided the task even further…
						Once you have an envelope and you have four sheets, and this is the right order, or you have to fold it into three parts. So they all have these easy steps that you can follow.
			Coordination	Segregated	To be performed individually	So maybe users don't have a kind of mindset that we are a team. All they have to do is to focus on their own work
						Type B users usually do the pre-processed work, and usually they do all by themselves, not as a group. In Type B, one person complete one thing
			Suitability	Cater to ability	Can be performed by user	So we told the client, if that is your request we cannot accept that because it is too difficult for us
						We offer jobs among the ones that can be done by disabled people. We give them choice.
					Start easy, gradually more difficult	First, I give a task which is easy to finish, something very simple. After doing this for some time, I will give a next challenge, something different.
				Cater to disability	Suitable for users > profitable	But our goal is not to expand the number of balls we can fix. So one of these facilities has this activity for one user with autism. People with autism prefer to have the work that has a clear beginning and end.
						On a daily basis we try to offer or create a job which is suitable for each disability

Table 2
Summary of Data Structure (continued)

HRM Practices	Theme	Target user	Category	Focused code	Initial code	Quotation samples
Task/job design and assignment	Attributes/ characteristics	Type Both[4]	Interaction	Interaction with customer	Involving customer	Of course, the purpose of this activity is to create a job of course, but in addition we want to have the communication with our customers. There's a [baseball] league for the elementary school students. We work with the university students, or the kids who practice baseball. When we collect these balls, our users go there. Our users also deliver the finished item, the balls. Then they can communicate. That could create a place of contact, communication through the job.
				Interaction with general society	Connect user with society	To interact with the local people is very important because recently there is a trend that people with disabilities should not be segregated. They are a part of the society, and they can work like other ordinary people. So even though they have a handicap, different types of training is needed, and then through this process the users can learn what is important to them…However, by interacting with local residents, they can provide the opportunity to take one step out of their shell.
						Instead, we try to find a job that connects people with disabilities to the society.

---

[4] We could not determine which group of users the statements refer to

Table 2
Summary of Data Structure (continued)

HRM Practices	Theme	Target user	Category	Focused code	Initial code	Quotation samples
Task/job design and assignment	**Assignment criteria**	Type A	Embracing individual circumstances	User's capability - Positive	Assign work to what user's good at	And I do not think that people should do something they're not really good at.
						Of course in advance we know that this person is good at taking photo for example..
					Ask Type A user their exact skill	Some users come to us and say, I can work. Then we ask, what exactly can you do? Word, Excel, Illustrator, Photoshop, what software can you use to adapt to desktop publishing?
				User's job/task preference	Ask user's preference	Therefore we do not force someone to do job they do not wish to do.
						When assigning people to some certain job, we are asking what you can do and what are you good at, or what you don't like.
						But more importantly, we try to see whether they like the task or not.
					Similar to future aspirations	In the case of Type A, if they are in the preparatory stage to get fully employed. That's why, we try to assign them jobs similar to what they hope to do in the future.
				User's nature of disability	Assign work to degree of disability	So we assign the work to the people according to the degree of disability and the area of what they are good at.
						I'm not sure if this is a good example, but there's a person who's not good at communicating with people and have hearing disabilities. When we explain and give leading instruction, that person stay very much focused on the packaging…
			Interpersonal circumstances	User relationship dynamics	Pay attention to chemistry between users	If one person is quite talkative and straightforward, but that straightforwardness sometimes could hurt others. And there's this not talkative and not straightforward person. We won't put them together
			Workload consideration	Seasonal task/job demand	Move user to other group when busy	but only if the season making the business a little busy, it is also possible to bring them in to [different] team and differently loaded under the supervision of staff members

Table 2
Summary of Data Structure (continued)

HRM Practices	Theme	Target user	Category	Focused code	Initial code	Quotation samples
Task/job design and assignment	**Assignment criteria**	Type B	Accommodating individual circumstances	User's capability - Negative	Users are not skilled, not capable,	The original starting point was, everyone could not do the task. If our users are skilled enough, we can just simply tell them what the clients want us to do, and they can do that
					Thinking is constraint	They have to think. That's the constraint for them.
				User's capability - Positive	Divide work by skill	Most people in the aged group, since they already have experience, most of them actually work in the woodwork and handle order-made orders..
				User's job/task preference	Check like/dislike	We also check their likes or dislikes. Some people really like to inspect clothing, they enjoy it..
						Everyday, I will check with the person what they would like to do, what they want to do...
					Ask Type B user's preference	But most of the times when they come, for B type users, we ask, like, are you interested in any of our activities?
					Always respect user's decision	Again, we have to respect their decisions, each user's decisions. That's a difficult point.
						Even though we are concerned about, this person might be difficult to do this one, we never decline their request
				User's nature of disability	Consider user's disability	Most of the designers are working from home, because most of them are having mental disabilities.
						I need to also consider the specific features of the disability itself. What kind of disabilities they have and other characteristics of the disability, what is suitable and what can be done, or maybe difficult, and so on

