

1 **Brief report**

2 **Title:** Workplace measures against COVID-19 during the winter third wave in Japan:
3 company size-based differences

4
5 Tomohiro Ishimaru¹, Masako Nagata², Ayako Hino³, Satoshi Yamashita¹, Seiichiro
6 Tateishi⁴, Mayumi Tsuji⁵, Akira Ogami⁶, Shinya Matsuda⁷, Yoshihisa Fujino¹ for the
7 CORoNaWork Project

8
9 **Author contributions:** Y.F. was the chairperson of the study group. T.I. conceived the
10 research questions. All the authors designed the research protocol and developed the
11 questionnaire. T.I. conducted the statistical analysis and drafted the initial manuscript
12 with Y.F. All the authors revised and approved the final manuscript.

13
14 **Authors' affiliations:**

15 ¹Department of Environmental Epidemiology, Institute of Industrial Ecological Sciences,
16 University of Occupational and Environmental Health, Japan, Kitakyushu, Japan

17 ²Department of Occupational Health Practice and Management, Institute of Industrial
18 Ecological Sciences, University of Occupational and Environmental Health, Japan,
19 Kitakyushu, Japan

20 ³Department of Mental Health, Institute of Industrial Ecological Sciences, University of
21 Occupational and Environmental Health, Japan, Kitakyushu, Japan

22 ⁴Department of Occupational Medicine, School of Medicine, University of Occupational
23 and Environmental Health, Japan, Kitakyushu, Japan

24 ⁵Department of Environmental Health, School of Medicine, University of Occupational and

25 Environmental Health, Japan, Kitakyushu, Japan

26 ⁶Department of Work Systems and Health, Institute of Industrial Ecological Sciences,

27 University of Occupational and Environmental Health, Japan, Kitakyushu, Japan

28 ⁷Department of Preventive Medicine and Community Health, School of Medicine,

29 University of Occupational and Environmental Health, Japan, Kitakyushu, Japan

30

31 **Corresponding author:**

32 Tomohiro Ishimaru, MD, MPH, PhD

33 Department of Environmental Epidemiology, Institute of Industrial Ecological Sciences,

34 University of Occupational and Environmental Health, 1-1 Iseigaoka, Yahata-nishi-ku,

35 Kitakyushu, Fukuoka 807-8555, Japan

36 Tel: +81-93-603-1611, Fax: +81-93-601-7324, e-mail: ishimaru@med.uoeh-u.ac.jp

37

38 **Abstract**

39 **Objectives:** Little is known about workplace measures against coronavirus disease 2019
40 (COVID-19) in Japan after the first state of emergency period, especially in micro-, small-,
41 and medium-sized enterprises (MSMEs). This study aimed to provide an overview of the
42 current situation of anti-COVID-19 measures in Japanese enterprises, considering
43 company size.

44 **Methods:** This study was an Internet-based nationwide cross-sectional study. Data were
45 collected using an online self-administered questionnaire in December 2020 during the
46 third wave of COVID-19. The chi-squared test for trend was performed to calculate the
47 *p*-value for trend for each workplace measure across company sizes.

48 **Results:** For the 27,036 participants, across company sizes, the most prevalent
49 workplace measure was encouraging mask wearing at work, followed by requesting that
50 employees refrain from going to work when ill and restricting work-related social
51 gatherings and entertainment. These measures were implemented by approximately
52 90% of large-scale enterprises and by more than 40% of micro- and small-scale
53 enterprises. In contrast, encouraging remote working and restricting eating and drinking
54 at personal workspaces were implemented by less than half of large-scale enterprises
55 and by around 15% of micro- and small-scale enterprises. There were statistically
56 significant differences in all workplace measures by company size (all *p*-values < .001).

57 **Conclusions:** We found that various responses to COVID-19 had been taken in
58 workplaces. However, some measures, including remote working, were still not well
59 implemented, especially in smaller enterprises. The findings suggest that occupational
60 health support for MSMEs is urgently needed to mitigate the current wave of COVID-19.

