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Objectives of Research

This is a summary of JILPT Research Report No.115, which summarizes the outcome of research on the diversification trends of employment in recent years based on the special tabulation of the “Comprehensive Survey on Diversification of Employment (2003 and 2007) (hereinafter referred to as “Diversification Survey”)”, which the Japan Institute for Labour Policy and Training (JILPT) addressed as one of its research themes for fiscal 2009.

The growing trend of non-standard or atypical employment is one of the distinct characteristics of employed labor in recent years. Amid the changing economic trends, including the low-growth economy, since the bursting of the bubble in the early 1990's, corporate needs for flexible employment have increased rapidly or continuously in tandem with the growing uncertainties of corporate management due to the “globalization of the economy,” including finance. It can be said that this background has led to an expansion of non-standard employment.

Looking toward future developments, such corporate needs are unlikely to decline. If we need to develop a society where women and the elderly can play more active roles in their work, non-standard employment is expected to increase further. Moreover, the number of young people, both male and female, who begin their working life with non-standard jobs upon graduation, has been on the increase, and in fact, it remains fairly difficult for them to find regular employment.

In light of this situation, trend research on how the growing tendency of non-standard employment is progressing, what sorts of problems are developing in the process, and what policy issues are involved, is gaining in importance. With an awareness of these issues, we conducted this research in fiscal 2009 with the objectives of capturing the trends in non-standard employment based on the comprehensive survey with authoritative representativeness, making necessary analyses based on the concrete awareness of issues of the time and deriving policy implications from there. JILPT has a track record of making a reanalysis of raw data in the survey, and in the latest research, we carried out a special tabulation and analysis of individual data from the 2003 survey and the latest 2007 survey. We entitled this report “Transition in Diversification of Employment II: 2003-2007,” adding “II” to indicate that this is a sequel to the previous report.

Outline of the Research Outcome

This report can be broadly divided into two parts. The first part, which has a chapter structure similar to the previous report, consists of Chapters 2, 3 and 4 that deal with
the permanent themes, so to speak. However, there are also some sections where we have established new analysis themes. The second part is Chapter 5, in which we set forth specific themes with a special emphasis on policy discussions on the issues of non-standard employment and attempt an analysis of these policy issues using the survey data.

We outline the discussions in each chapter below:

1. **Actual Conditions and the Changing Trend of the Use of Non-standard Employees by Businesses Establishments (Chapter 2 of the Report)**

   Using the data of a survey of businesses establishments (the establishment survey) of the “Diversification Survey,” we analyzed the actual situation of the use of non-standard employment and changes between 2003 and 2007, sorting out the progress of non-standard employment. In this process, following the deregulation of the dispatching of temporary workers to “product manufacturing” businesses in 2004 and the subsequent rapid expansion of the use of temporary workers in the manufacturing sector, we analyzed the actual situation of the use of temporary workers of the manufacturing industry using the Japan Standard Industrial Classification (JSIC). The results of these analyses are summarized below:

   (1) Between 2003 and 2007, the ratio of regular employees declined by 3.2 percentage points from 65.4% to 62.2%, while that of non-standard employees increased. By form of employment, the ratio of temporary agency workers rose from 2.1% to 4.7% and that of contract employees grew from 2.4% to 2.8%.

   (2) The ratio of regular employees has declined in many industries (the increase in non-standard employment), with manufacturing, transport and education/learning-support industries seeing a drop of 5 points or more between 2003 and 2007.

   (3) The ratio of temporary agency workers has risen in many industries, with the manufacturing industry experiencing a particularly large increase of 7.8 points from 2.0% to 9.8%, apparently reflecting the revision in the Worker Dispatch Act during this period.

   (4) Reasons for the hiring of contract employees showed no significant change between 2003 and 2007, with “Assignment to professional jobs” cited by the largest number of businesses surveyed, followed by “Securing immediately effective and capable human resources” and “Saving on wages” in that order in both surveys.

   (5) As for reasons for hiring temporary agency workers, “Securing immediately effective and capable human resources” was cited by the largest number of
businesses in both the 2003 and 2007 surveys. While the second-place reason was “For reducing labor costs other than wages” in 2003, “Because of the inability to secure regular employees” came in second in the 2007 survey. The third-place reason was “For adjusting labor in accordance with economic conditions” both in 2003 and 2007.

