medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.04.27.22273297; this version posted April 27, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

**TITLE**: Workplace and lifestyle heterogeneity in subjective wellbeing: Latent Class Analysis of UK Time Use Survey before and during COVID-19

Author: Mr Jerry Chen, University of Cambridge
Address: 16-21 Silver St, Cambridge CB3 9EP, United Kingdom
Email: jc2205@cam.ac.uk

Corresponding author: Dr Li Wan, University of Cambridge
Corresponding address: 16-21 Silver St, Cambridge CB3 9EP, United Kingdom
Corresponding email: lw423@cam.ac.uk

**KEYWORDS:** occupational health, subjective wellbeing, time use, COVID-19, workplace, homeworking, hybrid working, spatial flexibility, temporal flexibility, latent class analysis

*What is already known:* In the UK, mental health deteriorated compared with pre-pandemic trends. It is presumed that not everyone was affected equally, but there has been little evidence distinguishing population groups with distinct working modes and lifestyles.

*What are the new findings:* Direction of COVID-19 impact strongly correlates with working mode and extent of spatial flexibility: wellbeing decreased for homeworkers, but increased for some hybrid workers. Magnitude of COVID-19 impact strongly correlates with lifestyle and extent of temporal flexibility: those working long and dispersed hours more were sensitive, whereas non-work dominated lifestyles were more resilient.

*How might this impact policy*: Policymakers and employers need to consider the important function workplace has on mental health. As homeworking arrangements become permanent, the psychosocial function of traditional workplaces will become more pertinent. Flexibility around the established work-time regime will also benefit workers' mental health, and give them greater control to choose and transition between lifestyles.

**ABSTRACT**

**Background:** Mental health in the UK had deteriorated compared with pre-pandemic trends. The impact of COVID-19 on the subjective wellbeing of working populations with distinct lifestyles is not yet studied.

**Methods:** Combining time use surveys collected pre- and during COVID-19, latent class analysis was used to identify distinct lifestyles based on aggregated daily activity patterns and reported working modes. We provide qualitative pen portraits alongside pre-versus-during pandemic comparisons of intraday time use and wellbeing patterns. Lifestyle heterogeneity in wellbeing was quantified in relation to aggregated activity types.

**Results:** COVID-19 impact on wellbeing varied significantly between usual working hours (6am-6pm) and rest of the day. The decline in wellbeing outside of usual working hours was significant and consistent across lifestyles. During usual working hours, the direction of impact varied in line with working modes: wellbeing of homeworkers decreased, remained relatively stable for commuters, and increased for certain hybrid workers. Magnitude of impact correlates strongly with lifestyle: those working long and dispersed hours are more sensitive, whereas non-work dominated lifestyles are more resilient.

**Conclusion:** The direction and magnitude of impact from COVID-19 were not uniformly manifested across activity types, time of day, and latent lifestyles. Blurring work-life boundaries and general anxiety about the pandemic may be key determinants of the decline outside of usual working hours. During usual working hours, strong yet complex correlations between wellbeing and time-use changes suggested that policies aiming to enhance wellbeing of workers need to consider not only spatial flexibility but also provide wider support for temporal flexibility.


NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.04.27.22273297; this version posted April 27, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

## INTRODUCTION

Mental health in the UK had deteriorated compared with pre-pandemic trends (Pierce et al, 2021). Lockdown measures led to increased psychological distress (Niedzweidz et al., 2021), as mandates to work from home interrupted many social opportunities important to psychological health (Holmes et al., 2021). Time-use data is critical for understanding the subjective wellbeing (SWB) impact of COVID-19, and significant changes have been observed in both quantity and quality of time spent on different activities (Ines & Tipoe, 2021). Previous studies are limited to specific activity types (Barrero, Bloom & Davis, 2021), or specific demographic groups (Gagne, Nandi & Schoon, 2021). Few studies explicitly compared SWB changes of distinct worker groups such as commuters, homeworkers, and hybrid workers. Cross-sectional data during the first lockdown in Portugal showed that homeworkers had a higher level of job satisfaction, due to better work-life balance and flexibility (Sousa-Uva et al., 2021). Among homeworkers there were yet more distinct groups with varied SWB outcomes. A multi-national European study showed occasional homeworkers had high levels of satisfaction with their job quality, while highly mobile homeworkers reported poor work-life balance (Rodriguez-Modroño & Lopez-Igual, 2021). There was also evidence suggesting heterogeneous pandemic effects on mental health based on work environments (Ervasti et al, 2021).

