Title: Association between teleworking frequency and work functioning impairment: a nationwide cross-sectional study of Japanese full-time employees

Abstract

Objective: We examined the impact of teleworking frequency, including influencing factors and work functioning impairment.

Methods: This online cross-sectional study was conducted using a self-administered questionnaire among 27,036 full-time Japanese workers. We used the Work Functioning Impairment Scale to measure work functioning impairment and performed multilevel logistic regression analysis.

Results: We observed higher odds for work functioning impairment among employees who teleworked 4 or more days a week compared with those almost never teleworked: odds ratio (OR) 1.18, 95% confidence interval (CI) 1.07–1.3. After adjusting for influencing factors (teleworking preference, changes in working time, and commuting time), there was no significant association between teleworking frequency and work functioning impairment (OR 0.93, 95% CI 0.82–1.05).

Conclusions: Frequent telework may cause work functioning impairment; this can be explained by the impact of influencing factors.

Keywords: COVID-19; Japan; occupational health; presenteeism; telework; work from home; work functioning impairment

Introduction

Teleworking has increased among companies worldwide during the COVID-19 pandemic to prevent contact among workers and limit the spread of infection. [1,2] Telework involves working at a location other than a central office or workplace, such as at home. Individuals work separately from other employees during working time and use information and communications technology to interact with coworkers, as needed.[3] A recent survey in Japan revealed that 26.7% of employees were teleworking as of March 2020, the beginning of the COVID-19 pandemic, and this percentage increased to 52.7% as of May 2020 during the first the state of emergency declaration by the Japanese government.[4] To not only prevent infection but also maintain business continuity, some workers combine teleworking with going to their office or workplace.[5]

Teleworking is considered to have both positive and negative effects on workers' health. Teleworking is characterized by the absence of commuting time and flexibility regarding working location and time but also involves a lack of supervision by superiors, sitting and working at home for long periods, and little communication with colleagues.[3,6–8] The positive effects of teleworking on workers include the reduction in commuting time, which allows for more sleep, and greater flexibility in how employees use their time to improve their work–life balance.[3,6,7] However, the negative effects of teleworking on workers include musculoskeletal disorders owing to an inappropriate work environment, excessive

weight gain because of physical inactivity, increased risk of cardiovascular disease and diabetes, and adverse effects on mental health owing to limited opportunities to communicate with colleagues and superiors.[3,8] Teleworking affects the ease of work and performance through its impact on workers' health.

The negative effects of teleworking may cause work functioning impairment. Work functioning impairment is a functional limitation on work that leads to poor performance as a result of presenteeism, which is defined as working while feeling unwell.[9] A teleworking system permits employees to work even if they have certain symptoms of ill health. Previous studies have shown that teleworking increases sedentary behavior and that sedentary behavior leads to presenteeism.[7,10] The introduction of teleworking may promote presenteeism and working with some degree of work functioning impairment.

It is not known how teleworking affects work functioning impairment. In particular, the rapid introduction of teleworking during the early part of the COVID-19 pandemic may have created a mismatch between workers' preferences and teleworking practices. This rapid introduction of teleworking differed from teleworking before the COVID-19 pandemic because workers could not choose to work remotely at will. The option of teleworking was previously selected according to workers' preferences; however, teleworking during the COVID-19 pandemic was imposed by safety and social requirements, regardless of workers'

preferences. In this study, we examined the effects of teleworking frequency, including influencing factors, and work functioning impairment.

Methods

Study design and participants

This was a cross-sectional study using online questionnaire survey data from the Collaborative Online Research on Novel-coronavirus and Work study (CORoNaWork study). The questionnaires were sent by e-mail to target populations who were preregistered with Cross Marketing Inc. (Tokyo, Japan), and monitors responded so as to participate in the survey. The data collection period was from December 22 to 26, 2020. Details of the protocol have been previously reported.[11] In brief, the survey was conducted with an equal number of respondents from each of the 20 groups which consisted of five regions where study participants lived, two men or women from each region, and two office or non-office workers from each region, with 1,650 respondents employed at the time of the survey. The five regions were divided according to COVID-19 infection level, which was measured using the incidence rate at the time the state of emergency was declared, the number of infected people for the entire study period, the incidence rate, and number of infected people in the month before the survey. This study was conducted with approval from the Ethics Committee of University of Occupational and Environmental Health, Japan (Approval No. R2-079). Informed consent was obtained via a form on the survey website.