Table 2
Summary of Data Structure (continued)

HRM Practices	Theme	Target user	Category	Focused code	Initial code	Quotation samples
Sought specifications	Specifications	Type A	General premise	No skill required	No skill required	We're not really requesting these people with disabilities to have specific skills,
			Interpersonal skill	Communicative	Able to communicate with others	but we ask them whether they can communicate with us or they have motivation to work. These two things are very important to us whether to hire them
					Human skill/personality over working skill	It's very difficult to find people with both. So what we look at is human skill or personality
				Cooperative	Wants user everybody can work with	We want to hire somebody who everybody wants to work with
			Work attitude	Able to process instruction	Able to process instruction	If that person doesn't accept the instruction they cannot improve. They become like rebellious, which is a bad situation.
				Independent	Able to manage work themselves	To be honest, I must say I'm not doing well with human resource management. So, people who have to be managed by others are not suitable to work here.
				Willing to work	Have motivation to work	or they have motivation to work. These two things are very important to us whether to hire them.
					Have willingness to work	But the most important thing is whether that person is willing to work.
			Work skill	Fulfill employment contract	(Potential) Able to fulfill minimum working hours	people who can come to work 20 hours per week in a stable manner. So 4 hours a day for 5 days a week. Even if the candidate say I couldn't work for 20 hrs a week, but we see some potential, we may hire.
						For Type A, they have to at least have the minimum requirement to receive minimum wage

Table 2
Summary of Data Structure (continued)

HRM Practices	Theme	Target user	Category	Focused code	Initial code	Quotation samples
Sought specifications	Specifications	Type B	General premise	Accept anybody	Accept anybody	There's no specific people that we're looking for. We want anybody to come
						So everyone will be welcomed to start here. I will accept everyone
						So basically, as I explained, anybody is okay. We accept anybody
				No skill required	No skill required	What I'm looking at users for type B is, I don't care about whether the person can do some work or not, or have certain skills or not. I don't care
			Interpersonal skill	Harmonious	Not creating trouble > able to work	More important is the harmony with other users, the balance with other users, not causing trouble or stress to other users
					Able to fit in > able to work	Within the existing members, if one outrageous member joining, as you can imagine things gets really messed up if that person does not fit. If it is a good stimulus, then it is welcomed. But if it's negative, even if we know that that person have a high capacity of doing job, we turn down.
				Have basic manner	Gentle, kind person	Gentle, kind person. That's it. People who can say thank you, sorry, itadakimasu, gochisousama.. I think it is critical, honestly, because I think it is important to thank things, and to say sorry when you make mistakes.
				Attentive	Willing to listen	And when the six of them said how he or she is willing to listen to others, that I would hire. ..or listen to what others say
			Work attitude	Enthusiastic	Loves the job	We are focus on whether they like their position or not, their love for the job
					Willing to get to know the Office	We highly evaluate the action, their behavior to investigate web page or job description and apply for a job. So I put priority on their behavior, or action.
			Self-management	Able to manage mental condition	Doesn't get restless all the time	or not irritated all the time, or very strained because of stress…..

Table 2
Summary of Data Structure (continued)

HRM Practices	Theme	Target user	Category	Focused code	Initial code	Quotation samples
Recruitment	Channels	Type A	Passive involvement	Referrals - Government body	Users asigned by advisor (Welfare Dept. at City govt.)	There are other routes too..One is adviser assigned by local government
				Referrals - Welfare provision body	Receive references from consultation support office	A bit complicated. We're Type A facility, so most of the candidates came from employment service center.
					Receive reference from hospital/group home/daycare/personal	as well as group home and daycare center ...reference from the hospital, daycare center, or somebody that we know.
			Active involvement	Public employment security office	Run job ads through Hello Work	Because we're Type A so we can also run job ads through Hello Work. In many cases now, they come to know this place from Hello Work
				Special Needs School	Visiting Special Needs School	We do both approaches. For example we're trying to go to their school, for people with the disabilities
				Through internet outreach	Going to social media	We're also proactively going to the social media, so they know the name of our company when they search on the internet.
					Utilizing company website	Our company website has a page of hiring or recruiting, so some people access to our website
		Type B	Active involvement	[SP] Job advertisement website	Publish job ads at recruitment website	In some cases, Type B users are kind of forced to work at places where they don't like. I don't think that would be sustainable way for them to work. I don't want to do that kind of thing. That's why we decided to use "I".
				Through internet outreach	User apply after visiting website	people do search on the internet. They found our website and they get to know that we are making paper