61 **Keywords:** COVID-19, infection, prevention, occupational health, SARS-CoV-2, worksite

62 **Introduction**

63 Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) is an infectious disease caused by SARS-CoV-2
64 that is easily transmitted between persons; therefore, infection prevention and control in
65 the workplace are of major concern.¹ A previous study in Japan reported that most
66 companies had taken individual-level precautions, such as hand washing and cough
67 etiquette, but lagged behind in terms of organizational-level initiatives such as remote
68 working and staggered commuting, especially in micro-, small-, and medium-sized
69 enterprises (MSMEs), because of limited resources to respond to COVID-19.² However,
70 this previous study was conducted in mid-March 2020 during the early stages of the
71 epidemic, and the current situation may differ.

72
73 A state of emergency was first declared in some areas of Japan on April 7, 2020; this
74 declaration was later extended to the entire country until May 25, 2020.³ Although Japan
75 did not impose a mandatory lockdown, many companies followed the voluntary-basis
76 request from the government during the period, which included temporary closures and
77 restrictions on business.⁴ One reason for the relatively low COVID-19 infection rate in
78 Japan may be the corporate infection control efforts in the workplace.⁵ However, little is
79 known about the current situation regarding workplace measures in Japan after the first
80 state of emergency declaration, especially in MSMEs. Therefore, the purpose of this
81 study was to provide an overview of the current situation of measures against COVID-19
82 in Japanese enterprises, taking company size into account. The findings will offer
83 evidence on good practice for balancing business and infection control. The results will
84 be useful for both countries and workplaces struggling during the pandemic.

85

86 **Subjects and Methods**

87 Study design and participants

88 This study was a part of the Collaborative Online Research on the Novel-coronavirus and
89 Work (CORoNaWork) Project. Fujino et al. have introduced the details of the study
90 protocol elsewhere.⁶ In brief, the CORoNaWork Project is an Internet-based nationwide
91 prospective cohort study in Japan. The present cross-sectional study used data from the
92 baseline survey, which was performed in December 2020. A total of 33,087 participants
93 selected using cluster sampling with stratification by sex, age, region, and job type
94 answered the online self-administered questionnaire. Panelists registered as health care
95 workers or caregivers were not invited to participate in the survey. After excluding invalid
96 responses, 27,036 participants were eligible for the analysis. When this survey was
97 conducted, the numbers of COVID-19 infections and deaths were much higher than in
98 the first and second waves; therefore, Japan was on maximum alert during the third
99 wave.

100

101 Questionnaire

102 This study used questionnaire data on sex, age, postal code of workplace, job type,
103 company size, and workplace measures. Postal code was used to identify the
104 geographical region of each workplace. The participants reported their job type as mainly
105 desk work, work involving communicating with people, or manual work. Company size
106 was classified as micro-scale (< 10 employees), small-scale (10–49 employees),
107 medium-scale (50–999 employees), or large-scale (\geq 1,000 employees).

108

109 An original list of workplace measures was developed. We first prepared an initial list

110 based on relevant publications listing standard workplace measures against COVID-19 in
111 Japan.^{2, 7, 8} Subsequently, we developed the draft list in consultation with an expert panel
112 on the basis of their practical experience. Finally, we selected 10 prioritized items, and all
113 authors approved the final list. The question assessing workplace measures was as
114 follows: “Are any of the following measures against COVID-19 currently taken at your
115 workplace?” For each measure listed, the response options were *yes* or *no*.

116

117 Data analysis

118 The participants’ demographic information is shown using counts and percentages. We
119 compared the percentage for each of the 10 workplace measures against COVID-19 by
120 company size. Chi-square tests for trend were performed to calculate the *p*-values for
121 trend for each workplace measure across company sizes. Statistical significance was
122 assessed at *p*-value < 0.05. Stata/SE 16.1 (StataCorp, College Station, TX, USA) was
123 used for the statistical analysis.

124

125 Results

126 Of the 27,036 participants, approximately half were men (51.1%) and around half
127 engaged in desk work (49.8%) (Table 1). Regarding company size, 22.8% of the
128 participants worked at micro-scale companies, 16.2% worked at small-scale companies,
129 35.9% worked at medium-scale companies, and 25.1% worked at large-scale
130 companies.

