

1 **Job stress and loneliness among remote workers**

2 Fuyu Miyake¹, Chimed-Ochir Odgerel², Ayako Hino³, Kazunori Ikegami⁴, Tomohisa Nagata⁵,
3 Seiichiro Tateishi⁶, Mayumi Tsuji⁷, Shinya Matsuda⁸, Tomohiro Ishimaru¹

4

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

7 ²Department of Public Health and Health Policy, Hiroshima University, Hiroshima, Japan

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

10 ⁴Department of Work Systems and Health, Institute of Industrial Ecological Sciences,
11 University of Occupational and Environmental Health, Japan, Kitakyushu, Japan

12 ⁵Department of Occupational Health Practice and Management, Institute of Industrial
13 Ecological Sciences, University of Occupational and Environmental Health, Japan, Kitakyushu,
14 Japan

15 ⁶Department of Occupational Medicine, School of Medicine, University of Occupational and
16 Environmental Health, Japan, Kitakyushu, Japan

17 ⁷Department of Environmental Health, School of Medicine, University of Occupational and
18 Environmental Health, Japan, Kitakyushu, Japan

19 ⁸Department of Preventive Medicine and Community Health, School of Medicine, University
20 of Occupational and Environmental Health, Japan, Kitakyushu, Japan

21

22 Corresponding author: Tomohiro Ishimaru, MD, MPH, PhD; Department of Environmental
23 Epidemiology, Institute of Industrial Ecological Sciences, University of Occupational and
24 Environmental Health, Japan, 1-1 Iseigaoka, Yahata-nishi-ku, Kitakyushu, Fukuoka 807-8555,
25 Japan; Tel: +81-93-603-1611, Fax: +81-93-601-7324, email: ishimaru@med.uoeh-u.ac.jp

26 **Abstract**

27 **Background:** To prevent the spread of coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19), physical
28 distancing and isolation are crucial strategies in society. However, this response to the
29 pandemic promotes loneliness. Previous studies have reported an increase in loneliness since
30 the outbreak of COVID-19, but there is little evidence on the relationship between job stress
31 and loneliness among remote workers.

32 **Aims:** To assess the relationship between job stress and loneliness among remote workers.

33 **Methods:** This study is a part of nation-wide cross-sectional online survey evaluating the
34 impact of the COVID-19 pandemic in Japan. A total of 27,036 full-time workers completed
35 the self-administrated questionnaire in December 2020. We extracted data on 4,052 desk
36 workers who indicated that they were doing remote work. Loneliness was assessed using a
37 single question and job stress was measured using the Job Content Questionnaire. Multiple
38 logistic regression was performed.

39 **Results:** Frequency of remote work was moderately associated with loneliness (adjusted odds
40 ratio [AOR] = 1.60, 95% confidence interval [CI]: 1.04–2.46, $P = 0.033$). Participants who
41 reported of having a low level of co-worker or supervisor support had greater odds of feeling
42 lonely than those who were highly supported (co-worker support: AOR = 4.06, 95% CI:
43 2.82–5.84, $P < 0.001$; supervisor support: AOR = 2.49, 95% CI: 1.79–3.47, $P < 0.001$).

44 **Conclusions:** Co-worker support and supervisor support were strongly associated with
45 loneliness, whereas frequency of remote work was moderately associated with feeling lonely.
46 Support from co-workers and supervisors may be crucial factors to prevent loneliness caused
47 by remote work.

48

49 **Key words:** loneliness; occupational mental health; occupational stress; remote work;
50 telecommuting

51

52 **Introduction**

53 Loneliness, which has recently become a global concern, is generally defined as a discrepancy
54 between an individual's preferred and actual levels of social relations [1]. This discrepancy
55 leads to anxiety and distress because of the negative experience of feeling alone [2].
56 Loneliness relates not only to stressful and unpleasant feelings but also to critical physical and
57 psychological health issues. Although loneliness has often been regarded as a problem
58 affecting older adults, it is also a risk for younger people [3]. According to a recent study on
59 adults with loneliness [4], the prevalence of loneliness among adults aged 19 to 65 years was
60 around 40% to 48%, showing that loneliness is a critical issue for the working generation.
61 Although many factors are related to loneliness among adults, the major factors are
62 considered to be socioeconomic status and income [5]. In addition, high population density is
63 a robust correlate of loneliness [6]. Living alone and frequency of communication with
64 neighbours have also been shown to be associated with loneliness [7]. With the addition of
65 coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19), even more concern has been raised by the social
66 issues of loneliness and its related.

