HCEO WORKING PAPER SERIES

Working Paper

Gender inequality in COVID-19 times:

Evidence from UK Prolific participants[*]

Sonia Oreffice, University of Exeter, IZA and HCEO

Climent Quintana-Domeque, University of Exeter, IZA and HCEO

First draft: 3 July 2020

This draft: 6 July 2020

Abstract

We investigate gender differences across socioeconomic and wellbeing dimensions after three months of lockdown in the UK, using an online sample of approximately 1,500 respondents in Prolific, representative of the UK population with regards to age, sex and ethnicity. We find that women's mental health is worse than men's along the four metrics we collected data on, that women are more concerned about getting and spreading the virus, and that women perceive the virus as more prevalent and lethal than men do. Women are also more likely to expect a new lockdown or virus outbreak by the end of 2020, and are more pessimistic about the current and future state of the UK economy, as measured by their forecasted present and future unemployment rates. Consistent with their more pessimistic views about the economy, women choose to donate more to food banks. Women are more likely to have lost their job because of the pandemic, and working women are more likely to hold more coronavirus-risky jobs than men. We also find that between February and June 2020 women have decreased their work hours, but increased housework and childcare much more than men. These gender inequalities are not driven by differences in age, ethnicity, education, family structure, income in 2019, current employment status, place of residence or living in rural/urban areas.

Keywords: Coronavirus, sex, inequity, wellbeing, health, employment, perceptions, donations.

1. Introduction

We assess and measure gender gaps across multiple indicators after three months of lockdown in the UK. We collected primary data on mental wellbeing, perceptions, employment, health and behaviours via an online survey of 1,500 Prolific respondents in the UK who, conditional on participating in our survey, were chosen to be representative of the UK population by age, sex and ethnicity.

The data were collected on the 19th of June, during the first minor easing of the lockdown, so that we can estimate gender differences in the UK three months after the beginning of the lockdown on the 23rd of March. Our focus is on whether and to what extent mental wellbeing, perceptions and behaviours in COVID-19 times differ by gender. Our main findings can be grouped in seven blocks.

First, women's mental health in mid-June is worse than men's along several dimensions: generalised anxiety disorder, depression, anxiety attacks, and loneliness. The relative gender gaps (% higher than men) in mental health problems are sizeable, going from 81% in anxiety attacks to 22% in feeling depressed. Although not directly comparable, Banks and Xu (2020) show that women's mental health status in the UK in April, as measured by changes in the GHQ-12 in the UK Household Longitudinal Study (UKHLS), deteriorated relative to that of men comparing pre- and post-COVID-19 data, and the magnitude was pretty large.[1] Using the same dataset and measure, Davillas and Jones (2020) document that age and gender account for the largest share in explaining GHQ-12 differences in the post-COVID-19 period.

Second, women exhibit more concerns about getting and spreading the virus (12% and 8% higher than men, respectively), and perceive the virus as more prevalent and lethal than men do (31% and 39% higher than men, respectively).[2] This is interesting

---

[1] The deterioration in women's mental health relative to men's mental health was of the size of the pre-COVID-19 mental health gender gap (as measured during the period January 2017-May 2019). Etheridge and Spantig (2020) document similar gender differences using the same data. Daly et al. (2020) also document higher increases in mental health problems (GHQ-12 ≥ 3) for women using UKHKS data. Adams-Prassl et al. (2020a) use US data and the lockdowns across states in March and April to show that mental health decreased as a consequence of the "stay-at-home" lockdown, and highlight that this negative effect is entirely due to women, a 66% increase in the existing gender gap in mental health.

[2] Our survey questions on concerns and perceptions were inspired by Fetzer et al. (2020). While these authors show that the evolution of beliefs about the severity of the crisis and economic worries does not vary by gender, they do not investigate gender gaps in participants' beliefs about either Coronavirus mortality or its contagiousness.

because, while women are more likely to be exposed to COVID-19 than men,[3] the prevalence of COVID-19 fatalities is higher for men.[4]

Third, women's expectations of a new lockdown or virus outbreak by the end of 2020 are about 0.2 standard deviations higher than those of men. Women are more pessimistic about the current and future state of the UK economy, consistently predicting a higher unemployment rate now, in 6-month time, and 12 months from now. In particular, women's predicted unemployment in a year (June 2021) is 15% (about 0.23 standard deviations) higher than that for men. These disparities do not appear to be driven by misunderstandings of what the unemployment rate is, or different levels of attention to the survey by gender.[5]

Fourth, women donate to food banks 5 out of 50 pence (31%) more than men, which is consistent with them having more pessimistic views on the current and future state of the UK economy. Indeed, the COVID-19 pandemic is likely to affect people's donations because of both (a) changes in government policy and (b) changes in uncertainty about future health/economic outcomes (Scharf, 2020).

Fifth, women face worse labour outcomes and working conditions than men, which expose them to higher health risk. We find that women are 96% (4.2 percentage points, pp) more likely to have lost their job because of the COVID-19 pandemic than men, consistent with the findings in Alon et al. (2020) that women are concentrated in sectors disproportionately affected by the crisis. We also find that working women are more likely to be healthcare workers and NHS workers than men (96% or 4.2 pp and 126% or 4 pp more likely than men, respectively), and not surprisingly they are in jobs involving close contact with others. Women are more likely than men to have a job where distance kept among people in the workplace is shorter (by 13%), and with more direct contact with diseases or infections (by 14%). Our evidence is consistent with Lewandowski et al. (2020), who find that women are more likely to work in sectors associated with human health and social work, and Adams-Prassl et al. (2020b), who find that women are more affected by the crisis in terms of losing jobs, reduced work hours and decrease in earnings.

---

[3] Lewandowski et al. (2020) report that women make up more than half of the infected individuals in European countries. Galasso et al. (2020) ran surveys in March and April across eight countries (including the UK), and found that women are more likely to see COVID-19 as a serious health problem.

[4] Adams (2020) uses cross-country data to show that where women participate more fully in the labour market, they are more susceptible to the COVID-19, and was the first to suggest that women may fare worse in terms of health although the prevalence of COVID-19 fatalities is higher for men.

[5] Following the setup of Andre et al. (2019), respondents were provided with the definition of the unemployment rate, and also with its level this March 2020. Moreover, individuals did not exhibit different attention levels or survey experience by gender.

Sixth, between February and June 2020, women have reduced their hours of work 50% (almost 3 hours a week) more than men, while they have increased housework and childcare duties: 195% (3.5 hours) more childcare and home schooling hours than men, and 48% (2.2 hours) more in housework. This is consistent with Sevilla and Smith (2020) and Andrew et al. (2020) who find that during the lockdown women have done more childcare than men.[6]

Seventh, the patterns in terms of protective gear, socialisation and effectiveness show a mixed picture. Women report abiding more to lockdown rules by being more likely to wash their hands when coming back home (5% more likely than men), and to have hand sanitiser at home (11% higher than men); they are also more likely to socialise outdoors rather than indoors, if they socialise at all, showing compliance with the lockdown rules at the time of the survey. However, they are less likely to have face masks at home, and not more likely to use protective gear or social distance while socialising, at work, or just out of their homes. This is worrisome because women hold coronavirus-riskier jobs. They do not differ from men in their views on the effectiveness of wearing face covering or on how the UK government is dealing with the pandemic, although they are more in agreement than men with the statement that "everyone is protected if everybody wears face covering" (4% or 0.10 standard deviations gap).

The gender disparity in washing hands is consistent with the findings by Galasso et al. (2020) who report in March and April a higher compliance rate for women, which includes wearing gloves and face masks. However, in April they find lower rates of compliance than in March, and smaller gender differences. Papageorge et al. (2020) find that in the US in April 2020 men are less likely to engage in protective behaviours, and Capraro and Barcelo (2020) surveying respondents in Amazon M-Turk in the US on April 28 and May 4 report that men express more uneasiness in using face covering. Our findings could be indicative of changes in behaviour after three months of lockdown, and of the fact that in the UK face covering and gloves are not recommended to the general population, with the *exception* of face covering being mandatory on public transport only since the 15th of June.

These multifaceted gender gaps are not driven by differences in age, ethnicity, education, family structure, income in 2019, current employment status, place of residence or living in a rural/urban area, and are not accompanied by worse female physical health or unhealthy behaviours (smoking, drinking, chronic conditions, COVID symptoms, etc.). In addition, each of them is *individually* statistically significant at the 5% level.

---

[6] Del Boca et al. (2020) find that in Italy the additional workload in the household falls on women. Similarly, Farré et al. (2020) document that most of the burden fell on women in Spain.

Our empirical analysis documents a dramatic picture within three months after the beginning of the COVID-19 pandemic, namely a deterioration of working and time constraints of women relative to those of men, and gender inequalities in mental wellbeing, pessimistic concerns and expectations of the extent of the pandemic and its effects on the economy. We believe that the gender dimension of COVID-19 should be on the radar of policy-makers, and join Adams (2020) and Lewandowski et al. (2020) to call for more COVID-19 gender-related research and policy analysis. Women represent half of the population, they are key to family structure and early human capital accumulation, and they are more vulnerable to domestic violence, poverty and single parenthood. The gender gaps after three months of lockdown that we document in this paper are worrisome for the whole UK economy and deserve further scrutiny from the academic community and effective policy actions.