A systematic review of ten controlled before and after studies (CBA) found that increasing worker control and choice through flexible work interventions were likely to have a positive effect on health outcomes, but there was a clear need to delineate the impact of flexible working on wellbeing (Joyce et al., 2010). National lockdowns in the UK were widely imposed across demographic and socioeconomic groups, however studies involving occupational cohorts have largely been restricted to healthcare and or essential workers (Carr et al., 2021). Through combining the pre- and during pandemic Time Use Survey data, this study aims to quantify the changing relationship between time use and wellbeing across heterogenous yet latent groups of employed workers in the UK.

## METHODS

*Data source*

UKTUS (2015) is a large-scale household survey that provides data on how people spend their time. Time diaries record activity sequences, corresponding locations, as well as the respondent's level of SWB throughout the day (Gershuny & Sullivan, 2016).

A novel longitudinal SWB data set was compiled by combining the pre-pandemic UKTUS 2015 with four additional waves of population-representative (quota sample) time use diary data collected during the pandemic. These waves were collected online in 1) 2016; 2) May-June 2020 at the peak of first UK COVID-19 lockdown; 3) August 2020 following the relaxation of social restrictions 4) November 2020 during the second lockdown (Gershuny & Sullivan, 2021). The latter three waves collected throughout 2020 were classified in our analysis as 'during COVID', while the 'pre-COVID' data consisted of UKTUS 2015 and the first online wave collected in 2016. All data was obtained from the UK Data Service.

The study sample comprised all those aged 16-64, in full employment, with sufficient data on activity-level episodic SWB, and a non-zero survey weight. Our analysis included 3855 individuals, each contributing 24 hours of time use schedule during a weekday considered typical to them. A total of 369,394 activity-location-SWB bundles were analysed (see sample distribution in Appendix 3).

*Measures*

To understand the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on workers' time use, we first separated all samples by the reported location of paid work into three distinct working modes: 1) homeworkers; 2) commuters; 3) hybrid. Homeworkers engaged in paid work exclusively at home during the diary day; commuters engaged in paid work exclusively at the workplace; whilst hybrid workers reported paid work activities both at home and in the workplace. Such information had been collected consistently across survey periods. Other sociodemographic

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.04.27.22273297; this version posted April 27, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

characteristics considered were income, educational attainment, occupation classification, gender, age, and marital status.

The breakdown of activity recorded in UKTUS was highly detailed, with 144 distinct activities. To reduce the complexity, we followed literature (Ines & Tipoe, 2021) and aggregated them into five broad activity types: 1) personal; 2) paid work; 3) non-paid work; 4) leisure; 5) transport (see breakdown in Appendix 2). Intraday time use pattern was also aggregated from 10-minute intervals as in the original data into 24 hourly categorical variables, based on the broad activity type the respondent was engaged in for the majority of the given hour.

SWB was measured with an episodic enjoyment variable in the original data, reporting the instantaneous utility of the respondent on a seven-point ordinal Linkert scale. Our analysis found that the distribution of ordinal responses was heavily right skewed, where the proportion of the top two scores accounted for roughly half of overall responses (see distribution histogram in Appendix 4). As such, it was transformed into a binary variable with enjoyment six and above defined as high SWB, five and below defined as average-to-low SWB. The use of binary SWB measurement had two advantages. Firstly, the original enjoyment measurement was purely ordinal, hence hardly comparable across years. Using a binary variable could, to some extent, enhance the comparability of enjoyment measurement between survey periods. It enabled us to focus on identifying determinants that may lead to higher-than-average enjoyment, as opposed to factors that may lead to a general increase of enjoyment. Secondly, it reduced the computing load for model estimation.