The survey was completed by 33,302 Japanese full-time workers between the ages of 20 to 65 years. After excluding 215 incomplete responses and 6,051 invalid responses, 27,036 people were included in the analysis. Invalid responses were those from surveys completed in less than 6 minutes, participants with weight less than 30 kg or height less than 140 cm, inconsistent responses, and misinterpretation of a question.

Outcome

We used The Work Functioning Impairment Scale (WFun) as a measure of work functioning impairment. The WFun is a self-administered measure of work functioning impairment validated and developed according to the Consensus-based Standards for the Selection of Health Measurement Instruments (COSMIN) and based on the Rasch model.[9] The instrument comprises seven items, including the statement, "I could not do my job carefully," with five response options. The total of the seven items is the overall score, which ranges from 7 to 35 points, with higher scores indicating higher work functioning impairment. Six of the seven items were used in this study, and the scores were transformed based on the Rasch model. We used the definition of work functioning impairment as a WFun score of 21 or higher, in line with previous studies.[12]

Explanatory variables

We queried the teleworking frequency and factors influencing teleworking frequency, such as teleworking preferences, changes in working time compared with before COVID-19 pandemic, and one-way commuting time when not teleworking, as explanatory variables. Participants responded to the following question regarding teleworking frequency, “Do you work from home?” with the following options: a) 4 or more days a week; b) 2 or 3 days a week; c) 1 day a week; d) more than once a month and less than once a week; and e) almost never. Participants responded to the following question about teleworking preferences, “How do you feel about teleworking?” with the following options: a) I would like to telework as much as possible; b) I prefer teleworking; c) I don't mind either; d) I prefer regular work; and e) I prefer regular work as much as possible. The following question addressed changes in working time during the COVID-19 pandemic, “Has your working time been affected by changes in society and life owing to COVID-19?” with the following response options regarding working time: a) increased; b) remained the same; and c) decreased. The following question queried one-way commuting time prior to the pandemic, “In your average daily life, how much time do you spend commuting when not teleworking?” with the following options: a) more than 2 hours; b) more than 1 hour but less than 2 hours; c) more than 30 minutes but less than 1 hour; d) less than 30 minutes; and e) almost none.

Covariates

Socioeconomic factors include sex, age, marital status (married, divorced/widowed, and unmarried), annual equivalent household income, education (junior high school, high school, vocational school, junior college, university, and graduate school), smoking, alcohol consumption, occupation (mainly desk work, jobs mainly involving interpersonal communication, mainly physical work), number of employees, and COVID-19 incidence rate.

Statistical analysis

A WFun score of 21 was used as the cutoff value. Scores above 21 were binarized as work functioning impairment and scores below 21 as no work functioning impairment. For teleworking frequency, “once a week” was included in “more than once a month and less than once a week” owing to the small number of respondents. Multilevel logistic regression analysis was performed to assess the relationship between teleworking frequency, influencing factors, and WFun score, according to the prefecture of residence. Three adjusted models were selected, an age- and sex-adjusted model, model 1, and model 2. Model 1 was adjusted for sex, age, marital status, equivalent household income, education, smoking, alcohol consumption, occupation, number of employees, and COVID-19 incidence rate in the month before the survey. In addition to the factors adjusted in model 1, model 2 was adjusted for teleworking preference, change in working time, and one-way commuting time when not

teleworking. All statistical analyses were conducted using Stata/SE 16.1 (StataCorp, College Station, TX, USA). A p-value less than 0.05 was considered statistically significant.

Results

The characteristics of respondents are shown in Table 1. Of 27,036 respondents, around half were men (51.1%) and office workers (49.8%). Approximately three-quarters (72.9%) had a technical college, junior college, university, or graduate degree. Most respondents (78.7%) reported nearly no teleworking; 10.3% of respondents reported very frequent (4 or more days a week) teleworking. Respondents who reported nearly no teleworking had the lowest percentage (22.1%) of high WFun scores. There were no missing data because the survey system was designed to ensure that all questions were answered.

Table 2 shows the association of work functioning impairment with teleworking frequency, working time, and commuting time when not teleworking. In the age- and sex-adjusted model, the odds ratio (OR) of work functioning impairment was significantly higher among participants who teleworked 4 or more days a week than workers who almost never teleworked (OR: 1.18, 95% confidence interval [CI]: 1.07–1.3). In model 1, adjusted for socioeconomic factors, the OR of work functioning impairment was significantly higher among employees who teleworked 4 or more days a week (OR: 1.32, 95% CI: 1.18–1.46) and those who teleworked 2 or 3 days a week (OR: 1.28, 95% CI: 1.12–1.46) compared with those who almost never teleworked. In model 2, adjusted for teleworking preferences, change in

working time, and commuting time in addition to socioeconomic factors, the ORs of work functioning impairment were no longer significantly different among workers who teleworked 4 or more days a week (OR: 0.93, 95% CI: 0.82–1.05) and those who teleworked 2 or 3 days a week (OR: 0.97, 95% CI: 0.85–1.11).

