

## **Effect of working from home on the association between job demands and psychological distress**

Hisashi Eguchi<sup>1\*</sup>, Akiomi Inoue<sup>2</sup>, Ayako Hino<sup>1</sup>, Mayumi Tsuji<sup>3</sup>, Seiichiro Tateishi<sup>4</sup>, Kazuhiro Ikegami<sup>5</sup>, Tomohisa Nagata<sup>6</sup>, Ryutaro Matsugaki<sup>7</sup>, Yoshihisa Fujino<sup>8</sup>, and the CORoNaWork project

<sup>1</sup>Department of Mental Health, Institute of Industrial Ecological Sciences, University of Occupational and Environmental Health, Japan, Kitakyushu, Japan

<sup>2</sup>Institutional Research Center, University of Occupational and Environmental Health, Japan, Kitakyushu, Japan

<sup>3</sup>Department of Environmental Health, School of Medicine, University of Occupational and Environmental Health, Japan, Kitakyushu, Japan

<sup>4</sup>Disaster Occupational Health Center, Institute of Industrial Ecological Sciences, University of Occupational and Environmental Health, Kitakyushu, Japan

<sup>5</sup>Department of Work Systems and Health, Institute of Industrial Ecological Sciences, University of Occupational and Environmental Health, Japan, Kitakyushu, Japan

<sup>6</sup>Department of Occupational Health Practice and Management, Institute of Industrial Ecological Sciences, University of Occupational and Environmental Health, Japan, Kitakyushu, Japan

<sup>7</sup>Department of Preventive Medicine and Community Health, School of Medicine, University of Occupational and Environmental Health, Japan, Kitakyushu, Japan

<sup>8</sup>Department of Environmental Epidemiology, Institute of Industrial Ecological Sciences, University of Occupational and Environmental Health, Japan, Kitakyushu, Japan

Corresponding author:

Hisashi Eguchi, MD, MBA, PhD

Department of Mental Health, Institute of Industrial Ecological Sciences, University of Occupational and Environmental Health, Japan, 1-1 Iseigaoka, Yahatanishi-ku, Kitakyushu 807-8555, Japan

Email: [eguchi@med.uoeh-u.ac.jp](mailto:eguchi@med.uoeh-u.ac.jp)

Telephone: +81-93-691-7475, Fax: +81-93-692-5419

Conflicts of interest

All authors declare that they have no competing interests.

Author contributions

HE wrote the initial draft of the manuscript. AI, AH, MT, ST, HA, TN, AI, SM, and YF contributed to the analyses and interpretation of the data and assisted in preparing the manuscript. HE, AH, MT,

ST, HA, TN, SM, and YF contributed to the data collection. All authors critically reviewed the manuscript, approved the final version of the manuscript, and agree to be accountable for all aspects of the work and ensure that questions related to the accuracy or integrity of any part of the work are appropriately investigated and resolved.

#### Funding

This study was funded by: a research grant from the University of Occupational and Environmental Health, Japan; a general incorporated foundation (Anshin Zaidan) for the development of educational materials on mental health measures for managers at small-sized enterprises; Health, Labour and Welfare Sciences Research Grants: Comprehensive Research for Women's Healthcare (H30-josei-ippan-002), Research for the establishment of an occupational health system in times of disaster (H30-roudou-ippan-007) and Work-related Diseases Clinical Research Grant 2021 (200401-01); consigned research foundation (the Collabo-health Study Group); scholarship donations from Chugai Pharmaceutical Co., Ltd.; and the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science (JSPS KAKENHI: Grant Number JP20K10477).

Number of words: 2,153

Number of tables: 2, Number of figures: 1

## **Abstract**

### **Purpose**

Limited information is available about the association between workplace psychosocial factors and general mental health status among workers during the COVID-19 pandemic. This study examined how working from home affected the association between job demands and psychological distress (PD).

### **Method**

A cross-sectional online survey was conducted in December 2020 (N=27,036). The dependent variable (PD) was assessed using the Kessler Psychological Distress Scale. Job demands were assessed using the Job Content Questionnaire. Working from home was determined by participants' responses to the question: "Do you currently work from home?" We used a two-level regression analysis adjusted for prefecture; each individual-level variable at level 1 was nested into each prefecture at level 2, stratified by working from home or not.

