Mapping internet activity in Australian cities during COVID-19 lockdown: how occupational factors drive inequality

Cameron Zachreson,[1] Erika Martino,[2] Martin Tomko,[3]
Freya M. Shearer,[2] Rebecca Bentley,[2] and Nicholas Geard[1,4]

[1]*School of Computing and Information Systems, The University of Melbourne, Australia*

[2]*Melbourne School of Population and Global Health, The University of Melbourne, Australia*

[3]*Melbourne School of Engineering, The University of Melbourne, Australia*

[4]*Department of Infectious Diseases, Melbourne Medical School, The University of Melbourne, Australia*

(Dated: February 5, 2021)

Abstract

During the COVID-19 pandemic, evidence has accumulated that movement restrictions enacted to combat virus spread produce disparate consequences along socioeconomic lines. One explanation for this differential impact is the distribution of people into occupations that can be performed from home and may provide greater financial security. However, little is known about the nature and scale of shifting home-based work patterns and their geographic distribution, despite this being a likely determinant of the success of geographically defined COVID-19 lockdown strategies. We investigate the hypothesis that people engaged in financially secure employment are better able to adapt to mobility restrictions, due to common occupational factors. In the context of two Australian urban centres, we test this hypothesis by analysing changes to home-based internet usage and quantify the relationship between area-level measures of population income security, the ability to perform job requirements remotely, and the degree of transition to home-based work during COVID-19. Our analysis confirms that financial security in Australia is geographically clustered and concentrated. Income security is also correlated with increased internet traffic during work hours under lockdown, and home-based work patterns that persist post-lockdown. Our findings suggest that geographic diversity in preparedness for government-imposed restrictions should be factored into response planning and provision of social and economic support for residents within lockdown areas.

Globally, the COVID-19 pandemic has dramatically changed the ways in which people live and work. Governments have adopted various strategies to stem the spread of infection by restricting mobility and limiting the rate of physical interaction between people [1]. In Australia, these strategies have included limitations on gathering size, restrictions on travel across state borders, the closing of many workplaces, and encouragement of work-from-home practices. To help ensure compliance with these policies, and to dampen their short-term economic impact, the Australian government implemented sweeping social assistance programs. These included the temporary COVID Supplementary payment for the unemployed (JobSeeker), the JobKeeper wage subsidy, early access to superannuation (retirement) accounts, and targeted support for severely affected sectors [2, 3]. However, these measures cannot be maintained indefinitely, and the protracted COVID-19 pandemic may outlast Australia's ability to maintain the high levels of economic support that have so far helped ensure compliance with response measures. The broad aim of the present study is to quantify and map socioeconomic factors that are likely to determine future robustness to pandemic-related stress. Detailed knowledge of the geographic distribution of these factors will assist when predicting the social impact of targeted mitigation policies during future outbreaks of COVID-19, or any subsequent pandemic.

Broadly, we expect a reduced effectiveness and increased economic impact of pandemic mitigation measures where there is a concentration of people who cannot adapt to home-based work because of the nature of their employment. We know, for example, that factory-based occupations, hospitality, and essential service workers are unable to work from home [4–7]. In Australia, these types of occupations are generally associated with lower income security, as our findings corroborate. The confluence of such occupational and financial constraints place many workers at a greater risk of exposure to infectious disease, either through the occupational hazard of close social interactions, or because without adequate leave or income entitlements, they have a limited ability to remain at home when unwell [6, 8, 9]. This conflict between household economic needs and public health orders to stay at home is problematic for governments implementing non-pharmaceutical pandemic mitigation measures.

COVID-19 has driven a general economic contraction brought about through concerted reductions in consumer, recreational, and occupational activity [10–12]. Impact disparities can be explained (at least partially) by examining the distribution of employment types within and between subpopulations. Those who can perform their work requirements at home from a computer with internet access have experienced less-severe economic impact [13–18]. By en-

gaging in written communication, and replacing face-to-face interactions with online streaming activity, work-related tasks are likely to result in measurable increases to home internet traffic. Population-level data on home internet usage may therefore provide a useful complement to the widely available mobility data typically used to monitor and model the real-time effects of COVID-19 [16, 17, 19–27]. While mobility data can tell us who is staying home and where people are going when they leave the home, internet data provides critically important information on what is happening within households, particularly in relation to adapting their work arrangements to COVID-19 lockdown requirements.

Here, we demonstrate how relationships between occupational factors and home internet traffic can provide unique insights into the disparities amplified by the pandemic and associated non-pharmaceutical intervention policies. Our results support the hypothesis that occupational factors link the ability to work from home with income security, and clearly show how this link produces strong positive correlations between income security and increases to home internet activity during COVID-19 restrictions. Our results in the Australian context may help explain the observations of other recent studies describing the connection between income, internet, and the ability to self-isolate during COVID-19 [17, 21]. Overall, the results we present contribute to the detailed picture that is currently forming of the impacts of COVID-19 on human behaviour, and will help policy makers to understand the balance between public health and social impact in making future decisions. Furthermore, results such as those presented in this work will contribute to the ability to produce precise, integrated models of epidemic dynamics connected to social and economic phenomena.