67

68 Since the outbreak of the COVID-19 pandemic, work styles have changed dramatically,
69 especially for desk workers. In February 2020, the Japanese government issued a basic policy
70 describing measures against COVID-19. These measures included a recommendation that
71 companies implement teleworking to prevent the spread of COVID-19 [7]. Following the
72 continued spread of the disease throughout Japan, the government declared a state of
73 emergency in April 2020, further promoting telework and requesting that people refrain from
74 going out [8]. As a result, in Japan, the percentage of companies implementing telework
75 climbed from 26% in March 2020 to 67% May 2020 [9]. Even after the state of emergency
76 ended, an increasing number of companies continued to implement anti-COVID-19 measures

77 by combining in-person work with remote work [10]. However, the impact of job stress on
78 remote workers is unknown, especially in terms of loneliness. Previous research about
79 teleworking in other countries has indicated that remote workers tend not to be able to
80 establish social work relationships with others and that telework can induce feelings of
81 loneliness [11]. It has been suggested that office workers should spend at least 20% of their
82 work time in the office to prevent feelings of isolation [12].

83

84 Loneliness was already a critical issue before COVID-19. Physical distancing was then
85 introduced as a crucial societal strategy to prevent the spread of COVID-19; this response to
86 the pandemic further promotes loneliness. Several studies have revealed an increase in
87 loneliness since the outbreak of COVID-19 [13], but no reports have clarified how job stress
88 influences loneliness among remote workers during the pandemic. Therefore, the purpose of
89 this study was to assess the relationship between job stress and loneliness among remote
90 workers. The results will be useful for interventions targeted towards remote workers
91 experiencing loneliness to improve the situation in the work environment.

92

93 **Methods**

94 We conducted a cross-sectional study about COVID-19 among the working-age population in
95 Japan on December 22–26, 2020, under the CORoNaWork (Collaborative Online Research on
96 the Novel-coronavirus and Work) Project [14]. In brief, the CORoNaWork Project is an
97 Internet-based nationwide cross-sectional study conducted during the third wave of
98 COVID-19 infections in Japan. A total of 33,087 participants were selected using cluster
99 sampling with stratification by sex, job type, and region on the basis of COVID-19 incidence
100 rate data. These participants completed an online self-administered questionnaire. After
101 excluding invalid responses, 27,036 participants were eligible for the analysis. In the current
102 study, from these 27,036 participants, we selected the 4,052 desk workers who indicated that

103 they were doing remote work. The study was conducted according to the guidelines of the
104 Declaration of Helsinki, and it was approved by the Ethics Committee of the University of
105 Occupational and Environmental Health, Japan (Approval number: R2-079).

106

107 The original questionnaire of the CORoNaWork Project consists of 54 main questions
108 including items on general demographic characteristics, socioeconomic characteristics,
109 work-related characteristics, lifestyle factors, quality of life, health conditions, and
110 COVID-19-related issues (e.g. preventive measures at the workplace and individual levels,
111 vaccination, telework, and lifestyle changes during COVID-19). For the current study, we
112 included questions on demographic characteristics (age and sex), socioeconomic
113 characteristics (education, annual household income, and household composition), regional
114 state-of-emergency status, frequency of remote work, job stress, and loneliness.

115

116 We asked the participants whether they felt lonely during the study period. Loneliness was
117 assessed by a single question: ‘Do you feel alone?’ The response options were *yes* and *no*. The
118 question is a part of the Japanese version of the University of California, Los Angeles
119 (UCLA) Loneliness Scale [15].