### **Results**

Overall, 21.3% of participants worked from home. The interaction between working from home and job demands was significant. Job demands were positively associated with PD. The stratified analysis showed the associations were weaker among employees who worked from home compared with those who did not.

### **Conclusion**

The association between job demands and PD may be weakened by working from home.

Keywords: COVID-19 pandemic, psychological distress, psychosocial factors, work from home, Japan

1 Introduction

2 The ongoing coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) pandemic poses a threat to psychological health.  
3 Previous research revealed profound and wide ranging psychosocial impacts at the individual,  
4 community, and international levels during past outbreaks of infectious diseases (Mukhtar 2020).  
5 The current health crisis has had unprecedented impacts on workplace practices.

6

7 High job demands cause depression, which can lead to suicide. Karoshi, or death from overwork,  
8 represents a growing public health issue in East Asia (Eguchi et al. 2016). Factors related to COVID-  
9 19 infection in the workplace may affect individual coping styles and response to threats (Eguchi et  
10 al. 2021). However, workplace-based COVID-19 pandemic countermeasures may weaken the  
11 association between job demands and psychological distress.

12

13 The COVID-19 pandemic meant that millions of employees across different countries rapidly shifted  
14 to working from home. Working from home became crucial for many companies and governments  
15 as it allowed people to continue working during the pandemic while reducing the spread of the virus  
16 (Şentürk et al. 2021). The positive impacts of working from home, such as reduced commuting time  
17 and costs, reduced environmental pollution, and opportunity to support family duties (e.g., picking  
18 up children from school) may be desirable for many workers (Kotera and Correa Vione 2020).  
19 Employees who worked from home at least 1 day per week demonstrated higher autonomy than  
20 those that did not and achieved higher levels of flow (enjoyment, absorption, and intrinsic  
21 motivation), which was improved by perceived supervisor and collegial support (Peters et al. 2014).  
22 In addition, the association between telecommuting and psychological distress differs depending on  
23 telecommuting preference (Otsuka et al. 2021).

24

25 The job demands–resources model conceptualizes job resources as “those physical, psychological,  
26 social, or organizational aspects of the job that are either/or: 1. functional in achieving work goals, 2.  
27 reduce job demands and the associated physiological and psychological costs, and 3. stimulate  
28 personal growth, learning, and development” (Demerouti and Bakker 2011, p.2). Working from  
29 home may therefore be positioned as a job resource related to job control.

30

31 The present study hypothesized that working from home may weaken the association between high  
32 job demands and increased psychological distress among general Japanese workers during the third  
33 wave of COVID-19 infections. Figure 1 shows the concept model underlying the study hypothesis.

34

35 --- insert Figure 1 here ---

36

37 Materials and Methods

38 A cross-sectional online survey was conducted in December 2020 among participants who had  
39 previously registered with a Japanese web survey company. Invitations to participate were sent to  
40 665,381 registrants via email. Details of the survey protocol have previously been reported (Fujino et  
41 al. 2021). A sampling plan was designed to recruit an equal number of respondents from 20  
42 collection units comprising a combination of five regions each, with comparable sex and office/non-  
43 office worker status. The target sample size was 1,500 respondents from each collection unit, giving  
44 a total of 30,000 respondents. In total, 1,650 respondents (target sample size plus a margin of 10%)  
45 were recruited from each collection unit. Of the 33,302 eligible respondents, 215 were excluded  
46 because they were deemed to have provided fraudulent responses by Cross Marketing Inc., leaving  
47 33,087 respondents. Participants were selected using a random number generator. The study  
48 population comprised individuals interested in participating in a survey. There was a modest  
49 financial incentive for survey participation (equivalent to a few US dollars). We excluded 6,051  
50 surveys with invalid responses or response errors, leaving 27,036 surveys for analysis in this study.  
51 The exclusion criteria were: extremely short response time ( $\leq 6$  minutes), extremely low body weight  
52 ( $< 30$  kg), extremely short height ( $< 140$  cm), inconsistent answers to similar questions throughout the  
53 survey (e.g., inconsistent responses to questions about marital status and living area), and incorrect  
54 answers to a staged question used to identify fraudulent responses (i.e., “Choose the third-largest  
55 number from the following five numbers”).