The next section provides a description of our sample and how we obtained these primary data. Section 3 describes our methodology. Section 4 presents and discusses our findings. Section 5 concludes.

2. Data Description

We collected a sample of approximately 1,500 UK respondents in Prolific, an online platform collection that connects researchers with participants, who get paid cash for taking part in research.[7] Conditional on participating in our survey, the sample is representative of the UK population with regards age, sex and ethnicity.[8]

We launched our survey on 19 June 2020, at 10:40 am (GMT+1). The survey was announced with the title "BIDCOFU Survey" and the following brief summary: *This study is conducted by researchers from the University of Exeter. Participants will be asked to answer a set of questions on demographic patterns. This includes questions that may be sensitive, including but not limited to questions related to Coronavirus.*

When restricting the attention to representative samples, the maximum number of respondents that Prolific can provide in a given day is approximately 1,500, and this was our targeted sample size. In practice, we ended up collecting data on 1,503 respondents. After dropping observations whose gender did not match the one provided by Prolific (7), whose age was older or at least two years younger than that provided by Prolific (33), or whose answers to their geographical location of residence (asked twice in the survey) differed (4), our maximum sample size becomes 1,461 (757 women, 704

---

[7] We paid £1.50 to each respondent for a completed survey. The median duration was 12 minutes.
[8] Prolific allows for the possibility of obtaining representative samples for an extra fee by cross-stratifying on sex (male or female), age (18-27, 28-37, 38-47, 48-57, or 58+) and ethnicity (Asian, Black, Mixed, Other, or White).

men). Due to connectivity and/or logistic reasons, 3 respondents could not complete the survey. This means that for some questions located towards the end of the survey we have responses for 1,458 respondents. We also note that some variables have a smaller number of observations because they are based on questions asked conditional on the answer to previous questions.[9] The questionnaire is available at https://sites.google.com/site/climentquintanadomeque/covid-19-data and the data will be available from this same site after August 1, 2020. A full description of the variables used in this paper is available in Appendix A.

Table 1 summarises the main sociodemographic and economic characteristics of our sample. Men and women are similar along several dimensions: there are no gender gaps in the fraction of non-white individuals in the sample, in the distribution of age groups, in the distribution of geographic location of residence, in the fraction living in urban areas, or in the distribution of educational categories. The only two exceptions are the non-statistically significant difference in the higher fraction of women aged 55-64 (25.4%) than of men (21.7%), and the statistically significant higher fraction of men with a trade/technical/vocational training (12%) than that for women (7.5%).

No differences are observed regarding household composition, in terms of living with a partner or with others (any other person in the household but the respondent), but remarkable gender gaps appear when focusing on employment status and the income distribution. 44.6% of men are employed working from home, while this figure is 5.6 percentage points lower for women, 39% (p-value = 0.029). Also, 33% of women are not in the labour force, while this percentage is 10 pp lower for men, 23% (p-value = 0.000). Finally, the fraction of women with the lowest income category (Less than £15,000) is 32% while among men is 19% (p-value = 0.000), and the fraction of women with income between £45,000 and £49,999 is 7% while among men is 14% (p-value = 0.000). The average income in 2019 is £30,049 among men and £27,031 among women, an average income gap of £3,018 (p-value = 0.000).[10]

---

[9] For instance, the question on concerns of getting coronavirus was not asked to the seven people who had answered that they tested positive to the virus in the previous question. Also, all work-related outcome variables are asked only to individuals who are working.

[10] We construct our (discrete) income measure by assigning the midpoint value of each interval for intervals other than the top and the bottom. For the bottom and the top intervals, we take the maximum value (of the bottom interval) and the minimum value (of the top interval). The intervals are as follows: less than £15,000, £15,000-£19,999, £20,000-£24,999, £25,000-£29,999, £30,000-£34,999, £35,000-£39,999, £40,000-£44,999, £45,000-£49,999, and more than £50,000.

Table 1. Descriptive statistics

	Men		Women		Difference	_p-value_
	N	Mean	N	Mean	Mean	
Ethnicity						
Non-white	704	0.142	757	0.133	-0.009	_0.633_
Age						
18-24	704	0.094	757	0.078	-0.016	_0.282_
25-34	704	0.186	757	0.189	0.003	_0.890_
35-44	704	0.192	757	0.184	-0.008	_0.691_
45-54	704	0.168	757	0.152	-0.016	_0.414_
55-64	704	0.217	757	0.254	0.036	_0.102_
65+	704	0.143	757	0.144	0.001	_0.977_
Geographic location of residence						
North East	704	0.037	757	0.044	0.007	_0.517_
North West	704	0.115	757	0.104	-0.011	_0.514_
Yorkshire and the Humber	704	0.077	757	0.085	0.008	_0.582_
East Midlands	704	0.071	757	0.081	0.010	_0.490_
West Midlands	704	0.080	757	0.100	0.021	_0.163_
East of England	704	0.077	757	0.066	-0.011	_0.430_
London	704	0.146	757	0.144	-0.002	_0.900_
South East	704	0.153	757	0.155	0.001	_0.952_
South West	704	0.104	757	0.106	0.002	_0.901_
Wales	704	0.041	757	0.032	-0.009	_0.335_
Scotland	704	0.078	757	0.074	-0.004	_0.765_
Northern Ireland	704	0.021	757	0.011	-0.011	_0.104_
Area						
Urban	704	0.720	757	0.700	-0.020	_0.399_
Education						
No qualifications	703	0.013	755	0.012	-0.001	_0.879_
Fewer than 5 GCSE/O-Levels	703	0.065	755	0.057	-0.008	_0.500_
5 or more GCSE/O-Levels	703	0.080	755	0.095	0.016	_0.289_
Trade/technical/vocational training	703	0.119	755	0.075	-0.044	_0.005_
A-Levels	703	0.191	755	0.211	0.020	_0.341_
Bachelor's degree	703	0.354	755	0.370	0.015	_0.543_
Master's degree	703	0.115	755	0.126	0.011	_0.534_
Doctoral or Professional degree	703	0.063	755	0.054	-0.008	_0.501_
Household composition						
Living with a partner	704	0.651	757	0.631	-0.019	_0.447_
Living with others	704	0.828	757	0.849	0.021	_0.270_
Employment situation						
Employed working outside home	704	0.232	757	0.193	-0.039	_0.071_
Employed working from home	704	0.446	757	0.390	-0.056	_0.029_
Unemployed	704	0.089	757	0.087	-0.002	_0.877_
Not in labour force	704	0.233	757	0.330	0.097	_0.000_

Table 1. Descriptive statistics (cont')

	Men		Women		Difference	p-value
	N	Mean	N	Mean	Mean	
Income in 2019 (£)						
Less than £15,000	704	0.185	757	0.318	0.134	*0.000*
£15,000-£19,999	704	0.143	757	0.144	0.001	*0.977*
£20,000-£24,999	704	0.119	757	0.122	0.002	*0.897*
£25,000-£29,999	704	0.119	757	0.079	-0.040	*0.011*
£30,000-£34,999	704	0.082	757	0.065	-0.018	*0.198*
£35,000-£39,999	704	0.063	757	0.044	-0.019	*0.108*
£40,000-£44,999	704	0.038	757	0.022	-0.016	*0.078*
£45,000-£49,999	704	0.139	757	0.070	-0.069	*0.000*
More than £50,000	704	0.111	757	0.136	0.025	*0.142*

Note: Each robust to heteroscedasticity p-value is obtained from the t-test of the coefficient on the female indicator being zero in a regression of the binary indicator in each row on a constant and the female indicator.

3. Methodology

We compute unadjusted (b^S) and adjusted (b^L) gender gaps, obtained from estimating "short" and "long" linear regressions by means of ordinary least squares. The "short" regression is given by:

$$y_i = a^S + b^S F_i + e_i^S,$$

where y_i is the outcome for respondent i, F_i is a female indicator (= 1 if respondent i is female, = 0 if respondent i is male), and e_i^S is the regression residual of this "short" regression. The "long" regression is given by:

$$y_i = a^L + b^L F_i + c X_i + e_i^L,$$

where X_i is a vector of control variables (age, ethnicity, education, family structure, income in 2019, current employment status, place of residence and rural-urban area) and e_i^L is the regression residual of this "long" regression.[11] In the tables of the results section

---

[11] The actual list of control variables is as follows: an indicator for ethnicity other than white, five age indicators (18-24, 25-34, 35-44, 55-64 and 65+), eleven geographic location indicators, one indicator of area of residence (urban/rural area), seven education indicators, one indicator of living with a partner (married or cohabiting), one indicator of living with other people in the household, log of income in 2019, and three indicators on the current employment situation (working outside home, working from home, being unemployed). For work related variables,

we report estimates of the *absolute* gender gap b^S (resp. b^L) and the *relative* gender gap, defined as b^S (resp. b^L) divided by the mean of y_i among men in %, and the robust to heteroskedasticity p-values for both b^S and b^L, which contain information against the null hypothesis of *no gender gap* ($b^S = 0$ and $b^L = 0$, respectively). We discuss both statistical significance (p-value < 0.05) and economic relevance (size of the gap).