120

121 We included frequency of remote work and job stress as independent variables in the current
122 study. Frequency of remote work was categorized as once per week, 2 or 3 days per week, or
123 4 or more days per week. We used the Job Content Questionnaire (JCQ) to evaluate the
124 remote workers’ job stress. The JCQ is a self-administered instrument proposed by Karasek in
125 1985 [16] that was designed to measure the social and psychological characteristics of jobs on
126 the basis of theoretical models. The original instrument comprises 45 core items; however, in
127 1995, Japanese researchers first translated the JCQ and developed the Japanese version of the
128 JCQ with 22 items on four topics: co-worker support, supervisor support, psychological job

129 demands, and decision latitude. The researchers then verified the reliability and validity of the
130 questionnaire among the employees of telecommunication and electric power companies in
131 the Chubu region [17] and among the workers of a computer company [18]. The average
132 score and reliability coefficient of the Japanese version of the JCQ are very similar to the
133 results in other countries; thus, the JCQ is considered to be internationally applicable in
134 occupational settings [16]. Therefore, we used the Japanese version of the JCQ to assess job
135 stress in the current research.

136

137 We present descriptive statistics of demographic and socioeconomic characteristics for all
138 participants. Each of the 22 JCQ items had a four-point response ranging from 1 (*strongly*
139 *disagree*) to 4 (*strongly agree*). The weighted item scores were summed to produce scores on
140 the following four scales, following the authors of the Japanese version of the JCQ: the
141 psychological demands scale (five items, range: 12–48), the decision latitude scale (nine items,
142 range: 24–96), the co-worker support scale (four items, range: 4–16), and the supervisor
143 support scale (four items, range: 4–16) [17]. Each sub-scale was classified into tertiles based
144 on the sample distributions. The *high* group was used as a reference group for co-worker
145 support, supervisor support, and decision latitude, whereas the *low* group was taken as a
146 reference for psychological job demands. Logistic regression analysis was performed to
147 identify the associations of frequency of remote work and the four JCQ scale scores with
148 loneliness. We show the results of both the univariate model and the model adjusting for sex,
149 age, education, income, household composition, and regional state-of-emergency status.
150 Statistical significance was defined as $P < 0.05$. Stata/SE 16.1 (StataCorp, College Station,
151 TX, USA) was used for the statistical analysis.

152

153 **Results**

154 A total of 4,052 remote workers were analysed in the current study. Table 1 shows the

155 socio-demographic characteristics of the participants. Over half of the respondents were male
156 (58%), were aged 50–65 years (52%), and had completed a university or graduate school
157 degree (67%). Of the 4,052 remote workers participating in the study, 2,042 (50%) worked
158 remotely 4 or more days per week, 1,058 (26%) worked remotely 2 or 3 days per week, and
159 952 (24%) worked remotely 1 day per week. Regarding job stress, almost half of all remote
160 workers felt a high level of support from their co-workers (46%) and supervisors (49%). A
161 total of 191 (5%) workers reported feeling lonely.

162

163 Table 2 shows the association between job stress and loneliness among remote workers. The
164 highest percentage of loneliness was observed in the group with a low level of support from
165 their co-workers (11%). In the multivariate model, participants who worked remotely 4 or
166 more days per week had significantly greater odds of feeling lonely than those who worked at
167 home once per week (adjusted odds ratio [AOR] = 1.60, 95% confidence interval [CI]:
168 1.04–2.46, $P = 0.033$). Participants who reported having a low level of co-worker support had
169 greater odds of feeling lonely than those who were highly supported by their co-workers
170 (AOR = 4.06, 95% CI: 2.82–5.84, $P < 0.001$). Those who were less supported by their
171 supervisors also had greater odds of feeling lonely than those who were highly supported by
172 their supervisors (AOR = 2.49, 95% CI: 1.79–3.47, $P < 0.001$). Compared with those who had
173 low psychological job demands, participants who had high demands felt more loneliness
174 (AOR = 2.04, 95% CI: 1.39–2.99, $P < 0.001$). No significant associations were found between
175 decision latitude and feeling lonely.

176

177 **Discussion**

178 The present study revealed that frequency of remote work was moderately associated with
179 loneliness among remote workers in Japan. In addition, co-worker and supervisor support and
180 psychological job demands were related to loneliness, whereas decision latitude was not.

181 These findings provide insight into strategies for improving loneliness resulting from working
182 remotely during the COVID-19 pandemic.