131

132 Table 2 displays the number and percentage of respondents reporting each workplace
133 measure against COVID-19 by company size. For all company sizes, the most prevalent

134 workplace measure was encouraging mask wearing at work, followed by requesting that
135 employees refrain from going to work when ill and restricting work-related social
136 gatherings and entertainment. These measures were implemented by approximately
137 90% of large-scale enterprises and by more than 40% of micro-scale enterprises. In
138 contrast, encouraging remote working and restricting eating and drinking at personal
139 workspaces were implemented by less than half of large-scale enterprises and by around
140 15% of micro- and small-scale enterprises. There were statistically significant differences
141 in all 10 workplace measures across companies of different sizes (all p -values < .001).

142

143 **Discussion**

144 The current study provides an overview of workplace measures against COVID-19 during
145 the winter third wave in Japan, taking company size into account. We found that,
146 especially in large-scale enterprises, various responses to COVID-19 had already been
147 taken at workplaces, including encouraging mask wearing at work, requesting that
148 employees refrain from going to work when ill, and restricting work-related social
149 gatherings and entertainment. Our results are similar to those reported in a previous
150 study on workplace measures conducted in mid-March 2020 (encouraging mask wearing
151 at work: 80.2%; requesting that employees refrain from going to work when ill: 76.4%).²
152 These measures align with recommendations of the national campaign during the first
153 state of emergency period, which included avoiding “the 3Cs” (closed spaces, crowded
154 places, and close-contact settings).³ Thus, these types of workplace measures have
155 been implemented since the early stage of the epidemic.

156

157 Another remarkable finding of this study is that smaller enterprises were less likely to

158 have implemented workplace measures against COVID-19. The finding is consistent with
159 a previous study conducted in mid-March 2020.² This finding therefore indicates that
160 MSMEs did not make much progress in terms of measures against COVID-19 since the
161 first state of emergency declaration. One possible reason for this lack of progress is that
162 MSMEs often face difficulty in implementing occupational health activities because of a
163 lack of financial, human capital, and technological resources.⁹ In Japan, the requirements
164 for occupational health staff members depend on the number of employees in a
165 workplace: $\geq 1,000$ employees—a full-time occupational physician, 50–999
166 employees—a part-time occupational physician, ≥ 50 employees—a health officer, and
167 10–49 employees—a health promoter.¹⁰ Therefore, the results of the present study may
168 be attributed to the difference in occupational health staff members by company size.
169 This finding suggests that occupational health support from external resources is urgently
170 needed for MSMEs. For example, the development of simple tools for infection
171 prevention, mechanisms for external occupational health experts to offer advice, and
172 financial support for workplace measures can be considered.

173
174 Some measures, such as remote working and restrictions on eating and drinking at
175 personal workspaces, had still not been implemented by the majority of
176 companies—even large-scale enterprises. Few studies have investigated the proportion
177 of companies imposing restrictions on eating and drinking at personal workspaces, but
178 the implementation of remote working has not changed much, compared with the results
179 of previous studies conducted around the first state of emergency period.^{2, 4} The finding
180 suggests potential obstacles to promoting remote working, such as cultural barriers and
181 administrative difficulties.¹¹ Cultural barriers may exist for both employers and employees.

182 For example, employers may excessively demand that work to be carried out on site, and
183 workers are willing to work at the office.¹² Interestingly, the current study found that the
184 frequency of encouraging remote work was lower in workplaces with 10–49 employees
185 (14.9%) than in workplaces with nine or fewer employees (21.3%). We considered the
186 possibility that administrative difficulties might be more likely to occur in small-scale
187 enterprises than in micro-scale enterprises. However, remote working is effective not only
188 during a pandemic but also during large earthquakes and other disasters.¹³ In terms of
189 business continuity, future research is warranted on the further expansion of remote
190 working, especially in small-scale enterprises.

191
192 This study has several limitations. First, the current study did not use random sampling or
193 collect data from all companies. Consequently, the sample may not represent the
194 national situation, and any generalization of the results should be carried out with care.
195 For example, there is a risk of overestimation if multiple study participants were from the
196 same organization. To cope with these problems, the current study was conducted using
197 cluster sampling with stratification by sex, age, region, and job type. Second, the current
198 study did not evaluate all types of workplace measures; for instance, information
199 dissemination and actions for confirmed COVID-19 cases were not considered. However,
200 because we focused on preventive measures listed in guidelines and relevant
201 publications in Japan,^{2, 7, 8} we believe that these items reflect the current situation of
202 measures against COVID-19 at each company.