56

57 The study aims and protocol were approved by the Ethics Committee of Medical Research,  
58 University of Occupational and Environmental Health, Japan (R2-079). Informed consent to  
59 participate in this study was obtained from all participants. Participants were informed in advance  
60 that their participation was strictly voluntary and all information they provided would remain  
61 confidential. Individuals who consented to participate were able to access a designated website (after  
62 confirmation of their personal information) where they could complete the survey. Participants had  
63 the option to not respond to any part of the questionnaire and could discontinue participation at any  
64 time.

65

66 Dependent variable: psychological distress

67 Psychological distress was assessed using the Kessler Psychological Distress Scale (K6). The K6  
68 was originally developed as a screening instrument for non-specific psychological distress and  
69 serious mental illness. Its internal reliability and validity have been documented (Furukawa et al.  
70 2008). The K6 comprises a six-item battery asking how frequently respondents had experienced  
71 specific symptoms of psychological distress in the past 30 days. Responses range from 0 (none of  
72 the time) to 4 (all of the time), giving a total score of 0–24. The K6 has been translated into Japanese,

73 and the Japanese version has been validated. In this sample, the Cronbach's  $\alpha$  coefficient for the K6  
74 was 0.88.

75

76 Independent variable: Job demands

77 We used the job demands scale from the Japanese version of the Job Content Questionnaire (JCQ)  
78 (Kawakami et al. 1995). The JCQ was developed by Karasek and is based on the job demands–  
79 control (or demand–control–support) model. It contains five items that assess job demands, rated on  
80 a 4-point scale (1 = strongly disagree to 4 = strongly agree). The total score was calculated according  
81 to the JCQ User's Guide (score range: 12–48) (Karasek et al. 1998). The Japanese version of the  
82 JCQ had acceptable reliability and validity (Kawakami et al. 1995). In the present study, the  
83 Cronbach's  $\alpha$  coefficient for job demands was 0.68.

84

85 Moderator variable: working from home

86 Working from home was determined by participants' responses to the question: "Do you currently  
87 work from home?" Response options were "More than 4 days per week," "More than 2 days per  
88 week," "Less than 1 day per week," and "Hardly ever." Responses were subsequently dichotomized  
89 using a two-point scale: 0 = yes ("More than 4 days per week," "More than 2 days per week," "Less  
90 than 1 day per week"); and 1 = no ("Hardly ever").

91

92 Assessment of covariates

93 Covariates were measured using a self-administered questionnaire and included demographic and  
94 lifestyle characteristics such as sex, age, marital status, educational attainment, occupation, job type,  
95 annual family income, and company size. Age was expressed as a continuous variable. Marital status  
96 was classified into three categories: married, divorced/widowed, and unmarried. Educational  
97 attainment was classified into three categories: junior high school and high school, college and  
98 technical school, and university and graduate school. Occupation was classified into 10 categories:  
99 staff member; manager; executive; public official/teaching staff/non-profit organization employee;  
100 temporary and contract employee; self-employed person; small office/home office worker;  
101 agriculture, forestry, and fishery worker; professional (e.g., lawyer, accountant, medical doctor); and  
102 others. Job type was classified into three categories: mainly desk work (clerical or computer work),  
103 mainly talking to people (e.g., customer service, sales, selling), and mainly labor (e.g., work at  
104 construction sites, physical work, nursing care). Participants were asked to indicate their yearly  
105 equivalent household income by choosing one of five income bands: (i) 47.4–224.5 million JPY; (ii)  
106 225.0–317.5 million JPY; (iii) 318.1–428.7 million JPY; (iv) 433.0–525.0 million JPY; and (v)  
107 530.3–1050.0 million JPY. Company size was categorized into 10 groups by number of employees:  
108 1 (self-employment), 2–4, 5–9, 10–29, 30–49, 50–99, 100–499, 500–999, 1,000–9,999, and  $\geq 10,000$

109 employees. The cumulative incidence rate of COVID-19 infection 1 week before the survey in the  
110 residential prefectures was used as a prefecture-level variable. This information was collected from  
111 the websites of public institutions.