183

184 Previous studies in other countries have reported that telework is associated with isolation and
185 loneliness [11, 19]; we found a moderate relationship between frequency of remote work and
186 feeling lonely among Japanese workers in our study. Generally, remote workers are thought to
187 be separated from their colleagues and from work-related social relationships. Consequently,
188 remote workers tend to have fewer opportunities for work-related social interaction and are
189 also distanced from the specific instructions, attention, and praise of their supervisors. Being
190 physically distant from the workplace and from one's colleagues can lead to feelings of
191 isolation and loneliness. This is regarded as the principal problem with telework [19]. Another
192 study found that informal social interaction with colleagues declines for employees working
193 at home, leading to professional isolation [20]. However, in recent years, advanced
194 information and communication technology (ICT) has provided remote workers with
195 opportunities for real - time social interaction [21], which may keep people socially
196 connected and help to overcome feelings of loneliness [22]. Our study was conducted in
197 December 2020, and we assume that most of the remote worker participants had the necessary
198 ICT to work from home. In this situation, remote workers' loneliness might be reduced by
199 using the ICT that has been developed for this purpose. In this study, the frequency of
200 telecommuting was found to be moderately related to feeling lonely. However, a previous
201 study showed that the number of teleworking days per week was not associated with
202 work-related well-being [23], so it may be important to consider how telecommuting is
203 implemented to prevent loneliness and improve workers' well-being.

204

205 Our analysis showed that the levels of support provided by co-workers and supervisors were
206 strongly associated with feelings of loneliness among remote workers. Co-worker support

207 contributed more to reducing loneliness than did supervisor support. A previous study
208 indicated that the subjective experience of feeling physically distant from one's colleagues
209 increased loneliness and was stressful for remote workers [24], which can be taken to suggest
210 the importance of support and connection among colleagues. Furthermore, although there are
211 many opportunities to interact with supervisors through work instructions, even in the context
212 of remote work, the frequency of communication between co-workers may be lower in remote
213 work situations unless the co-workers make a conscious effort to stay in touch. Support from
214 colleagues is likely to be particularly important in preventing the reduction of communication
215 between co-workers.

216

217 The present study suggests that, although a middle level of psychological job demands did not
218 affect the presence of loneliness, a high level of psychological job demands was associated
219 with loneliness among remote workers. The presence of loneliness was also not affected by
220 decision latitude. According to Karasek's Demand–Control Model, a higher level of
221 psychological job demands and a lower level of decision latitude result in an employee
222 experiencing a high level of strain [25]; however, we found that, in terms of loneliness, only a
223 high level of psychological job demands was related to loneliness. Therefore, our study
224 indicates that job stress factors are not always associated with loneliness. Previous research
225 has suggested that, if workers face higher levels of psychological work demands, they are
226 more likely to work overtime [26]. As a result, one would expect those in jobs with high
227 psychological demands to decrease the time spent communicating with colleagues and
228 supervisors, which might lead to the experience of loneliness. Regarding decision latitude, it
229 is generally thought that those with lower levels of decision latitude are managed or instructed
230 by their supervisors and senior colleagues. To some extent, receiving instructions from others,
231 as a form of communication, may play a role in preventing these workers from feeling lonely,
232 although a low level of decision latitude is also a known stress factor for workers [25].

233

234 To the best of our knowledge, the present study is the first to report an association between
235 job stress and loneliness among remote workers in Japan during the COVID-19 pandemic.
236 However, there are several limitations in our study. First, the present study was conducted
237 over the Internet, and the generalization of the results is thus unclear. However, to increase the
238 external validity and reduce bias as much as possible, we defined the target population
239 according to sex, job type, and region on the basis of COVID-19 incidence rate data. In
240 addition, remote workers were the target population in this study; these individuals use the
241 Internet daily, and some extent of generalizability is therefore guaranteed. Second, although
242 there are several measurements of loneliness [27], in the present study, the presence of
243 loneliness was assessed through a single question. However, this approach follows previous
244 research that used a single item to measure loneliness [27]. Third, the causal relationship
245 between remote work and the presence of loneliness is unknown because this was a
246 cross-sectional study. Concerns have been raised about the existence of reverse causality in
247 this relationship because, for example, certain workers might not choose to work remotely
248 because they wish to avoid loneliness. However, during the COVID-19 pandemic, workers
249 were not likely to be able to decide the frequency of telecommuting on their own, and the
250 possibility of reverse causality is therefore probably low.