4. Results

Before diving into the main results of our paper, we briefly report that we also investigated average gender differences in the degree of patience, duration in minutes (to complete the survey), attention to the survey questions[12], and participation in Coronavirus-related surveys so far. There is no gender gap in the average degree of patience (1.6%, p-value=0.225), average duration (-1.2%, p-value=0.734), and attention to the survey (-0.7%, p-value=0.521). However, women appear to have completed on average about 1 fewer Coronavirus-related studies than men (11%, p-value=0.007). We have also investigated whether there were gender differences about the perception of how the UK government handled the UK Coronavirus crisis and the Brexit negotiations, failing to find any (results available upon request). Thus it does not appear that women have more negative views than men in general. All of these differences are essentially the same, in sign and magnitude, after adjusting for control variables.

4.1. Mental health and wellbeing

Table 2 shows that women report worse levels of mental health in the last 2 weeks than men across the different mental health problems in our survey:

- Women's GAD-7 (0-21) average <u>anxiety score</u> is 5.32, 1.07 units (0.20 standard deviations) above (or 25% higher than) that of men.[13]
- The average female indicator on <u>feeling down, depressed or hopeless</u> (0-3), which corresponds to item two of the PHQ-9, is 0.86, 0.16 units (0.20 standard deviations) above (or 22% higher than) that of males.

---

we only include a control for the current employment situation (working outside/from home). See Appendix A for the details on the control variables.

[12] Attention to the survey is measured by checking whether the individual remembers a piece of information given in the survey. In particular, in the last block of questions individuals are told the unemployment rate in March (3.9%). Then, a few questions later, they are asked about that same unemployment rate in a multiple choice question (2.9%, 3.9%, 4.9%, 5.9%, 6.9% and 7.9%). 95% of the respondents choose 3.9% and are considered to pay attention to the survey.

[13] The Generalized Anxiety Disorder 7-item scale (GAD-7) is a validated diagnostic tool designed for use in the primary care setting. It follows the DSM-IV diagnostic criteria for generalized anxiety disorder and is sensitive to the presence of social phobia, panic disorder and post-traumatic stress disorder (Spitzer et al. 2006). The GAD-7 screener is available at: https://www.phqscreeners.com/images/sites/g/files/g10060481/f/201412/GAD-7_English.pdf

- 25.8% of women report having had an <u>anxiety attack</u> (suddenly feeling fear or panic), while the figure for men is 14.2%. Hence, women are 11.6 percentage points (81%) more likely than men to have had an anxiety attack.
- Women also seem to <u>feel lonely</u> more frequently than men, scoring 0.09 units (0.13 standard deviations) above (or 6% higher than) that of men in the loneliness indicator (1-3).

Table 2. Mental health and wellbeing				
	GAD7 (0-21)	Depressed (0-3)	Anxiety (0-1)	Loneliness (1-3)
Mean for Men	4.257	0.707	0.142	1.523
N for men	704	704	704	704
Mean for women	5.322	0.863	0.258	1.616
N for women	757	757	757	757
Mean difference	1.065	0.155	0.116	0.093
Adjusted mean difference	1.040	0.148	0.108	0.092
% Mean difference	25.0%	21.9%	81.3%	6.1%
% Adj. mean difference	24.4%	20.9%	76.0%	6.0%
p-value mean difference	*0.000*	*0.000*	*0.000*	*0.008*
p-value adj. mean diff.	*0.000*	*0.001*	*0.000*	*0.006*
N (without controls)	1,461	1,461	1,461	1,461
N (with controls)	1,458	1,458	1,458	1,458

Note: p-values robust to heteroscedasticity. Difference is computed as the coefficient on the indicator woman on a regression of the outcome on each column against the indicator woman and a constant. Adjusted difference is computed in the same way after including the following control variables: ethnicity indicator (1 if non-white, 0 if white), age indicators, education indicators, couple indicator, living with others indicator, log of income in 2019, employment status indicators, rural/urban indicator, geographical location of residence indicators.

The GAD-7 appears to be highly reliable as judged by its Cronbach's alpha, which is 0.9222. Its validity, as measured by its Pearson correlation coefficients with the other indicators in Table 2, is high as well. The correlation coefficient between the GAD-7 and the depression indicator (item 2 of the PHQ-9) is 0.7505 (0.0000), between the GAD-7 and the anxiety indicator is 0.5437 (0.0000), and between the GAD-7 and the loneliness indicator is 0.4708 (0.0000).

4.2. Physical health and health-related behaviours

Table 3 displays several physical health indicators for men and women:

- Women's <u>obesity rate</u> is estimated at 26.3%, while the one for men at 18.8%, so that women are 7.5 percentage points (40%) more likely than men to be obese (BMI ≥ 30).
- Women are 5 percentage points (19%) less likely than men to <u>drink alcohol</u>.
- Women are 10 percentage points (31%) more likely than men to <u>have not gone out of their home</u> the day before the survey: 42% of women versus 32% of men.

We do not find statistically significant or economically important gender differences in the average self-reported health status (1 if good or very good, 0 otherwise), in the prevalence of chronic conditions, in having had the flu vaccine this season, or in having fever or cough in the last two weeks. Women are 4 percentage points (26%) less likely than men to smoke, but the difference is not statistically significant at the 5% level after adjusting for control variables.

Table 3. Physical health and health-related behaviours

	Good (0-1)	Chronic (0-1)	Obesity (0-1)	Smoke (0-1)	No drink (0-1)	No out (0-1)	Flu vac. (0-1)	Fever (0-1)	Cough (0-1)
Mean for Men	0.716	0.241	0.188	0.152	0.266	0.321	0.284	0.016	0.011
N for Men	704	704	704	704	703	704	704	704	704
Mean for Women	0.745	0.244	0.263	0.112	0.317	0.420	0.316	0.011	0.008
N for Women	757	757	757	757	757	757	757	757	757
Mean difference	0.029	0.003	0.075	-0.040	0.051	0.099	0.032	-0.005	-0.003
Adj. mean diff.	0.042	-0.003	0.068	-0.031	0.049	0.088	0.021	-0.005	-0.002
% Mean diff.	4.1%	1.2%	40.2%	-26.1%	19.2%	30.9%	11.1%	-32.4%	-30.3%
% Adj. mean diff.	5.9%	-1.2%	36.3%	-20.4%	18.4%	27.4%	7.4%	-32.0%	-17.6%
p-value mean diff.	*0.210*	*0.897*	*0.001*	*0.025*	*0.032*	*0.000*	*0.187*	*0.398*	*0.503*
p-value adj. diff.	*0.074*	*0.909*	*0.002*	*0.079*	*0.042*	*0.001*	*0.346*	*0.443*	*0.739*
N (w/o controls)	1,461	1,461	1,461	1,461	1,460	1,461	1,461	1,461	1,461
N (w/ controls)	1,458	1,458	1,458	1,458	1,458	1,458	1,458	1,458	1,458

Note: See Table 2.

4.3. Concerns and perceptions about Coronavirus, its prevalence and lethality

Table 4 contains information on the differences between men and women on coronavirus-related concerns and perceptions, showing that women are more concerned and have more negative perceptions than men:

- Women are more <u>concerned of getting coronavirus</u> than men, scoring 0.6 units (~0.24 standard deviations) above (or 12% higher than) men in the indicator of being concerned about getting coronavirus (1-10).
- Women are more <u>concerned of spreading coronavirus</u> than men, scoring 0.5 units (~0.2 standard deviations) above (or 8% higher than) men in the indicator of being concerned about spreading coronavirus (1-10).
- Women's <u>perceived coronavirus prevalence</u> is about 4 percentage points (~0.24 standard deviations or 31%) higher than that of men.
- Women's <u>perceived Coronavirus</u> lethality is about 1.5 percentage points (~0.15 standard deviations or 39%) higher than that of men.

Table 4. Concerns and perceptions about Coronavirus, its prevalence and lethality				
	Concerned Getting (1-10)	Concerned Spreading (1-10)	Prob. Positive (0-100)	Prob. Dying (0-100)
Mean for Men	5.688	6.121	12.733	4.916
N for Men	701	704	704	704
Mean for Women	6.345	6.617	16.613	6.402
N for Women	753	757	757	757
Mean difference	0.658	0.496	3.880	1.485
Adjusted mean difference	0.616	0.496	4.361	1.601
% Mean difference	11.6%	8.1%	30.5%	30.2%
% Adjusted mean difference	10.8%	8.1%	34.2%	32.6%
p-value mean difference	*0.000*	*0.000*	*0.000*	*0.004*
p-value adj. mean difference	*0.000*	*0.001*	*0.000*	*0.002*
N (w/o controls)	1,454	1,461	1,461	1,461
N (w/ controls)	1,451	1,458	1,458	1,458

Note: See Table 2.