I. RESULTS

We examine the relationships between income security, the ability to work from home, and changes to home internet use volumes during the COVID-19 pandemic in Australia. We utilise a population-scale data set describing home internet use patterns aggregated on the scale of Statistical Area Level 2 (SA2) released by nbn co ltd. (**nbn**™), a Government Business Enterprise providing national, wholesale broadband access in Australia. The SA2 regions are defined by the Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS), and typically contain between 1,000 and 10,000 residents. We also leverage detailed population surveys quantifying the distributions of occupation types within local regions, and the characteristics of different occupation classifications [28–31]. Finally, we use recent survey data collected in September, 2020 by the COVID-19 Attitudes Resilience and Epidemiology (CARE) study to substantiate

our individual-level interpretation of observed population-scale trends.

The data provided by **nbn**™ consist of upload and download volume (in bytes) by individual households over 30 minute intervals, spatially aggregated into SA2 regions. Different types of internet usage (such as streaming movies, videoconferencing and online gaming) are associated with different patterns of upload and download volume. The high time resolution and structure of the data allowed us to approximately differentiate between background activity, recreational activity, and work-related activity.

To reveal spatial variations in residents' ability to adapt their working arrangements to home-based activities, we investigate the relationship between internet activity and the characteristics of local occupation distributions. We define several measures to translate local distributions of occupation types into meaningful quantifiers of two properties: a) income security, and b) the ability to work from home. We then assess the relationship between these quantifiers and putative work-related internet activity.

We focus on the urban areas of Sydney and Melbourne during a pre-COVID period (which we use as a baseline), during the first pandemic wave (with Australia-wide transmission and restrictions), and during the second wave (with substantial transmission and restrictions in Melbourne only). We identify positive correlations between income security and changes to internet activity during COVID-19. These correlations are consistent with the assertion that higher income security is associated with more people working from home during lockdown. This assertion is further supported by individual-level data from the CARE survey. We observe that in Sydney this trend persists after the release of lockdown restrictions, indicating the possibility of a "new normal" of remote working conditions, particularly for occupations associated with higher income security. In Melbourne, we find that the role of children conducting their studies online disrupts these correlations due to an inverse relationship between income security and the proportion of families with children.

A. Employment, income security, and the ability to work from home

To quantify the salient features of the complex distributions of employment characteristics in Sydney and Melbourne, we constructed an income security index using data on employment security and income characteristics linked to the Australian and New Zealand Standard Classification of Occupations (ANZSCO). Income data was sourced from the ABS Census of 2016, and employment security data was extracted from the survey of Household, Income and Labour Dynamics in Australia (HILDA).

For each occupation, we computed income security as the product of the proportion of securely employed HILDA respondents, and the average weekly wage reported by the ABS (with income rescaled to the sample maximum). This gives a value between 0 and 1, with zero corresponding to occupations with no securely employed individuals and values of 1 corresponding to occupations with maximal remuneration as well as 100% securely employed respondents. The distributions of these values and the component measures of income and proportion securely employed are shown in the Supporting Material Fig. S3 (See the Methods section for a complete description of income security calculations).

After computing income security values for each occupation, we used occupation distributions from the ABS National Census of 2016 to compute the weighted average income security for each region on the scale of SA2 to match the spatial granularity of the internet traffic data used in this study. The result is a geospatial distribution of average income security for Sydney and Melbourne, as estimated from independent distributions of income security by occupation type, and occupation by region.

Income security is distributed spatially according to distinct patterns, with high values in the central and northeast suburbs of both Sydney and Melbourne (Figure 1a and 1b). The upper 50% income security quantile (Figure 1c) favours managerial and office-based occupations, while the lower 50% quantile (Figure 1d) contains more service staff and other socially-oriented occupations. The distributions of average income security among SA2s in Sydney and Melbourne (respectively) are provided in the Supporting Information Figure S4, which demonstrates that the distributions in the two regions are not significantly different (two sample t-test, $p = 0.552$).

To examine the qualitative association between income security and the ability to work from home indicated by the distributions in Figures 1c and 1d, we apply the occupation classification method developed by Dingel and Neiman [32]. This results in a binary (0 or 1) value indicating whether or not a particular occupation type can be performed from home. We found a strong association between income security and the ability to work from home (Figure 2). This association was observed both by occupation (Figure 2a) and by geographic region (Figure 2b). See the Supporting Information Figure S5 for histograms of the distributions shown in Figure 2a as well as the distributions of the x- and y-axis variables used in Figure 2b.



FIG. 1. Geospatial and occupational distribution of income security. The choropleth maps in (a) and (b) demonstrate the geospatial distribution of income security in Greater Melbourne and Greater Sydney (respectively) on the scale of Statistical Area Level 2 (SA2). Areas below the median income security index of 0.1809 are colored orange while those above the median are colored purple. The histograms in (c) and (d) demonstrate the distribution of the population in these regions over the income security spectrum, with indicative occupation types for each bin shown in the bottom y-axis labels (the label corresponding to the most prevalent occupation classification for each bin is shown). For both histograms, waiters have the lowest income security, while anaesthetists have the highest.



FIG. 2. Relationship between income security and the ability to work from home. Box plots in (a) compare the distributions of log-transformed income security, grouped by the ability to work from home for each of 321 occupations classified by 4-digit ANZSCO codes. The distributions in (a) are computed from the HILDA survey, 2018. The scatter plot in (b) demonstrates the correlation between average income security for each SA2 region, and the corresponding average proportion of individuals who can work from home, computed from the occupation distribution of each SA2 in the Greater Sydney and Greater Melbourne regions released in the 2016 ABS Census. [Note: the log-transformed income security data in (a) omits 24 occupations that had a value of 0 for income security (no securely employed HILDA respondents), of these, 2 were grouped into the "can work from home" category and 22 into the "cannot work from home" category.]