(6) As for reasons for the hiring of part-time workers, “Saving on wages” was cited by the largest number of businesses surveyed in both 2003 and 2007, and the second-place reason, “For responding to fluctuations of workloads during the day and the week,” also remained unchanged. But the third-place reason shifted from “For reducing labor costs other than wages” in 2003 to “For responding to long business hours” in 2007. Also, the ratio of businesses citing “Saving on wages” as the reason for the hiring of part-time workers declined significantly between 2003 and 2007.

(7) As for the ratios of businesses covering contract employees for various in-house systems, other than public schemes, the ratio for the “bonus payment system” declined, while the ratios for “in-house education and training,” “self-development support system,” “promotion/advancement” and “system for the status change to regular employees” increased. In particular, the ratio for the “system for the status change to regular employees” rose by more than 10 points in such sectors as manufacturing, transportation, finance/insurance, restaurant/lodging, education/learning support and services. These changes show that the number of businesses offering the system for changing the employment status from contract workers to regular employees has increased in many industries between 2003 and 2007.

(8) As for the ratios of businesses covering part-time workers for various systems, the ratios for “employment insurance,” “health insurance” and “employees’ pension insurance” increased slightly. The ratio for the “bonus payment system” dropped marginally, while the ratio for the “system for the status change to regular employees” increased. The ratio for the “system for the status change to regular employees” showed increases in all industries surveyed.

(9) Looking at the middle classification of the manufacturing sector, most industries saw the ratio of temporary agency workers rise in 2007. Manufacturers of information and communications equipment and devices, which had the largest ratio of temporary agency workers in the 2003 survey, raised the ratio by 9.96 points from 3.15% in 2003 to 13.11% in 2007. Other industries with high ratios of temporary agency workers included manufacturers of electronic parts and device
(7.76%), chemicals (6.38%), plastics products (5.88%), transportation equipment and devices (5.28%), and electric machinery and devices (4.69%).

(10) Looking at reasons for the hiring of temporary agency workers in the middle classification of the manufacturing sector, “Because of the inability to secure regular employees” was cited by a larger number of businesses in 2007 than 2003, in 16 industries.

(11) As the economic conditions between 2003 and 2007 were generally not so bad compared with the conditions under the economic slump after the autumn of 2008, manufacturers in particular expanded the use of non-standard employees, mostly temporary agency workers. We also saw an increase in the number of businesses offering part-time workers and contract employees the scheme for the status conversion to regular employees.

(12) However, as is widely known, the economic slump since the autumn of 2008 is believed to be having a significant impact on the use of temporary agency workers and other non-standard employees. Thus, an even more careful study would be necessary on the differences between the results of the 2007 survey and the forthcoming next survey.

2. Attributes of Non-standard Employees and Wages (Chapter 3 of the Full Report)

Using data from a survey on individual workers (the individual survey) of the “Diversification Survey,” we make an analysis of the attributes of non-standard employees and also analyze the impact of household attributes on the employment patterns and awareness of employment of non-standard employees. We specifically address issues confronting mothers in single-parent households as a concrete theme related to household attributes (see (5), (6) and (7) below). We summarize the results of these analyses below:

(1) The breakdown of non-standard employees became more diversified between 2003 and 2007. More specifically, the ratios of non-standard employees other than part-time workers increased, suggesting an advance in full-time non-standard employment.

(2) During the same period, partly because of the massive retirement of baby boomers and the revision to the Act on Stabilization of Employment of Elderly Persons, the ratio of non-standard employees (employees on short-term contracts, etc., usually re-hired employees after retirement) to workers aged 60 or older increased, while the ratio of older people to total non-standard employees also rose. In other words, non-standard employees themselves are aging.
Following the deregulation of the dispatching of temporary workers to “product manufacturing” businesses in March 2004, temporary workers, including male high school graduates, increased between 2003 and 2007, leading to some changes in the gender and educational background composition of non-standard employees.