4.4. Expectations on COVID-19 and unemployment

In **Table 5** the focus is on the gender differences in expectations on a future lockdown and a new COVID wave, and unemployment rate forecasts:

- The average level of agreement that a <u>new lockdown will be necessary before the end of 2020</u> is larger among women than men. Female's average agreement score is 2.95 on a scale of 1 to 4, while the male's one is 2.81. This is a difference of 0.14 units (~0.18 standard deviations) or 4.8%.
- The average level of agreement that there will be <u>another Coronavirus outbreak before the end of 2020</u> is larger among women than men. Female's average agreement score is 3.14 on a scale of 1 to 4, while the male's one is 3.0. This is a difference of 0.14 units (~0.20 standard deviations) or 4.6%.
- Women's <u>forecasted unemployment rates</u> for June 2020, December 2020 and June 2021 are 0.5, 0.9 and 1.1 percentage points (~0.12 standard deviations or 0.8%, ~0.21 standard deviations or 10%, ~0.23 standard deviations or 15%) larger than those forecasted by men.[14]

The difference in the expectation about the COVID-19 vaccine being found in a year or never is 3 percentage points and not statistically significant.

Table 5. Expectations on COVID-19 and unemployment

	Covid vaccine (0-1)	Lockdown again (1-4)	Covid again (1-4)	UR June 2020 (0-20)	UR Dec 2020 (0-20)	UR June 2021 (0-20)
Mean for Men	0.232	2.814	2.997	6.957	8.376	7.262
N for Men	704	703	703	703	703	703
Mean for Women	0.260	2.950	3.136	7.487	9.238	8.379
N for Women	757	755	755	755	755	755
Mean difference	0.029	0.136	0.139	0.530	0.863	1.117
Adjusted mean difference	0.030	0.135	0.129	0.548	0.949	1.175
% Mean difference	12.4%	4.8%	4.6%	7.6%	10.3%	15.4%
% Adjusted mean difference	13.0%	4.8%	4.3%	7.9%	11.3%	16.2%
p-value mean difference	*0.203*	*0.001*	*0.000*	*0.012*	*0.000*	*0.000*
p-value adj. mean difference	*0.186*	*0.001*	*0.001*	*0.011*	*0.000*	*0.000*
N (w/o controls)	1,461	1,458	1,458	1,458	1,458	1,458
N (w/ controls)	1,458	1,458	1,458	1,458	1,458	1,458

Note: See Table 2.

---

[14] The unemployment rate answer is restricted in the range 0-20% given the historical evolution of the unemployment rate in the UK: Bank of England, Unemployment Rate in the United Kingdom [UNRTUKA], retrieved from FRED, Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis; https://fred.stlouisfed.org/series/UNRTUKA, June 18, 2020.

4.5. NHS perceptions and donations to charities

In **Table 6** we focus on gender differences in measures of NHS perceptions and donations to charities. Respondents were given the option to ask us to donate up to 50 pence to the NHS Charities Together or The Trussell Trust. They could donate the whole 50 pence, part of it, or none to any of these two charities. Respondents were not allowed to keep the amount not donated.

- The average level of agreement that "the NHS is crucial to British society and we must do everything to maintain it" is slightly larger among women than men. Female's average agreement score is 3.87 on a scale of 1 to 4, while the male's one is 3.81, a difference of 0.06 units (~0.14 standard deviations) or 1.6%.
- On average, women choose to donate 23 out of 50 pence to The Trussell Trust, which supports a nationwide network of food banks providing emergency food and support to people locked in poverty, and campaigns for change to end the need for food banks in the UK. Men choose to donate about 18 out of 50 pence to that charity. Hence, the women-men average difference is 5 pence (~0.28 standard deviations) or 31%.
- On average, women's allocation to the "no donation" option is 4 pence (~0.21 standard deviations or 33%) smaller than that of men. Women also donate on average 1 penny less to the NHS charity than men, but our sample size is not large enough to detect effects of the size of 0.05 standard deviations.

Table 6. NHS perceptions and donations to charities

	NHS is crucial (1-4)	Food charity Donation (0-50p)	NHS charity donation (0-50p)	Amount not donated (0-50p)
Mean for Men	3.805	17.760	20.661	11.579
N for Men	703	703	703	703
Men for Women	3.868	23.200	19.074	7.726
N for Women	755	755	755	755
Mean difference	0.062	5.440	-1.587	-3.853
Adjusted mean difference	0.056	5.130	-1.130	-3.999
% Mean difference	1.6%	30.6%	-7.7%	-33.3%
% Adjusted mean difference	1.5%	28.9%	-5.5%	-34.5%
p-value mean difference	*0.008*	*0.000*	*0.086*	*0.000*
p-value adj. mean difference	*0.020*	*0.000*	*0.229*	*0.000*
N (w/o controls)	1,458	1,458	1,458	1,458
N (w/ controls)	1,458	1,458	1,458	1,458

Note: See Table 2.

Finally, we note that the total amounts given by respondents to each charity were: £290 to NHS Charities Together and £300 to The Trussell Trust. These payments were made on the 5th of July 2020.

4.6. Employment and job characteristics

In **Table 7** the focus is on the gender gaps in employment and job characteristics:

- 8.6% of women report having <u>lost their job because of the Coronavirus pandemic</u>, while the figure for men is 4.4%. Thus, women are about 4.2 percentage points (96%) more likely than men to have lost their jobs.
- 8.6% of women report being <u>healthcare workers</u>, while the figure for men is 4.4%. Thus, women again are 4.2 percentage points (96%) more likely than men to be healthcare workers.
- 7% of women report <u>working for the NHS</u>, while the percentage for men is 3.1. Women are about 4 percentage points (126%) more likely than men to work for the NHS.
- 62.1% of women report <u>working full-time</u>, while the figure for men is 84.3%. Women are 22 percentage points (26%) less likely than men to work full time.
- Working women have more <u>physically close to other people jobs</u> than men. On a scale of 1 ("don't work near people") to 5 ("very close (near touching)"), the index average is 3.75 for women and 3.33 for men, a difference of 0.42 units (~0.35 standard deviations) or about 13%.

Both men and women report similar rates of being furloughed because of the Coronavirus pandemic: 20.1% for men and 23.5% for women, and the 3.4 percentage points (17%) difference is not statistically significant. The fraction of key workers among men and women is also similar (25.2% among men and 27.7% among women), and not statistically different. Finally, we note that women report a higher index of being frequently exposed to disease or infection in their jobs than men do, but the difference is not statistically significant. The magnitude of this gender gap is large, 14% (or ~0.22 standard deviations / 16%, when adjusted), but not statistically "detectable" (p-value > 0.05) on account of the smaller sample size for working individuals (only 309 individuals employed working out of their home). The 95% confidence interval [-.03, .82] (see **Table A6** in the Appendix B) is compatible with women facing higher risks in their workplaces (Adams, 2020; Lewandowski et al., 2020).

Table 7. Employment and job characteristics	Lost job Covid (0-1)	Furloughed Covid (0-1)	Healthcare Worker (0-1)	NHS worker (0-1)	Key worker (0-1)	Full time (0-1)	Physically closeness job (1-5)	Disease exposure job (1-5)
Mean for Men	0.044	0.201	0.044	0.031	0.252	0.843	3.331	2.448
N for Men	564	553	477	477	477	477	163	163
Men for Women	0.086	0.235	0.086	0.070	0.277	0.621	3.753	2.795
N for Women	573	548	441	441	441	441	146	146
Diff.	0.042	0.034	0.042	0.039	0.025	-0.222	0.422	0.347
Adj. diff.	0.036	0.046	0.044	0.043	0.023	-0.196	0.359	0.395
% Diff.	95.5%	16.9%	95.5%	125.8%	9.9%	-26.3%	12.7%	14.2%
Adj. % diff.	81.8%	22.9%	100.0%	138.7%	9.1%	-23.3%	10.8%	16.1%
p-value diff.	*0.005*	*0.164*	*0.010*	*0.008*	*0.390*	*0.000*	*0.002*	*0.091*
p-value adj. diff.	*0.006*	*0.069*	*0.009*	*0.003*	*0.403*	*0.000*	*0.011*	*0.066*
N (w/o controls)	1,137	1,101	918	918	918	918	309	309
N (w/ controls)	1,134	1,099	916	916	916	916	308	308
Note: See Table 2.								

4.7. Labour market time and changes, and protective behaviour at work

In **Table 8** the focus is on the gender differences in labour market time and changes, and protective behaviour at work:

- In the last month, women <u>worked on average</u> 19 hours a week, 7.7 weekly hours (29%) less than men. Adjusting for control variables, the absolute (relative) gap decreases to 4.7 weekly hours (18%) less than men.
- Women's *reduction* <u>in hours of work</u> between the last month and before the COVID-19 pandemic was 2.1 hours (42%) higher than that for men. The absolute (relative) gap increases to 2.7 hours (52%) when adjusting for control variables.