B. Changes to internet traffic during COVID-19

To quantify changes to home internet use during COVID-19 restrictions, we aggregated internet activity data reported for the SA2 regions within Greater Sydney and Greater Melbourne. For the pre-COVID baseline, we chose the period spanning from October through November, 2019. Over this period, we averaged the per-user upload and download rates from the hours of 9am to 12pm in order to capture putative work-related activity (see Methods). During the first and second waves of COVID-19 in Australia, peaks in case incidence coincided with the implementation of the most restrictive policies, and were followed by increases in total internet use, which peaked approximately one to three weeks after implementation of the tightest level of restrictions (Figure 3). The grey bands in Figure 3 show the periods over which **nbn**™ data was averaged in order to quantify changes to internet activity during first and second waves of COVID-19.

We found that during restrictions associated with the first wave, areas with higher income security tended to exhibit larger absolute and relative changes to download volume (Figure 4a, 4b, and 4c). Examination of absolute download volumes during the baseline and first-wave periods shows that increasing absolute and relative changes to download volume with income security corresponds to a shift from decreasing, to uncorrelated absolute download levels (Figure 4a). However, absolute upload volume shows the opposite trend (Figure 4d). For upload activity, baseline rates are uncorrelated with income security, while first-wave rates demonstrate an increasing trend. This produces relative and absolute changes with income security similar to those observed for downloads (Figure 4e and 4f). The strong spatial correspondence between income security and relative increases in internet traffic during the first-wave lockdown is apparent in heat maps of these quantities for Sydney and Melbourne (Figure 5).

In our analysis of the first-wave period (Figure 4), we grouped the regions of Greater Sydney and Greater Melbourne because lockdown policies were implemented as a nationally-coordinated response, and both jurisdictions were under essentially the same policy framework. However, it is worth noting here that during the selected time interval (April 18th to April 24th), school holidays were still in effect in Greater Sydney. On the other hand, children had returned to their studies in Greater Melbourne where school facilities were closed and most students were engaging in classroom activities remotely. Regions with higher income security tend to have a lower proportion of families with children ($\rho = -0.39$ 95%CI $[-0.45, -0.32]$). Remote learning activity therefore weakens the positive association between upload activity



FIG. 3. Timeseries plots of average daytime internet use, COVID-19 case incidence, and restriction policy implementation for (a) New South Wales and (b) Victoria, Australia. Daily average upload rates per household, per 30 min interval between 9am and 12pm are shown as blue dots for weekdays (blue dots, the blue line is the 7-day average). Daily case incidence is shown as black dots (the black line is the 7 day average), and dates on which restriction policies were modified are shown as vertical dashed lines for increasing (red) and decreasing (green) restriction levels. The grey bands indicate the dates over which **nbn**^{TM} data was averaged for our analysis of first- and second-wave changes. See the Supporting Information Figure S1 for an equivalent timeseries presenting average downloads rather than uploads.

and income security produced by adults working from home. Correlations between income security, the proportion of families with children, and internet activity in Sydney and Melbourne (respectively) during the first wave of COVID-19 restrictions are shown in the Supporting Information Tables S2 and S3.

Despite these differences in student activity, households in regions with higher income security increased both upload and download volume during the first wave of restrictions (Figure 4), consistent with the hypothesis that common factors determine financial resilience and the ability to respond to lockdown by working from home. Notably, changes in upload rates are much higher relative to baseline (up to approximately a factor of six, Figure 4f) than relative changes to download rates, which could be explained by the types of activities associated with replacing face-to-face interaction with online activity (i.e., video and audio streaming). In addition to the negative relation between income security and the proportion of families with children, there is a strong positive association between the proportion of families with children and baseline upload rates ($\rho = 0.72$ 95%CI $[0.68,\ 0.75]$). This suggests that children play a role in establishing the negative baseline correlation between download rates and income security (Figure 4a).

For the second wave of COVID-19 (and associated restrictions), we selected the appropriate time period using internet data from Victoria, where the second epidemic wave was concentrated. In Victoria during the second wave, internet activity peaked during the week of August 8th to August 14th. As for the first wave, this home internet activity peak immediately followed the implementation of the highest level of restrictions (Figure 3b).

Because of the substantially different epidemiological situations in Sydney (New South Wales) and Melbourne (Victoria) during the second-wave period (Figure 3), we examined the relationship between internet traffic, lockdown policy, and income security for each city separately. Comparing the two cities provides insight regarding the difference between discretionary changes in behaviour following COVID-19 (Greater Sydney), and the changes in behaviour associated with mandatory movement restrictions during an epidemic (Greater Melbourne).

