
Managerial Working Hours and Heavy Workloads

Kazuya Ogura

The Japan Institute for Labour Policy and Training

This article uses microdata from the Japan Institute for Labour Policy and Training to explore the factors that might affect the long working hours and heavy workloads of management staff in Japan. Compared with rank-and-file employees, low-ranking section managers and middle management department managers have longer average working hours, and even when the effects of various attributes were kept constant, it was found that persons in managerial positions worked somewhat longer hours. Further, this article examines differences within management. In order to consider the issue of managing supervisors, who are excluded from the application of company-controlled working hours, this article studies the effects that their freedom to decide their office arrival and departure times has on their heavy workloads, but our analysis found that this factor has no influence. Regardless of whether they can freely decide their office arrival and departure times, many people in managerial positions work long hours, and one might speculate that their exclusion from the application of controlled working hours as managing supervisors has very little meaning in reality, in the sense of any autonomous selection of the length of their working hours. Meanwhile, it was found that personnel-related work such as recruitment and placement affected management's heavy workloads. This point can be considered an issue that is unique to management and is not seen among rank-and-file employees.

I. Nominal Management

Article 41, Item (ii) of the Labor Standards Act sets forth a working-hour exemption for managing supervisors. Since a company, in principle, is not required to pay these persons for overtime work, except for late-night work, it can save labor costs by making them work long hours (See Yashiro [2009]). Whether convenience store managers or fast-food restaurant managers fall under this category was a significant issue in the past, and even today, this issue of “nominal management” is featured in the news from time to time (See Ouchi [2008] and K. Takahashi [2005]).

According to the Basic Survey on Wage Structure (2008), the total number of persons in non-managerial positions and those at the levels of assistant manager, section manager, and department manager came to 11,600,970 among corporations with a workforce of 100 or more. Of this total, persons at the section manager level came to 907,820, accounting for 7.8% of the total, and those at the department manager level came to 380,720, accounting for 3.3%.¹ Needless to say, section managers and department managers in this survey are

¹ In the Basic Survey on Wage Structure, the definitions of “people at the department manager level” are as follows: (i) people who are in a position of what is called department (bureau) manager, who control, coordinate and supervise business and technical teams that are engaged in business

not necessarily the same as the managing supervisors provided for in the Labor Standards Act and in administrative notifications. It is likely that there are considerable numbers of people who are put in managerial positions by their companies, but who, in reality, cannot be described as being managing supervisors. That is to say that many such persons are a part of the “nominal management.”²

It is difficult to determine the exact number or percentage of persons in nominal management, as there has been no survey that addresses this issue. That said, it would be difficult to conduct such a survey in the first place, since it would require capturing the diverse realities of management, such as the job descriptions, authority, work hours, and treatment of such managers, with a high level of reliability.

Fortunately, there is a survey that was conducted with this issue in mind, a survey by the Japan Personnel Research Institute (2005), which sent out survey forms to the human resources departments and managing supervisors at 10,000 business establishments. While the collection rates were low—6.9% for survey forms for business establishments (human resources departments) and 6.8% for survey forms for managing supervisors—possibly due to a deterioration in the survey environment in recent years, the survey form was well thought out by legal, human resources, and labor experts.

The Japan Personnel Research Institute (2005) looked at the proportion of “management” who fell under the category of managing supervisors as set forth in Article 41, Item (ii) of the Labor Standards Act. It then divided them into persons in line jobs and staff jobs, and asked human resources departments about their numbers, their authority (type of business operation and extent of involvement), assessment of their working hours, their wages, etc. In addition, it asked managing supervisors about the extent of their involvement in business operations, their working hours, their income, etc.

This survey noted the following points as its main results (Japan Personnel Research Institute 2005):

- (i) Most section managers and higher-ranking managers were said to be “managing su-

management, including sales, human resources, accounting, production, research and analysis, and who are engaged in the operation of the departments for which they are responsible, as well as persons who are engaged in duties of equivalent responsibility and importance; and (ii) people who are usually referred to as “department manager” or “bureau manager” in their business establishments, and who head a team comprising two or more sections, or a team with 20 or more members (including the department or bureau manager). Similarly, the definitions of “people at the section manager level” are as follows: (i) people who are in a position of what is called section manager, who control, coordinate, and supervise business and technical teams that are engaged in business management, including sales, human resources, accounting, production, research and analysis, and who are engaged in the operation of the departments for which they are responsible, as well as people who are engaged in duties of equivalent responsibility and importance; and (ii) people who are usually referred to as “section manager” in their business establishments, and who head a team comprising two or more sub-sections, or a team with 10 or more members (including the section manager).

² Oi (2005) showed the paucity of line managers from official statistics.

pervisors” (74% according to the survey of business establishments and 85% according to the survey of managing supervisors).

- (ii) Assistant department managers and higher-ranking managers held authority regarding important decisions at their business establishments, while persons at the section manager level were involved in the decision process (but not the decision itself). Meanwhile, authority over matters concerning the status of workers (subordinates) and decisions on their working conditions was held by persons at the department manager level or higher.
- (iii) At least 90% of business establishments kept track of management’s office arrival and departure times, irrespective of whether they were line managers or staff managers.
- (iv) In the survey of managing supervisors, 54% responded that attendance was a subject of discipline and penalties.
- (v) Overall, the working hours of managing supervisors were not excessively long, and there was little late-night work.
- (vi) The issue of whether executive perquisites were paid was not unique to managing supervisors; it was also seen among managers who were not managing supervisors.
- (vii) An analysis of 29 judicial cases found that treatment which gave a person a comparative advantage over rank-and-file employees was considered important as a criterion for judging whether he/she was a managing supervisor, while freedom of time management was a secondary criterion.

The survey by the Japan Personnel Research Institute (2005) is excellent in that it reveals the specific characteristics of persons in nominal management. While many people understand that the tasks involved in management are varied, few are actually aware of their details.

The survey data used in this article has the following three advantages over those used in the Japan Personnel Research Institute’s survey. The first advantage is the large survey size: questionnaires were mailed to a research company’s paid survey-takers, with 8,000 subjects at the time of sampling. The second advantage is the decent sampling and collection conditions: 8,000 survey-takers were extracted³ from a total of approximately 300,000 people⁴ so as to match Japan’s overall structure, and the simple collection rate came to 88.2%.⁵ Third, the survey asked about the characteristics of management roles,

³ This corresponded to the gender and age bracket distribution of “employees” who are “mostly working” aged 20-59 according to the 2005 national census. For details, see the Japan Institute for Labour Policy and Training (2009).

⁴ The parameters of the paid survey-takers were roughly in line with Japan’s demographic structure.

⁵ Of the collected responses, those of 6,430 survey-takers were used in the survey after excluding respondents who were judged as not being “regular employees” at the time of the survey. For details, see the Japan Institute for Labour Policy and Training (2009).

such as freedom in office arrival and departure times and the degree of involvement in personnel matters. The main themes of this survey (Japan Institute for Labour Policy and Training 2009) were regular employees' working hours and workplace flexibility; however, since there was also an interest in the issue of nominal management that has emerged in recent years, a few related questions were included as well.

This article uses individual data from the survey by the Japan Institute for Labour Policy and Training (2009) and, instead of merely looking at nominal titles such as section manager and department manager, aims to explore factors that might affect managerial working hours and heavy workloads by shedding light on the relationship between positions and degrees of job discretion, workplace flexibility, freedom of deciding office arrival and departure times, and degrees of involvement in personnel matters. It is clear that management cannot be lumped together, a point that was actually confirmed by the Japan Personnel Research Institute (2005); however, since there are few similar research projects,⁶ estimating the types of management that exist in Japan as a whole and their numbers, as well as finding out the actual working hours and affecting factors, is a certain contribution to discussions on management.