Differences in social distancing at work and the use of face covering or gloves at work are not statistically significant. While the difference in the prevalence of social distancing and the use of face covering at work is not large in magnitude, the difference in the use of gloves at work does not appear to be negligible, between 6 and 10 percentage points or 13% and 21% difference (possibly due to disparities in job types such as being a healthcare worker or working in the NHS). Finally, a similar fraction of men and women, around 42%, report a loss in gross household income because of the Coronavirus

pandemic. Our evidence of no gender gap in income loss is consistent with Table A1 in Belot et al. (2020).

Table 8. Labour market time and changes, and protective behaviour at work

	Face covering at work (0-1)	Gloves at work (0-1)	Distance at work (0-1)	Hours of work	Hours of work before COVID	Change in hours of work	Income loss (0-1)
Mean for Men	0.411	0.466	0.681	26.774	31.923	-5.149	0.416
N for Men	163	163	163	704	704	704	704
Men for Women	0.397	0.370	0.658	19.078	26.37	-7.292	0.429
N for Women	146	146	146	757	757	757	757
Diff.	-0.014	-0.096	-0.023	-7.696	-5.553	-2.143	0.013
Adj. diff.	0.027	-0.062	-0.013	-4.683	-1.992	-2.691	0.032
% Diff.	-3.4%	-20.6%	-3.4%	-28.7%	-17.4%	41.6%	3.1%
Adj. % diff.	6.6%	-13.3%	-1.9%	-17.5%	-6.2%	52.3%	7.7%
p-value diff.	*0.806*	*0.087*	*0.663*	*0.000*	*0.000*	*0.044*	*0.612*
p-value adj. diff.	*0.647*	*0.320*	*0.823*	*0.000*	*0.119*	*0.017*	*0.210*
N (w/o controls)	309	309	309	1,461	1,461	1,461	1,461
N (w/ controls)	308	308	308	1,458	1,458	1,458	1,458

Note: See Table 2.

4.8. Non-labour market time and changes

In **Table 9** we shift our attention to gender differences in non-labour market time and changes:

- In the last month, women spent on childcare and homeschooling on average 14.4 hours a week, 8.4 weekly hours (140%) more than men.
- Before the COVID-19 pandemic, women spent on childcare and homeschooling on average 9.2 hours a week, 5 weekly hours (117.5%) more than men.
- Women's increase in time spent on childcare and homeschooling between the last month and before the COVID-19 pandemic was 3.5 hours (195%) higher than that for men.
- In the last month, women spent on housework (e.g. cooking, cleaning, laundry) on average 29.3 hours a week, 9.2 weekly hours (46%) more than men.

- Before the COVID-19 pandemic, women spent on housework (e.g. cooking, cleaning, laundry) on average 22.5 hours a week, 7 weekly hours (45%) more than men.
- Women's increase in time spent on housework (e.g. cooking, cleaning, laundry) between the last month and before the COVID-19 pandemic was 2.2 hours (48%) higher than that for men.
- The gender gap in the weekly number of hours spent on caring for disabled, elderly or sick adult did not change between the last month and before the COVID-19 pandemic.

Table 9. Non-labour market time and changes

	Hours childcare	Hours childcare before COVID	Change in hours childcare	Hours housework	Hours housework before COVID	Change in hours housework	Hours caring	Hours caring before COVID	Change in hours caring
Men	5.999	4.232	1.767	20.128	15.5	4.628	2.564	2.165	0.399
N for Men	704	704	704	704	704	704	704	704	704
Women	14.42	9.205	5.215	29.305	22.465	6.84	3.423	3.119	0.304
N for Women	757	757	757	757	757	757	757	757	757
Diff	8.421	4.973	3.448	9.177	6.965	2.212	0.859	0.954	-0.095
Adj. diff.	8.320	4.451	3.869	8.712	5.919	2.793	0.422	0.473	-0.052
% Diff.	140.4%	117.5%	195.1%	45.6%	44.9%	47.8%	33.5%	44.1%	-23.8%
% Adj. diff	138.7%	105.2%	219.0%	43.3%	38.2%	60.4%	16.5%	21.8%	-13.0%
p-value	*0.000*	*0.000*	*0.000*	*0.000*	*0.000*	*0.023*	*0.249*	*0.129*	*0.781*
p-value adj. diff.	*0.000*	*0.000*	*0.000*	*0.000*	*0.000*	*0.004*	*0.569*	*0.477*	*0.872*
N (w/o controls)	1,461	1,461	1,461	1,461	1,461	1,461	1,461	1,461	1,461
N (w/ controls)	1,458	1,458	1,458	1,458	1,458	1,458	1,458	1,458	1,458

Note: See Table 2.

4.9. Protective behaviours

In **Table 10** the focus is on protective behaviours:

- Almost 90% of women report having hand sanitiser gel at home, and they are 8.5 percentage points (11%) more likely than men to have it.
- Almost 60% of women report having face masks at home, and they are 7.4 percentage points (11%) less likely than men to have them.
- Both men and women are equally likely to have gloves at home, with a prevalence of 62%.

- Women appear to <u>socialise outdoors</u> more than men: 78% of women versus 71% of men, to comply with the lockdown rules at the time of the survey.
- Around 3.5%, for both men and women, appear to have <u>met 7 people or more</u> in violation to the lockdown rules at the time of the survey.

Table 10. Protective behaviours

	Hand sanitiser (0-1)	Face masks (0-1)	Gloves (0-1)	Socialising outdoors (0-1)	Meeting ≥ 7 people (0-1)
Mean for Men	0.805	0.663	0.616	0.712	0.033
N for Men	704	704	704	427	427
Men for Women	0.890	0.589	0.616	0.782	0.038
N for Women	757	757	757	504	504
Diff.	0.085	-0.074	-0.001	0.070	0.005
Adj. diff.	0.084	-0.070	-0.016	0.070	0.008
% Diff.	10.5%	-11.2%	-0.1%	9.8%	15.0%
Adj. % diff.	10.4%	-10.6%	-2.6%	9.8%	24.4%
p-value diff.	*0.000*	*0.003*	*0.972*	*0.015*	*0.685*
p-value adj. diff.	*0.000*	*0.006*	*0.532*	*0.014*	*0.532*
N (w/o controls)	1,461	1,461	1,461	931	931
N (w/ controls)	1,458	1,458	1,458	931	931

Note: See Table 2.

4.10. Behaviours when going out

In **Table 11** the focus is on gender differences in behaviours when going out:

- 95% of women report <u>washing their hands</u> as soon as they got home. This fraction is 4.4 percentage points (5%) higher than the one for men.

We do not find either statistically significant or sizeable differences between men and women in the use of face covering (34% vs 36%) or gloves (19% vs 17%), or in observing social distance (95% vs 96%)[15], in spite of anecdotal evidence in the media suggesting women's higher face covering usage rates.

---

[15] Similarly, we do not find any statistically significant or sizeable differences between men and women in the use of face covering (9.6% vs 6.5%) or gloves (5.4% vs 3.0%), or in observing social distance (86% vs 84%) when socialising with members of other households.

Table 11. Behaviours when going out

	Face Covering (0-1)	Gloves (0-1)	Distance (0-1)	Wash hands (0-1)
Mean for Men	0.343	0.191	0.946	0.906
N for Men	703	703	703	703
Men for Women	0.359	0.173	0.956	0.95
N for Women	757	757	757	757
Diff.	0.016	-0.018	0.010	0.044
Adj. diff.	0.011	-0.018	0.006	0.043
% Diff.	4.7%	-9.4%	1.1%	4.9%
Adj. % diff.	3.2%	-9.4%	0.6%	4.7%
p-value diff.	*0.510*	*0.385*	*0.355*	*0.001*
p-value adj. diff.	*0.664*	*0.377*	*0.586*	*0.003*
N (w/o controls)	1460	1460	1460	1460
N (w/ controls)	1458	1458	1458	1458

Note: See Table 2.

4.11. Views on the effectiveness of masks

In **Table 12** the focus is on the views on the effectiveness of masks:

- The average level of agreement that "if everybody wears a face mask, everyone is protected from Coronavirus" is higher among women than men. Female's average agreement score is 2.43 on a scale of 1 to 4, while the male's one is 2.34. This represents a difference of about 0.10 standard deviations or 4%.
- The average level of agreement that the UK government encourages wearing a face covering in enclosed spaces is higher among women than men. Female's average agreement score is 3.21 on a scale of 1 to 4, while the male's one is 3.09. This represents a difference of about 0.15 standard deviations or 4%.
- We do not find differences between men on women with regards the perceived effectiveness of masks in not getting coronavirus (2.50 vs 2.44) or not spreading coronavirus (3.37 vs 3.36), or the perceived use of masks by people in enclosed spaces (2.74 vs 2.75).