The ORs of work functioning impairment were significantly different after adjustment for teleworking preferences, changes in working time compared with before the COVID-19 pandemic, and one-way commuting time more than 1 hour. In the age- and sex-adjusted model, the association between teleworking preference and work functioning impairment was OR 2.08 (95% CI: 1.9–2.28) for the group who said they would like to telework as much as possible, in comparison with the group who preferred regular work as much as possible. In the age- and sex-adjusted model, the association between changes in working time compared with before the COVID-19 pandemic and work functioning impairment was OR 1.50 (95% CI: 1.33–1.68) for the group who reported increased working time and OR 0.81 (95% CI: 074–0.89) for respondents who said their working time remained the same, as compared with the group who reported decreased working time. In the age- and sex-adjusted model, the association between one-way commuting time when not teleworking and work functioning impairment was OR 1.8 (95% CI 1.48–2.18) for those reporting more than 2 hours of commuting time compared with those reporting almost no commuting time.

Discussion

This study demonstrated that frequent teleworking may lead to work functioning impairment, but this can be explained by the impact of influencing factors such as teleworking preferences, changes in working time, and commuting time. A stronger degree of preference for teleworking was associated with work functioning impairment. Work functioning impairment owing to changes in working time compared with before the COVID-19 pandemic was highest among workers who reported longer working times and lower among those reporting no change in working time, in comparison with respondents who reported shorter working times. We found that a long commuting time was associated with work functioning impairment.

Our findings showed that teleworking frequency was associated with work functioning impairment through the influence of factors such as teleworking preference, changes in working time compared with before COVID-19 pandemic, and commuting time. After adjusting for these factors, the difference in the association with work functioning impairment was no longer significant, regardless of the teleworking frequency. Teleworking improves presenteeism owing to flexible work arrangements and fewer interruptions.[6,13] However, factors that lead to a higher frequency of teleworking include poor health conditions and less time lost in commuting.[14–16] In our study, the effect of the worker's preference, changes in working time compared with before the COVID-19 pandemic, and commuting time, on the

association between teleworking frequency and work functioning impairment was demonstrated by the disappearance of this association when these factors were adjusted. This result implies that the above factors influence work functioning impairment. Because the frequency of teleworking affects work functioning impairment in dependence on these factors, it is important to determine whether work functioning among workers worsens when teleworking is introduced.

The results of this study indicated that workers who preferred to telework had greater work functioning impairment. Our study results may suggest that workers who prefer teleworking may do so owing to feeling unwell for various reasons. This finding is consistent with those of a previous study showing that workers who prefer teleworking are happy to work from home when feeling unwell.[15] The widespread adoption of teleworking could offer possibilities for workers who feel unwell and prefer not to go into an office. This suggests that managers need to communicate frequently with teleworkers to check on their health, adjust their workload appropriately, and determine if they need to take rest days.

This study showed that longer working time was related to work functioning impairment, versus shorter or unchanged working times. This result is consistent with the findings of previous studies on the negative consequences of longer working times.[6,17–19] Arlinghaus et al.[20] suggested that a small amount of supplemental work increases the risk of work-related health impairments. However, in our study, respondents who reported shorter

working times also had higher levels of work functioning impairment. Economic burden and job insecurity have been found to be associated with higher presenteeism.[21,22] One reason for the reduced working times in our study might be increased financial stress owing to downsizing of businesses as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic. Another reason could be higher stress owing to employment instability because fewer tasks could be conducted via teleworking. Our results suggest that both increased and decreased working times have influenced work functioning impairment during the COVID-19 pandemic.

We found that commuting more than an hour one way led to work functioning impairment. This result is consistent with those of previous studies. Kazekami et al.[23] found that workers who commute more than 1 hour had greater effects from teleworking, which is explained by the negative impact of rush hour commuting congestion on fatigue. Another study reported that commuting more than 6 hours per week was associated with mental health problems.[24] Our study was conducted during the COVID-19 pandemic, and anxiety about the risk of infection while commuting on public transport may have further negatively impacted work functioning impairment. The active use of teleworking may reduce work functioning impairment owing to the burden of a long commuting time.