*Statistical analysis*

We estimated latent class models using robust maximum likelihood estimation with Newton-Raphson stepping mechanism, repeated for one to six latent classes. The 24 hourly categorical variables indicating activity type were used as explanatory variables. To help with model convergence, we used a two-step integration process: Laplacian approximation was used in the first round of integration, the results matrix was then used as starting value for the more accurate mean-variance adaptive Gauss-Hermite quadrature integration method. The final class size within each working mode was determined using the Akaike's information criterion (AIC) and Bayesian information criterion (BIC) values (see model fit estimations in Appendix 5), average latent class probabilities, and substantive interpretation of the classes identified. Note that the latent class analysis (LCA) was conducted using pooled samples from both pre- and during COVID. After LCA, the samples were then separated into pre- and during COVID groups according to the survey date.

*Outcomes*

A total of ten lifestyles were identified across the three working modes: three within homeworkers; four within commuters; and three within hybrid workers. Figure 1 shows the distinct intraday time use patterns of different lifestyles and the corresponding intraday SWB patterns. Figure 2 provides the pen portrait for each lifestyle, which features a combination of generic *lifestyles* and reported working modes. We define *lifestyles* primarily based on paid work schedules because of its dominant role in lifestyle choice and identity (Antilla et al., 2015). Sociodemographic characteristics of each lifestyle are summarised in Appendix 1.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.04.27.22273297; this version posted April 27, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

## RESULTS

*Figure 1: Intraday patterns of time use (top two rows) and SWB (bottom row) **




* The x-axis represents 24 hours of the day for all charts. For time use patterns, the y-axis is the percentage proportion of the samples engaged in each of the five time use categories summing to 100%. For SWB patterns, the y-axis is the percentage proportion of the samples reporting high SWB. Usual working hours (6am-6pm) are highlighted for SWB charts.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.04.27.22273297; this version posted April 27, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

*Figure 2: Lifestyle pen portraits*

| **Lifestyle** \ **Working Mode** | | **Homeworker** | **Commuting Worker** | **Hybrid Worker** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Paid work engaged exclusively in the home environment. Younger and single demographies increased during COVID-19, signalling democratisation of working from home. | Paid work engaged exclusively in the workplace environment. Demography became older and generally worse off economically during COVID-19, most of whom are essential workers. | Paid work split between home and workplace. The proportion of respondents in hybrid work mode remained consistent pre- and during lockdown. |
| **Early Concentrated Working** | Most start work around 7-8am and finish before 6pm. Their paid work hours are highly concentrated around the conventional working hours. | ***Emergent Homeworker (EH)*** Becomes the dominant lifestyle during COVID-19 representing 40% of all respondents (70% of homeworkers), a tenfold increase from its pre-pandemic levels. | ***Conventional Commuter (CC)*** Dominant lifestyle pre-pandemic representing 39% of all respondents (50% of commuters), during COVID-19 it is the second most populous lifestyle (13% of all & 46% of commuters). | ***Conventional Hybrid (CH)*** Highly male dominated both pre- and during COVID-19, it is the dominant lifestyle within the hybrid work mode (8 % of all & 60% of hybrid). |
| **Long Dispersed Working** | 9-10am sees the majority starting paid work, though a large number work late until 8pm. Their working hours are more disperse and flexible. They spend the least time on non-paid work both before and during COVID-19. | ***Highflying Homeworker (HH)*** Consistently has the highest share of high income earners. They spend little time on commuting, and more time on paid work and personal maintenance. | ***Long-distance Commuter (LC)*** Spends the most time on commuting, and very little time on non-paid work. They have leisure activities late into the evening and tend to be younger. | ***Long-hour Hybrid (LH)*** The only lifestyle to spend more than 10 hours in paid work both pre- and during COVID-19; spends consistently little time on sleep and other personal maintenance activities. |
| **Non-work Dominated** | Non-paid work and leisure dominate daily schedule, while engaging in a fraction of paid work hours as other lifestyles. Travel is flexible and not concentrated around the peak commute windows. | ***Domestic Homeworker (DH)*** Spends the least amount of time in paid work and most time in non-paid work consistently pre- and during COVID-19. One of the few lifestyles dominated by women. | | ***Mobile Hybrid (MH)*** Highest proportions of married young and middle aged respondents. Spends significant amount of time on commute, and saw the biggest increase in its share of high income earners during COVID-19. |
| **Half-day Working** | Only identified within commuters. Paid work starts very early before 7 am and ends around noon. Their afternoons have high concentrations of leisure. | | ***Half-day Commuter (HC)*** High proportion of manual workers, and low proportion of managers; has the lowest proportion of undergrad degree holders. Demography was heavily skewed toward older age groups. | |
| **Nightshift** | Only identified within commuters. Paid work activities are concentrated in the evening hours, their mornings are dominated with non-paid work and long leisure durations in the afternoons. | | ***Nightshift Commuter (NC)*** Greatest decrease of high earners during COVID-19, as a result, it has the highest portion of low earners and only 2% in the high earner category. | |