251

252 In conclusion, among remote workers in Japan, we found that support from co-workers and
253 support from supervisors were strongly associated with loneliness, and frequency of remote
254 work showed a moderate association with loneliness. These findings suggest that co-worker
255 support and supervisor support may be crucial factors in preventing loneliness caused by
256 working remotely. To prevent remote workers from feeling lonely and from developing
257 mental health problems following loneliness, remote workers should engage in interaction
258 with supervisors and co-workers using the ICT developed for this purpose.

259 **Key points**

260 **What is already known about this subject**

- 261 • There has been an increase in loneliness since the outbreak of COVID-19.
- 262 • Even before COVID-19, loneliness was a critical issue not only for older adults but also
- 263 for the working generation.
- 264 • Telework can induce feelings of loneliness and isolation.

265

266 **What this study adds**

- 267 • The frequency of telecommuting was moderately associated with loneliness.
- 268 • Support from co-workers and support from supervisors were strongly associated with
- 269 feelings of loneliness.
- 270 • A high level of psychological job demands was associated with loneliness, whereas
- 271 decision latitude was not associated with loneliness.

272

273 **What impact this may have on practice or policy**

- 274 • Supervisors and co-workers may play an important role in preventing remote workers
- 275 from feeling lonely and from developing mental health problems following loneliness.
- 276 • Decreasing psychological job demands may reduce the likelihood of loneliness for
- 277 remote workers.

278

279 **Acknowledgements**

280 We thank the other members of the CORoNaWork Project: Yoshihisa Fujino (present

281 chairperson of the study group), Hajime Ando, Hisashi Eguchi, Arisa Harada, Kyoko

282 Kitagawa, Kosuke Mafune, Ryutaro Matsugaki, Koji Mori, Keiji Muramatsu, Masako Nagata,

283 Ning Liu, Akira Ogami, Rie Tanaka, and Kei Tokutsu.

284

285 **Competing interests**

286 None declared.

287

288 **Funding**

289 This work was supported and partly funded by the University of Occupational and
290 Environmental Health, Japan; General Incorporated Foundation (Anshin Zaidan): The
291 Development of Educational Materials on Mental Health Measures for Managers at
292 Small-sized Enterprises; Health, Labour and Welfare Sciences Research Grants:
293 Comprehensive Research for Women's Healthcare [grant number H30-josei-ippan-002] and
294 Research for the Establishment of an Occupational Health System in Times of Disaster [grant
295 number H30-roudou-ippan-007]; scholarship donations from Chugai Pharmaceutical Co.,
296 Ltd.; the Collabo-Health Study Group; and Hitachi Systems, Ltd.

297

298 **References**

- 299 1. Peplau LA, Perlman D. Perspectives on loneliness. In: Peplau LA, Perlman D, editors.
300 *Loneliness: A sourcebook of current theory, research and therapy*. New York: Wiley;
301 1982.
- 302 2. Weiss RS, editor. *Loneliness: The experience of emotional and social isolation*. Cambridge,
303 MA: MIT Press; 1973
- 304 3. Asghar A, Iqbal N. Loneliness matters: a theoretical review of prevalence in adulthood. *J*
305 *Psychol*. 2019;**7**:41-47.
- 306 4. Franssen T, Stijnen M, Hamers F, Schneider F. Age differences in demographic, social and
307 health-related factors associated with loneliness across the adult life span
308 (19-65 years): a cross-sectional study in the Netherlands. *BMC Public Health*.
309 2020;**20**:1118.
- 310 5. Bosma H, Jansen M, Schefman S, Hajema KJ, Feron F. Lonely at the bottom: a
311 cross-sectional study on being ill, poor, and lonely. *Public Health*. 2015;**129**:185-187.
- 312 6. Karmakar A, Raychaudhuri S. Loneliness & depression: An urban syndrome. *The*
313 *International Journal of Indian Psychology*. 2015;**2**:174-82.