112

### 113 Statistical analyses

114 Student's t-tests and chi-square tests were used to examine differences in demographic variables and  
115 psychological distress between participants who were working from home and those who were not.  
116 We used multilevel regression analyses with two levels adjusted for the prefectural level, whereby  
117 each individual-level variable at level 1 was nested into each prefecture at level 2. Examination of  
118 the interaction between working from home and job demands showed a significant interaction ( $p =$   
119  $0.02$ ). To compare the adjusted coefficients by presence or absence of working from home, multiple  
120 regression analyses were used to examine the association between job demands and psychological  
121 distress stratified by availability of telecommuting. We conducted multiple regression analysis using  
122 a crude model (Model 1) and a model adjusted for sex, age, marital status, educational attainment,  
123 occupation, job type, annual household income, and company size (Model 2). All analyses were  
124 performed using Stata 15SE (StataCorp, College Station, TX, USA), with statistical significance set  
125 at  $p < 0.05$ .

126

### 127 Results

128 Approximately 20% of participants had the opportunity to work from home. Employees who worked  
129 from home were older and had lower psychological distress than those who did not work from home.  
130 Men, self-employed people, those with a higher household income, those whose job mainly involved  
131 desk work, and employees in large companies were more likely to work from home (Table 1).

132

133 --- insert Table 1 here ---

134

135 We demonstrated a significant association between job demands and psychological distress ( $p <$   
136  $0.05$ ). The stratified analysis (post hoc simple slope analysis) showed that the effect of job demands  
137 on psychological distress was weaker among employees who worked from home (coefficient = 0.15)  
138 than among those who did not (coefficient = 0.18) (Table 2). Company size was positively associated  
139 with psychological distress among those who worked from home, and negatively associated with  
140 psychological distress among those who did not work from home.

141

142 --- insert Table 2 here ---

143

### 144 Discussion

145 We conducted a large online survey on December 22, 2020, just before the government declared a  
146 second state of emergency in the greater Tokyo area (January 7, 2021). Men, self-employed people,  
147 those with a higher household income, those whose job mainly involved desk work, and employees  
148 in large companies were more likely to work from home. The association between job demands and  
149 psychological distress was stronger among employees who did not work from home than among  
150 those worked from home.

151

152 Working from home may weaken the association between job demands and psychological distress.  
153 Working from home has been associated with reduced commuting time and costs, reduced  
154 environmental pollution, and the opportunity to support family duties (e.g., picking up children from  
155 school), which may be desirable for many workers (Kotera and Correa Vione 2020). Having a sense  
156 of control over worktime can also help employees manage their work-life balance (Beckers et al.  
157 2012). Irrespective of the COVID-19 pandemic, employers may proactively provide opportunities to  
158 work from home to prevent psychological distress among employees. In addition, working from  
159 home may reduce the fear of infection at or on the way to work (Nguyen 2021; Sato et al. 2021). Our  
160 previous study showed that the association between job demands and psychological distress may be  
161 strengthened by anxiety about COVID-19 infection in the workplace (Eguchi et al. 2020). Working  
162 from home may affect the association between job demands and psychological distress through  
163 reducing anxiety about COVID-19 infection.

164

165 The effect of company size on psychological distress differed between those who worked from home  
166 and those that did not. The association between company size and psychological distress in previous  
167 studies was inconsistent (Inoue et al. 2010; Kanamori et al. 2020). This discrepancy may be  
168 attributable to the use of different indicators (company size vs. worksite size) or different survey  
169 years reflecting different economic situations. Working from home decreased employees'  
170 communication with their supervisors and colleagues (Amano et al. 2021). Therefore, working from  
171 home may affect the association between company size and psychological distress via  
172 communication changes.