Table 12. Views on the effectiveness of masks

	Masks effective not getting (1-4)	Masks effective not spreading (1-4)	Masks everybody, everybody protected (1-4)	UK gov't encourages masks enclosed (1-4)	People wear masks enclosed (1-4)
Mean for Men	2.496	3.367	2.337	3.087	2.735
N for Men	703	703	703	703	703
Men for Women	2.444	3.356	2.432	3.207	2.751
N for Women	755	755	755	755	755
Diff.	-0.052	-0.011	0.095	0.120	0.016
Adj. diff.	-0.031	-0.009	0.102	0.114	0.021
% Diff.	-2.1%	-0.3%	4.1%	3.9%	0.6%
Adj. % diff.	-1.2%	-0.3%	4.4%	3.7%	0.8%
p-value diff.	*0.257*	*0.759*	*0.048*	*0.005*	*0.738*
p-value adj. diff.	*0.498*	*0.795*	*0.035*	*0.009*	*0.665*
N (w/ controls)	1458	1458	1458	1458	1458
N (w/o controls)	1458	1458	1458	1458	1458

Note: See Table 2.

5. Discussion and future work

Gender inequality is widening because of the COVID-19 pandemic. This can be seen in multiple margins of women's labour market attachment and other time adjustments between February and June 2020: women have decreased their work hours, but increased housework and childcare (including homes-schooling) much more than men. Women are also more likely to have lost their job because of the pandemic, while those currently working are more likely to hold more coronavirus-risky jobs than men. These gender-specific patterns are not driven by differences in age, ethnicity, education, family structure, income in 2019, place of residence, or living in a rural/urban area.

We also document gender gaps in other dimensions, including but not limited to mental health, COVID-19 health-related concerns (e.g. prevalence and lethality of COVID-19) and COVID-19 economic-related perceptions (e.g. forecasted unemployment rate). Women's mental health is worse than men's along several dimensions, they are more concerned about getting and spreading the virus, and perceive the virus as more prevalent and lethal than men do. Women are also more likely than men to expect a new lockdown or virus outbreak by the end of 2020, and are more pessimistic about the state of the UK economy, as measured by future unemployment rates. Consistent with them

having more pessimistic views on the current and future state of the UK economy, women donate more to food banks.

Our findings point to substantial gender differences in vulnerability to the pandemic and to the need for pandemic-related health policies to take gender into account, and for the government to devise stimulus policies that consider women's difficulties and channels to improve their mental and economic wellbeing. In future work we are planning to explore how their worse work and time constraints, on one hand, and their more pessimistic perceptions on the extent of the pandemic and its effects on the economy, on the other, might explain their worse mental wellbeing relative to men.

References

Adams, R.B (2020), "Gender equality in work and COVID-19 deaths", CEPR Press Issue 16.

Adams-Prassl, A., Boneva, T., Golin, M., Rauh, C. (2020a), "The Impact of the Coronavirus Lockdown on Mental Health: Evidence from the US," HCEO Working Paper 2020-030.

Adams-Prassl, A., Boneva, T., Golin, M., Rauh, C. (2020b), "Inequality in the Impact of the Coronavirus Shock: Evidence from Real Time Surveys," CEPR Discussion Paper 14665.

Alon, T., Doepke, M., Olmstead-Rumsey, J. and Tertilt, M. (2020), "This Time It's Different: The Role of Women's Employment in the Great Lockdown," mimeo Northwestern University.

Andre, P., Pizzinelli, C., Roth, C. and Wohlfart, J. (2019), "Subjective Models of the Macroeconomy: Evidence from Experts and a Representative Sample," CESifo Working Paper No. 7850.

Andrew, A., Cattan, S., Costa Dias, M., Farquharson, C., Kraftman, L., Krutikova, S., Phimister, A., Sevilla, A. (2020), "How are mothers and fathers balancing work and family under lockdown?" IFS Briefing Note BN290.

Banks, J., Xu, X. (2020), "The mental health effects of the first two months of lockdown and social distancing during the Covid-19 pandemic in the UK," CEPR Press Issue 28.

Belot, M.,, Choi, S., Tripodi, E., den Broek-Altenburg, E., Jamison, J. C., Papageorge, N. (2020), "Unequal Consequences of COVID-19 across Age and Income: Representative Evidence from Six Countries," IZA discussion paper 13366.

Capraro, V. and Barcelo, H. (2020), "The effect of messaging and gender on intentions to wear a face covering to slow down COVID-19 transmission," https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/tg7vz

Daly, M., Sutin, A., Robinson, E. (2020), "Longitudinal changes in mental health and the COVID-19 pandemic: Evidence from the UK Household Longitudinal Study," https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/qd5z7

Davillas, A., Jones, A.M. (2020), "The COVID-19 pandemic and its impact on inequality of opportunity in psychological distress in the UK," ISER working paper 2020-07.

Del Boca, D., Oggero, N., Profeta, P., Rossi, M.C. (2020), "Women's work, housework and childcare, before and during COVID-19," CEPR Press Issue 28.

Etheridge, B., Spantig, L. (2020), "Impact of The Gender Gap in Mental Well-Being During the Covid-19 Outbreak: Evidence from the UK," ISER working paper 2020-08.

Farré, L., Fawaz, Y., Gonzalez, L., Graves, J. (2020), "How the COVID-19 Lockdown Affected Gender Inequality in Paid and Unpaid Work in Spain," IZA discussion paper 13434.

Fetzer, T., Hensel, L., Hermle, J., Roth, C. (2020), "Coronavirus Perceptions and Economic Anxiety," *Review of Economics and Statistics*, forthcoming.

Galasso, V., Pons, V., Profeta, P. Becher, M., Brouard, S., Foucault, M. (2020), "Gender differences in COVID-19 related attitudes and behaviour: evidence form a panel survey in eight OECD countries," NBER working paper 27359.

Lewandowski, P., Lipowska, K., Mgda, I. (2020), "The Gender Dimension of Occupational Exposure to Contagion in Europe," IZA discussion paper 13336.

Papageorge, N. W., Zahn, M., Belot, M., den Broek-Altenburg, Choi, S., Jamison, J. C. (2020) "Socio-Demographic Factors Associated with Self-Protecting Behavior during the COVID-19 Pandemic," IZA discussion paper 13333.

Scharf, K. (2020), "The economic effects of Covid-19 on charitable donations," https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=8wuXLTaR-iQ

Sevilla, A., Smith, S. (2020), "Baby steps: the gender division of childcare during the COVID-19 pandemic," IZA discussion paper 13302.

Spitzer, R.L., Kroenke, K., Williams, J.B., Lowe, B. (2006), "A brief measure for assessing generalized anxiety disorder: the GAD-7," *Archives of Internal Medicine*, 166 (2006), pp. 1092-1097.

Appendix A. Description of variables.

Outcome variables

To measure <u>mental health</u> we use four indicators:

- The Generalised Anxiety Disorder Assessment (GAD-7) which is a seven-item instrument whose score is calculated by assigning scores of 0, 1, 2, and 3, to the response categories of "not at all," "several days," "more than half the days," and "nearly every day," respectively, and then adding together the scores for the seven questions. Thus, the variable GAD-7 ranges from 0 to 21.
- A depression indicator based on whether the respondent has been feeling down, depressed or hopeless in the last two weeks, taking value of 0 if "not at all", 1 if "several days", 2 if "more than half the days", and 3 "nearly every day" (this depression indicator corresponds to item 2 of the PHQ-9).
- An indicator for whether the respondent has had an anxiety attack in the last two weeks, 1 corresponding to "yes" and 0 corresponding to "no"
- A loneliness indicator taking value of 1 if the respondent feels lonely "hardly ever or never", of 2 if "some of the time" and of 3 if "often".

To measure <u>physical health and health-related behaviours</u>:

- A dummy variable for being in good health (1 if the respondent is in good health).
- A dummy variable for suffering from any underlying health condition (1 if the respondent has any chronic condition).
- A dummy variable for being obese (1 if the respondent is obese).
- A dummy variable for whether the respondent smokes (1 if they do).
- A dummy variable for whether they drink at all (1 if they do not).
- A dummy variable if they have gone out of their homes the day before the survey (1 if they have not).
- A dummy variable for whether they had the flu vaccine this season (1 if they had).
- A dummy variable for whether they had a high temperature in the last days (1 if they had).
- A dummy variable for whether they had a new continuous cough in the last days (1 if they had).

To measure <u>concerns and perceptions about the coronavirus</u>:

- A variable taking values from 1 to 10 measuring how concerned the respondent is about getting the coronavirus, where 1 is not at all and 10 is extremely concerned.
- A variable taking values from 1 to 10 measuring how concerned the respondent is about spreading the coronavirus, where 1 is not at all and 10 is extremely concerned.
- A variable from 0 to 100 capturing out of 100 individuals how many the respondent believes would test positive for Coronavirus if tested today.
- A variable from 0 to 100 capturing out of 100 individuals who test positive for Coronavirus how many the respondent believes would die of Coronavirus.

24

To measure <u>expectations about the future of the coronavirus and its pandemic effects on the economy</u>:

- A dummy variable for when a vaccine against Coronavirus will be found according to the respondent (1 if "in more than a year's time" or "never", 0 sooner).
- An indicator variable for the level of agreement that a new lockdown will be necessary before the end of 2020, taking values of 1 if "strongly disagree", of 2 if "somewhat disagree", of 3 "somewhat agree", of 4 if "strongly agree".
- An indicator variable for the level of agreement that there will be another Coronavirus outbreak before the end of 2020, taking values of 1 if "strongly disagree", of 2 if "somewhat disagree", of 3 if "somewhat agree", of 4 if "strongly agree".
- Three indicators for the forecasted unemployment rates for June 2020, December 2020 and June 2021, respectively, ranging from 0 to 20.