- 314 7. Decisions by the Headquarters for Novel Coronavirus Disease Control. Basic Policies for
315 Novel Coronavirus Disease Control. February 25, 2020. [cited March 28, 2021].
316 Available from: <https://www.mhlw.go.jp/content/10200000/000603610.pdf>
- 317 8. Decisions by the Headquarters for Novel Coronavirus Disease Control. Basic Policies for
318 Novel Coronavirus Disease Control (Revised on April 7,2020). April 7, 2020. [cited
319 March 28, 2021]. Available from:
320 <https://www.mhlw.go.jp/content/10900000/000620733.pdf>
- 321 9. Situation regarding telework. (written in Japanese) 2020 [cited March 21, 2021] Available
322 from <https://www.mhlw.go.jp/content/11911500/000662173.pdf>
- 323 10. Tokyo Metropolitan Government. [Results of a survey on telework adoption rates].
324 January 22, 2021. [cited March 28, 2021]. Available from:
325 <https://www.metro.tokyo.lg.jp/tosei/hodohappyo/press/2021/01/22/17.html>
- 326 11. Tavares IA. Telework and health effects review. *International Journal of Healthcare*.
327 2017;**3**:30-36.
- 328 12. Fairweather NB. Surveillance in employment: the case of teleworking. *Journal of*
329 *Business Ethics*. 1999;**22**:39-49.
- 330 13. Dahlberg L. Loneliness during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Aging Ment Health*.
331 2021;**25**:1-4.
- 332 14. Fujino Y, Ishimaru T, Eguchi H, et al. Protocol for a nationwide Internet-based health
333 survey in workers during the COVID-19 pandemic in 2020. *medRxiv*
334 2021:2021.02.02.21249309
- 335 15. Masuda Y, Tadaka E, Dai Y. Reliability and validity of the Japanese version of the UCLA
336 Loneliness Scale Version 3 among the older population. *Journal of Japan Academy of*
337 *Community Health Nursing*. 2012;**15**:25-32
- 338 16. Karasek R, Brisson C, Kawakami N, Houtman I, Bongers P, Amick B. The Job Content
339 Questionnaire (JCQ): an instrument for internationally comparative assessments of
340 psychosocial job characteristics. *Journal of occupational health*
341 *psychology*.1998;**3**:322-355.
- 342 17. Kawakami N, Kobayashi F, Araki S, Haratani T, Furui H: Assessment of job stress
343 dimensions based on the Job Demands-Control model of employees of
344 telecommunication and electric power companies in Japan: reliability and validity of
345 the Japanese version of Job Content Questionnaire. *Int J Behav Med*. 1995;**2**:358-375.
- 346 18. Kawakami N, Fujigaki Y: Reliability and validity of the Japanese version of Job Content
347 Questionnaire: replication and extension in computer company employees. *Ind Health*.
348 1996;**34**:295-306.

- 349 19. Montreuil S, Lippel K. Telework and occupational health: a Quebec empirical study and
350 regulatory implications. *Safety Science*. 2003;**41**:339-358.
- 351 20. Cooper CD, Kurland NB. Telecommuting, professional isolation, and employee
352 development in public and private organizations. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*,
353 2002;**23**:511–532.
- 354 21. McFarland LA, Ployhart RE. Social media: A contextual framework to guide research and
355 practice. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 2015;**100**:1653–1677.
- 356 22. Wang B, Liu Y, Qian J, Parker SK. Achieving Effective Remote Working During the
357 COVID-19 Pandemic: A Work Design Perspective. *Appl Psychol*. 2020 Nov
358 5:10.1111/apps.12290. doi: 10.1111/apps.12290. Epub ahead of print. PMID:
359 33230359; PMCID: PMC7675760.
- 360 23. Vander Elst T, Verhoogen R, Sercu M, Van den Broeck A, Baillien E, Godderis L. Not
361 Extent of Telecommuting, But Job Characteristics as Proximal Predictors of
362 Work-Related Well-Being. *J Occup Environ Med*. 2017;**59**:e180-e186.
- 363 24. Toscano F, Zappalà S. Social Isolation and Stress as Predictors of Productivity Perception
364 and Remote Work Satisfaction during the COVID-19 Pandemic: The Role of Concern
365 about the Virus in a Moderated Double Mediation. *Sustainability*. 2020;**12**:9804;
366 <https://doi.org/10.3390/su12239804>
- 367 25. Karasek. R. Job demands, job decision latitude, and mental strain: Implications for job
368 redesign. *Administrative Science Quarterly*. 1979;**24**:285-307.
- 369 26. van der Hulst M, van Veldhoven M, Beckers D. Overtime and need for recovery in
370 relation to job demands and job control. *J Occup Health*. 2006;**48**:11-19.
- 371 27. Courtin E, Knapp M. Social isolation, loneliness and health in old age: a scoping review.
372 *Health Soc Care Community*. 2017;**25**:799-812