II. Diversity of Management

The survey by the Japan Institute for Labour Policy and Training (2009) divided position titles into five classifications: (i) rank-and-file employee, (ii) assistant manager/supervisor, (iii) section manager level, (iv) department manager level, and (v) other (board member, etc.). The breakdown of the 6,430 respondents were: (i) 61.8%, (ii) 23.0%, (iii) 9.8%, (iv) 3.9%, and (v) 1.5%.⁷ Persons falling under the three categories of (iii), (iv) and (v) were asked the question: "Does your company's system allow you to freely decide your office arrival and departure times?" The choices of answers were "Yes, it does" or "No, it does not." Persons who responded "yes" were further asked the question: "In that case, do you actually decide your office arrival and departure times by yourself?" The choices of answers were "Yes, I do" or "No, I do not." In addition, persons falling under (iii), (iv), and (v) were asked about their degree of involvement in personnel matters. With regard to each

⁶ Y. Takahashi (2005) looked at the relationship between unpaid overtime work and people at the section manager level with subordinates, people at the assistant department manager level, and people at the department manager level. Ogura (2007) examined the long work hours of workers with a relaxed system of time management such as those in managerial positions and those working under a discretionary labor system. Ogura and Fujimoto (2007) looked at the worker demographic that might become subject to white collar exemptions by income bracket. Kuroda and Yamamoto (2009) focused on white collar exemptions and analyzed, from panel data, the impact of working hour regulations on the working hours and wages of management, etc.

⁷ People in the position of board member, etc. were excluded from further calculation and analysis due to the difficulty of judging whether they were employed.

of (a) recruitment of regular employees, (b) placement of regular employees, (c) recruitment of non-regular employees, and (d) placement of non-regular employees, they were asked to choose one from among four choices: “heavily involved,” “somewhat involved,” “not very involved,” or “not involved.” Furthermore, they were asked the question: “Do you receive management perquisites?” Of the choices “Yes, I do” and “No, I do not,” those who responded “yes” were further asked: “How much do you receive per month?” and were asked to enter the specific amount in units of 10,000 yen.

Table 1 through Table 8 show the results of cross tabulation regarding the above. In Table 1, 73.9% of people at the section manager level and 63.0% of people at the department manager level responded that they were not able to freely decide their office arrival and departure times. Since these responses were judged by the workers themselves, it was not clear whether they really were not free to decide this under their companies’ personnel systems. Table 1-1, which was added as a supplement, shows that many respondents at the section manager and department manager levels said they worked under an “ordinary working hour system,” while few responded that their “company does not control workers’ hours” which was the expected response from managing supervisors. Even so, since these were responses from individuals, there remained a possibility that they were not consistent with their actual treatment under the personnel system (in which they were treated as “managing supervisors” in accordance with laws, notifications, and judicial precedent). Nevertheless, in reality, many people in managerial positions believed that they were not working under a system in which they were able to freely decide their office arrival and departure times.

Table 2, which focuses only on those respondents who responded “yes” in Table 1, shows that 58.4% of people at the section manager level and 59.1% of people at the department manager level actually decided their office arrival and departure times freely. Thus, just under 60% of those who were able to freely decide their office arrival and departure times under their company systems responded that they actually did so.

Table 3 through Table 6 show degrees of involvement concerning the recruitment and placement of regular and non-regular employees. Throughout the four tables, it is evident that people at the department manager level responded that they were “heavily involved” or “somewhat involved” in higher percentages than people at the section manager level. While the extent of the authority of the management is likely to differ from company to company, this result is consistent with common belief.

In Table 7, which focuses on whether the subjects received management perquisites, no large difference was found between people at the section manager level and the department manager level, with the majority responding that they received such perks. Table 8, which shows the distribution of the amount of management perquisites among those who received such perks, reveals higher percentages at the section manager level for the relatively lower amounts of “less than 30,000 yen” and “less than 50,000 yen,” while higher percentages for higher amounts of “100,000 yen or more” were revealed at the department

Table 1. Does Your Company's System Allow You to Freely Decide Your Office Arrival and Departure Times? (%)

	Yes, it does.	No, it does not.	Total	N
Section manager level	26.1	73.9	100.0	(621)
Department manager level	37.0	63.0	100.0	(243)
Total	29.2	70.8	100.0	(864)

Table 1-1. What Is the Working Hour System at Your Workplace? (%)

	Rank-and-file employees	Assistant managers/supervisors	Section manager level	Department manager level	Total
Ordinary working hour system (In the case where none of the choices at right are applicable)	70.3	68.4	66.1	63.7	69.2
Flex-time	9.0	11.2	14.2	12.2	10.2
Variable working hour system	3.3	3.6	1.1	4.1	3.2
Shift system	12.5	10.0	2.9	1.2	10.5
Discretionary labor system/ conclusive presumption system	3.3	4.4	5.0	4.5	3.8
Company does not control workers' hours	1.5	2.4	10.7	14.3	3.1
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
N	(3885)	(1447)	(619)	(245)	(6196)

Table 2. Do You Actually Decide Your Office Arrival and Departure Times by Yourself? (%)

	Yes, I do.	No, I do not.	Total	N
Section manager level	58.4	41.6	100.0	(161)
Department manager level	59.1	40.9	100.0	(88)
Total	58.6	41.4	100.0	(249)

Table 3. Degree of Involvement in the Recruitment of Regular Employees (%)

	Heavily involved	Somewhat involved	Not very involved	Not involved	Total	N
Section manager level	9.7	15.9	15.9	58.4	100.0	(616)
Department manager level	32.2	26.9	12.4	28.5	100.0	(242)
Total	16.1	19.0	14.9	50.0	100.0	(858)

Table 4. Degree of Involvement in the Placement of Regular Employees (%)

	Heavily involved	Somewhat involved	Not very involved	Not involved	Total	N
Section manager level	9.3	25.1	18.8	46.8	100.0	(613)
Department manager level	31.8	36.4	12.0	19.8	100.0	(242)
Total	15.7	28.3	16.8	39.2	100.0	(855)

Table 5. Degree of Involvement in the Recruitment of Non-Regular Employees (%)

	Heavily involved	Somewhat involved	Not very involved	Not involved	Total	N
Section manager level	14.0	21.7	13.4	50.9	100.0	(613)
Department manager level	30.8	26.3	14.2	28.8	100.0	(240)
Total	18.8	23.0	13.6	44.7	100.0	(853)

Table 6. Degree of Involvement in the Placement of Non-Regular Employees (%)

	Heavily involved	Somewhat involved	Not very involved	Not involved	Total	N
Section manager level	13.4	23.4	14.9	48.4	100.0	(612)
Department manager level	30.3	27.4	15.8	26.6	100.0	(241)
Total	18.2	24.5	15.1	42.2	100.0	(853)

Table 7. Do You Receive Management Perquisites? (%)

	Yes, I do.	No, I do not.	Total	N
Section manager level	58.0	42.0	100.0	(621)
Department manager level	54.3	45.7	100.0	(245)
Total	56.9	43.1	100.0	(866)

Table 8. The Amount of Management Perquisites (%)

	Less than ¥30,000	Less than ¥50,000	Less than ¥100,000	¥100,000 or more	Total	N
Section manager level	16.9	26.2	40.2	16.6	100.0	(343)
Department manager level	6.3	15.7	44.9	33.1	100.0	(127)
Total	14.0	23.4	41.5	21.1	100.0	(470)

manager level. However, as pointed out by the Japan Personnel Research Institute (2005), since the issue of whether a person receives management perquisites and their amount requires relative comparisons with employees in other positions within the company, data in this item should be regarded more as reference indicators.

III. Decision on Office Arrival and Departure Times

Table 9 compares the total actual working hours by position. The average hours were longer as the positions became higher. The percentages of people at the section manager level and department manager level working shorter hours of “80-160 hours” and “161-180 hours” were relatively low; on the other hand, they were high for longer hours of “221-240 hours,” “241-280 hours,” and “281 hours or more.”