203
204 In conclusion, this study revealed the current situation regarding workplace measures
205 against COVID-19 in Japan. We found that various responses to COVID-19 have been

206 implemented at workplaces. However, some measures, including remote working, were
207 still not well implemented, especially in relatively small enterprises. The findings suggest
208 that occupational health support for MSMEs is urgently needed to mitigate the current
209 wave of COVID-19.

210

211 **Acknowledgments**

212 This study was supported by a research fund from the University of Occupational and
213 Environmental Health, Japan; General Incorporated Foundation (Anshin Zaidan): The
214 Development of Educational Materials on Mental Health Measures for Managers at
215 Small-sized Enterprises; Health, Labour and Welfare Sciences Research Grants:
216 Comprehensive Research for Women's Healthcare (H30-josei-ippan-002); Research for
217 the Establishment of an Occupational Health System in Times of Disaster
218 (H30-roudou-ippan-007), and scholarship donations from CHUGAI PHARMACEUTICAL
219 CO., LTD.

220

221 The current members of the CORoNaWork Project, in alphabetical order, are as follows:
222 Dr. Yoshihisa Fujino (present chairperson of the study group), Dr. Akira Ogami, Dr. Arisa
223 Harada, Dr. Ayako Hino, Dr. Chimed-Ochir Odgerel , Dr. Hajime Ando, Dr. Hisashi Eguchi,
224 Dr. Kazunori Ikegami, Dr. Keiji Muramatsu, Dr. Koji Mori, Dr. Kyoko Kitagawa, Dr. Masako
225 Nagata, Dr. Mayumi Tsuji, Dr. Rie Tanaka, Dr. Ryutaro Matsugaki, Dr. Seiishiro Tateishi, Dr.
226 Shinya Matsuda, Dr. Tomohiro Ishimaru, Dr. Tomohisa Nagata, Dr. Yosuke Mafune, and
227 Ms. Ning Liu. All members are affiliated with the University of Occupational and
228 Environmental Health, Japan.

229

230 **Disclosure**

231 *Approval of the research protocol:* This study was approved by the Ethics Committee of
232 the University of Occupational and Environmental Health, Japan. *Informed Consent:*
233 Informed consent was obtained from all participants. *Registry and the Registration No. of*
234 *the study/trial:* N/A. *Animal Studies:* N/A. *Conflict of Interest:* N/A.

235

236 **References**

237 1. Wu D, Wu T, Liu Q, Yang Z. The SARS-CoV-2 outbreak: What we know. *Int J Infect Dis*
238 2020;94:44-48.

239 2. Sasaki N, Kuroda R, Tsuno K, Kawakami N. Workplace responses to COVID-19 and
240 their association with company size and industry in an early stage of the epidemic
241 in Japan. *Environmental and Occupational Health Practice*
242 2020;2:eohp.2020-0007-OA.

243 3. Shimizu K, Negita M. Lessons Learned from Japan's Response to the First Wave of
244 COVID-19: A Content Analysis. *Healthcare (Basel)* 2020;8.

245 4. Nomura S, Yoneoka D, Tanoue Y, *et al.* Time to Reconsider Diverse Ways of Working
246 in Japan to Promote Social Distancing Measures against the COVID-19. *J Urban*
247 *Health* 2020;97:457-460.

248 5. World Health Organization. WHO Coronavirus Disease (COVID-19) Dashboard.
249 <https://covid19.who.int/>. Published January 2020. Accessed February 1, 2021.

250 6. Fujino Y, Ishimaru T, Eguchi H, *et al.* Protocol for a nationwide Internet-based health
251 survey in workers during the COVID-19 pandemic in 2020. *medRxiv*
252 2021:2021.02.02.21249309.

253 7. Japan Society for Occupational Health, Japanese Society of Travel Medicine.

