

Notes on statistical tables

【 Notes on overall tables 】

1. Figures may not add up to totals because figures are rounded to ten thousand or “unclassifiable/not reported” is included in totals.
2. “0” indicates that the figure is less than half of the given unit. “-” indicates that the figure does not exist. “…” indicates that the figure is not surveyed, tabulated or calculated.
3. In the Detailed Tabulation, inmates of prisons, detention centers and other such facilities and the personnel resided in Self-Defense Forces areas are excluded from the tabulation. And the Detailed Tabulation sample universe covers only the second month of the second year sample in the Basic Tabulation, with the sample size being approximately one-quarter of that in the Basic Tabulation. Figures in the Detailed Tabulation don’t necessarily correspond with those in the Basic Tabulation because of the difference in the coverage. Items related to “labour underutilization” were presented in the category “labour force status” in Detailed Tabulation in January 2018. Hence, the definition of “Not in Labour force” and some other items in Detailed Tabulation are different from the ones used in Basic Tabulation or used in Detailed Tabulation until 2017.

【 Notes on time series tables 】

1. Attention needs to be paid when comparing the change over the year of weekly hours of work, etc. because the number of holidays and days of the week in the survey week* are not always the same.
* The last seven days of every month. As for December, 20th to 26th.
2. The benchmark population for calculating the results of the Labour Force Survey is revised every five years since 1982. The data from October 2005 through December 2021 and the data until 1977 have been adjusted to comparable time-series data. In addition, some of database on e-Stat have been adjusted to comparable time-series data. Therefore, these data are different from the annual report published in each year and from the data of the old criteria, which is no longer used for comparable time-series data. For further information, refer to “2022 revision of benchmark population”. In comparable time-series data, there are periods where the figures have not been adjusted, and the results for those periods include difference due to the revision. For further information of difference, refer to “Reference Tab. 1 Difference in level of the benchmark revisions” of “Sampling Method, Estimation Method, and Sampling Errors of Estimates”.
3. Due to the Great East Japan Earthquake, results for whole Japan and Tohoku are missing from March through August 2011. So “Supplementary-estimated figures” have been used. “< >” indicates supplementary estimated figures or year-on-year changes (for the same month or period) based on comparisons with such estimates.
4. On the release of January results, the seasonal adjustments are computed retroactively by adding new data for twelve months of the previous year. For further information, refer to “5. Seasonal adjustment methods” of “Sampling Method, Estimation Method, and Sampling Errors of Estimates”.
5. Concerning the number of unemployed persons by reason for seeking a job, the figures prior to 1984 are not available. The categories of reasons for seeking a job were changed and subdivided from January 2002. Therefore, attention needs to be paid when making time series comparisons.

【 Notes on results by Industrial Classification and Occupational Classification 】

Along with the revision of the Japan Standard Industrial Classification (JSIC) and the Japan Standard Occupational Classification, the industrial classification and occupational classification of employed persons used in the tabulation of the Labour Force Survey are revised. Retrospective data are prepared to the extent possible for each revision. However, it should be noted that long-term, accurate retrospective connections cannot be made due to the impact of the changes in the classification contents by the revision.

Period of revision of the Japan Standard Industrial Classification
and the corresponding time series data range

Period of revision of the Japan Standard Industrial Classification	The corresponding time series data range for the Labour Force Survey
13th revision (2013)	2002～
12th revision (2007)	2002～

11th revision (2002)	1998~2009
10th revision (1993)	1953~2002

* In the Labour Force Survey, the results classified by JSIC revision 12th and JSIC revision 13th are directly comparable.

Period of revision of the Japan Standard Occupational Classification
and the corresponding time series data range

Period of revision of the Japan Standard Occupational Classification	The corresponding time series data range for the Labour Force Survey
5th revision (2009)	2009~
4th revision (1997)	1953~2010

【 Notes on regional tables and reference tables monthly results for Southern-Kanto and Kinki 】

1. The regional classification used in the current Labour Force Survey consists of the prefectures in the following table.

Region	Prefecture
Hokkaido	Hokkaido
Tohoku	Aomori, Iwate, Miyagi, Akita, Yamagata, Fukushima
Southern-Kanto	Saitama, Chiba, Tokyo, Kanagawa
Northern-Kanto, Koshin	Ibaraki, Tochigi, Gumma, Yamanashi, Nagano
Hokuriku	Niigata, Toyama, Ishikawa, Fukui
Tokai	Gifu, Shizuoka, Aichi, Mie
Kinki	Shiga, Kyoto, Osaka, Hyogo, Nara, Wakayama
Chugoku	Tottori, Shimane, Okayama, Hiroshima, Yamaguchi
Shikoku	Tokushima, Kagawa, Ehime, Kochi
Kyushu	Fukuoka, Saga, Nagasaki, Kumamoto, Oita, Miyazaki, Kagoshima
Okinawa	Okinawa

2. Rates for regional results are calculated with numerators and denominators which are rounded off to the nearest thousand.
3. The precision of “the monthly results for Southern-Kanto and Kinki” released as reference tables are insufficient compared to the results of whole Japan.

【 Notes on reference tables prefectural results (model-based estimation) 】

1. The precision of the prefectural results is lower compared to the results of whole Japan. The sampling design aims for wider region than prefectural, thus the sample size for each prefecture (excluding Hokkaido, Okinawa) is relatively small and might be insufficient.
2. The figures are estimated by the time series regression model (TSRM). However, Hokkaido, Tokyo, Kanagawa, Aichi, Osaka and Okinawa have sufficient sample size and are estimated by the ratio estimation. The estimates are made using retrospectively adjusted comparable time-series data, for periods affected by the revision of the benchmark population to 2015 Census-based population estimates and 2020 Census-based population estimates.
3. The annual average of Kumamoto for 2016 is estimated using both collected questionnaire data and predicted values based on TSRM, due to the lack of questionnaire data caused by the 2016 Kumamoto Earthquake.
4. Figures of the latest five years are revised at the following release of the first quarter results.