Our study has several limitations: First, this was an Internet-based survey, so detailed job descriptions of the participants were not available, and the sample may be biased. To reduce bias, we included workers from regions and occupations according to COVID-19

infection status. Second, the self-reported data may be inaccurate; self-reporting may lead to systematic errors, which may reduce or may increase the significance of the differences. Third, this was a cross-sectional study, and it is not possible to determine causality. For example, in this study, we cannot determine whether there is a causal relationship between the frequency of and preference for teleworking.

In conclusion, we found that frequent teleworking may lead to work functioning impairment among employees. The relationship between teleworking frequency and work functioning impairment was suggested to be influenced by teleworking preferences, changes in working time, and commuting time. It is important to determine whether work function worsens when teleworking is introduced. The present results provide evidence that teleworkers who prefer to telework, those whose working time has changed owing to telework, and workers who have long commuting times require special attention to ensure their well-being and functioning at work.

References

1. Belzunegui-Eraso A, Erro-Garcés A. Teleworking in the context of the Covid-19 crisis. *Sustain Sci Pract Policy*. 2020;12(9):3662.
2. Bick A, Blandin A, Mertens K. Work from Home after the Covid-19 Outbreak. Published online July 1, 2020. Accessed February 9, 2021. https://papers.ssrn.com/abstract=3650114
3. Allen TD, Golden TD, Shockley KM. How Effective Is Telecommuting? Assessing the Status of Our Scientific Findings. *Psychol Sci Public Interest*. 2015;16(2):40-68.
4. Sasaki N, Imamura K, Kataoka M, et al. COVID-19 measurements at the workplace in

various industries and company sizes: a 2-month follow-up cohort study of full-time employees in Japan. *Environmental and Occupational Health Practice*. 2021;3(1). doi:10.1539/eohp.2020-0017-OA

5. Shao Y, Fang Y, Wang M, Chang C-HD, Wang L. Making daily decisions to work from home or to work in the office: The impacts of daily work- and COVID-related stressors on next-day work location. *J Appl Psychol*. 2021;106(6):825-838.

6. Ishimaru T, Fujino Y. Association between work style and presenteeism in the Japanese service sector. *J Occup Health*. 2021;63(1):e12211.

7. Barone Gibbs B, Kline CE, Huber KA, Paley JL, Perera S. COVID-19 shelter-at-home and work, lifestyle and well-being in desk workers. *Occup Med* . Published online February 18, 2021. doi:10.1093/occmed/kqab011

8. van der Lippe T, Lippényi Z. Co-workers working from home and individual and team performance. *New Technol Work Employ*. 2020;35(1):60-79.

9. Fujino Y, Uehara M, Izumi H, et al. Development and validity of a work functioning impairment scale based on the Rasch model among Japanese workers. *J Occup Health*. 2015;57(6):521-531.

10. Brown HE, Ryde GC, Gilson ND, Burton NW, Brown WJ. Objectively measured sedentary behavior and physical activity in office employees: relationships with presenteeism. *J Occup Environ Med*. 2013;55(8):945-953.

11. Fujino Y, Ishimaru T, Eguchi H, et al. Protocol for a nationwide Internet-based health survey in workers during the COVID-19 pandemic in 2020. *medRxiv*. Published online 2021. https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2021.02.02.21249309v1.abstract

12. Nagata T, Fujino Y, Saito K, et al. Diagnostic Accuracy of the Work Functioning Impairment Scale (WFun): A Method to Detect Workers Who Have Health Problems Affecting their Work and to Evaluate Fitness for Work. *J Occup Environ Med*. 2017;59(6):557-562.

13. Bailey DE, Kurland NB. A review of telework research: Findings, new directions, and lessons for the study of modern work. *J Organ Behav*. Published online 2002. https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/job.144?casa_token=8bJsEQHv2msAAAAA:q3feFnhk7EQdyHkhJDwuDv5_ZmLEHZUVwkaifKaPKewkQymf7xdWBA40oaPhiqAKwSbtZnduMggWzcY

14. Steidelmüller C, Meyer S-C, Müller G. Home-Based Telework and Presenteeism Across Europe. *J Occup Environ Med*. 2020;62(12):998-1005.

15. Vargas-Llave O, Mandl I, Weber T, Wilkens M. Telework and ICT-based mobile work: Flexible working in the digital age. *Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union*. Published online 2020. https://www.voced.edu.au/content/ngv:86087

16. O'Brien W, Yazdani Aliabadi F. Does telecommuting save energy? A critical review of quantitative studies and their research methods. *Energy Build*. 2020;225:110298.