173

174 This study had some limitations. First, our study population required Internet access to complete the  
175 survey and therefore might have comprised participants that were more aware of COVID-19  
176 infection through access to online information. People should be aware of the psychological risk of  
177 too much media exposure and control their access in health crises such as the COVID-19 outbreak  
178 (Sasaki et al. 2020). Our results are not completely generalizable to individuals without Internet  
179 access or to people in other countries and settings. Second, we had no information about participants'  
180 personality traits. In addition, we had no information about the number of confirmed cases of



181 COVID-19 in the workplace. Further studies are needed to evaluate whether other confounding  
182 factors provide possible mechanisms for the observed attenuation in the associations between job  
183 demands, working from home, and psychological distress. Third, this study used a cross-sectional  
184 design, and no causal associations could be determined. A further study using an interventional or  
185 prospective design is needed to clarify potential causal associations between job demands, working  
186 from home, and psychological distress in the Japanese working population. Finally, we should  
187 consider the possible effects of common method bias when interpreting the results.

188

#### 189 Conclusion

190 The association between job demands and psychological distress may be weakened by working from  
191 home.

192 **References**

- 193 Amano H, Fukuda Y, Shibuya K, Ozaki A, Tabuchi T (2021) Factors associated with the work  
194 engagement of employees working from home during the COVID-19 pandemic in Japan. *Int J*  
195 *Environ Res Public Health* 18(19):10495. doi:10.3390/ijerph181910495
- 196 Beckers DG, Kompier MA, Kecklund G, Härmä M (2012) Worktime control: theoretical  
197 conceptualization, current empirical knowledge, and research agenda. *Scand J Work Environ Health*  
198 38(4):291-297. doi:10.5271/sjweh.3308
- 199 Demerouti E, Bakker AB (2011) The job demands-resources model: Challenges for future research.  
200 *SA J Ind Psychol* 37(2):01-09.
- 201 Eguchi H, Inoue A, Hino A, et al (2021) Effect of anxiety about COVID-19 infection in the  
202 workplace on the association between job demands and psychological distress. *Front Public Health*  
203 9:722071. doi:10.3389/fpubh.2021.722071
- 204 Eguchi H, Wada K, Smith DR (2016) Recognition, compensation, and prevention of karoshi, or  
205 death due to overwork. *J Occup Environ Med* 58(8):e313-e314.  
206 doi:10.1097/jom.0000000000000797
- 207 Fujino Y, Ishimaru T, Eguchi H, et al (2021) Protocol for a nationwide Internet-based health survey  
208 of workers during the COVID-19 pandemic in 2020. *J UOEH* 43(2):217-225.  
209 doi:10.7888/juoeh.43.217
- 210 Furukawa TA, Kawakami N, Saitoh M, et al (2008) The performance of the Japanese version of the  
211 K6 and K10 in the World Mental Health Survey Japan. *Int J Methods Psychiatr Res* 17(3):152-158.  
212 doi:10.1002/mpr.257
- 213 Inoue A, Kawakami N, Tsuchiya M, Sakurai K, Hashimoto H (2010) Association of occupation,  
214 employment contract, and company size with mental health in a national representative sample of  
215 employees in Japan. *J Occup Health* 52(4):227-240. doi:10.1539/joh.o10002
- 216 Kanamori S, Tsuji T, Takamiya T, et al (2020) Size of company of the longest-held job and mortality  
217 in older Japanese adults: A 6-year follow-up study from the Japan Gerontological Evaluation Study.  
218 *J Occup Health* 62(1):e12115. doi:10.1002/1348-9585.12115
- 219 Karasek R, Brisson C, Kawakami N, Houtman I, Bongers P, Amick B (1998) The Job Content  
220 Questionnaire (JCQ): an instrument for internationally comparative assessments of psychosocial job  
221 characteristics. *J Occup Health Psychol* 3(4):322-355.
- 222 Kawakami N, Kobayashi F, Araki S, Haratani T, Furui H (1995) Assessment of job stress dimensions  
223 based on the job demands- control model of employees of telecommunication and electric power  
224 companies in Japan: reliability and validity of the Japanese version of the Job Content Questionnaire.  
225 *Int J Behav Med* 2(4):358-375. doi:10.1207/s15327558ijbm0204\_5
- 226 Kotera Y, Correa Vione K (2020) Psychological impacts of the new ways of working (NWW): A  
227 systematic review. *Int J Environ Res Public Health* 17(14):5080. doi:10.3390/ijerph17145080