While household internet traffic declines in Sydney during the second wave relative to the first wave, the positive correlation between income security and internet activity relative to baseline remains prominent for both downloads (Figure 6a, 6c), and uploads (Figure 6d, 6f). This is despite the absence of formal stay-at-home orders in the Greater Sydney region. The time interval between the first and second waves was long enough to support the assertion that behavioural changes made in response to COVID-19 lockdown policies remain observable



FIG. 4. Changes to internet use during the 1st wave of COVID-19 restrictions in Australia, plotted against income security for each SA2 region. (a) Shows absolute average household download rates before (black dots) and during (green dots) the selected period (April 18th to April 24th, 2020). (b) Plots the absolute change in average per-household download rate during the first-wave period, and (c) plots the change in download rate relative to baseline. (d) Shows absolute upload rates before (black) and during (green) COVID-19, while (e) shows absolute changes to upload volume, and (f) shows changes to upload volume relative to baseline. In each subplot, the internet traffic quantifiers are plotted against the income security score for the corresponding SA2 region, and Pearson's correlation coefficients with 95% CI intervals are shown in the legends.

after those policies have been formally relaxed.

Greater Melbourne behaves similarly in both waves with respect to changes in download traffic as a function of income security (compare Figure 4(a, c) to Figure 6(a, b)). However, changes to upload volumes do not mirror the correlations observed during the first-wave period (compare Figure 4(d, f) to Figure 6(d, e)). In fact, there are many areas of Melbourne with high income security that show substantial reductions in upload traffic during the second wave, relative to the first. While our data gives no immediate explanation for this counter-intuitive trend, we speculate that it may be due to alterations in work habits that occurred as the lockdown became protracted. Decreases in upload traffic without corresponding decreases in



FIG. 5. Choropleth maps demonstrating the geospatial distributions of income security and changes to internet activity during the first wave of COVID-19 restrictions in Greater Sydney and Greater Melbourne. The maps in (a) show the spatial distribution of aggregate income security, while (b) and (c) show the spatial distribution of changes in download and upload volumes (respectively) during the first-wave period (April 18th to April 24th, 2020).

download traffic could result from individuals continuing to perform work activities from home, but participating in less "face-to-face" online interaction. Conversely, widespread adoption of remote schooling practices could help explain the increase in upload rates for regions in the mid-range of the income security spectrum. Such an effect is consistent with the weak but positive correlations between the proportion of families with children and changes to upload volumes ($\rho = 0.15$ 95% CI $[0.033, 0.25]$, see Supporting Information Table S5). This suggestion is also consistent with the observation that daytime internet activity increases during school holidays, when children are more likely to be in the home (Figure 7b).

We hypothesise that schooling in the home had a greater impact on internet volume in general, and upload rates in particular, than working in the home during the second wave of COVID-19 restrictions in Melbourne. This hypothesis is supported by a preliminary principal component analysis, summarised in the Supporting Information Figure S2. This 3-component PCA shows an increased role of children in determining upload rates in Greater Melbourne during the second-wave period. Specifically, Figure S2 demonstrates a qualitative change in the relationship between the proportion of families with children, income security, and second-wave changes to upload activity. Upload rate is positively associated with the proportion of families with children in the first component (explaining 55% of the variance) and positively

associated with income security in the second component (explaining 32% of the variance). In both components, income security and the proportion of families with children are negatively associated. These PCA results support the suggestion that occupation-related correlations between net changes to upload activity and income security are disrupted by the activities of children in online schooling. This may be explained as a competing effect because lower average income security is associated with a higher proportion of families with children ($\rho = -0.45$ 95% CI $[-0.53, -0.35]$, Table S5), while the capacity to work from home increases with income security ($\rho = 0.90$ 95% CI $[0.88, 0.91]$, Figure 2b).



FIG. 6. Changes to internet use during the second wave of COVID-19 restrictions in Australia, plotted against income security for each SA2 region. (a) Shows absolute download volumes averaged over the baseline period and second wave of COVID-19 restriction policies (August 8th to August 14th, 2020), which includes baseline (black dots), 2nd wave values for Greater Sydney (blue squares), and second wave values for Greater Melbourne (orange triangles). Plots (b) and (c) show the change in download volumes relative to pre-COVID baseline as a function of income security index for each SA2 in Sydney and Melbourne, respectively. Plots (d), (e) and (f) show the same analysis as (a), (b), and (c), respectively, for uploads rather than downloads. In each subplot, the internet traffic quantifiers are plotted against the income security score for the corresponding SA2 region, and Pearson's correlation coefficients with 95% CI intervals are shown in the legends.

C. Change of work environment for above- and below-median income earners

To complement our analysis of spatially-aggregated household-level associations between income security and the ability to work from home, we also analysed individual-level survey data collected by the COVID-19 Attitudes Resilience and Epidemiology (CARE) study. An online cross-sectional survey of 1006 residents of Victoria, Australia. While the CARE study did not collect data on income security *per-se*, it did record the annual income bracket reported by each respondent.

CARE survey results for income and working from home due to COVID-19 (Victoria)

changed work environment?	yes	no	total
above median income	144	267	411
below median income	93	371	464
total	237	638	875

TABLE I. From the CARE survey: comparison between above and below-median income groups' responses to the question: "Have you personally experienced a change in work environment (working from home) because of COVID-19 and the measures to prevent its spread? (yes or no)"

One of the survey questions was posed as follows: "Have you personally experienced a change in work environment (working from home) because of COVID-19 and the measures to prevent its spread? (yes or no)". We computed the proportion of respondents who reported income above and below (or within) the median income bracket for the sample (sample median annual income was $AUD 60,000 to 69,999) who answered "yes" to this question. We then performed a two-tailed Fisher's exact test to determine the resulting odds ratio between the two groups, and its statistical significance given the response numbers (see Table I). The results demonstrate a strong positive relationship between income and switching to work from home, with an odds ratio of 2.15 (95% CI [1.59, 2.92], $p = 6.8\times10^{-7}$) computed for the above-median income group, relative to the median-and-below income group. While the income data tabulated by the CARE survey is not an exact representation of the income security score used in our analysis of internet trends (which incorporated contract classification), this result supports the same conclusion: those with higher financial security have more capacity to change their work environments in response to COVID-19 restrictions.