Next, Table 10 shows the total actual working hours of people at the section manager and department manager levels in combination with the question on office arrival and departure times described earlier. Those who were allowed to freely decide their office arrival and departure times under the company system and actually did so fell under “I am free to decide,” those who were allowed to decide under the company system but did not actually do so fell under “I am free to decide, but do not,” and those who were not allowed to decide under the company system fell under “I am not free to decide.” The average hours were slightly longer for people at the section manager level who responded “I am free to decide”

Table 9. Distribution of Total Actual Monthly Working Hours by Position (%)

	80-160 hours	161-180 hours	181-200 hours	201-220 hours	221-240 hours	241-280 hours	281 hours or more	Total	N	Average (hours)
Rank-and-file employees	11.8	25.0	23.1	15.7	9.1	8.9	6.4	100.0	(3653)	203.5
Assistant managers/supervisors	10.3	22.1	23.0	16.9	9.8	10.9	6.9	100.0	(1393)	206.5
Section manager level	7.3	17.5	20.8	21.3	13.0	12.0	8.0	100.0	(600)	213.6
Department manager level	7.7	15.9	18.9	24.9	10.7	12.0	9.9	100.0	(233)	216.1
Total	10.8	23.2	22.7	16.9	9.7	9.8	6.8	100.0	(5879)	205.8

Note: The table shows the total actual working hours for the month of July 2008, including overtime work, etc. (hours worked beyond scheduled working hours, hours worked from home, etc.)

Table 10. Distribution of Total Actual Monthly Working Hours of Management by Freedom of Office Arrival and Departure Times (%)

	80-160 hours	161-180 hours	181-200 hours	201-220 hours	221-240 hours	241-280 hours	281 hours or more	Total	N	Average (hours)
<i>Section manager level</i>										
I am free to decide	8.6	15.1	19.4	21.5	16.1	9.7	9.7	100.0	(93)	216.3
I am free to decide, but do not	9.4	9.4	23.4	29.7	9.4	14.1	4.7	100.0	(64)	212.5
I am not free to decide	6.8	19.3	20.9	20.0	12.9	12.0	8.2	100.0	(441)	213.0
Total	7.4	17.6	20.9	21.2	13.0	11.9	8.0	100.0	(598)	213.5
<i>Department manager level</i>										
I am free to decide	16.3	14.3	12.2	22.4	10.2	16.3	8.2	100.0	(49)	210.8
I am free to decide, but do not	2.9	28.6	11.4	31.4	8.6	2.9	14.3	100.0	(35)	212.7
I am not free to decide	5.6	14.0	21.0	25.2	11.9	13.3	9.1	100.0	(143)	218.7
Total	7.5	16.3	17.6	25.6	11.0	12.3	9.7	100.0	(227)	216.1

Notes: 1. Same as Table 9.

2. See the main text with regard to freedom of office arrival and departure times.

and, on the contrary, for people at the department manager level who responded “I am not free to decide.” While the distribution of total actual working hours of people at the section manager level failed to show a clear difference, people at the department manager level who responded “I am free to decide” showed a high percentage in the shortest “80-160 hours” category.

Frankly speaking, Table 10 fails to show a clear trend. This means that whether or not management staff can freely decide their office arrival and departure times is unlikely to have a strong influence on their working hours. Could there be other characteristics of management that might affect working hours? Table 11 and Table 12 were designed to answer this question.

Table 11 shows working hours by the degree of job discretion. The degree of job discretion was judged by asking the question “How much discretion do you have in deciding your work schedule and protocol?” Four answers were available: “A high degree,” “some degree,” “not much,” or “very little.” Since this question is applicable to rank-and-file employees and assistant managers/supervisors as well, the results are shown for all positions.

By position, among the rank-and-file employees, no clear difference could be found in terms of average hours or distribution of total actual working hours. Among assistant managers/supervisors, the average hours of those who responded “very little” appeared to be slightly shorter. Among people at the section manager level, those who responded “a high degree” and “some degree” showed slightly higher percentages in the “80-160 hours” category, while those who responded “not much” or “very little” showed higher percentages in the longer categories of “221-240 hours,” “241-280 hours,” and “281 hours or more.” The average hours of those who responded “very little” also appeared to be longer. The picture was somewhat different for people at the department manager level; while those who responded “a high degree” showed a higher percentage in the short-hour category, those who responded “some degree” as well as “not much” showed higher percentages in the longer categories.

Compared to the freedom to decide office arrival and departure times, it seems that the degree of job discretion was on the whole more closely related to the length of working hours of people at the section manager and department manager levels. In particular, for people at the section manager level, those who responded as having lower degrees of discretion in deciding their work schedules and protocols tended to work longer hours.

Table 12 shows working hours by the possibility of performing job duties in places other than the office (or “workplace flexibility,” below). This was judged by asking the question “To what degree is it possible for you to perform your job duties in places other than the office, such as at home, on the train, or in a coffee shop?” The four possible answers were: “A high degree,” “some degree,” “not much,” or “virtually impossible.” The results for this question are also shown for all positions.

Among rank-and-file employees, assistant managers/supervisors and people at the department manager level, those who responded “a high degree” showed the longest average

Table 11. Distribution of Total Actual Monthly Working Hours by Degree of Job Discretion (%)

	80-160 hours	161-180 hours	181-200 hours	201-220 hours	221-240 hours	241-280 hours	281 hours or more	Total	N	Average (hours)
<i>Rank-and-file employees</i>										
A high degree	10.8	25.0	22.0	14.2	11.0	10.5	6.4	100.0	(591)	206.0
Some degree	12.2	25.5	23.0	16.9	8.2	8.3	5.9	100.0	(1885)	201.6
Not much	11.9	24.1	24.1	14.3	9.4	9.4	6.7	100.0	(847)	204.3
Very little	11.0	23.9	23.6	15.1	10.1	8.5	7.9	100.0	(318)	207.9
Total	11.8	25.0	23.2	15.7	9.1	8.9	6.4	100.0	(3641)	203.5
<i>Assistant managers/supervisors</i>										
A high degree	10.5	19.6	23.5	16.9	10.8	11.4	7.2	100.0	(332)	206.7
Some degree	10.6	22.8	22.6	17.0	9.7	10.4	6.9	100.0	(795)	206.9
Not much	8.0	22.6	23.6	17.5	9.4	12.3	6.6	100.0	(212)	206.3
Very little	14.3	28.6	26.5	10.2	4.1	10.2	6.1	100.0	(49)	198.0
Total	10.3	22.2	23.1	16.8	9.7	11.0	6.9	100.0	(1388)	206.5
<i>Section manager level</i>										
A high degree	8.8	17.5	21.7	21.2	11.1	11.5	8.3	100.0	(217)	214.4
Some degree	7.3	16.5	19.9	23.1	13.3	13.0	7.0	100.0	(316)	212.6
Not much	4.2	20.8	29.2	10.4	12.5	12.5	10.4	100.0	(48)	214.6
Very little	0.0	23.5	5.9	23.5	29.4	0.0	17.6	100.0	(17)	219.6
Total	7.4	17.4	20.9	21.4	12.9	12.0	8.0	100.0	(598)	213.6
<i>Department manager level</i>										
A high degree	11.6	13.2	17.8	21.7	14.7	14.0	7.0	100.0	(129)	211.9
Some degree	3.3	18.7	20.9	29.7	4.4	9.9	13.2	100.0	(91)	221.1
Not much	0.0	23.1	15.4	23.1	15.4	7.7	15.4	100.0	(13)	221.7
Very little	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Total	7.7	15.9	18.9	24.9	10.7	12.0	9.9	100.0	(233)	216.1

Notes: 1. Same as Table 9.