- 228 Kotera Y, Green P, Sheffield D (2020) Work-life balance of UK construction workers: relationship  
229 with mental health. *Constr Manag and Econ* 38(3):291-303. doi:10.1080/01446193.2019.1625417
- 230 Mukhtar S (2020) Psychological health during the coronavirus disease 2019 pandemic outbreak. *Int*  
231 *J Soc Psychiatry* 66(5):512-516. doi:10.1177/0020764020925835
- 232 Nguyen MH (2021) Factors influencing home-based telework in Hanoi (Vietnam) during and after  
233 the COVID-19 era. *Transportation (Amst)* 48(6):3207-3238. doi:10.1007/s11116-021-10169-5
- 234 Otsuka S, Ishimaru T, Nagata M, et al (2021) A cross-sectional study of the mismatch between  
235 telecommuting preference and frequency associated with psychological distress among Japanese  
236 workers in the COVID-19 pandemic. *J Occup Environ Med* 63(9):e636-e640.  
237 doi:10.1097/jom.0000000000002318
- 238 Peters P, Poutsma E, Van der Heijden BIJM, Bakker AB, Bruijn Td (2014) Enjoying new ways to  
239 work: an HRM-process approach to study flow. *Hum Resour Manag* 53(2):271-290.  
240 <https://doi.org/10.1002/hrm.21588>
- 241 Sasaki N, Kuroda R, Tsuno K, Kawakami N (2020) Exposure to media and fear and worry about  
242 COVID-19. *Psychiatry Clin Neurosci* 74(9):501-502. doi:10.1111/pcn.13095
- 243 Sato K, Sakata R, Murayama C, Yamaguchi M, Matsuoka Y, Kondo N (2021) Changes in work and  
244 life patterns associated with depressive symptoms during the COVID-19 pandemic: an observational  
245 study of health app (CALO mama) users. *Occup Environ Med*. doi:10.1136/oemed-2020-106945
- 246 Şentürk E, Sağaltıcı E, Geniş B, Günday Toker Ö (2021) Predictors of depression, anxiety and stress  
247 among remote workers during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Work* 70(1):41-51. doi:10.3233/wor-  
248 210082

Table 1. Participants' characteristics (N=27,036)

|  | Working from home |               | p                   |
|--|-------------------|---------------|---------------------|
|  | Yes<br>(n=5,760)  | No (n=21,276) |                     |
| Age, years (SD)  | 48.9 (10.2)       | 46.5 (10.6)   | <0.001 <sup>a</sup> |
| Range (minimum–maximum)  | 20–65             | 20–65         |                     |
| Job demand, Job Content Questionnaire score (SD)                       | 29.1 (6.0)        | 30.3 (5.6)    | <0.001 <sup>a</sup> |
| Range (minimum–maximum)  | 12–48             | 12–48         |                     |
| Psychological distress, K6 score (SD)                                  | 4.5 (5.7)         | 4.7 (5.0)     | 0.04                |
| Range (minimum–maximum)  | 0–24              | 0–24          |                     |
| Sex  |                   |               |                     |
| Men  | 3361 (58.4)       | 10,453 (49.1) | <0.001 <sup>b</sup> |
| Women  | 2399 (41.7)       | 10,823 (50.9) |                     |
| Marital status   |                   |               |                     |
| Married  | 3280 (56.9)       | 11,479 (55.2) | 0.014 <sup>b</sup>  |
| Divorced or widowed  | 504 (8.8)         | 2339 (11.0)   |                     |
| Unmarried  | 1976 (34.3)       | 7188 (33.8)   |                     |
| Educational attainment, n (%)  |                   |               |                     |
| Junior high school and high school                                     | 993 (17.2)        | 6328 (29.7)   | <0.001 <sup>b</sup> |
| College and technical school   | 1132 (19.7)       | 5412 (25.4)   |                     |
| University and graduate school   | 3635 (63.1)       | 9536 (44.8)   |                     |
| Occupation, n (%)  |                   |               |                     |
| Staff member   | 2082 (36.2)       | 10,493 (49.3) | <0.001 <sup>b</sup> |
| Manager  | 796 (13.8)        | 1745 (8.2)    |                     |
| Executive  | 273 (4.7)         | 589 (2.8)     |                     |
| Public official, teaching staff, and non-profit organization employees | 248 (4.3)         | 2562 (12.0)   |                     |
| Temporary and contract employees                                       | 416 (7.2)         | 2478 (11.7)   |                     |
| Self-employed person   | 1055 (18.3)       | 1174 (5.5)    |                     |
| Small office home office worker  | 330 (5.7)         | 48 (0.2)      |                     |
| Agriculture, forestry, and fisheries                                   | 54 (0.9)          | 158 (0.7)     |                     |