II. DISCUSSION

By combining an analysis of occupational factors and distributions with large-scale, high-resolution, real-time data on internet activity, we have broadly characterised the impact of COVID-19 restrictions on two major urban centres in Australia, demonstrating three main results:

1. The occupations associated with greater income security are also associated with the ability to work from home.

2. Internet usage increased during periods in which COVID-19 restrictions were in place. Increases were greatest in regions with high income security, suggesting that they may be caused by people who were able to adapt to working from home.

3. During the second wave in Melbourne, lower-income regions also displayed increased internet usage, potentially driven by increased levels of home schooling.

These findings confirm and elaborate on the general observation that COVID-19 and the associated restrictions on human activity produce diverse distortions to normal life activities, largely determined by occupational and demographic distributions [33–36]. We are left with a picture of unequal impact dominated by two major factors: the types of occupations in which people are engaged, and the compositions of households and families. From our analysis we can produce a qualitative description of how life changed during lockdown. For those with no children and work that could be conducted from home, the internet provided a means of continuing livelihood during the prolonged periods of restrictions implemented to combat virus transmission. Furthermore, such individuals were likely to have been previously employed in high-income occupations with relatively strong employment guarantees, adding a measure of confidence in the ability to financially out-last the economic downturn. On the other hand, those with lower income security are also less likely to be able to complete their work from home, and are more likely to have children who require care during school closures. For such individuals, life during lockdown was financially insecure, potentially stressful on the family, and came with a heightened risk of exposure to the pandemic virus due to the work requirements of those occupations which remained active.

Due to the nature of the data we analysed, our study has several limitations. With the exception of the CARE survey results, all of the data analysed in this work is aggregated to sub-populations. Therefore, a direct behavioural interpretation of the correlations we report is contingent on the assumption that the variables we investigate are independently distributed within these sub-populations. While there are likely to be exceptions, the spatial aggregation of areas by income security (Figure 1a and 1b), suggests that the spatial resolution of SA2 regions is sufficient to sample within the boundaries that define salient heterogeneity of the population for the purposes of our study. Another inherent limitation is introduced through the use of household internet data in quantifying behaviour across the income spectrum: home internet connections have financial requirements including usage fees and installation costs that may be prohibitive for those at the low end of the income spectrum. For example, a study in United States recently determined that household internet speeds typically increase with

income, and the combination of both high income and high-speed internet is associated with an enhanced ability to self-isolate during the pandemic [21]. Using Australian data from the 2016 ABS Census, we computed a correlation of $\rho = 0.50,\ 95\%$ CI $[0.44,\ 0.56]$, associating the fraction of households with an internet connection (as of 2016) with the income security measure computed here (see Supporting Information Table S1). Therefore, our use of home internet traffic data to estimate the ability of workers with differing income security to adapt to COVID-19 restrictions may omit the behaviour of the most impacted demographics. As such, the relationship between income security and increased internet traffic is likely to represent a conservative estimate for the effects of occupational factors on behaviour during the crisis.

In conclusion, the COVID-19 pandemic has highlighted occupational disparities in urban Australia. Historically, the spatial concentration of income insecurity has produced inequality in the risk that entire urban districts face during crisis situations, such as pandemics [33, 37]. So far, the immediate economic impacts of COVID-19 in Australia have been delayed and suppressed by extensive government economic support measures. As these measures are reduced and eliminated, careful practical planning for pandemic preparedness must take into account inequality with respect to resilience. This work demonstrates that such inequalities derive from a confluence of occupational factors and suggests that mechanisms designed to promote equity in resilience to crisis must target these factors.

III. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

CZ, NG, and MT were supported by an internal seed grant from the Melbourne School of Engineering, of the University of Melbourne. We gratefully acknowledge the contribution of **nbn** co ltd. who provided access to the internet usage data, and in particular the data expertise and extraction of Michael Joyce, Jason Godden and Neil Sequeira. This publication uses data collected as part of the COVID-19 Attitudes Resilience and Epidemiology (CARE) Study. We would like to acknowledge all of the study participants, and the University of Melbourne and Centre for Ethnicity, Culture and Health staff who helped to make this study possible. We acknowledge the work of the investigator team: Lisa Gibbs, David Price, Katitza Marinkovic Chavez, Niamh Meagher, Lauren Carpenter and Colin MacDougall. The CARE Study was funded by the Melbourne School of Population and Global Health and the Optimise Study. We thank Tara Purcell for assembling information on Australian national and state COVID-19 response measures.