While some considerations are warranted in the interpretation of survey data, overall, wages of contract employees and employees on short-term contracts increased, presumably partly because the years between the two surveys fell during the period of economic expansion.

As for problems facing mothers in single-parent households, the survey data revealed that they cannot become regular employees due to large childcare burdens, particularly while their children are very young, and they have to stay as non-standard employees with inadequate pay.

As another problem for mothers in single-parent households, the survey data pointed to the fact that many of them have to work as non-standard employees with inadequate pay in close to full-time jobs, as businesses do not accommodate their wishes for being employed as regular employees.

It is necessary to improve childcare support for mothers with infants in single-parent households and also to provide all mothers in single-parent households with skill-acquiring capacity-development opportunities in order to promote their employment as regular employees.

3. **Reasons for the Employment Form Choices by Non-standard Employees and the Degree of Satisfaction (Chapter 4 of the Full Report)**

Using the “individual survey” data, as in the case of 2 above, we analyzed the reasons why non-standard employees chose their current employment forms as well as qualifications and licenses helping them in their current jobs and the degree of job satisfaction. In this analysis, we divided part-time workers into “young part-time workers,” “married female part-time workers” and “older part-time workers.” We summarize the results of these analyses below:

As for reasons for choosing the current employment forms, the ratios of non-standard employees saying “Because they cannot become regular employees” were relatively high among contract employees and temporary agency workers but relatively low among temporary short-term employees and part-time workers.

The ratio of male contract employees replying “Because they can make use of their qualifications and skills” was higher than that of those saying “Because they cannot become regular employees.” Many part-time workers gave reasons related to the
flexible patterns of working, such as “Because they can work during hours convenient for them.”

(3) Many older employees said “Because working hours and working days are short.”

(4) Female workers’ reasons for choosing the form of non-standard employment were more varied than those for males, with many of them saying “For the purpose of supporting household income and earning education expenses, etc.” and “Because they can balance work with family life and other activities easily, besides other reasons mentioned above.”

(5) We classified reasons for choosing the form of non-standard employment into the three categories of “involuntary,” “focus on income/expertise” and “voluntary” choices, and it was found that the ratio of “involuntary” choices (“They cannot become regular employees”) was relatively high among temporary agency workers and relatively low among married female part-time workers and older part-time workers. The ratio of “voluntary” choices was high among temporary short-term employees and part-time workers, while the ratio of “focus on income/expertise” choices was high among male contract employees and employees on short-term contracts.

(6) The ratios of those wishing to work as regular employees going forward were high among contract workers, temporary agency workers and young part-time workers. The ratios were higher in 2007 than in 2003, except for young part-time workers. The ratios were low among female married part-time workers and older part-time workers.

(7) As reasons for hoping to become regular employees (asked only in the 2007 survey), “Because regular employees have greater job security” and “Because they want more income” drew the highest ratios of responses. Other reasons with relatively high ratios included “Because they want to gain more experiences and broaden their perspectives,” “Because they want to make the most of their eagerness to work and their capabilities” and “Because they want career enhancement.”

(8) By looking at the above replies in (7) by the three categories of reasons for choosing the current forms of employment, the ratio was high for “Because regular employees have greater job security” among the “involuntary” choices, for “Because regular employees have greater job security” among the “focus on income/expertise” choices and the “involuntary” choices, and for “Because they want to gain more experiences and broaden their perspectives” among the “voluntary” choices.

(9) The indexation of the degree of occupational satisfaction (overall) found that the degree of satisfaction was low among temporary agency workers. Other than regular
employees, the degree of satisfaction was generally lower in 2007 than in 2003, with the decline in the degree of satisfaction particularly large for male young part-time workers.

(10) Looking at the degree of satisfaction by individual items, the level of satisfaction was high for “substance of work and rewarding work” among contract employees and employees on short-term contracts, for “working hours and the number of holidays” and “workplace human relationships and communication” among temporary agency workers, and for “substance of work and rewarding work” or “workplace human relationships and communication” among temporary short-term employees and part-time workers.

(11) Items with a low level of satisfaction were common across the employment patterns, including “wages,” “education and training/capacity development,” “welfare benefits” and “performance evaluation and treatment.”