2. See the main text with regard to the degrees of job discretion.

Table 12. Distribution of Total Actual Monthly Working Hours by the Degree of Possibility of Performing Job Duties in Places Other Than the Office (%)

	80-160 hours	161-180 hours	181-200 hours	201-220 hours	221-240 hours	241-280 hours	281 hours or more	Total	N	Average (hours)
<i>Rank-and-file employees</i>										
A high degree	12.9	13.7	23.4	14.5	12.9	11.3	11.3	100.0	(124)	215.1
Some degree	12.6	22.4	22.9	16.0	10.0	10.0	6.1	100.0	(689)	203.7
Not much	10.3	24.9	24.1	18.2	8.1	8.6	5.8	100.0	(892)	203.5
Virtually impossible	12.1	26.6	23.0	14.5	9.0	8.5	6.3	100.0	(1925)	202.6
Total	11.8	25.0	23.3	15.7	9.1	8.9	6.3	100.0	(3630)	203.4
<i>Assistant managers/supervisors</i>										
A high degree	12.1	13.6	21.2	25.8	4.5	13.6	9.1	100.0	(66)	213.8
Some degree	10.4	20.5	23.4	16.9	11.9	11.6	5.3	100.0	(337)	205.0
Not much	7.2	23.6	24.8	16.2	7.6	11.6	9.0	100.0	(432)	210.7
Virtually impossible	12.7	23.0	21.9	16.3	10.7	9.6	6.0	100.0	(553)	203.1
Total	10.4	22.1	23.1	16.9	9.7	10.9	6.9	100.0	(1388)	206.4
<i>Section manager level</i>										
A high degree	5.7	14.3	34.3	14.3	8.6	11.4	11.4	100.0	(35)	214.7
Some degree	8.5	16.1	20.1	25.1	10.1	12.6	7.5	100.0	(199)	212.3
Not much	6.0	19.4	19.9	18.9	13.4	13.4	9.0	100.0	(201)	215.5
Virtually impossible	8.0	17.3	20.4	21.6	16.0	9.9	6.8	100.0	(162)	212.7
Total	7.4	17.4	20.9	21.4	12.7	12.1	8.0	100.0	(597)	213.6
<i>Department manager level</i>										
A high degree	9.1	27.3	0.0	0.0	45.5	0.0	18.2	100.0	(11)	224.0
Some degree	9.6	14.5	19.3	26.5	9.6	10.8	9.6	100.0	(83)	213.2
Not much	5.1	14.1	17.9	29.5	6.4	17.9	9.0	100.0	(78)	219.1
Virtually impossible	8.3	16.7	23.3	21.7	11.7	8.3	10.0	100.0	(60)	215.4
Total	7.8	15.5	19.0	25.0	10.8	12.1	9.9	100.0	(232)	216.3

Notes: 1. Same as Table 9.

2. See the main text with regard to the degrees of possibility of performing job duties in places other than the office.

hours. With regard to people at the department manager level, however, it might be better to reserve judgment, as the sample size was small. Among people at the section manager level, while those who responded “a high degree” did not show the longest average hours, they showed higher percentages in the longer categories of “241-280 hours” and “281 hours or more.” These results indicate a trend of those who responded that they were able to perform work in places other than the office tending to work longer hours.

From these results, it can be speculated that characteristics such as the degree of job discretion and workplace flexibility have a greater influence on the length of working hours than the freedom to decide office arrival and departure times.

IV. Degree of Involvement in Personnel Matters

Next, we looked at the influence of the degree of involvement in the recruitment and placement of regular and non-regular employees on working hours. Table 13 shows the total actual working hours by degree of involvement in the recruitment of regular employees. Among people at the section manager level, those who responded that they were “not very involved” showed the longest average hours and a relatively high percentage in the “241-280 hours” category. Among people at the department manager level, those who responded that they were “heavily involved” showed the longest average hours and a slightly higher percentage in the “281 hours or more” category.

Table 14 shows working hours by degree of involvement in the placement of regular employees. The trend was similar to that of Table 13; among people at the section manager level, those who responded that they were “not very involved” showed the longest average hours, as did people at the department manager level who responded that they were “heavily involved.”

Table 15 shows working hours by degree of involvement in the recruitment of non-regular employees. The trend was also similar to that of Table 13; among people at the section manager level, those who responded that they were “not very involved” showed the longest average hours, as did people at the department manager level who responded that they were “heavily involved.”

Table 16 shows working hours by degree of involvement in the placement of non-regular employees. Again, the trend was similar to that of Table 13; among people at the section manager level, those who responded that they were “not very involved” and among people at the department manager level, those who responded that they were “heavily involved” showed the longest average hours.

The results that people at the department manager level who were “heavily involved” in the recruitment and placement of regular and non-regular employees tended to work longer hours make it possible to assume some manner of cause-and-effect relationship. That is, there is a possibility that work related to personnel matters is making people at the department manager level work longer hours. However, the same cannot be said for people

Table 13. Distribution of Total Actual Monthly Working Hours by the Degree of Involvement in the Recruitment of Regular Employees (%)

	80-160 hrs	161-180	181-200	201-220	221-240	241-280	+ 281	Total	N	Average (hrs)
<i>Section manager level</i>										
Heavily involved	8.5	20.3	15.3	22.0	10.2	13.6	10.2	100.0	(59)	214.4
Somewhat involved	5.2	15.5	20.6	21.6	16.5	12.4	8.2	100.0	(97)	217.7
Not very involved	8.6	10.8	21.5	16.1	15.1	20.4	7.5	100.0	(93)	220.2
Not involved	7.5	19.4	21.7	22.3	12.2	9.0	7.8	100.0	(345)	210.4
Total	7.4	17.5	20.9	21.2	13.1	11.8	8.1	100.0	(594)	213.5
<i>Department manager level</i>										
Heavily involved	6.9	15.3	12.5	20.8	15.3	15.3	13.9	100.0	(72)	224.8
Somewhat involved	8.1	9.7	24.2	29.0	9.7	12.9	6.5	100.0	(62)	213.7
Not very involved	3.3	10.0	20.0	36.7	16.7	6.7	6.7	100.0	(30)	217.1
Not involved	9.2	26.2	18.5	21.5	4.6	10.8	9.2	100.0	(65)	207.1
Total	7.4	16.2	18.3	25.3	10.9	12.2	9.6	100.0	(229)	215.8

Note: Same as Table 9.

Table 14. Distribution of Total Actual Monthly Working Hours by the Degree of Involvement in the Placement of Regular Employees (%)

	80-160 hrs	161-180	181-200	201-220	221-240	241-280	+ 281	Total	N	Average (hrs)
<i>Section manager level</i>										
Heavily involved	5.3	14.0	17.5	31.6	12.3	8.8	10.5	100.0	(57)	220.5
Somewhat involved	7.5	16.3	22.4	21.1	13.6	10.9	8.2	100.0	(147)	212.9
Not very involved	7.1	13.4	17.9	15.2	15.2	21.4	9.8	100.0	(112)	225.8
Not involved	8.0	20.7	21.8	21.8	12.0	9.1	6.5	100.0	(275)	207.1
Total	7.4	17.6	20.8	21.3	13.0	11.8	8.0	100.0	(591)	213.4
<i>Department manager level</i>										
Heavily involved	9.7	15.3	13.9	20.8	15.3	13.9	11.1	100.0	(72)	219.4
Somewhat involved	3.7	11.0	23.2	28.0	11.0	14.6	8.5	100.0	(82)	218.4
Not very involved	6.9	13.8	13.8	31.0	13.8	13.8	6.9	100.0	(29)	216.7
Not involved	10.9	28.3	19.6	23.9	2.2	4.3	10.9	100.0	(46)	204.9
Total	7.4	16.2	18.3	25.3	10.9	12.2	9.6	100.0	(229)	215.8

Note: Same as Table 9.