|  |             |             |                     |
|--|-------------|-------------|---------------------|
| Professionals (e.g., lawyer, accountant, medical doctor)             | 153 (2.7)   | 1694 (8.0)  |                     |
| Other  | 353 (6.1)   | 335 (1.6)   |                     |
| Job type   |             |             |                     |
| Mainly desk work (clerical or computer work)                         | 4052 (70.4) | 9416 (44.3) | <0.001 <sup>b</sup> |
| Mainly talking to people (customer service, sales, selling)          | 1219 (21.2) | 5708 (26.8) |                     |
| Mainly labor (work at production sites, physical work, nursing care) | 489 (8.5)   | 6152 (28.9) |                     |
| Yearly household income, million JPY, n (%)                          |             |             |                     |
| 1 (47.4–224.5)   | 1049 (18.2) | 4054 (19.1) | <0.001 <sup>b</sup> |
| 2 (225.0–317.5)  | 922 (16.0)  | 4690 (22.0) |                     |
| 3 (318.1–428.7)  | 944 (16.4)  | 4317 (20.3) |                     |
| 4 (433.0–525.0)  | 1119 (19.4) | 3914 (18.4) |                     |
| 5 (530.3–1050.0)   | 1726 (30.0) | 4301 (20.2) |                     |
| Company size, employees, n (%)                                       |             |             |                     |
| 1 (self-employment)  | 1518 (26.4) | 1038 (4.7)  | <0.001 <sup>b</sup> |
| 2–4  | 557 (9.7)   | 1439 (6.8)  |                     |
| 5–9  | 213 (3.7)   | 1400 (6.6)  |                     |
| 10–29  | 270 (3.7)   | 2528 (11.9) |                     |
| 30–49  | 160 (4.7)   | 1432 (6.7)  |                     |
| 50–99  | 273 (2.8)   | 2277 (10.7) |                     |
| 100–499  | 668 (11.6)  | 4488 (21.1) |                     |
| 500–999  | 363 (6.3)   | 1634 (7.7)  |                     |
| 1,000–9,999  | 1076 (18.7) | 3643 (17.1) |                     |
| ≥10,000  | 662 (11.5)  | 1397 (6.6)  |                     |

<sup>a</sup> Student's t-test, <sup>b</sup> chi square test; SD, standard deviation; K6, Kessler Psychological Distress Scale.

Table 2. Associations between job demand and psychological distress by working from home (N=27,036)