17. Lee D-W, Lee J, Kim H-R, Kang M-Y. Association of long working hours and health-related productivity loss, and its differential impact by income level: A cross-sectional study of the Korean workers. *J Occup Health*. 2020;62(1):e12190.

18. Goto E, Ishikawa H, Okuhara T, et al. Presenteeism among workers: health-related factors, work-related factors and health literacy. *Occup Med* . 2020;70(8):564-569.

19. Jeon S-H, Leem J-H, Park S-G, et al. Association among Working Hours, Occupational Stress, and Presenteeism among Wage Workers: Results from the Second Korean Working Conditions Survey. *Ann Occup Environ Med*. 2014;26(1):6.

20. Arlinghaus A, Nachreiner F. Health effects of supplemental work from home in the European Union. *Chronobiol Int*. 2014;31(10):1100-1107.

21. Callen BL, Lindley LC, Niederhauser VP. Health risk factors associated with presenteeism in the workplace. *J Occup Environ Med*. 2013;55(11):1312-1317.

22. Kinman G, Grant C. Presenteeism during the COVID-19 pandemic: risks and solutions. *Occup Med* . Published online November 18, 2020. doi:10.1093/occmed/kqaa193

23. Kazekami S. Mechanisms to improve labor productivity by performing telework. *Telecomm Policy*. 2020;44(2):101868.

24. Milner A, Badland H, Kavanagh A, LaMontagne AD. Time Spent Commuting to Work and Mental Health: Evidence From 13 Waves of an Australian Cohort Study. *Am J Epidemiol*. 2017;186(6):659-667.

Table 1. Participant characteristics

	Teleworking frequency								
	4 or more days a week		2 or 3 days a week		More than once a month and less than once a week		Almost never		p-value
	n=2,790		n=1,477		n=1,493		n=21,276		
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	
Age, mean (standard deviation)	49.6	(10)	48.7	(10.3)	47.6	(10.4)	46.5	(10.6)	<0.001
Sex, male	1,576	56.5	860	58.2	925	62.0	10,453	49.1	<0.001
Marital status									
Married	1,406	50.4	915	61.9	959	64.2	11,749	55.2	<0.001
Divorced/Widowed	284	10.2	114	7.7	106	7.1	2,339	11.0	
Unmarried	1,100	39.4	448	30.3	428	28.7	7,188	33.8	
Job type									
Mainly desk work	2,042	73.2	1,058	71.6	952	63.8	9,416	44.3	<0.001
Jobs mainly involving interpersonal communication	495	17.7	333	22.5	391	26.2	5,708	26.8	
Mainly physical work	253	9.1	86	5.8	150	10.0	6,152	28.9	
Annual equivalent household income (JPY)									
< 2,500,000	751	26.9	207	14.0	189	12.7	4,563	21.4	<0.001
2,500,000–3,750,000	643	23.0	297	20.1	305	20.4	6,305	29.6	
3,750,000–5,000,000	576	20.6	362	24.5	371	24.8	5,316	25.0	
> 5,000,000	820	29.4	611	41.4	628	42.1	5,092	23.9	
Education									
Junior high school	31	1.1	13	0.9	6	0.4	318	1.5	<0.001
High school	507	18.2	198	13.4	238	15.9	6,010	28.2	
Vocational school, junior college, university, or graduate school	2,252	80.7	1,266	85.7	1,249	83.7	14,948	70.3	
Current smoker	693	24.8	406	27.5	441	29.5	5,464	25.7	
Alcohol consumption									
6 or more days a week	658	23.6	360	24.4	341	22.8	4,315	20.3	<0.001
4 or 5 days a week	234	8.4	165	11.2	163	10.9	1,515	7.1	
2 or 3 days a week	316	11.3	195	13.2	241	16.1	2,514	11.8	
Within 1 day a week	445	15.9	262	17.7	281	18.8	3,559	16.7	
Almost never	1,137	40.8	495	33.5	467	31.3	9,373	44.1	
Number of employees									
1–9	1,670	59.9	343	23.2	275	18.4	3,877	18.2	<0.001
10–99	228	8.2	230	15.6	245	16.4	6,237	29.3	
100–999	321	11.5	335	22.7	375	25.1	6,122	28.8	
>1000	571	20.5	569	38.5	598	40.1	5,040	23.7	
Work functioning impairment scale (Wfun) score									
7–20	2,163	77.5	1,134	76.8	1,154	77.3	16,794	78.9	0.052
21–35	627	22.5	343	23.2	339	22.7	4,482	21.1	
Teleworking preference									
I would like to telework as much as possible	1,789	64.1	463	31.3	259	17.3	2,196	10.3	<0.001
I prefer teleworking	409	14.7	440	29.8	376	25.2	2,666	12.5	
I don't mind either	436	15.6	376	25.5	483	32.4	6,637	31.2	
I prefer regular work	98	3.5	154	10.4	272	18.2	2,845	13.4	
I prefer regular work as much as possible	58	2.1	44	3.0	103	6.9	6,932	32.6	
Recommendation for teleworking	1,778	63.7	1,205	81.6	1,087	72.8	3,724	17.5	
Working time (compared with before the COVID-19 pandemic)									
Increased	369	13.2	240	16.2	208	13.9	1,438	6.8	<0.001
Remained the same	2,022	72.5	978	66.2	1,049	70.3	17,882	84.0	
Decreased	399	14.3	259	17.5	236	15.8	1,956	9.2	
One-way commuting time (excluding teleworking)									
More than 2 hours	49	1.8	65	4.4	52	3.5	419	2.0	<0.001
More than 1 hour but less than 2 hours	278	10	386	26.1	377	25.3	2,634	12.4	
More than 30 minutes but less than 1 hour	398	14.3	510	34.5	484	32.4	6,023	28.3	
Less than 30 minutes	330	11.8	317	21.5	462	30.9	10,101	47.5	
Almost none	1,735	62.2	199	13.5	118	7.9	2,099	9.9	