To measure <u>perceptions of the NHS and donations</u>:

- An indicator variable for the level of agreement that "the NHS is crucial to British society and we must do everything to maintain it" on a scale from 1 to 4 as before.
- A variable with the actual amount donated to the food bank charity The Trussell Trust ranging from 0 to 50 pence.
- A variable with the actual amount donated to the NHS Charities Together ranging from 0 to 50 pence.
- A variable with the actual amount not to be donated, ranging from 0 to 50 pence.

To measure <u>employment, jobs and work conditions</u>:

- A dummy variable taking value of 1 if the respondent lost their job because of the Coronavirus pandemic.
- A dummy variable taking value of 1 if the respondent has been furloughed under the Coronavirus Job Retention Scheme because of the Coronavirus pandemic.
- A dummy variable taking value of 1 if the respondent is a healthcare worker.
- A dummy variable taking value of 1 if the respondent works for the NHS.
- A dummy variable taking value of 1 if the respondent is a key worker.
- A dummy variable taking value of 1 if the respondent works full time.
- An indicator variable about how physically close to other people the respondent is in their current job, ranging from 1 "don't work near people", to 5 "very close (near touching)".
- An indicator variable about how often the respondent is exposed to diseases or infection in his current job, ranging from 1 "never", to 5 "every day".

To measure <u>labour market time and changes due to the pandemic</u>:

- A dummy variable taking value of 1 if the respondent wears face covering at work.
- A dummy variable taking value of 1 if the respondent wears disposable gloves at work.
- A dummy variable taking value of 1 if the respondent keeps at least 2 metres away from other people at work.

- A variable for the number of weekly hours worked.
- A variable for the number of weekly hours worked before the coronavirus, i.e., in January or February 2020.
- A variable computing the change in weekly hours of work between after the pandemic and before.
- A dummy variable taking value of 1 if the respondent experienced a loss in gross household income because of the Coronavirus pandemic.

To measure <u>non-labour market time and changes due to the pandemic</u>:

- A variable for the number of weekly hours spent doing childcare.
- A variable for the number of weekly hours spent doing childcare before the coronavirus, i.e., in January or February 2020.
- A variable computing the change in weekly hours of childcare between after the pandemic and before.
- A variable for the number of weekly hours doing housework (cooking, doing laundry…).
- A variable for the number of weekly hours doing housework before the coronavirus, i.e., in January or February 2020.
- A variable computing the change in weekly hours doing housework between after the pandemic and before.
- A variable for the number of weekly hours spent caring for disabled, elderly or sick adults.
- A variable for the number of weekly hours spent caring before the coronavirus, i.e., in January or February 2020.
- A variable computing the change in weekly hours spent caring between after the pandemic and before.

To measure <u>protective behaviour and socialisation patterns</u>:

- A dummy variable taking value of 1 if the respondent has hand sanitiser gel at home.
- A dummy variable taking value of 1 if the respondent has face masks at home.
- A dummy variable taking value of 1 if the respondent has disposable gloves at home.
- A dummy variable taking value of 1 if the respondent socialises outdoors rather than also indoors.
- A dummy variable taking value of 1 if the respondent has socialised with 7 or more people at a time, conditional on having socialised with people outside their household.

To measure <u>behaviours when going out</u>:

- A dummy variable taking value of 1 if the respondent wore a face covering when entered a shop or a building the last time they went out of their homes.
- A dummy variable taking value of 1 if the respondent wore disposable gloves when entered a shop or a building the last time they went out of their homes.

- A dummy variable taking value of 1 if the respondent kept at least 2 metres away from other people the last time they went out of their homes.
- A dummy variable taking value of 1 if the respondent washed their hands as soon as they got home.

Finally, to measure <u>views on the effectiveness of face covering</u>:

- An indicator variable for the level of agreement that wearing a face mask is effective to prevent you from getting Coronavirus, taking values of 1 if "strongly disagree", of 2 if "somewhat disagree", of 3 "somewhat agree", of 4 if "strongly agree".
- An indicator variable for the level of agreement that wearing a face mask is effective to prevent you from spreading Coronavirus, taking values of 1 if "strongly disagree", of 2 if "somewhat disagree", of 3 "somewhat agree", of 4 if "strongly agree".
- An indicator variable for the level of agreement that if everybody wears a face mask, everyone is protected from Coronavirus, taking values of 1 if "strongly disagree", of 2 if "somewhat disagree", of 3 "somewhat agree", of 4 if "strongly agree".
- An indicator variable for the level of agreement that the UK government encourages the use of face covering in enclosed spaces, taking values of 1 if "strongly disagree", of 2 if "somewhat disagree", of 3 "somewhat agree", of 4 if "strongly agree".
- An indicator variable for the level of agreement that people in enclosed spaces wear face coverings, taking values of 1 if "strongly disagree", of 2 if "somewhat disagree", of 3 "somewhat agree", of 4 if "strongly agree".

Control variables

We use the following set of control variables:

- Age group dummy variables corresponding to the age categories 18-24, 25-34, 35-44, 45-54, 55-64, 65 and above.
- An ethnicity dummy variable taking value of 1 if the respondent has a non-white ethnicity and 0 otherwise.
- An urban indicator taking value of 1 if the respondent lives in an urban area and 0 if lives in a rural area.
- Twelve dummy variables indicating the geographical location of residence: North East, North West, Yorkshire and the Humber, East Midlands, West Midlands, East of England, London, South East, South West, Wales, Scotland, Northern Ireland.
- Eight education dummy variables corresponding to the following education qualifications: no qualifications, fewer than 5 GCSE/O-Levels, 5 or more GCSE/O-Levels, trade/technical/vocational training, A-Levels, Bachelor's degree, Master's degree, Doctoral or Professional degree.
- An indicator taking value of 1 if the respondent lives with a partner (married or cohabiting) and 0 otherwise.

- An indicator taking value of 1 if the respondent does not live alone and 0 if they do.
- Four dummy variables corresponding to the following employment categories: employed working outside home, employed working from home, unemployed, not in the labour force.
- The logarithm of income in 2019.

Appendix B. Tables of regressions.

Table A1. OLS regressions of mental health and wellbeing indicators.

	GAD7 (0-21)	Depressed (0-3)	Anxiety (0-1)	Loneliness (1-3)
Female	1.040***	0.148***	0.108***	0.092***
	(0.251)	(0.043)	(0.021)	(0.034)
Non-white	-0.623	-0.147**	-0.034	-0.026
	(0.404)	(0.064)	(0.034)	(0.054)
Age group 18-24	0.740	0.064	0.024	0.244***
	(0.612)	(0.103)	(0.053)	(0.079)
Age group 25-34	0.731	0.145	0.051	0.189***
	(0.465)	(0.074)	(0.038)	(0.061)
Age group 35-44	0.617	0.017	0.041	0.055
	(0.439)	(0.071)	(0.037)	(0.058)
Age group 55-64	-1.485***	-0.220***	-0.066	-0.104
	(0.425)	(0.070)	(0.035)	(0.056)
Age group 65+	-2.711***	-0.395***	-0.184***	-0.172**
	(0.490)	(0.083)	(0.039)	(0.069)
Fewer than 5 CGSE/O-Levels	0.467	0.421***	0.094	0.110
	(1.033)	(0.133)	(0.059)	(0.123)
5 or more CGSE/O-Levels	0.871	0.371***	0.112**	0.190
	(1.003)	(0.115)	(0.057)	(0.121)
Trade/technical/vocational training	0.427	0.376***	0.088	0.211
	(0.968)	(0.113)	(0.054)	(0.119)
A-Levels	0.291	0.397***	0.114**	0.211
	(0.949)	(0.105)	(0.051)	(0.115)
Bachelor's degree	0.234	0.347***	0.056	0.126
	(0.922)	(0.099)	(0.048)	(0.111)
Master's degree	0.746	0.440***	0.090	0.215
	(0.970)	(0.112)	(0.055)	(0.119)
Doctoral or Professional degree	0.055	0.348***	0.024	0.237
	(1.028)	(0.126)	(0.057)	(0.128)
Living with a partner	-0.156	-0.089	-0.031	-0.289***
	(0.354)	(0.058)	(0.030)	(0.048)
Living with others	-0.013	-0.027	0.041	-0.082
	(0.449)	(0.074)	(0.036)	(0.064)
Log of income in 2019	-0.417	-0.058	-0.016	-0.038
	(0.290)	(0.050)	(0.024)	(0.039)
Employed working outside home	-0.599	-0.126	-0.092***	-0.062
	(0.410)	(0.067)	(0.035)	(0.054)
Employed working from home	-0.519	-0.106	-0.094***	-0.059
	(0.355)	(0.061)	(0.031)	(0.049)
Unemployed	0.656	0.099	0.007	-0.005
	(0.546)	(0.093)	(0.047)	(0.070)
Observations	1,458	1,458	1,458	1,458
R^2	0.097	0.088	0.074	0.135

Note: Reference categories are "Age group 45-54", "No qualifications", and "Not in the labour force". All regressions include 11 dummy variables indicating the geographical location of residence and an urban/rural area indicator. Robust standard errors in parentheses. Asterisks reported if p-value < 0.05: *** p-value <0.01, ** p-value <0.05.