The defining time use pattern for each lifestyle remained largely consistent pre- and during COVID-19, though the sample distribution across lifestyles changed significantly, notably a shift from Conventional Commuter (CC, N=1046 pre-COVID) to Emergent Homeworker (EH, N=482 during COVID). The direction and magnitude of pandemic impact on SWB were heterogenous across lifestyles and between usual working hours (6am-6pm) and rest of day.

*Time use and SWB patterns outside usual working hours (before 6am or after 6pm)*

SWB declined uniformly across lifestyles outside usual working hours when most people engaged in leisure or sleeping. The uniform SWB decline corroborated the deteriorated mental health in the UK during COVID-19, however, time patterns during these hours remained virtually unchanged pre- and during COVID, which suggested that the SWB decline outside usual working hours seemed uncorrelated with time use and may be attributed to general anxiety and potentially blurred boundary between work and life associated with flexible working. Before COVID-19, a rapid rebound of SWB was observed outside of usual working hours consistently

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.04.27.22273297; this version posted April 27, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

across lifestyles. During COVID-19, however, the rate of SWB rebound in the early evening flattened, particularly for homeworkers and hybrid workers who tend to be more susceptible to the effect of blurred boundary between work and life.

*Time use and SWB patterns within usual working hours (6am-6pm)*

The negative SWB impact of paid work activities was reflected in the majority of lifestyles. Enjoyment tended to plummet as usual working hour started, with slight uptick in mid-day which coincided with usual lunch breaks, and returned to pre-work levels after work. Lifestyles with more concentrated paid work periods such as EH, CC, and CH would experience greater intraday SWB fluctuations.

The direction of COVID-19 impact differed across working modes: average SWB of homeworkers decreased significantly; commuters remained relatively stable; by contrast, some hybrid lifestyles experienced a positive impact. SWB changes for each working mode are further discussed below.

***Homeworker,*** in particularly Highflying Homeworker (HH) and Domestic Homeworker (DH), had higher SWB pre-pandemic, which was attributed to the less negative SWB impact from paid work during usual working hours compared to commuting and hybrid lifestyles. During the pandemic, hours of concentrated paid work became significantly more detrimental to SWB for EH lifestyle. In addition, the uptick of SWB around mid-day, which was prevalent pre-pandemic, disappeared for HH and DH during the pandemic.

***Commuter*** lifestyles maintained similar levels of SWB during usual working hours before and during the pandemic. Workers who were able to commute to work during the pandemic were likely essential workers. Nightshift Commuter (NC) was the only commuting lifestyle experiencing a notable downward shift in usual-working-hour SWB during COVID-19. Increased workload and anxiety linked to the pandemic and job security concerns might explain the SWB decline.