Table 15. Distribution of Total Actual Monthly Working Hours by the Degree of Involvement in the Recruitment of Non-Regular Employees (%)

	80-160 hrs	161-180	181-200	201-220	221-240	241-280	+ 281	Total	N	Average (hrs)
<i>Section manager level</i>										
Heavily involved	10.8	14.5	12.0	33.7	10.8	10.8	7.2	100.0	(83)	214.5
Somewhat involved	3.8	15.4	26.9	17.7	19.2	7.7	9.2	100.0	(130)	215.4
Not very involved	8.6	9.9	17.3	16.0	16.0	24.7	7.4	100.0	(81)	223.9
Not involved	7.7	21.2	21.5	21.2	10.1	10.4	7.7	100.0	(297)	209.5
Total	7.4	17.4	20.8	21.5	13.0	11.8	8.0	100.0	(591)	213.5
<i>Department manager level</i>										
Heavily involved	8.6	10.0	12.9	25.7	12.9	15.7	14.3	100.0	(70)	226.3
Somewhat involved	0.0	15.0	26.7	26.7	16.7	11.7	3.3	100.0	(60)	212.4
Not very involved	6.1	9.1	24.2	27.3	12.1	12.1	9.1	100.0	(33)	217.3
Not involved	12.3	27.7	13.8	23.1	3.1	9.2	10.8	100.0	(65)	207.9
Total	7.0	16.2	18.4	25.4	11.0	12.3	9.6	100.0	(228)	216.1

Note: Same as Table 9.

Table 16. Distribution of Total Actual Monthly Working Hours by the Degree of Involvement in the Placement of Non-Regular Employees (%)

	80-160 hrs	161-180	181-200	201-220	221-240	241-280	+ 281	Total	N	Average (hrs)
<i>Section manager level</i>										
Heavily involved	7.5	13.8	12.5	36.3	11.3	10.0	8.8	100.0	(80)	218.7
Somewhat involved	7.2	17.3	25.9	13.7	16.5	12.2	7.2	100.0	(139)	212.1
Not very involved	6.8	12.5	15.9	18.2	14.8	21.6	10.2	100.0	(88)	227.0
Not involved	7.8	20.1	22.3	21.9	11.3	9.2	7.4	100.0	(283)	208.5
Total	7.5	17.5	20.8	21.4	13.1	11.9	8.0	100.0	(590)	213.5
<i>Department manager level</i>										
Heavily involved	8.6	10.0	12.9	27.1	12.9	15.7	12.9	100.0	(70)	225.2
Somewhat involved	0.0	15.5	24.1	20.7	19.0	13.8	6.9	100.0	(58)	218.2
Not very involved	2.6	10.5	28.9	28.9	7.9	13.2	7.9	100.0	(38)	214.6
Not involved	14.5	27.4	12.9	25.8	3.2	6.5	9.7	100.0	(62)	204.6
Total	7.0	16.2	18.4	25.4	11.0	12.3	9.6	100.0	(228)	216.1

Note: Same as Table 9.

at the section manager level. Looking back at Table 3, as much as 58.4% of people at the section manager level were “not involved” in the recruitment of regular employees in the first place, compared with 28.5% of people at the department manager level. Combining those who responded that they were “heavily involved” and “somewhat involved,” the percentage of people at the section manager level stood at 25.6% while that of people at the department manager level came to 59.1%. This shows that there are significant differences between people at the section manager level and people at the department manager level in their degrees of involvement in recruitment and placement. Might this difference affect their working hours?

V. Degree of Job Discretion, Workplace Flexibility, and Working Hours

The results of cross tabulation showed differences in the length of working hours depending on work characteristics such as the degree of job discretion and workplace flexibility. However, it is possible that these have been distorted by the influence of other attributes. We therefore considered whether these results could be established even when the influence of various attributes was held constant.

Table 17 shows the results of analyzing the determining factors of total actual working hours. Using annual income directly as an explanatory variable of working hours may lead to a simultaneous decision problem in which the cause-and-effect relationship remains unclear. Thus, estimates were worked out with the two-stage least squares method by using academic background, industry classification, and occupation as instrumental variables of annual income in the first stage.

Annual income, age, gender, marital status, size, labor union, and preferred work and leisure balance were perceived as variables for controlling these attributes, and were not considered in depth in this article. First, the coefficient of people at the section manager level was significantly positive. In other words, their total actual working hours were long. The coefficient of people at the department manager level was also positive, albeit weak, thus not significantly different from the results of the simple average value. The degree of job discretion was consistent with the results of cross tabulation; those who had discretion showed shorter total actual working hours (and those who did not have discretion showed longer total actual working hours).⁸ Workplace flexibility differed from the results of cross tabulation, and a significant outcome could not be obtained.⁹ However, those who worked in places other than their usual workplace showed significantly longer working hours. Taken together, these results suggested that persons with relatively lower degrees of job discretion

⁸ In the multivariate analysis, the responses “a high degree” and “some degree” were combined as “yes,” and “not much” and “very little” were combined as “no.”

⁹ In the multivariate analysis, the responses “a high degree” and “some degree” were combined as “flexible,” and “not much” and “virtually impossible” were combined as “not flexible.”

Table 17. Determining Factors of Total Actual Working Hours

Explained variable: Total actual working hours Method: 2SLS		N=5418 adj. R ² =0.12 F= 18.88 (P=0.00) Sargan $\chi^2= 135.53$ (P=0.00) Basmann $\chi^2= 137.71$ (P=0.00)		
Explanatory variable	Coefficient	Standard error	Z value	
Annual income (logarithm)	0.006	0.013	0.480	
Age (logarithm)	-0.057	0.007	-7.900	**
Male	0.108	0.007	16.440	**
Married	0.001	0.007	0.150	
Size{29-99 employees}				
100-999 employees	-0.013	0.007	-1.810	*
1000 employees or more	-0.044	0.008	-5.670	**
Has a labor union	-0.023	0.007	-3.610	**
Works in places other than the usual workplace	0.068	0.006	11.860	**
Work/leisure balance preference {About the same}				
Fully committed to work	0.086	0.019	4.480	**
I need some leisure	0.038	0.007	5.460	**
I prefer leisure	-0.018	0.007	-2.620	**
I live for leisure	-0.030	0.011	-2.680	**
Degree of work discretion {Yes}	-0.013	0.008	-1.690	*
Workplace flexibility {Flexible}	-0.001	0.008	-0.100	
Position {Rank-and-file employee}				
Assistant managers/supervisors	0.005	0.015	0.370	
Section manager level	0.046	0.027	1.710	*
Department manager level	0.097	0.061	1.600	
Position×Degree of job discretion {Rank-and-file employee×No}				
Assistant managers/supervisors×Yes	0.012	0.016	0.710	
Section manager level ×Yes	-0.019	0.028	-0.690	
Department manager level ×Yes	-0.085	0.063	-1.340	
Position×Workplace flexibility {Rank-and-file employee×Not flexible}				
Assistant managers/supervisors×Flexible	-0.019	0.015	-1.240	
Section manager level×Flexible	-0.008	0.019	-0.420	
Department manager level ×Flexible	-0.020	0.029	-0.680	
Constant	5.401	0.085	63.730	**

Notes: 1. Estimates calculated by the author based on the survey data of the Japan Institute for Labour Policy and Training (2009). *: P<0.1, **: P<0.05.

2. { } shows the reference group of each dummy variable.

3. Academic background, industry classification and occupation were used as instrumental variables of annual income.

and higher workplace flexibility tended to work longer actual hours. In other words, if a person has a low degree of discretion at his/her job, such as in relation to work schedule, and if it is possible for him/her to perform his/her work anywhere, the result is that this will extend his/her working hours. This result is convincing when we look around ourselves.

However, neither the cross-term between degree of job discretion and position nor the cross-term between workplace flexibility and position were significant. No marked difference was apparent when people at the section manager and department manager levels were divided into those who had job discretion and those who did not, or into those who had workplace flexibility and those who did not.