Table 2
Summary of Data Structure (continued)

HRM Practices	Theme	Target user	Category	Focused code	Initial code	Quotation samples
Recruitment	Channels	Type B	Passive involvement	Referrals - Government body	User assigned by advisor (Welfare Dept. at City govt.)	The users go to the welfare offices, or welfare section in the public offices, and the welfare office contact us. That's number one.
				Referrals - Welfare provision body	Receive references from consultation support office	And there are several consultation support companies, or organizations. So they sometimes give us the information. This person is looking for a job, why don't you interview them?
					Receive reference from hospital/group home/daycare/personal	We have community for people with disabilities, and I visited those community and asked them if they would like to work.
				Across-organization mobility path	User mover from other offices	Some are used to work at other facility, but it didn't work there so they came here
				Special Needs School	Receives graduates of special needs school	If they go to Special Needs school, and the school has a special connection with certain facility, the graduates from the Special Needs school could work at that facility. That's the common channel.
					Receives internship from special needs schools	You know, there is a kind of system, the second grade or the third grade of the special school would receive the training, the practical training. If they would like, they can keep working here
				Through pure chance	Uses applies through pure chance	Also some people are just having a walk and find us, and then they just came in and asking, can I join here?

Table 2
Summary of Data Structure (continued)

HRM Practices	Theme	Target user	Category	Focused code	Initial code	Quotation samples
Recruitment	Rejection by discretion	Type A	Lack of work attitude	Unwilling to work	Reject user who doesn't want to work at all	Some people actually don't want to work at all. They just want to be here, and actually they can't do any work. For those people, unfortunately we have to say no
			Lack of work skill	Unable to fulfill employment contract	Reject user who can't work at all	I then look at the skill they have, and if they cannot work at all, you know, the process work they are doing, if they cannot do that, we wouldn't hire that person.
					If user is unable to work 20h/week	Even if the candidate say I couldn't work for 20 hrs a week, but we see some potential, we may hire. But if it's absolutely difficult when we see them, we might have to decline.
			Lack of interpersonal skill	If user harm others	Reject user who harms other	or some people with mental disability do the harmful thing to others, so in that case we wouldn't hire those people.
				Not harmonious	Reject user who creates trouble	or creating trouble..only in this case we decline application we just accepted
				Not communicative	Reject user who can't communicate	Here is basically not declining application from anyone. Only when they're not able to communicate well, or creating trouble..only in this case we decline application we just accepted.
	Rejection by exception	Type A Type B	Unavailability	If disability needs extra medical attention	Allowed to reject user who needs special medical care	If an applicant has internal illness and requires some nursing support at our facility. Obviously we don't have them. In that case, we explain our situation and propose other sites that can provide some nursing care, we have to reject them. It's not like we can accept anybody who has disability.
				If Office's capacity is full	Allowed to reject user if full capacity	The first one is that when the capacity, user capacity is full. If we are not able to accept more due to the limited capacity of the staff members, then we can reject.
				If user`s residence is outside pick-up area	Allowed to reject user whose residence is off-limit	And also, if the area where the people are living are very far away from this place. It is not possible to pick them up and to bring them back home.

Table 2
Summary of Data Structure (continued)