***Hybrid worker*** lifestyles, CH and Long-hour Hybrid (LH), experienced an increase of SWB within usual working hours during COVID-19. In contrast to the general adverse SWB impact observed for other working modes, this finding suggested the optionality of having dedicated workplace and the ability to continue to travel during the pandemic seemed to bring SWB betterment. We also found that the SWB increase may stem from enjoyment boost associated with some activity types but not all, which will be investigated in the next section. Other plausible factors that may contribute to the SWB increase may include social interaction opportunities associated with the workplace, the ability to travel outside during the pandemic *per se*, and increased desirability of the hybrid working mode from lived experience of mandated homeworking.

*Heterogeneity of SWB impact across latent lifestyles*

To better understand the heterogeneity of SWB impact across lifestyles, Figure 3 shows average SWB changes from pre- to during COVID-19 within usual working hours (6am-6pm) by activity type.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.04.27.22273297; this version posted April 27, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Figure 3*: Difference in mean SWB within usual working hours (6am-6pm) by activity type*




In terms of the direction of COVID-19 impact on SWB, paid work average decreased for all lifestyles except Long-distance Commuters (LC) and hybrid lifestyles CH and LH. SWB decline from leisure activities was observed for almost all lifestyles but was particularly pronounced for LC. Enjoyment associated with travel activities (mainly as derived demand) has increased for most lifestyle groups except the Domestic Homeworker (DH), who spent more time on transport than other homeworkers and on par with some commuters. Overall, paid work appeared to be the main driver of directional changes, and non-paid work further contributes as its directional changes are often consistent with paid work.

In terms of the magnitude of COVID-19 impact, five out of six large SWB changes (>= 0.5 or <=-0.5) occurred in late and dispersed lifestyles: HH, LC, and LH. This is contrasted by the relatively low magnitude of impact for the non-work dominated lifestyles: DH, HC, NC, and MH. These lifestyles tended to be less constrained by established work-time regime, enabling a higher degree of flexibility for adjusting their time use to mitigate the pandemic impact.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.04.27.22273297; this version posted April 27, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

## DISCUSSION

*Findings statement*

Our analysis shows COVID-19 impact on SWB is heterogeneous in direction and magnitude for different working modes and lifestyles. The identification of latent lifestyles and the comparison of SWB impact across lifestyles shed a new light on the conceptualisation of 'flexibility' from a time use perspective. Specifically, flexibility could be conceptualised over two dimensions, spatial flexibility and temporal flexibility (Antilla et al., 2015).

Spatial flexibility denotes the optionality on place of work and the suitability of the space chosen. When work-from-home became mandatory, many commuters (CC lifestyle) would, perceivably, switch hastily into the dominant EH lifestyle. The domestic space of those new homeworkers, however, may not be suitable for homeworking. Compared with commuters and homeworkers, hybrid working was the only working mode with prior experience of working effectively both at home and the usual workplace, and as such retained spatial flexibility during the pandemic. The spatial flexibility may explain the increase of SWB of hybrid workers within usual working hours during COVID-19.

Temporal flexibility refers to the flexibility in deciding when to work, for how long and the time split between paid work and other activities. Temporal flexibility is often overlooked as spatial flexibility dominates discussion around flexible working practices. Empirically, more than half of the samples in each working mode adopted an early-concentrated working lifestyle (EH, CC, and CH), and a majority of the perceived "flexible workers" were still constrained to the 8-hour workday model, which revealed a highly inflexible temporal structure in the labour market. Our study found that workers of HH, LC, and LH lifestyles tended to spread out their paid work activities leading to less time for other activity types, particularly non-paid work, which is in line with the findings from the Australian TUS (Craig & Powell, 2011). Nonetheless, temporal flexibility seemed to come at a price – average income of non-work dominated lifestyles, particularly DH, HC, and NC, tended to be lower than that of other lifestyles in the same working mode.