VI. Where Does the Difference among Persons in Management Lie?

Differences in working hours could not be found between persons in managerial positions who had job discretion and workplace flexibility and those who did not. Thus, as the next step, this study takes the issue of differences within management one step further by using a variable unique to people at the section manager and department manager levels.

As described in section 2, approximately 74% of people at the section manager level and 63% of people at the department manager level responded that they were not free to decide their office arrival and departure times under their companies' systems. From the results of cross tabulation, being able to freely decide office arrival and departure times did not appear to be closely related to working hours. However, the fact that managing supervisors are excluded from the application of ordinary controls on working hours suggests that their office arrival and departure times, in principle, are left to their own discretion. Does the freedom of deciding office arrival and departure times really not affect management's working hours?

In addition, persons with greater degrees of involvement in the recruitment and placement of regular and non-regular employees tended to work longer hours, although the trend was slight.

Thus, this section explores the part of management who considered their workload to be heavy, among people at the section manager and department manager levels, by using the variables of freedom to decide office arrival and departure times as well as those concerning recruitment and placement.

To the question "Do you work beyond scheduled working hours?" four choices of answers were provided: "often," "sometimes," "rarely," and "never."¹⁰ Those who responded "often" or "sometimes" were then asked the reason, and one of the possible answers was a heavy workload or, to be precise, "because the amount of work I have cannot

¹⁰ The percentages of (i) "often," (ii) "sometimes," (iii) "rarely," and (iv) "never" were as follows: (i) 60.2%, (ii) 24.2%, (iii) 13.4%, and (iv) 2.3% for people at the section manager level (N621); and (i) 57.5%, (ii) 25.9%, (iii) 15.4%, and (iv) 1.2% for people at the department manager level (N247).

be completed within scheduled working hours.”

Among the twelve choices of reasons that the subjects exceeded their scheduled working hours (multiple responses were possible), “because the amount of work I have cannot be completed within scheduled working hours” was selected the most (60.2% among people at the section manager level and 53.4% among people at the department manager level). This reason has always come in at the top (selected by 60% in simple tabulation) in past surveys conducted by this author (Japan Institute for Labour Policy and Training 2005, 2006), who considers it to be the greatest reason why Japanese workers work overtime. As such, it seems meaningful to find out the attributes of management who selected this reason.

Put simply, “because the amount of work I have cannot be completed within scheduled working hours” means “the workload is heavy.” It is, in a way, not surprising that a person would not be able to finish his/her work within scheduled working hours because of a heavy workload. Recently, however, this author has been questioning what a “heavy workload” actually means. Ongoing research studies looking at the size of people’s workloads from a qualitative standpoint by directly interviewing workers in various occupations and positions seem to show various causes that increase a person’s workload depending on occupation, rank, specific work protocols, experience, human relations, and individual personality. While an analysis incorporating these factors cannot be conducted here, a large-scale survey is under consideration for the next fiscal year, which could generalize these issues to some extent.

Here, probit analysis was conducted for people at the section manager and department manager levels who worked beyond scheduled working hours, with the explained variable being the dummy variable of selecting or not selecting “because the amount of work I have cannot be completed within scheduled working hours” (“the workload is heavy” or “heavy workload,” below), and the main explanatory variable being the freedom to decide office arrival and departure times and involvement in the recruitment and placement of regular and non-regular employees.

Table 18 shows the results of the analysis. Trends were detected to some extent according to factors such as industry classification, company size, and occupation. Persons in managerial positions in the fields of education and learning support, medical and welfare services, and public service (academic research and specialized or technical service to some extent) tended to choose “heavy workload.” In terms of company size, people who worked at larger companies tended to choose “heavy workload” more than those at smaller companies. With regard to occupation, administrative professionals such as research analysis and patent law service professionals, as well as medical service and education-related professionals, were significantly negative. That is, persons in management in these occupations worked beyond scheduled working hours but their likelihood of selecting “heavy workload” was relatively low.

Management who worked in places other than the usual workplace tended to select “the workload is heavy.” Among management who worked beyond scheduled working

Table 18. What Are the Types of Management

Explained variable: Selection of “because the amount of work I have cannot be completed within scheduled working hours”=1, non-selection=0 Method: Probit		Estimate 1 N=649 pseudo R ² =0.13 Loglikelihood= -380.10		
Explanatory variable	Coefficient	Standard error	Z value	
Annual income (logarithm)	0.102	0.104	0.970	
Age (logarithm)	0.394	0.428	0.920	
Male	-0.263	0.263	-1.000	
Married	-0.137	0.213	-0.640	
Academic background {Junior high school/high school graduate}				
Junior college/technical college/special training school graduate	0.001	0.204	0.000	
University/Graduate school graduate	0.169	0.146	1.160	
Total actual working hours (logarithm)	1.606	0.304	5.280	**
Industry classification {Manufacturing}				
Construction	0.095	0.240	0.400	
Electricity, gas, water and heat supply	-0.238	0.410	-0.580	
Information and telecommunication	-0.235	0.280	-0.840	
Transportation and postal service	0.242	0.276	0.880	
Wholesale and retail	0.177	0.228	0.780	
Finance and insurance	0.231	0.252	0.920	
Academic research and specialized or technical service	0.491	0.310	1.580	
Lodging, restaurant, life services, and entertainment	0.008	0.476	0.020	
Education and learning support	1.192	0.374	3.180	**
Medical and welfare service	0.970	0.328	2.960	**
Service	0.203	0.243	0.840	
Public service	0.591	0.271	2.180	**
Other service	-0.346	0.406	-0.850	
Other	0.133	0.317	0.420	
Size {29~99 employees}				
100~999 employees	0.332	0.149	2.230	**
1000 employees or more	0.501	0.168	2.980	**
Occupation {General clerical work}				
General affairs, human resources, accounting, etc.	0.213	0.224	0.950	
Sales and marketing	0.304	0.207	1.470	
Customer service	-0.133	0.313	-0.420	
Administrative professional such as research analysis and patent law service	-0.963	0.439	-2.190	**
Technical professional such as R&D, design and SE	-0.012	0.232	-0.050	
Medical service and education-related professional	-0.814	0.327	-2.490	**
Field management/superintendent	0.083	0.275	0.300	
Manufacturing and construction work	-0.184	0.267	-0.690	
Transportation and driving	-0.269	0.323	-0.830	
Security and cleaning	-0.371	0.629	-0.590	
Other	0.002	0.257	0.010	

Who Have Heavy Workloads?