	Age- and sex-adjusted				Model 1				Model 2			
	OR	95% CI		*p*	OR	95% CI		*p*	OR	95% CI		*p*
Teleworking frequency												
4 or more days a week	1.18	1.07	1.30	0.001	1.32	1.18	1.46	<0.001	0.93	0.82	1.05	0.227
2 or 3 days a week	1.21	1.06	1.37	0.004	1.28	1.12	1.46	<0.001	0.97	0.85	1.11	0.682
More than once a month and less than once a week	1.13	1.00	1.28	0.057	1.18	1.04	1.35	0.011	0.99	0.87	1.14	0.937
Almost never	reference				reference				reference			
Teleworking preference												
I would like to telework as much as possible	2.08	1.90	2.28	<0.001	2.2	2.01	2.42	<0.001	2.20	1.99	2.43	<0.001
I prefer teleworking	1.74	1.58	1.92	<0.001	1.78	1.62	1.97	<0.001	1.73	1.56	1.92	<0.001
I don't mind either	1.24	1.14	1.35	<0.001	1.25	1.14	1.36	<0.001	1.24	1.14	1.35	<0.001
I prefer regular work	1.21	1.09	1.35	<0.001	1.22	1.09	1.36	<0.001	1.19	1.07	1.33	0.001
I prefer regular work as much as possible	reference				reference				reference			
Working time (compared with before COVID-19 pandemic)												
Increased	1.50	1.33	1.68	<0.001	1.59	1.40	1.80	<0.001	1.57	1.39	1.79	<0.001
Remained the same	0.81	0.74	0.89	<0.001	0.80	0.73	0.88	<0.001	0.81	0.74	0.89	<0.001
Decreased	reference				reference				reference			
One way commuting time (excluding teleworking)												
More than 2 hours	1.8	1.48	2.18	<0.001	1.74	1.43	2.11	<0.001	1.80	1.47	2.2	<0.001
More than 1 hour but less than 2 hours	1.36	1.22	1.51	<0.001	1.28	1.14	1.43	<0.001	1.36	1.20	1.54	<0.001
More than 30 minutes but less than 1 hour	1.09	0.99	1.19	0.09	1.03	0.93	1.15	0.51	1.15	1.03	1.28	0.015
Less than 30 minutes	0.93	0.85	1.02	0.111	0.89	0.81	0.98	0.016	1.02	0.92	1.13	0.728
Almost none	reference				reference				reference			

Table 2. Odds ratio of work functioning impairment associated with teleworking frequency, preference, working time, and commuting time

OR: odds ratio, CI: confidence interval.

Model 1: adjusted for sex, age, marital status, equivalent household income, education, smoking, alcohol consumption, occupation, number of establishments, and COVID-19 incidence rate in the month before the survey.

Model 2: adjusted for teleworking preference, change in working hours, and one-way commuting time when not teleworking, in addition to the factors adjusted in model 1.