COVID-19 brought about considerable changes to the spatial flexibility of homeworkers, and their decrease in SWB was associated with diminishing spatial flexibility during lockdown; hybrid workers maintained their spatial flexibility and experienced in increase in SWB during usual working hours. Higher degree of temporal flexibility was associated with the higher SWB resilience of non-work dominated lifestyles; those who worked long and dispersed hours were more sensitive to COVID-19 SWB impacts in both positive and negative directions.

*Implication for key stakeholders*

The argument for flexibilisation of work relies heavily on its implicit benefits for workers' wellbeing. Spatial focus on flexible working (i.e., home and hybrid working) became highly pertinent during COVID-19, but the temporal dimension of work flexibility had been overlooked. The 4-day work week proposal is gaining popularity in certain knowledge intensive sectors, and in regions looking to attract highly skilled workers (Whillans & Lockhart, 2021). However, the unintended consequence might be intensification of work on the intraday basis. The resulting lifestyle change will likely be a shift from early-concentrated to long-dispersed working schedule, regardless of working mode. Preparing for the future of work, giving workers more choice of working modes, providing wider support for lifestyle adaptation and transitions, and maintaining the important social function of work should be prioritised.

*Strengths and weaknesses of the study*

The main strength of the study is our novel time use approach, allowing us to identify latent but distinct lifestyles within working modes. Our research is timely and provides insights from the SWB perspective when the future of work is rapidly changing. The richness of the multi-wave time use data allows us to visualise intraday patterns in an interpretable way, and reveal distinguishable differences between working modes,

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.04.27.22273297; this version posted April 27, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

between lifestyles, before and during the pandemic. The proposed method for identifying latent lifestyles provides a viable strategy for tackling the high dimensionality issue associated with time use data.

A key limitation of the study is the measurement issue of SWB. As per the original data, each activity episode had a single SWB variable. The measurement weakness is twofold: firstly, we had to transform the ordinal results into a binary SWB outcome, increasing interpretability but trading off some sensitivity; secondly, the relationship between instantaneous utility and the long-term SWB is not yet clear. A more comprehensive set of SWB questions are required to better understand the impact mechanisms of time use on wellbeing. A supplemental questionnaire on long-term mental wellbeing of the respondents will allow future studies to understand the long-term mental health implications based on lifestyle differences. Furthermore, the data from the UKTUS are population-representative but nevertheless cross-sectional. Higher quality longitudinal data, such as a cohort study may be required to better quantify the relationship between lifestyles and SWB.

*Future directions*

To better quantify the relationship between spatio-temporal flexibility and wellbeing, a dedicated wellbeing module will be necessary for future TUS collections in the UK and beyond. Standardised TUS data is collected in more than 30 countries, currently only the US and UK incorporate activity-episode level SWB questions. If more countries incorporate an ordinal SWB variable into their national time use surveys, a large-scale international comparison could be used as benchmark for understanding of the changing future of work from an occupational health perspective.

*Funding and competing interest*

This study received no external funding. The authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

*Research ethics approval*

Ethics approval for this study was not required. All data involved is openly available to the public before the initiation of the study. The public data is hosted by UK Data Service, and can be accessed via the DOIs below:
http://doi.org/10.5255/UKDA-SN-8128-1
http://doi.org/10.5255/UKDA-SN-8741-3

## CONCLUSION

COVID-19 hastened the adaptation of flexible working arrangements such as homeworking and hybrid working. Homeworking is not inherently more flexible, especially when its spatial flexibility diminishes and the temporal inflexibility of established work-time regime persists, as we observed during the pandemic. Paid work contributes significantly to the lowering of SWB. Intervention to increase temporal flexibility may lead to higher resilience to negative shocks in the labour market. Employers and policymakers must pay closer attention to the long-term SWB implications of flexible work intervention both along the spatial and temporal dimensions if they want to deliver occupational health benefits. Identifying latent lifestyles is an effective approach for better understanding the complex relationship between time use and subjective wellbeing.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.04.27.22273297; this version posted April 27, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