Estimate 2 N=646 pseudo R ² =0.13 Loglikelihood= -380.47			Estimate 3 N=646 pseudo R ² =0.13 Loglikelihood= -381.81			Estimate 4 N=645 pseudo R ² =0.13 Loglikelihood= -381.36		
Coefficient	Standard error	Z value	Coefficient	Standard error	Z value	Coefficient	Standard error	Z value
0.093	0.105	0.890	0.091	0.104	0.870	0.098	0.104	0.940
0.371	0.421	0.880	0.356	0.420	0.850	0.392	0.422	0.930
-0.291	0.263	-1.110	-0.271	0.264	-1.030	-0.286	0.265	-1.080
-0.160	0.213	-0.750	-0.161	0.213	-0.760	-0.173	0.213	-0.810
0.030	0.203	0.150	0.063	0.203	0.310	0.070	0.203	0.350
0.184	0.145	1.270	0.185	0.146	1.270	0.192	0.146	1.320
1.545	0.306	5.050 **	1.592	0.304	5.240 **	1.598	0.306	5.230 **
0.101	0.240	0.420	0.137	0.240	0.570	0.136	0.239	0.570
-0.280	0.410	-0.680	-0.228	0.412	-0.550	-0.235	0.413	-0.570
-0.219	0.279	-0.780	-0.163	0.278	-0.590	-0.160	0.279	-0.570
0.230	0.277	0.830	0.296	0.276	1.070	0.304	0.276	1.100
0.182	0.229	0.790	0.239	0.229	1.040	0.242	0.229	1.050
0.227	0.252	0.900	0.276	0.252	1.090	0.270	0.252	1.070
0.513	0.307	1.670	0.542	0.307	1.770 *	0.559	0.308	1.820 *
0.037	0.475	0.080	0.089	0.471	0.190	0.095	0.471	0.200
1.217	0.373	3.270 **	1.206	0.369	3.270 **	1.270	0.372	3.410 **
0.983	0.329	2.990 **	1.038	0.328	3.170 **	1.028	0.329	3.130 **
0.279	0.241	1.160	0.317	0.242	1.310	0.319	0.242	1.320
0.606	0.270	2.240 **	0.645	0.271	2.380 **	0.646	0.270	2.390 **
-0.303	0.404	-0.750	-0.302	0.404	-0.750	-0.287	0.402	-0.710
0.152	0.317	0.480	0.157	0.318	0.490	0.179	0.317	0.560
0.295	0.148	1.990 **	0.311	0.147	2.110 **	0.296	0.147	2.010 **
0.433	0.166	2.610 **	0.457	0.166	2.750 **	0.437	0.166	2.630 **
0.172	0.225	0.770	0.194	0.223	0.870	0.184	0.223	0.820
0.287	0.207	1.390	0.288	0.207	1.390	0.283	0.207	1.370
-0.165	0.313	-0.530	-0.126	0.316	-0.400	-0.146	0.318	-0.460
-0.970	0.439	-2.210 **	-0.937	0.435	-2.150 **	-0.923	0.435	-2.120 **
-0.010	0.232	-0.040	0.021	0.231	0.090	0.012	0.232	0.050
-0.834	0.326	-2.550 **	-0.837	0.325	-2.570 **	-0.836	0.326	-2.560 **
0.067	0.276	0.240	0.071	0.275	0.260	0.062	0.275	0.230
-0.186	0.265	-0.700	-0.134	0.266	-0.500	-0.145	0.266	-0.540
-0.319	0.321	-0.990	-0.279	0.321	-0.870	-0.290	0.320	-0.910
-0.395	0.633	-0.630	-0.402	0.629	-0.640	-0.401	0.635	-0.630
0.015	0.258	0.060	0.003	0.257	0.010	-0.006	0.257	-0.020

Table 18 (Continued)

Explained variable: Selection of “because the amount of work I have cannot be completed within scheduled working hours”=1, non-selection=0 Method: Probit		Estimate 1 N=649 pseudo R ² =0.13 Loglikelihood=-380.10		
Explanatory variable	Coefficient	Standard error	Z value	
Has a labor union	-0.051	0.130	-0.390	
Works in places other than the usual workplace	0.290	0.116	2.490	**
Work/leisure balance preference {About the same}				
Fully committed to work	0.026	0.314	0.080	
I need some leisure	-0.029	0.131	-0.220	
I prefer leisure	0.076	0.162	0.470	
I live for leisure	-0.595	0.260	-2.290	**
Degree of job discretion {Yes}	-0.089	0.189	-0.470	
Workplace flexibility {Flexible}	-0.096	0.114	-0.840	
Department manager level	-0.485	0.134	-3.610	**
Office arrival and departure times {I am not free to decide}				
I am free to decide	0.134	0.154	0.870	
I am free to decide, but do not	-0.026	0.171	-0.150	
Involvement in recruitment of regular employees {Not involved}				
Heavily involved	0.453	0.182	2.490	**
Somewhat involved	0.229	0.151	1.520	
Not very involved	0.199	0.161	1.230	
Involvement in placement of regular employees {Not involved}				
Heavily involved				
Somewhat involved				
Not very involved				
Involvement in recruitment of non-regular employees {Not involved}				
Heavily involved				
Somewhat involved				
Not very involved				
Involvement in placement of non-regular employees {Not involved}				
Heavily involved				
Somewhat involved				
Not very involved				
Constant	-10.874	2.567	-4.240	**

Notes: 1. Estimates calculated by the author based on the survey data of the Japan Institute for Labour Policy and Training (2009). *: P<0.1, **: P<0.05.

2. { } shows the reference group of each dummy variable.

3. The targets are people at the section manager and department manager levels who work beyond scheduled working hours.

Managerial Working Hours and Heavy Workloads

Estimate 2 N=646 pseudo R ² =0.13 Loglikelihood= -380.47			Estimate 3 N=646 pseudo R ² =0.13 Loglikelihood= -381.81			Estimate 4 N=645 pseudo R ² =0.13 Loglikelihood= -381.36		
Coefficient	Standard error	Z value	Coefficient	Standard error	Z value	Coefficient	Standard error	Z value
-0.058	0.130	-0.450	-0.085	0.130	-0.660	-0.095	0.129	-0.730
0.258	0.116	2.230 **	0.266	0.116	2.300 **	0.259	0.116	2.240 **
0.060	0.312	0.190	0.095	0.311	0.310	0.114	0.311	0.370
-0.041	0.131	-0.310	-0.018	0.131	-0.140	-0.014	0.131	-0.110
0.061	0.162	0.380	0.025	0.160	0.160	0.054	0.161	0.330
-0.587	0.261	-2.250 **	-0.565	0.259	-2.180 **	-0.559	0.259	-2.150 **
-0.078	0.189	-0.410	-0.111	0.189	-0.590	-0.095	0.189	-0.510
-0.077	0.114	-0.680	-0.059	0.114	-0.520	-0.067	0.114	-0.590
-0.430	0.132	-3.270 **	-0.419	0.129	-3.240 **	-0.411	0.130	-3.160 **
0.170	0.155	1.100	0.157	0.153	1.020	0.150	0.154	0.980
-0.032	0.171	-0.190	-0.037	0.171	-0.210	-0.045	0.171	-0.260
0.266	0.180	1.480						
0.200	0.137	1.460						
0.297	0.162	1.830 *						
			0.247	0.158	1.570			
			0.120	0.136	0.890			
			0.062	0.174	0.360			
						0.166	0.160	1.040
						0.124	0.138	0.900
						-0.008	0.168	-0.050
-10.341	2.552	-4.050 **	-10.517	2.547	-4.130 **	-10.686	2.559	-4.180 **

hours, those who had multiple workplaces tended to have heavy workloads. The likelihood of selecting “heavy workload” was low among management who “lived for leisure,” even if they worked beyond scheduled working hours. Discontent was expected to be high among these people as they worked beyond scheduled working hours in spite of their strong preference for leisure.

The freedom to decide office arrival and departure times in question failed to obtain a significant value in all of the four estimates. What this result suggested was that management’s freedom to decide their office arrival and departure times did not affect their heavy workloads. As described in section 1, according to the Japan Personnel Research Institute’s (2005) analysis of judicial cases, freedom of time management was a secondary criterion in court decisions, and the results of this article’s analysis supported this point.

With respect to the recruitment and placement of regular and non-regular employees, the four items were analyzed separately on the assumption that they were strongly correlated. As a result, it was found that those who were heavily involved in the recruitment of regular employees and those who were not very involved in the placement of regular employees tended to select “the workload is heavy.” Since the benchmark was that they were “not involved,” “not very involved” could be interpreted as “involved, even if only slightly.” In other words, it can be said that management who were at all involved in the recruitment and placement of regular employees tended to select “heavy workload.” While the coefficients were positive for management heavily involved in the recruitment and placement of non-regular employees, they were not statistically significant. Thus, it can be inferred that the recruitment and placement of regular employees had a greater influence on the size of the workload than the recruitment and placement of non-regular employees.