(12) The ratio of people having qualifications and licenses for current jobs was higher than 40% among regular employees, contract employees and employees on short-term contracts, but low at 20-30% for the other patterns of employment. The ratio was higher for males than for females, except for registration-type temporary agency workers and young part-time workers.

(13) By the three categories of reasons for choosing the current forms of employment, the ratio of people with qualifications and licenses was high among the “focus on income/expertise” choices. Comparison between the “involuntary” and “voluntary” choices showed that the ratio of people who have qualifications and licenses or want to acquire them was higher among the “involuntary” choices than among the “voluntary” choices.

(14) Looking at the degree of occupational satisfaction by the three categories of the reasons for choosing the current forms of employment, overall, the level of satisfaction was the highest among the “focus on income/expertise” choices and the lowest among the “involuntary” choices. The level of satisfaction was lower in 2007 than in 2003 among both the “involuntary” and “voluntary” choices.


In Chapter 5, we set forth specific themes bearing in mind policy issues concerning non-standard employment and made an analysis of them using the data from the “Diversification Survey.” The analysis mainly covered contract employees, temporary agency workers (registration-type/regularly-employed-type) and part-time workers. We
summarize the results of the analysis by each issue addressed (in separate sections):

The first policy issue (Section 1) is designed to present findings of the analysis for reference in discussions of the “employment portfolio” by industry to find out the extent of the increase in the use of non-standard employment in which industries and for what reasons. The analysis results are summarized below:

1) We classified businesses by certain criteria into businesses with “high use,” “average use,” “low use” and “no use (no employment)” for each form of employment (including regular employees), and found that the use of non-standard employment as a whole was high in the “restaurant/lodging,” “retailing” and “education/learning support” industries, in that order.

2) Looking at industries with a high ratio of “businesses with high use” by employment form, “education/learning support,” “information and communications” and “transportation” ranked high for contract workers, “information and communications,” “finance/insurance” and “machinery manufacturing” for temporary agency workers, and “restaurant/lodging,” “retailing” and “education/learning support” for part-time workers. The ratio of “businesses with high use” of temporary agency workers in “machinery manufacturing” increased significantly from 2.5% to 7.7% between 2003 and 2007.

3) Businesses employing part-time workers accounted for 60% of the total number of businesses surveyed, but the ratio of those with contract employees and temporary agency workers was low at around 10%.

4) Looking at the increase or decrease in the ratio of non-standard employment around the survey years for all industries and by industry, the increase in the ratio of non-standard employment was found to be slower in 2007 than in 2003. Meanwhile, the use of temporary agency workers increased, notably in manufacturing industry, particularly machinery manufacturing.

5) As reasons for the use of non-standard employment, “labor cost reduction” was most commonly noted. However, for the use of contract employees and temporary agency workers, the largest number of businesses cited “personnel strategy factors” in almost all industries, while for part-time workers, the largest number of businesses cited “labor cost reduction” along with “means of responding to fluctuations in workloads.” Most businesses are not just expanding non-standard employment with the single-minded focus on cost reductions, but they are believed to be using non-standard employment on the basis of broad personnel strategy needs while carefully calculating labor costs within that scope. Therefore, the non-standard employment is unlikely to maintain an upward trend without
limitations, but should continue in an orderly fashion in the future. In developing and promoting policy measures concerning non-standard employment, it is desirable to give adequate consideration to the above-described reasonable behavioral characteristics of these businesses.

(6) The regression analysis of the use and non-use of non-standard employment led to the findings that industries with high use of non-standard employment include “education/learning support,” “information and communications,” “finance/insurance,” “business-related services” and “transportation” for contract employees, “finance/insurance,” “materials-related manufacturing,” “information and communications” and “machinery manufacturing” for temporary agency workers, and “restaurant/lodging,” “medical services/welfare,” “retailing,” “education/learning support” and “consumption-related manufacturing” for part-time workers. Another regression analysis was also made of the ratio of the use of each form of non-standard employment, and it was found that industries with the high use of non-standard employment include “education/learning support,” “medical services/welfare” and “transportation” for contract employees, “information and communications,” “transportation” and “livelihood-related services” for temporary agency workers, and “restaurant/lodging,” “retailing,” “education/learning support” and “consumption-related manufacturing” for part-time workers. The result of these two analyses shows that industries with many business establishments that employ non-standard employees and industries with the high ratios of non-standard employees may sometimes differ.