373
374

375 Table 1 General characteristics of the study participants

	Total <i>n</i> = 4,052
Sex	
Female	1,689 (42)
Male	2,363 (58)
Age (years)	
20–39	807 (20)
40–49	1,128 (28)
50–65	2,117 (52)
Education	
Junior high or high school	617 (15)
Vocational school or college	734 (18)
University or graduate school	2,701 (67)
Annual household income (Japanese yen)	
< 4 million	890 (22)
≥ 4 million and < 8 million	1,554 (38)
≥ 8,000,000	1,608 (40)
Household composition	
Single	912 (22)
Couple	1,156 (29)
3 or more persons	1,984 (49)
Regional state-of-emergency status	
No (34 prefectures)	1,485 (37)
Yes (13 prefectures)	2,567 (63)
Co-worker support	
High (12–16 points)	1,877 (46)
Middle (10 or 11 points)	1,170 (29)
Low (4–9 points)	1,005 (25)
Supervisor support	
High (12–16 points)	1,965 (49)
Middle (9–11 points)	609 (15)
Low (4–8 points)	1,478 (36)
Psychological job demand	
High (32–48 points)	1,362 (34)
Middle (27–31 points)	1,341 (33)
Low (12–26 points)	1,349 (33)
Decision latitude	
High (71–96 points)	1,262 (31)
Middle (63–70 points)	1,628 (40)
Low (26–62 points)	1,162 (29)
Frequency of remote work	
1 day/week	952 (24)
2 or 3 days/week	1,058 (26)
4 or more days/week	2,042 (50)
Loneliness	
Yes	191 (5)
No	3,861 (95)

Table 2 Association between job stress and loneliness among remote workers (n=4,052)

	Participants <i>n</i>	Loneliness %	Univariate			Adjusted*		
			OR	(95% CI)	<i>P</i> value	OR	(95% CI)	<i>P</i> value
Frequency of remote work								
1 day/week	952	3	1.00	-	-	1.00	-	-
2 or 3 days/week	1,058	5	1.60	(0.99–2.57)	0.049	1.59	(0.98–2.56)	0.059
4 or more days/week	2,042	6	1.95	(1.28–2.97)	0.002	1.60	(1.04–2.46)	0.033
Co-worker support								
High (12–16 points)	1,877	3	1.00	-	-	1.00	-	-
Middle (10 or 11 points)	1,170	3	1.34	(0.86–2.07)	0.191	1.33	(0.85–2.06)	0.209
Low (4–9 points)	1,005	11	4.74	(3.33–6.76)	<0.001	4.06	(2.82–5.84)	<0.001
Supervisor support								
High (12–16 points)	1,965	3	1.00	-	-	1.00	-	-
Middle (9–11 points)	609	3	1.02	(0.60–1.75)	0.944	1.05	(0.61–1.80)	0.872
Low (4–8 points)	1,478	8	2.85	(2.06–3.94)	<0.001	2.49	(1.79–3.47)	<0.001
Psychological job demand								
High (32–48 points)	1,362	5	1.71	(1.18–2.47)	0.004	2.04	(1.39–2.99)	<0.001
Middle (27–31 points)	1,341	4	1.06	(0.73–1.55)	0.752	1.10	(0.75–1.62)	0.619
Low (12–26 points)	1,349	5	1.00	-	-	1.00	-	-
Decision latitude								
High (71–96 points)	1,262	4	1.00	-	-	1.00	-	-
Middle (63–70 points)	1,628	4	0.81	(0.56–1.17)	0.258	0.80	(0.55–1.17)	0.250
Low (26–62 points)	1,162	7	1.11	(0.79–1.56)	0.560	0.99	(0.69–1.42)	0.945

OR: odds ratio; CI: confidence interval

* Adjusted for sex, age, education, annual household income, household composition, and regional state-of-emergency status.