IV. DATA AVAILABILITY

All processed data necessary for reproducing the figures and results of this paper is available in the GitHub repository located here: `https://github.com/cjzachreson/Internet_Income_and_COVID19_in_Australia`. Access to raw data from the HILDA survey, **nbn**™, and CARE survey was obtained under restricted access agreements and cannot be made directly available. However, arrangements for access may be made for eligible researchers. All ABS data can be accessed by following the instructions provided here: `https://www.abs.gov.au/websitedbs/D3310114.nsf/home/How+to+Apply+for+Microdata`.

V. AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

All authors contributed to study design, data interpretation, and manuscript preparation. CZ composed the manuscript and figures, and performed all statistical analysis. MT performed pre-processing of **nbn**™ data. EM performed pre-processing of HILDA survey data and computed work-from-home classifications for each occupation. FMS provided CARE survey data and assisted in its interpretation. NG, MT, and RB conceived of and initialised the study.

VI. METHODS

A. Computation of income security by occupation

The income security index was constructed using data on employment security and income characteristics linked to the Australian and New Zealand Standard Classification of Occupations (ANZSCO). For income, we used Australian Bureau of Statistics average weekly earnings by occupation [38]. To calculate the employment security associated with an occupation, we used the most recent iteration (2018) of the nationally-representative Household, Income and Labour Dynamics in Australia (HILDA) survey. Occupation security status was developed as an individual categorical variable with two levels: 0-secure employment, 1-insecure employment. An individual was classified as 'secure' if they had a fixed-term or permanent job. Those on a fixed-term contract were deemed securely employed, because the associated conditions with this type of employment are more similar those on permanent contracts rather than casual employees and they are shown to be more socio-demographically similar to those employed permanently than casual employees [39, 40]. We computed the employment security

score associated with each occupation as the proportion of respondents in each occupation who were securely employed. We then computed the index of income security by occupation as the product of the employment security score and average weekly earnings (rescaled to the sample maximum). Distributions of the resulting income security values and the component measures of income and proportion securely employed are shown in Fig. S3.

B. Computation of ability to work from home by occupation

To compute the working from home indicator for each occupation classification, we adapted an analysis done by Dingel and Neiman [32] (available on GitHub, `https://github.com/jdingel/DingelNeiman-workathome`) to establish which occupations could potentially be performed from home. Dingel and Neiman used the "Work Context" and "Generalized Work Activities" occupational surveys from the O*NET® Database. Drawing on a series of questions, they classified occupations according to whether they were compatible with working from home. For example, occupations with activities that required a workplace - such as needing to operating machinery, handling specialised items, requiring access to the outdoors - where considered to be unsuitable for working from home (for more information in methodology, please refer to Dingel [32]). To produce international estimates we linked their binary work-from-home classifications (N = 969) to the 4-digit International Standard Classification of Occupations (ISCO-08) codes. This data (N = 1024) was then linked to the 6-digit Australian and New Zealand Standard Classification of Occupations (ANZSCO) and aggregated to 4-digits for compatibility with other data. During this crosswalk process some of the occupation codes did not link (N = 36), for these, binary values were manually determined by referring to similar occupation descriptions from the original O*Net and SOC descriptions.

C. Computation of SA2-level measures

To generate indicators of the ability to work from home and income security for each SA2, we computed the weighted average of the respective indicator variables based on the occupation distribution in each region. Weights corresponded to the fraction of employed individuals working in each occupation within each SA2 region as reported by the ABS Census of 2016. The distributions of employed persons by occupation (4-digit level), by SA2 region was generated using the Census TableBuilder application provided by the ABS [29]. The data set queried was the 2016 Census Count of Persons by Usual Residence, aggregated by OCCP

4-Digit Level, by SA2 (UR).

D. Analysis of internet usage data from nbn™

nbn co ltd. (**nbn**™) is a Government Business Enterprise providing national, wholesale broadband access in Australia. **nbn**™ provided access to aggregated Australian internet usage volume data from household customers. The data were restricted to the total download and upload volume for 30min intervals, per SA2 region, and the corresponding number of active internet connections per time slot that generated these data. Only data generated by at least 50 domestic connections were included, to avoid privacy concerns and to reduce the impact of aberrant individual household behaviours in regions with insufficient service coverage.

Outlier data points beyond three standard deviations from the corresponding time period mean were removed, to limit the impact of outlier usage data points, usually caused by network management or internal infrastructure configuration changes.

We set the data collection interval of October 10th, 2019 until November 29th, 2019 as the baseline period, when life in Australia was not impacted by school holidays or major, longer public holidays, and preceding the major disturbance produced by the bushfire season of summer 2019-2020.

The period representing behaviour during the 1st wave of restrictions was set to the interval of April 18th - April 24th, 2020, while the period representing the second wave of restrictions was set to the interval of August 8th - August 14th, 2020.

The following upload and download volume characteristics per SA2 region were computed for these three periods (baseline and the two COVID-19 intervals): (1) an overall daytime average volume; (2) the daily average minimum volume relating to the minimum internet usage, between 4:30am and 5:30am; (3) the average volume generated during the daytime period (from school start until noon, 9:00am - 12:00pm noon); and (4) the average daily maximum usage (8:30pm - 10:00pm). See Figure 7 depicting the daily fluctuation of average internet use for the period of September 2019 - September 2020 in Australia, illustrating the relative changes in internet use in these periods.