The second policy issue (Section 2) covers the trends of non-standard employees by age group. This section follows the trajectory of employment forms of people who were employed as non-standard employees in the past, or, in short, whether they eventually became regular employees or not. For this purpose, we conducted a cohort analysis (an analysis to study age groups elevated in accordance with the intervals between survey years) of the young, middle-age and old groups. The results are summarized below:

(7) For the young cohort, the increase in non-standard employment for university graduates appears to have been halted, while the ratio of non-standard employees has increased for male high school graduates and female graduates of specialized vocational high schools and junior colleges as time passed and they grew older. The rise in the ratio of non-standard employment stemmed chiefly from the increasing ratio of part-time workers until 2003, but can be attributed largely to the rise in the ratio of temporary agency workers and other non-standard employees other than part-time workers over the period through 2007. Though the ratio of involuntary
employment was high for part-time workers during periods when they were young, the ratio tended to decline as they grew older. Meanwhile, the ratio of involuntary employment was generally high among contract workers and temporary agency workers, and the ratio increased for many cohorts of temporary agency workers particularly between 2003 and 2007.

(8) As for the middle-age cohort, the ratio of non-standard employees tended to rise as they grew older, indicating the difficulty people in the middle-age cohort face in seeking to become regular employees. Between 2003 and 2007, the ratios of temporary agency workers and contract employees increased, and the ratio of involuntary employment also rose across the board. This indicates that the rising ratio of non-standard employment for the middle-age group is not a result of the voluntary choices of employment forms.

(9) For both the young cohort and the middle-age cohort, there were increases in temporary agency workers in the manufacturing sector over the period through 2007. This may indicate that the dispatching of labor to the manufacturing sector not only provided many employment opportunities to high school graduates, but not a few male university graduates also found temporary jobs in the manufacturing sector. Furthermore, it was also indicated that a broader range of people in the older cohort found temporary jobs in the manufacturing sector. These include female graduates from specialized vocational high schools or female university graduates. However, while male high school graduates earned an average of relatively high wages from being dispatched as temporary workers in the manufacturing sector, the dispatch work at manufacturers did not necessarily provide good job opportunities in terms of the degree of satisfaction.

The third policy issue (Section 3) addresses the two specific issues of the status change of non-standard employees to regular employees and the disparity in the treatment of regular and non-standard employees, and makes relevant analyses. We also used the data from the individual survey in the “Diversification Survey” for the analyses made in this section. The results are summarized below:

(10) Regarding the change of status from non-standard to regular employees, as the basis of study, we presented a table that shows non-standard employees’ employment expectations for the future, with the base figure of 100 used for the total number of non-standard employees in each form of employment. For example, for registration-type temporary agency workers with the highest ratio of people wishing to become regular employees, while 43.4% of them want to become regular employees, 34.1% of them want to keep their current form of employment. The
difference between the ratios of those wishing to become regular employees and those wishing to stay as non-standard employees narrow or even reverse in other forms of employment. It must be noted that while there are people who want to become regular employees, there also are equal or a greater number of people who wish to keep the current non-standard employment.

(11) We estimated the wage gap between regular and non-standard employees by developing the regression formula for monthly wages of regular employees. By substituting attributes of non-standard employees in the regression formula, we obtained the control wages for regular employees. We found that on average, the wage gap between regular and non-standard employees was about 90% for regularly-employed-type temporary agency workers and in the 80% range for contract employees and registration-type temporary agency workers, with the gap slightly smaller for contract employees. For part-time workers, the gap was around 70% for male workers and around 50% for female workers. By age, for contract employees and temporary agency workers, the wage gap tended to grow larger, particularly for males, as they grew older. For those in their 20s, however, wages were higher for non-standard employees (See the figures below).