HRM Practices	Type of mobility	Target user	Theme	Category	Focused code	Initial code	Quotation samples
User mobility	**Stay**	Type A	Necessary + Sufficient criteria	User's preference	User's preference	User may work until retirement	they're able to work as long as they wish
		Type B		User's profile	Aged user	Hard for elderly users to find other work	But the people who are elderly people, it's difficult for them to find a different working place…. I would like them to stay and work as long as they can
				User's preference	User's preference	User can stay as long as they want	It is not like we have to send them to the next step. If they want to stay, they can stay.
	Move	Type A Type B	Necessary + Sufficient criteria	User's decision	Accessibility/logistic reason	User moves to office closer to home	For example, one user who was coming here was on a wheelchair and he was coming by train..So he moved to a place which is closer to his neighborhood
					Prefer shorter working hours	Type A user moves to Office with shorter working hours	Type A requires a higher level, and there's a wide range of things happened in Type A. For example, having a mental disorder patient or user staying here for 7 hours might be a little bit tough, so other facilities will only give him 2 or 3 hours. So in that case, he might move over there.
				Office's discretion	Violent behavior	Let go users who are violent, makes trouble	The only reason they move to other Type B facility is because they have trouble in this facility. Only when they get wild or violent to other users, we have to let them go. It's a big no, I told this to everyone. Not immediately, though.
	Leave	Type A	Necessary + Sufficient criteria	Office discretion	User can't be contacted	Never fire user, unless can't be contacted	Although I mentioned that basically I will not fire people, but there are certain cases that I have to ask them to leave. For example, there are people who cannot get in touch or their contact is lost
					Lack of work attitude	Never fire user, unless they don't want to work	Or people who do not work at all, even to submit daily Report. At the end of the month they just write down something and get salary.
		Type B		User's decision	Deteriorating health	User may leave when condition worsens	and the 20% leaves this company because their worsening physical condition
					Unable to keep up with work	User may leave when overwhelmed with work	..people who cannot stay with us just quit. Because it's clear and fair here. If you can't do the light work inside, you have to quit. If you can't do the cleaning work outside, you have to quit.

Table 2
Summary of Data Structure (continued)

HRM Practices	Type of mobility	Target user	Theme	Category	Focused code	Initial code	Quotation samples
User mobility	Step-up	Type A	Assistance provided	Pre-mobility assistance	Customized training	Teach business manner	For those who want to work in regular company, we teach them business manners..
						Train to come to work in regular basis	but their issue was coming to work in regular basis. Like, stable working condition. Sometimes they failed to come to the shift. So we had interview, discussion, and gave support
					Connect	Accompany to visit Hello Work	So we went to Hello Work with him, and we recommended the job apparently suitable for him.
				Post-mobility assistance	Re-admittance	User may return after step-up	There are the case in the past, they decided to work at another company, and then they go there, but they decided, oh it is not my place. Then they came back.
		Type B	Assistance provided	Pre-mobility assistance	Customized training	Provide different training as necessary	Those who are young and willing to do different jobs, we encourage them to get employed in a different company. In that case, we will also provide different training menus for this person.
					Connect (with future employer)	Assist users in finding works	if they have a specific job they want to do, besides the businesses and activities I'm doing, then I will look for this kind of job and then take the users to this company or this place. So, like a bridging, to the next step or next job they want to do.
							Some people, even though they can't communicate well, they do want to move to regular company. In that case, we try to get an appropriate company for them.
				Post-mobility assistance	Monitoring	Help solve issues with new employer	And once they get a job, it doesn't mean goodbye. We also support them in a way so that they can retain the job for long time. Sometimes, once they got hired by the company, they face difficulties. At that time, we go with them to the company and try to solve the issues.
						Visit and check on users who stepped-up	I visit them once a month to see and to check whether they are doing okay and if they are still working.
					Re-admittance	User may come back	Of course you can go and try. And if it didn't work, you can come back here again. So that's also their choice.

Table 2
Summary of Data Structure (continued)

HRM Practices	Type of mobility	Target user	Theme	Category	Focused code	Initial code	Quotation samples
User mobility	**Step-up**	Type A	Necessary criteria	User's preference	User's preference	Respect user's decision to step-up	If somebody wants to leave here and work at another company, sometimes I feel, okay of course it is your decision
							Some of them finished working here, and if they want to they can transfer to private company
			Sufficient criteria	Interpersonal skill	Communicative	No issue with communication	There is one, I think. That person has no issue with communication skill
				Work skill	Fulfill minimum work requirement	User should coming to work regularly	but their issue was coming to work in regular basis. Like, stable working condition. Sometimes they failed to come to the shift. So we had interview, discussion, and gave support. So finally they're able to work for 20 hours a week
		Type B	Necessary + Sufficient criteria	Interpersonal skill	Communicative	Can greet other people, communicate	First of all, whether they can at least greet or communicate with other people.
					Cooperative	If user gets along well	The other thing is softskills, if they have good manner as people in the real world, and if they can consider other people, working along with them.
				Work skill	Skilled at task/job	Posses working technique	First of all the skill or technique of orchid making, like what so called the bending process
						Have trained or acquired working experience	For example, if they want to work in a restaurant, we would look for a restaurant that accept them twice or three times a week. They will start from there, and they will acquire experience, and if it's okay they will be employed full-time.
					Fulfill minimum work requirement	User should coming to work regularly	The criteria for whether it's right or not is, for example, that this person can work every day, they go to work every day
						User should able to fulfill contract	That's also the minimum requirements to work in companies, to be employed. This needs to be reached
				Self-management	Able to manage physical/mental condition	If mental status is stable	Also if their mental status does not frustrate them, there are ups and downs
					Independent	Able to commute to work	for example, that this person can work every day, they go to work every day. They can commute to work