What do these analysis results suggest? While the freedom to decide office arrival and departure times was considered as a variable for finding out the influence of exclusions from the application of company-controlled working hours, a factor for managing supervisors, this element did not affect management’s heavy workloads. However, personnel-related work such as recruitment and placement (of regular employees in particular) did have an effect. In many cases, the recruitment and placement of human resources, as well as the coaching and fostering of subordinates, are important jobs for persons in managerial positions. If these personnel-related jobs are tough, they are likely to lead to heavy workloads.

Furthermore, people at the department manager level tended to select “the workload is heavy” less than people at the section manager level. Even when the various variables included in the analysis were kept constant, people at the section manager level were more likely to select “heavy workload.” However, this result cannot be explained merely by the nominal difference between people at the section manager and department manager levels. In other words, it suggests that other factors that were not included in this analysis might

have an influence on the difference between people at the section manager and department manager levels.¹¹ Although it would be very interesting to find out what those factors might be, unfortunately, further analysis is not possible due to the constraints of survey data. For now, as Sato (2004) has pointed out,¹² this author shall adopt the “playing-manager hypothesis” (that the workload becomes heavier as the degree of being a player-manager increases) with the intention to further pursue this issue in the future.

VII. Conclusion and Issues

According to a simple comparison of average values, people at the section manager and department manager levels tended to work longer hours than rank-and-file employees. Furthermore, even when the influence of various attributes was kept constant, it was found that persons in management worked somewhat longer hours.

In order to consider the issue of management’s exclusion from the application of company-controlled working hours, the effect of the freedom to decide office arrival and departure times on the size of their workloads was studied, but this article’s analysis found that this factor did not have an influence. Regardless of whether they are free to decide their office arrival and departure times, many people in managerial positions work long hours, and their exclusion from the application of controlled working hours due to their status as managing supervisors can be speculated as having very little meaning under current circumstances, in the sense of any autonomous selection of the length of working hours.

Meanwhile, it was found that personnel-related work such as recruitment and placement affected the size of the workload. This point can be considered as an issue that is unique to management and is not seen among rank-and-file employees.

While this article’s analysis is exploratory and first-stage, since the effect of some personnel-related work has been suggested, further study into the content of management’s work is necessary as a future task. If factors such as the content of work, the degree to which a person is a playing-manager, the number of subordinates, and how many of them stand in the way to his/her success can be found, the possibilities for research could expand.

The issue of long working hours is a big problem, and the fundamental questions of “What kind of person works long hours?” and “Why do they work long hours?” remain mostly unanswered.¹³ While the issue of working hours is a matter of legal systems and

¹¹ A separate analysis was conducted using cross-terms between degrees of involvement in the recruitment and placement of regular and non-regular employees on the one hand and people at the section manager and department manager levels on the other, but no clear difference could be found.

¹² Sato (2004) pointed out that management staff were becoming more like playing-managers.

¹³ Ogura (2008) described the issues for research on working hours. Genda (2009) organized research work on long working hours and found, by analyzing the Employment Status Survey, a growing trend for long working hours among workers with short lengths of service in recent years. This is an important finding in terms of detecting change.

each working individual, it is also a matter of organizations' personnel systems and their operations, as well as a matter of management.¹⁴

References

- Genda, Yuji. 2009. Bunpai mondai to shiteno chojikan rodo: "Soku senryoku" shiko no kage de [Long working hours as a distribution problem: Behind the trend for immediately useful human resources]. CIS Discussion Paper, no.429, Institute of Economic Research, Hitotsubashi University, Tokyo.
- The Japan Institute for Labour Policy and Training. 2005. *Nippon no chojikan rodo, fubarai rodo no jittai to jissho kenkyu* [Empirical study on long working hours and unpaid working time in Japan]. JILPT Research Report, no. 22, the Japan Institute for Labour Policy and Training (JILPT), Tokyo.
- . 2006. *Hatarakikata no genjo to ishiki ni kansuru anketo chosa* [Results of a questionnaire survey on the current conditions and awareness of working styles]. Research Series, no. 20, the Japan Institute for Labour Policy and Training (JILPT), Tokyo.
- . 2009. *Hataraku basho to jikan no tayosei ni kansuru chosa kenkyu* [Research study on the diversity of workplace and working hours]. JILPT Research Report, no. 106, the Japan Institute for Labour Policy and Training (JILPT), Tokyo.
- Japan Personal Research Institute. 2005. *Kanri kantokusha no jittai ni kansuru chosa kenkyu hokokusho* [Report on a research study on the reality of managing supervisors]. Tokyo: Japan Personal Research Institute.
- Kuroda, Sachiko, and Isao Yamamoto. 2009. Howaito kara eguzenpushon to rodosha no hatarakikata: Rodo jikan kisei ga rodo jikan ya chingin ni ataeru eikyo [White collar exemptions and workers' working styles: The impact of working hour regulations on working hours and wages]. RIETI Discussion Paper Series 09-J-021, the Research Institute of Economy, Trade and Industry (RIETI), Tokyo.
- Ogura, Kazuya. 2007. *Endoresu wakazu: Hatarakisugi nihonjin no jitsuzo* [Endless workers: The real image of the overworked Japanese]. Tokyo: Nihon Keizai Shinbun Shuppansha.
- . 2008. Nippon no chojikan rodo: Kokusai hikaku to kenkyu kadai [Long working hours in Japan: International comparison and research subjects]. *The Japanese Journal of Labour Studies* 50, no. 6:4-16.
- Ogura, Kazuya, and Takashi Fujimoto. 2007. Chojikan rodo to waku sutairu [Long working hours and working style]. JILPT Discussion Paper 07-01, the Japan Institute for Labour Policy and Training (JILPT), Tokyo.

¹⁴ Sato (2003) pointed to the importance of managers' actions at the workplace level in order for a discretionary labor system to function properly. In addition, Sato (2008) described workplace-level management issues concerning long working hours.

- Oi, Masako. 2005. Suji de miru kanrishokuzo no henka: Ninzu, shoshin sokudo, ippanshoku tono sotai chingin [Quantitative changes in managerial positions: Based on their number, promotion speed and relative wage with respect to non-managerial employees]. *The Japanese Journal of Labour Studies* 47, no. 12:4-17.
- Ouchi, Shinya. 2008. "Nabakari kanrishoku" mondai no toikakeru mono [Questions raised by the issue of nominal management]. *Business Labor Trend* (August): 18-20.
- Sato, Atsushi. 2003. Jinji kanri no henka to sairyō rodosei [Changing human resource management and "discretionary work system"]. *The Japanese Journal of Labour Studies* 45, no. 10:34-46.
- . 2004. Chukan kanrishoku wa fuyo ni narunoka [Is middle-management useless?]. *The Japanese Journal of Labour Studies* 46, no. 4:30-33.
- . 2008. Shigoto kanri to rodo jikan: Chojikan rodo no hassei mekanizumu [Work management and working hours: Mechanism that generate prolonged working hours]. *The Japanese Journal of Labour Studies* 50, no. 6:27-38.
- Takahashi, Kenji. 2005. Kanrishoku no koyo kankei to ho [Employment relations of managerial employees and law]. *The Japanese Journal of Labour Studies* 47, no. 12:18-28.
- Takahashi, Yoko. 2005. Howaito kara "sabisu zangyo" no keizaigakuteki haikai: Rodo jikan, hoshu, ni kansuru anmoku no keiyaku [Economic background of white collar "overtime work without pay": The implicit contract about working hours and remuneration]. *The Japanese Journal of Labour Studies* 47, no. 2-3:56-68.
- Yashiro, Atsushi. 2002. *Kanrishokuso no jinteki kanri: Rodo shijoronteki apurochi* [Human resources management of management-level workers: A labor market theory approach]. Tokyo: Yuhikaku.
- . 2009. Naze "nabakari kanrishoku" ga umarerunoka [On the mechanism of managers 'disguised' in Japanese companies]. *The Japanese Journal of Labour Studies* 51, no. 4:38-41.