- 254 Information of new coronavirus infection. <https://www.sanei.or.jp/>. Published
255 December 2020. Accessed February 1, 2021.
- 256 8. Ministry of Health Labour and Welfare, Japan. Checklist for the prevention of
257 COVID-19 spreading at workplaces.
258 <https://www.mhlw.go.jp/content/000694987.pdf>. Published November 2020.
259 Accessed February 1, 2021.
- 260 9. Hasle P, Limborg HJ. A review of the literature on preventive occupational health and
261 safety activities in small enterprises. *Ind Health* 2006;44:6-12.
- 262 10. Muto T. Status and Future Challenges of Japanese Occupational Health Services.
263 *Policy and Practice in Health and Safety* 2007;5:169-180.
- 264 11. Chung H, van der Horst M. Women's employment patterns after childbirth and the
265 perceived access to and use of flexitime and teleworking. *Human relations;*
266 *studies towards the integration of the social sciences* 2018;71:47-72.
- 267 12. Lott Y, Abendroth A-K. The non-use of telework in an ideal worker culture: why
268 women perceive more cultural barriers. *Community, Work & Family*
269 2020;23:593-611.
- 270 13. Anan T, Mori K, Kajiki S, Tateishi S. Emerging Occupational Health Needs at a
271 Semiconductor Factory Following the 2016 Kumamoto Earthquakes: Evaluation of
272 Effectiveness and Necessary Improvements of List of Postdisaster Occupational
273 Health Needs. *J Occup Environ Med* 2018;60:198-203.

274

275 Table 1. Demographic characteristics of the participants

	<i>n</i>	(%)
Sex		
Men	13,814	(51.1)
Women	13,222	(48.9)
Age (years)		
20–29	1,905	(7.0)
30–39	4,858	(18.0)
40–49	8,011	(29.6)
50–59	9,012	(33.2)
60–65	3,250	(12.0)
Geographical region of workplace		
Hokkaido	695	(2.6)
Tohoku	2,346	(8.7)
Kanto	6,322	(23.3)
Chubu	4,894	(18.1)
Kansai	3,180	(11.8)
Chugoku and Shikoku	3,379	(12.5)
Kyushu and Okinawa	2,305	(8.5)
Unknown	3,915	(14.5)
Job type		
Desk work	13,468	(49.8)
Communication work	6,927	(25.6)
Manual work	6,641	(24.6)
Company size (number of employees)		
1–9	6,165	(22.8)
10–49	4,390	(16.2)
50–999	9,703	(35.9)
≥ 1000	6,778	(25.1)

277 Table 2. Workplace measures against COVID-19 by company size

	Company size (number of employees)				<i>p</i> -value for trend
	1–9 <i>n</i> = 6,165	10–49 <i>n</i> = 4,390	50–999 <i>n</i> = 9,703	≥ 1000 <i>n</i> = 6,778	
Encouraging mask wearing at work, <i>n</i> (%)	3,319 (53.8)	3,303 (75.2)	8,452 (87.1)	6,149 (90.7)	< .001
Requesting that employees refrain from going to work when ill, <i>n</i> (%)	2,972 (48.2)	3,052 (69.5)	8,103 (83.5)	6,103 (90.0)	< .001
Restricting work-related social gatherings and entertainment, <i>n</i> (%)	2,743 (44.5)	2,838 (64.6)	7,709 (79.4)	5,924 (87.4)	< .001
Enforcing temperature measurement, <i>n</i> (%)	2,068 (33.5)	2,543 (57.9)	7,308 (75.3)	5,330 (78.6)	< .001
Installing partitions or changing the working environment (e.g., desk layout or flow lines), <i>n</i> (%)	1,908 (30.9)	2,059 (46.9)	6,457 (66.5)	5,310 (78.3)	< .001
Restricting face-to-face meetings, <i>n</i> (%)	1,835 (29.8)	1,782 (40.6)	6,036 (62.2)	5,024 (74.1)	< .001
Stopping business trips, <i>n</i> (%)	1,757 (28.5)	1,836 (41.8)	6,056 (62.4)	5,011 (73.9)	< .001
Arranging health screenings for visitors, <i>n</i> (%)	1,496 (24.3)	1,498 (34.1)	5,279 (54.4)	4,026 (59.4)	< .001
Encouraging remote working, <i>n</i> (%)	1,314 (21.3)	652 (14.9)	2,556 (26.3)	3,272 (48.3)	< .001
Restricting eating and drinking at personal workspaces, <i>n</i> (%)	677 (11.0)	511 (11.6)	1,843 (19.0)	1,566 (23.1)	< .001

278

279