E. CARE survey

Our analysis used data from the CARE study's Victoria-wide survey which aimed to address the overall question: How were Victorians thinking, feeling and behaving in response to the



FIG. 7. Long-term daily fluctuation of average internet activity per active service, per 30min period, for downloads (a), and uploads (b). The daily minimum and maximum, as well as the daytime plateau of activity are clearly visible. The changes between normal work days (school days), weekends and public holidays are salient.

"second wave" of the COVID-19 epidemic and the associated public health measures.

The survey was self-administered online in English to 1006 Victorian residents aged 18 years and over. The survey was based on research developed and conducted by Imperial College in the UK in mid-March 2020 [41]. Some questions in the Australian survey were modified slightly to reflect local response measures and terminology. Additional questions were added

to the Australian survey to measure social and emotional impacts. Data collection in both the UK and Australia was conducted by the online market research agency YouGov.

We used a structured questionnaire addressing the following three domains: perceptions of risk and consequences of COVID-19 infection; measures taken by individuals to protect themselves and others from COVID-19 infection; and social and emotional impact.

The questionnaire was administered online to members of the YouGov Australia panel of individuals who have agreed to take part in surveys of public opinion (over 120,000 Australian adults). Panellists, selected at random from the base sample, received an email inviting them to take part in a survey, which included a survey link. Once a panel member clicked on the link and logged in, they were directed to the survey most relevant to them available on the platform at the time, according to the sample definition and quotas based on census data. A plain language statement appeared on screen and respondents were required to electronically consent prior to the survey questions appearing. Proportional quota sampling was used to ensure that respondents were demographically representative of the Victorian adult population, with quotas based on age, gender, household income, location (state and metropolitan or regional) and whether a language other than English is spoken at home.

The study was by approved by the University of Melbourne Human Research Ethics Committee (2056694).

VII. REFERENCES

[1] International Labour Organisation (ILO). COVID-19 and the World of Work: Country Policy Responses. ILO, Geneva, Switzerland; 2020. `https://www.ilo.org/global/topics/coronavirus/regional-country/country-responses/lang--en/index.htm`.

[2] Australian Government, The Treasury. The JobKeeper Payment: Three-month review; 2020. `https://treasury.gov.au/publication/jobkeeper-review`.

[3] Phillips B, Gray M, Biddle N, et al. COVID-19 JobKeeper and JobSeeker impacts on poverty and housing stress under current and alternative economic and policy scenarios. Australian National University, Canberra;.

[4] Anderson G, Frank JW, Naylor CD, Wodchis W, Feng P. Using Socioeconomics to Counter Health Disparities Arising from the COVID-19 Pandemic. BMJ. 2020;369.

[5] Bambra C, Riordan R, Ford J, Matthews F. The COVID-19 pandemic and health inequalities. J Epidemiol Community Health. 2020;74(11):964–968.

[6] Cubrich M. On the frontlines: Protecting low-wage workers during COVID-19. Psychological Trauma: Theory, Research, Practice, and Policy. 2020;12(S1):S186.

[7] Fisher J, Languilaire JC, Lawthom R, Nieuwenhuis R, Petts RJ, Runswick-Cole K, et al. Community, work, and family in times of COVID-19. Community, Work & Family. 2020;23(3):247–252.

[8] Sanderson K, Cocker F, et al. Presenteeism: Implications and Health Risks. Australian family physician. 2013;42(4):172.

[9] Abedi V, Olulana O, Avula V, Chaudhary D, Khan A, Shahjouei S, et al. Racial, Economic, and Health Inequality and COVID-19 Infection in the United States. Journal of racial and ethnic health disparities. 2020;p. 1–11.

[10] Lee K, Sahai H, Baylis P, Greenstone M. Job Loss and Behavioral Change: The Unprecedented Effects of the India Lockdown in Delhi. University of Chicago, Becker Friedman Institute for Economics Working Paper. 2020;(2020-65).

[11] Forsythe E, Kahn LB, Lange F, Wiczer D. Labor Demand in the Time of COVID-19: Evidence from Vacancy Postings and UI Claims. Journal of public economics. 2020;189:104238.

[12] Cajner T, Crane LD, Decker RA, Grigsby J, Hamins-Puertolas A, Hurst E, et al.. The US labor market during the beginning of the pandemic recession; 2020. National Bureau of Economic Research, `https://www.nber.org/papers/w27159`.

[13] Adams-Prassl A, Boneva T, Golin M, Rauh C. Inequality in the impact of the coronavirus shock: Evidence from real time surveys. Journal of Public Economics. 2020;189:104245.

[14] Couch KA, Fairlie RW, Xu H. The Impacts of COVID-19 on Minority Unemployment: First Evidence from April 2020 CPS Microdata. Available at SSRN 3604814. 2020;.

[15] Montenovo L, Jiang X, Rojas FL, Schmutte IM, Simon KI, Weinberg BA, et al.. Determinants of Disparities in COVID-19 Job Losses; 2020. National Bureau of Economic Research, `https://www.nber.org/papers/w27132`.

[16] Brough R, Freedman M, Phillips D. Understanding socioeconomic disparities in travel behavior during the COVID-19 pandemic. University of California, Irvine Department of Economics Working Paper Series. 2020;.

[17] Jay J, Bor J, Nsoesie EO, Lipson SK, Jones DK, Galea S, et al. Neighbourhood Income and Physical Distancing During the COVID-19 Pandemic in the United States. Nature Human Behaviour. 2020;4(12):1294–1302.