## REFERENCES


1. Anttila, T., Oinas, T., Tammelin, M., Nätti, J., 2015. Working-Time Regimes and Work-Life Balance in Europe. European Sociological Review 31, 713–724. https://doi.org/10.1093/esr/jcv070
2. Barrero, J.M., Bloom, N., Davis, S.J., 2021. Why Working from Home Will Stick, NBER working paper series. National Bureau of Economic Research, Cambridge, Mass.
3. Carr, E., Davis, K., Bergin-Cartwright, G., Lavelle, G., Leightley, D., Oetzmann, C., Polling, C., Stevelink, S.A.M., Wickersham, A., Razavi, R., Hotopf, M., 2022. Mental health among UK university staff and postgraduate students in the early stages of the COVID-19 pandemic. Occup Environ Med 79, 259–267. https://doi.org/10.1136/oemed-2021-107667
4. Chatzitheochari, S., Arber, S., 2012. Class, gender and time poverty: a time-use analysis of British workers' free time resources. The British Journal of Sociology 63, 451–471. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-4446.2012.01419.x
5. Craig, L., Powell, A., 2011a. Non-standard work schedules, work-family balance and the gendered division of childcare. Work, Employment and Society 25, 274–291. https://doi.org/10.1177/0950017011398894
6. Ervasti, J., Aalto, V., Pentti, J., Oksanen, T., Kivimäki, M., Vahtera, J., 2022. Association of changes in work due to COVID-19 pandemic with psychosocial work environment and employee health: a cohort study of 24 299 Finnish public sector employees. Occup Environ Med 79, 233–241. https://doi.org/10.1136/oemed-2021-107745
7. Gagné, T., Nandi, A., Schoon, I., 2021. Time trend analysis of social inequalities in psychological distress among young adults before and during the pandemic: evidence from the UK Household Longitudinal Study COVID-19 waves. J Epidemiol Community Health. https://doi.org/10.1136/jech-2021-217266
8. Gershuny, J., Sullivan, O., 2021. United Kingdom Time Use Survey United Kingdom Time Use Survey Sequence Pre and During COVID-19 Social Restrictions, 2016-2020. https://doi.org/10.5255/UKDA-SN-8741-2
9. Giuntella, O., Hyde, K., Saccardo, S., Sadoff, S., 2021. Lifestyle and mental health disruptions during COVID-19. PNAS 118. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2016632118
10. Holmes, E.A., O'Connor, R.C., Perry, V.H., Tracey, I., Wessely, S., Arseneault, L., Ballard, C., Christensen, H., Cohen Silver, R., Everall, I., Ford, T., John, A., Kabir, T., King, K., Madan, I., Michie, S., Przybylski, A.K., Shafran, R., Sweeney, A., Worthman, C.M., Yardley, L., Cowan, K., Cope, C., Hotopf, M., Bullmore, E., 2020a. Multidisciplinary research priorities for the COVID-19 pandemic: a call for action for mental health science. The Lancet Psychiatry 7, 547–560. https://doi.org/10.1016/S2215-0366(20)30168-1
11. Holmes, E.A., O'Connor, R.C., Perry, V.H., Tracey, I., Wessely, S., Arseneault, L., Ballard, C., Christensen, H., Cohen Silver, R., Everall, I., Ford, T., John, A., Kabir, T., King, K., Madan, I., Michie, S., Przybylski, A.K., Shafran, R., Sweeney, A., Worthman, C.M., Yardley, L., Cowan, K., Cope, C., Hotopf, M., Bullmore, E., 2020b. Multidisciplinary research priorities for the COVID-19 pandemic: a call for action for mental health science. The Lancet Psychiatry 7, 547–560. https://doi.org/10.1016/S2215-0366(20)30168-1
12. Joyce, K., Pabayo, R., Critchley, J.A., Bambra, C., 2010. Flexible working conditions and their effects on employee health and wellbeing. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews. https://doi.org/10.1002/14651858.CD008009.pub2
13. Lee, I., Tipoe, E., 2021. Changes in the quantity and quality of time use during the COVID-19 lockdowns in the UK: Who is the most affected? PLOS ONE 16, e0258917. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0258917
14. Niedzwiedz, C.L., Green, M.J., Benzeval, M., Campbell, D., Craig, P., Demou, E., Leyland, A., Pearce, A., Thomson, R., Whitley, E., Katikireddi, S.V., 2021. Mental health and health behaviours before and during the initial phase of the COVID-19 lockdown: longitudinal analyses of the UK Household Longitudinal Study. J Epidemiol Community Health 75, 224–231. https://doi.org/10.1136/jech-2020-215060
15. Pierce, M., Hope, H., Ford, T., Hatch, S., Hotopf, M., John, A., Kontopantelis, E., Webb, R., Wessely, S., McManus, S., Abel, K.M., 2020. Mental health before and during the COVID-19 pandemic: a longitudinal probability sample survey of the UK population. The Lancet Psychiatry 7, 883–892. https://doi.org/10.1016/S2215-0366(20)30308-4
16. Rodríguez-Modroño, P., López-Igual, P., 2021. Job Quality and Work-Life Balance of Teleworkers. Int J Environ Res Public Health 18, 3239. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph18063239
17. Sousa-Uva, M., Sousa-Uva, A., E Sampayo, M.M., Serranheira, F., 2021. Telework during the COVID-19 epidemic in Portugal and determinants of job satisfaction: a cross-sectional study. BMC Public Health 21, 2217. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-021-12295-2
18. Sullivan, O., Gershuny, J., Lamote de Grignon Perez, J., Vega-Rapun, M., 2022, Centre for Time Use Research UK Time Use Survey 6-Wave Sequence across the COVID-19 Pandemic, 2016-2021, [data collection], UK Data Service, 3rd Edition, Accessed 3 April 2022. SN: 8741, DOI: 10.5255/UKDA-SN-8741-3