Figure: Gaps with the Estimated Wages of Regular Employees and the Gap Index (Average for Non-standard Employees)

(12) While the level of satisfaction with wages was low among non-standard employees, the regression formula that incorporates the above-described wage gaps show that
the level of satisfaction with wages rises as wages for non-standard employees increase and the widening wage gaps between regular and non-standard employees lower the level of satisfaction with wages. However, on the whole, the impact of increases in monthly wages was larger than the impact of the narrowing wage gaps. It seems desirable to first increase the levels of monthly wages of non-standard employees through, for example, such measures as the raising of the minimum wage.

The fourth policy issue (Section 4) relates to the consideration of how to capture the “weak” in non-standard employment. The “weak” refers to the type of people who have some problems with being employed as non-standard workers. While all of them are not necessarily the kind of people to whom immediate policy responses are required, most of them are very likely to need such responses. We addressed and analyzed involuntary non-standard employment, maintenance of livelihood, low income, and hopes for becoming regular employees as the four factors (perspectives) of the “weak.” The analysis results are summarized below:

(13) Involuntary non-standard employment itself presents the supply-demand mismatching problem. People who cited only the lack of opportunities to work as regular employees as the reason for choosing the current form of non-standard employment (the reason for unavoidable choice) can be described as “Core I.” Among other “relative” involuntary non-standard employees, who also cited other reasons, those who cited “motivation for larger income” may be called “Core II.”

(14) From the viewpoint of maintenance of livelihood and marital status, people who are principal livelihood earners, not married and have children before school age or children who go to elementary and/or junior high schools are categorized as “Core I” and people who are married and principal livelihood earners and have children before school age or children who go to elementary and/or junior high schools are categorized as “Core II.”

(15) As for the factor of low income, we divided non-standard employees into the four brackets of low income earners, relatively low income earners, middle income earners and high income earners, using the thresholds of ¥160,000, ¥220,000 and ¥400,000 in September total wage amounts. We then categorized the lowest income earners as “Core I” and the second-lowest income earners as “Core II.” A certain relationship, albeit not so strong, was suggested between the levels of wages and the holding of qualifications and licenses helpful in jobs. Also, those in the low income bracket relatively tend to have practically no public social insurance coverage. To improve this situation, some appropriate policy measures are required.
(16) Regarding the hopes for becoming regular employees, people who wish to work as regular employees “at their current company” are categorized as “Core I” and those who wish to become regular employees “at other companies” as “Core II.” Non-standard employees who wish to work as regular employees “at their current company” tend to increase when their companies have the systems for converting their status to regular employees. Given this, it is important to work for the spread of such systems for the change of status of employment.

(17) A relationship, though only a moderate one, can be observed between being the “weak” in non-standard employment and the degree of job satisfaction.

(18) If we call people with two or more factors for the weak as the “multiple weak”:

(a) 20% of male non-standard employees and around 17% of female non-standard employees fall in the category of the “weak” in the broadest sense, and some kind of special measures should be taken to improve their situations. When the scope is limited to the “Core” brackets, those falling in these brackets accounts for 3-4% of non-standard employees.

(b) While the ratio of the most broadly defined “weak” is higher among males, the ratio of the “Core” brackets is higher among females, making it necessary to consider responses to the more severe situation with female employees as the main target.

(c) Looking at the “multiple weak” of the three types, who have three out of four factors of the “weak” described above, the “income” relationship (=low income) incorporates all the types. The “hopes for becoming regular employees” relationship covers the second broadest scope. Therefore, it can be assumed that measures to deal with “low income” will cover the broadest scope of the “weak in non-standard employment,” followed by measures to take care of the “hopes for becoming regular employees.”

(19) For the time being, the necessity for the following responses is suggested for the weak in non-standard employment.

(a) In developing measures to deal with “low income,” the raising of the minimum wage seems effective particularly for the above-described low income earners. Such measures should also focus on structural differences in employment conditions and employment purposes between part-time workers, and contract employees and temporary agency workers (registration-type in particular).

(b) For non-standard employees wishing to become regular employees “at their current company,” it is important, as pointed out above, for these companies to put the systems in place for providing such non-standard employees with
opportunities to become regular employees. For those hoping to work as regular employees “at other companies,” there is the need for the improvement of labor supply-demand matching systems, including HelloWork.