Table 2
Summary of Data Structure (continued)

HRM Practices	Type of mobility	Target user	Theme	Category	Focused code	Initial code	Quotation samples
User mobility	**Internal step up**	Type A	Necessary criteria	User's preference	User's preference	To become staff is user's preference	The first thing is what the person wants to do, wants to be a user or wants to be a provider of support. Number one priority is whether they want to be a supporter. If it's not their preferences, we won't ask them whether they want to be or not.
			Sufficient criteria	Interpersonal skill	Attentive	If user is good at paying attention	If they're good at paying attention to others, then we ask their preference. Their choices on whether they're interested in becoming supervisor
				Work skill	Able to supervise	If user has skill to supervise	But there was some cases where the Type A person becomes a staff. But that comes down to skill and competency. The skills of supervising jobs of users
					Skilled at certain task/job	Noticed user's extraordinary skill	From the moment he joined our company we noticed that his skill is extraordinary, much much farther than the other workers
		Type B	Necessary + Sufficient criteria	Work attitude	Have staff mindset	User now needs to strict to themselves	And also their mindset also needs to change as staff member. Maybe there are things that are allowed as user. Becoming staff, they need to also be strict with themselves.
				Work skill	Able to provide instruction	User needs to learn how to instruct	So, they need to learn how to teach, the way of teaching. That's the new thing which they need to learn by becoming. That's one of the big challenges they face at the moment, by changing staff to be able to teach.

Table 2
Summary of Data Structure (continued)

HRM Practices	Type of mobility	Target user	Theme	Category	Focused code	Initial code	Quotation samples
User mobility	**Internal Shift BA**	Type B	Necessary + Sufficient criteria	Perceived ability	Feels ready for Type A task/job	If users believe they're ready	The most important criteria is that the if users believe that they are ready for the Type A work.
				Self-management	Able to manage physical/mental condition	When user's health recovers	When users heath recover and becomes in a condition to achieve employment contract and then they can switch from B to A.
						Some users only come to work at certain season	The first condition is that they could work 5 days a week regardless of the season. They are cases where users can come to work only in particular season, let's say, in spring or winter.
				Work skill	Able to do Type A task/job	Check if user is able to perform Type A task	In Type B, one person complete one thing. But Type A users work in assembly line. I need to check whether the user can do that or not
						User should be able to work independently	The second condition is that we monitor how they work. In some cases they talk too much while working, or they cannot have a potential to go out and work alone, I mean independently, in that case we candidly talk with them about their situation, the negative aspects of their working.
					Fulfill minimum work requirement	Able to coming to work regularly	If your condition improved, as time passes, you started from 3 days a week. But in 2 years if you become able to work 5 days then you can switch to Type A.
	Internal Shift AB	Type A	Necessary + Sufficient criteria	User's decision	Deteriorating health	Health as reason to shift to Type B	If the users of Type A cannot control their health well, in that case they switch to Type B so that they can work in a more relaxed environment
					Unable to fulfill minimum working hours	Shift to Type B because feels troubled	Mainly people who went to Type A and have a little bit trouble, they shifted to Type B… In this company, if you can work more than 20 hours a week, you go with Type A. If it's less than 20 hours, it's Type B.
	Shift BA	Type B	Necessary + Sufficient criteria	Work skill	Skilled at task/job	Skilled user can shift to Type A	I think it's because of the skills... So as long as they have skills, they come to us and say they want to move to different places. But usually we don't propose them to move to different locations, even though we have to actually.

Table 3
Summary of User Mobility Paths

Mobility type	Across types of Office	Across organization	User's new status
Stay	No	No	User
Internal shift-AB	Yes, A to B	No	User
Internal shift-BA	Yes, B to A	No	User
Internal step-up	No	No	Staff
Shift-BA	Yes, B to A	Yes	User
Step-up	No	Yes	Staff
Move	No	Yes	User
Leave	Unclear	Unclear	Unclear