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.04.27.22273297; this version posted April 27, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

19. Sullivan, O., Gershuny, J., 2021. UKTUS; UK Time Diary Study United Kingdom Time Use Survey, 2014-2015. https://doi.org/10.5255/UKDA-SN-8128-1
20. Whillans, A., Lockhart, C., 2021. A Guide to Implementing the 4-Day Workweek. Harvard Business Review, Boston, Mass.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.04.27.22273297; this version posted April 27, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.






Pre-Covid - EH: 4.93 HH: 5.81 DH: 4.72 CC: 4.47 LC: 4.55 HC: 4.67 NC: 4.78 CH: 4.76 LH: 4.83 MH: 4.93
During Covid - EH: 4.55 HH: 4.88 DH: 4.62 CC: 4.46 LC: 4.63 HC: 4.52 NC: 4.43 CH: 4.80 LH: 5.24 MH: 4.80




Pre-Covid - EH: 4.93 HH: 4.91 DH: 4.98 CC: 5.02 LC: 4.97 HC: 5.08 NC: 5.35 CH: 5.00 LH: 4.81 MH: 5.00
During Covid - EH: 4.88 HH: 4.15 DH: 4.97 CC: 5.33 LC: 4.79 HC: 5.67 NC: 5.38 CH: 5.40 LH: 5.57 MH: 5.00




Pre-Covid - EH: 5.69 HH: 5.36 DH: 5.65 CC: 5.81 LC: 5.69 HC: 5.81 NC: 5.85 CH: 5.60 LH: 5.68 MH: 5.81
During Covid - EH: 5.35 HH: 5.29 DH: 5.48 CC: 5.52 LC: 4.66 HC: 5.61 NC: 5.68 CH: 5.61 LH: 5.64 MH: 5.35




Pre-Covid - EH: 4.89 HH: 5.20 DH: 4.91 CC: 4.81 LC: 4.70 HC: 5.07 NC: 5.05 CH: 4.83 LH: 4.87 MH: 5.00
During Covid - EH: 5.27 HH: 5.34 DH: 4.67 CC: 4.91 LC: 5.14 HC: 5.26 NC: 5.21 CH: 5.35 LH: 5.96 MH: 5.12

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.04.27.22273297; this version posted April 27, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.