[18] Brynjolfsson E, Horton JJ, Ozimek A, Rock D, Sharma G, TuYe HY. COVID-19 and Remote Work: An Early Look at US Data; 2020. National Bureau of Economic Research, https://www.nber.org/papers/w27344.

[19] Bonaccorsi G, Pierri F, Cinelli M, Flori A, Galeazzi A, Porcelli F, et al. Economic and social consequences of human mobility restrictions under COVID-19. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences. 2020;117(27):15530–15535.

[20] Weill JA, Stigler M, Deschenes O, Springborn MR. Social distancing responses to COVID-19 emergency declarations strongly differentiated by income. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences. 2020;117(33):19658–19660.

[21] Chiou L, Tucker C. Social Distancing, Internet Access and Inequality; 2020. National Bureau of Economic Research, https://www.nber.org/papers/w26982.

[22] Feldmann A, Gasser O, Lichtblau F, Pujol E, Poese I, Dietzel C, et al. The Lockdown Effect: Implications of the COVID-19 Pandemic on Internet Traffic. In: Proceedings of the ACM Internet Measurement Conference; 2020. p. 1–18.

[23] Zachreson C, Mitchell L, Lydeamore M, Rebuli N, Tomko M, Geard N. Risk mapping for COVID-19 outbreaks using mobility data. arXiv preprint arXiv:200806193. 2020;.

[24] Buckee CO, Balsari S, Chan J, Crosas M, Dominici F, Gasser U, et al. Aggregated mobility data could help fight COVID-19. Science (New York, NY). 2020;368(6487):145.

[25] Pepe E, Bajardi P, Gauvin L, Privitera F, Lake B, Cattuto C, et al. COVID-19 Outbreak Response, a Dataset to Assess Mobility Changes in Italy Following National Lockdown. Scientific data. 2020;7(1):1–7.

[26] Warren MS, Skillman SW. Mobility changes in response to COVID-19. arXiv preprint arXiv:200314228. 2020;.

[27] Chang S, Pierson E, Koh PW, Gerardin J, Redbird B, Grusky D, et al. Mobility network models of COVID-19 explain inequities and inform reopening. Nature. 2020;p. 1–6.

[28] HILDA Survey; 2020. [online; accessed 15-Dec-2020]. https://melbourneinstitute.unimelb.edu.au/hilda.

[29] About TableBuilder; 2020. [Online; accessed 12-Aug-2020]. https://www.abs.gov.au/websitedbs/d3310114.nsf/home/about+tablebuilder.

[30] Australian Bureau of Statistics Census; 2016. [online; accessed 15-Dec-2020]. https://www.abs.gov.au/census.

[31] Sila U, Dugain V. Income, wealth and earnings inequality in Australia: Evi-

dence from the HILDA Survey; 2019. https://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/economics/income-wealth-and-earnings-inequality-in-australia_cab6789d-en.

[32] Dingel JI, Neiman B. How many jobs can be done at home? Journal of Public Economics. 2020;189:104235.

[33] Karaye IM, Horney JA. The impact of social vulnerability on COVID-19 in the US: an analysis of spatially varying relationships. American Journal of Preventive Medicine. 2020;59(3):317–325.

[34] Hankivsky O, Kapilashrami A. Beyond sex and gender analysis: an intersectional view of the COVID-19 pandemic outbreak and response; 2020. Gender and Women's Health Unit, Centre for Health Equity, Melbourne School of Population and Health Equity, https://mspgh.unimelb.edu.au/__data/assets/pdf_file/0011/3334889/Policy-brief_v3.pdf.

[35] Chung H, Seo H, Forbes S, Birkett H. Working from home during the COVID-19 lockdown: Changing preferences and the future of work; 2020. Kent Academic Repository, University of Kent, https://kar.kent.ac.uk/83896/1/Working_from_home_COVID-19_lockdown.pdf.

[36] de Haas M, Faber R, Hamersma M. How COVID-19 and the Dutch 'intelligent lockdown' change activities, work and travel behaviour: Evidence from longitudinal data in the Netherlands. Transportation Research Interdisciplinary Perspectives. 2020;6:100150.

[37] DeBruin D, Liaschenko J, Marshall MF. Social justice in pandemic preparedness. American Journal of Public Health. 2012;102(4):586–591.

[38] ABS, 2019, cat. no. 6306.0 - Microdata: Employee Earnings and Hours, Australia; 2019. [online; accessed 01-Sep-2020]. https://www.abs.gov.au/statistics/labour/earnings-and-work-hours/employee-earnings-and-hours-australia/latest-release.

[39] LaMontagne AD, Smith PM, Louie AM, Quinlan M, Ostry AS, Shoveller J. Psychosocial and other working conditions: Variation by employment arrangement in a sample of working Australians. American Journal of Industrial Medicine. 2012;55(2):93–106.

[40] Louie A, Ostry A, Quinlan M, Keegel T, Shoveller J, LaMontagne A. Empirical study of employment arrangements and precariousness in Australia. Relations Industrielles/Industrial Relations. 2006;61(3):465–489.

[41] Atchison CJ, Bowman L, Vrinten C, Redd R, Pristera P, Eaton JW, et al. Perceptions and behavioural responses of the general public during the COVID-19 pandemic: A cross-sectional survey of UK Adults. medRxiv. 2020;.