| Work from home   | Yes (n=5,760) |              |             |              | No (n=21,276) |              |             |              |
|--|---------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|
|  | Model 1       |              | Model 2     |              | Model 1       |              | Model 2     |              |
|  | Coefficient   | 95% CI       | Coefficient | 95% CI       | Coefficient   | 95% CI       | Coefficient | 95% CI       |
| Job demand   | 0.15          | (0.13–0.17)  | 0.15        | (0.13–0.18)  | 0.19          | (0.17–0.20)  | 0.18        | (0.17–0.19)  |
| Sex  | 1.16          | (0.88–1.44)  | 0.28        | (–0.04–0.59) | 1.16          | (1.01–1.31)  | 0.13        | (–0.04–0.31) |
| Age  | –0.10         | (–0.11–0.09) | –0.07       | (–0.09–0.06) | –0.09         | (–0.10–0.08) | –0.06       | (–0.07–0.05) |
| Marriage   |               |              |             |              |               |              |             |              |
| Married  | ref           |              | ref         |              | ref           |              | ref         |              |
| Divorced or widowed  | 0.81          | (0.31–1.31)  | 0.75        | (0.26–1.24)  | 1.18          | (0.94–1.42)  | 0.88        | (0.64–1.12)  |
| Unmarried  | 1.66          | (1.37–1.96)  | 0.92        | (0.61–1.24)  | 1.69          | (1.53–1.85)  | 0.99        | (0.82–1.15)  |
| Educational attainment   |               |              |             |              |               |              |             |              |
| Junior high school and high school                                     | ref           |              | ref         |              | ref           |              | ref         |              |
| College and technical school   | 0.14          | (–0.32–0.59) | –0.06       | (–0.50–0.38) | 0.23          | (0.03–0.43)  | 0.03        | (–0.17–0.23) |
| University and graduate school   | –0.19         | (–0.56–0.19) | 0.01        | (–0.37–0.38) | –0.27         | (–0.45–0.10) | –0.11       | (–0.29–0.07) |
| Occupation   |               |              |             |              |               |              |             |              |
| Staff member   | ref           |              | ref         |              | ref           |              | ref         |              |
| Manager  | –1.05         | (–1.48–0.61) | 0.02        | (–0.42–0.47) | –1.30         | (–1.57–1.03) | –0.30       | (–0.58–0.02) |
| Executive  | –1.87         | (–2.54–1.19) | –0.96       | (–1.67–0.25) | –1.92         | (–2.37–1.47) | –0.47       | (–0.93–0.02) |
| Public official, teaching staff, and non-profit organization employees | 0.28          | (–0.43–0.98) | 0.74        | (0.06–1.42)  | –0.67         | (–0.91–0.44) | –0.18       | (–0.42–0.06) |
| Temporary and contract employees                                       | –0.14         | (–0.70–0.42) | –0.01       | (–0.56–0.55) | 0.18          | (–0.06–0.42) | 0.30        | (0.06–0.54)  |
| Self-employed person   | –0.46         | (–0.86–0.06) | –0.49       | (–1.05–0.07) | –1.22         | (–1.55–0.90) | –0.26       | (–0.61–0.10) |
| Small office home office   | 0.33          | (–0.29–0.95) | –0.19       | (–0.92–0.54) | –1.41         | (–2.95–0.12) | –0.72       | (–2.21–0.77) |

|  |       |              |       |              |       |              |       |              |
|--|-------|--------------|-------|--------------|-------|--------------|-------|--------------|
| worker   |       |              |       |              |       |              |       |              |
| Agriculture, forestry and fisheries                                  | 0.12  | (-1.33-1.56) | -0.37 | (-1.87-1.12) | -0.49 | (-1.34-0.36) | 0.09  | (-0.75-0.93) |
| Professionals (e.g., lawyer, accountant, medical doctor)             | -0.27 | (-1.15-0.61) | -0.36 | (-1.28-0.55) | -0.31 | (-0.59-0.03) | -0.58 | (-0.87-0.30) |
| Other  | 0.57  | (-0.03-1.18) | -0.16 | (-0.86-0.55) | -0.44 | (-1.03-0.15) | -0.19 | (-0.77-0.39) |
| Job type   |       |              |       |              |       |              |       |              |
| Mainly desk work (clerical or computer work)                         | ref   |              | ref   |              | ref   |              | ref   |              |
| Mainly talking to people (customer service, sales, selling)          | -0.11 | (-0.45-0.24) | -0.22 | (-0.56-0.12) | 0.12  | (-0.06-0.30) | -0.36 | (-0.54-0.18) |
| Mainly labor (work at production sites, physical work, nursing care) | 0.46  | (-0.05-0.96) | -0.08 | (-0.60-0.44) | 0.32  | (0.14-0.49)  | -0.22 | (-0.41-0.04) |
| Yearly household income  | -0.49 | (-0.58-0.40) | -0.42 | (-0.52-0.32) | -0.43 | (-0.48-0.38) | -0.32 | (-0.38-0.27) |
| Company size   | -0.06 | (-0.10-0.01) | -0.11 | (-0.18-0.04) | 0.07  | (0.05-0.10)  | 0.03  | (0.00-0.06)  |

Model 1: Crude model


Model 2: Adjusted for sex, age, marriage, educational attainment, occupation, job type, annual household income, and company size

CI, confidence interval.

249 Figure legend

250 Figure 1. Conceptual model of possible associations between working from home, job demand, and  
251 psychological distress

252



253