Table A2. OLS regressions of physical health indicators and health-related behaviours.

	Good (0-1)	Chronic (0-1)	Obesity (0-1)	Smoke (0-1)	No drink (0-1)	No out (0-1)	Flu vaccine (0-1)	Fever (0-1)	Cough (0-1)
Female	0.042	-0.003	0.068***	-0.031	0.049**	0.088***	0.021	-0.005	-0.002
	(0.023)	(0.023)	(0.022)	(0.018)	(0.024)	(0.025)	(0.023)	(0.006)	(0.005)
Non-white	-0.022	0.067	0.038	-0.039	0.212***	0.042	0.014	0.000	0.015
	(0.036)	(0.035)	(0.034)	(0.027)	(0.039)	(0.039)	(0.035)	(0.013)	(0.013)
Age group 18-24	0.252***	-0.146***	-0.221***	0.059	-0.099	0.033	-0.079	-0.003	0.019
	(0.051)	(0.049)	(0.045)	(0.046)	(0.054)	(0.056)	(0.049)	(0.020)	(0.016)
Age group 25-34	0.143***	-0.117***	-0.083**	0.028	-0.003	0.072	-0.083**	-0.022	0.002
	(0.040)	(0.038)	(0.039)	(0.030)	(0.042)	(0.043)	(0.037)	(0.013)	(0.009)
Age group 35-44	0.129***	-0.084**	-0.039	0.020	-0.003	0.036	-0.040	-0.030**	-0.000
	(0.040)	(0.039)	(0.039)	(0.028)	(0.042)	(0.042)	(0.038)	(0.013)	(0.008)
Age group 55-64	0.019	0.012	-0.019	-0.005	-0.079**	0.014	0.073	-0.020	-0.006
	(0.041)	(0.038)	(0.038)	(0.028)	(0.039)	(0.041)	(0.039)	(0.013)	(0.007)
Age group 65+	0.042	0.060	-0.056	0.025	-0.040	0.053	0.388***	-0.015	0.008
	(0.049)	(0.049)	(0.045)	(0.034)	(0.049)	(0.051)	(0.048)	(0.016)	(0.012)
< 5 CGSE Levels	0.052	-0.142	-0.106	0.089	-0.058	0.190	-0.158	0.020	-0.042
	(0.121)	(0.126)	(0.124)	(0.083)	(0.120)	(0.126)	(0.114)	(0.016)	(0.055)
5+ CGSE Levels	0.010	-0.067	-0.091	0.074	-0.101	0.149	-0.088	0.009	-0.054
	(0.119)	(0.126)	(0.121)	(0.080)	(0.117)	(0.123)	(0.111)	(0.010)	(0.055)
TTV training	-0.053	-0.055	-0.074	0.042	-0.075	0.107	-0.155	0.014	-0.039
	(0.119)	(0.125)	(0.120)	(0.078)	(0.116)	(0.122)	(0.110)	(0.012)	(0.056)
A-Levels	-0.065	0.019	-0.069	0.033	-0.128	0.140	-0.044	0.013	-0.046
	(0.116)	(0.123)	(0.118)	(0.074)	(0.113)	(0.120)	(0.108)	(0.011)	(0.056)
Bachelor's deg.	0.006	-0.077	-0.105	-0.010	-0.131	0.069	-0.047	0.009	-0.048
	(0.114)	(0.122)	(0.117)	(0.073)	(0.112)	(0.118)	(0.107)	(0.007)	(0.055)
Master's deg.	0.070	-0.041	-0.095	-0.008	-0.141	0.005	-0.015	0.021	-0.040
	(0.117)	(0.125)	(0.120)	(0.075)	(0.115)	(0.121)	(0.110)	(0.013)	(0.055)
Doct./Prof. deg.	0.072	-0.069	-0.148	-0.058	-0.067	0.207	0.016	-0.004	-0.057
	(0.121)	(0.128)	(0.122)	(0.076)	(0.120)	(0.126)	(0.118)	(0.006)	(0.054)
Liv. w/ partner	0.058	-0.024	-0.034	-0.025	-0.011	0.009	0.018	0.017**	0.004
	(0.031)	(0.031)	(0.029)	(0.025)	(0.032)	(0.033)	(0.029)	(0.007)	(0.007)
Liv. w/ others	0.045	0.012	0.054	-0.034	-0.044	0.038	-0.039	-0.009	-0.013
	(0.042)	(0.039)	(0.038)	(0.034)	(0.041)	(0.042)	(0.037)	(0.008)	(0.011)
Log of inc. 2019	0.019	0.035	-0.003	-0.003	-0.038	-0.073**	0.049	-0.005	0.002
	(0.027)	(0.027)	(0.025)	(0.020)	(0.027)	(0.029)	(0.025)	(0.006)	(0.006)
Employed out	0.098***	-0.049	-0.011	0.103***	0.002	-0.191***	-0.081**	0.009	0.009
	(0.036)	(0.036)	(0.035)	(0.030)	(0.038)	(0.038)	(0.037)	(0.011)	(0.010)
Employed home	0.080**	-0.043	-0.032	0.000	-0.047	0.045	-0.109***	0.009	0.006
	(0.034)	(0.034)	(0.032)	(0.023)	(0.034)	(0.037)	(0.034)	(0.010)	(0.006)
Unemployed	-0.001	-0.071	-0.017	0.157***	-0.001	0.009	-0.179***	0.006	-0.001
	(0.050)	(0.044)	(0.044)	(0.043)	(0.050)	(0.052)	(0.041)	(0.012)	(0.009)
Observations	1,458	1,458	1,458	1,458	1,458	1,458	1,458	1,458	1,458
R²	0.065	0.055	0.038	0.070	0.053	0.066	0.172	0.025	0.031

Note: See Table A1.

Table A3. OLS regressions of concerns and perceptions about Coronavirus, its prevalence and lethality.

	Concerned Getting (1-10)	Concerned Spreading (1-10)	Probability Positive (0-100)	Probability dying (0-100)
Female	0.616***	0.496***	4.361***	1.601***
	(0.132)	(0.143)	(0.863)	(0.510)
Non-white	0.322	-0.415	6.465***	3.616***
	(0.213)	(0.223)	(1.616)	(1.105)
Age group 18-24	-1.126***	-0.118	5.943***	1.557
	(0.297)	(0.306)	(1.964)	(1.303)
Age group 25-34	-0.494**	0.125	5.138***	2.054**
	(0.227)	(0.246)	(1.496)	(0.941)
Age group 35-44	-0.280	-0.038	3.100**	0.026
	(0.227)	(0.240)	(1.444)	(0.793)
Age group 55-64	0.064	-0.343	-2.080	-1.039
	(0.223)	(0.243)	(1.253)	(0.738)
Age group 65+	0.219	-0.649**	-2.676	-0.794
	(0.266)	(0.294)	(1.505)	(0.849)
Fewer than 5 CGSE/O-Levels	0.053	-0.503	-4.650	-1.608
	(0.617)	(0.733)	(6.203)	(4.079)
5 or more CGSE/O-Levels	0.009	-0.502	-6.245	-2.015
	(0.590)	(0.711)	(6.041)	(4.058)
Trade/technical/vocational training	-0.323	-0.533	-6.401	-2.178
	(0.587)	(0.702)	(6.055)	(4.061)
A-Levels	-0.310	-0.664	-7.572	-2.317
	(0.572)	(0.684)	(5.985)	(3.994)
Bachelor's degree	-0.398	-0.636	-9.779	-4.181
	(0.565)	(0.678)	(5.928)	(3.954)
Master's degree	-0.549	-0.821	-6.680	-3.067
	(0.583)	(0.693)	(6.113)	(4.022)
Doctoral or Professional degree	-0.777	-1.128	-10.126	-4.330
	(0.616)	(0.729)	(6.019)	(3.980)
Living with a partner	0.272	-0.007	0.161	-0.768
	(0.173)	(0.178)	(1.124)	(0.683)
Living with others	0.526**	0.666***	1.528	1.211
	(0.225)	(0.242)	(1.325)	(0.745)
Log of income in 2019	-0.239	-0.152	1.533	0.616
	(0.157)	(0.162)	(1.014)	(0.616)
Employed working outside home	-0.024	0.138	1.884	0.836
	(0.212)	(0.224)	(1.311)	(0.748)
Employed working from home	0.096	0.290	-0.682	0.007
	(0.186)	(0.201)	(1.119)	(0.639)
Unemployed	0.040	-0.059	2.912	2.963**
	(0.270)	(0.289)	(1.768)	(1.312)
Observations	1,451	1,458	1,458	1,458
R²	0.073	0.039	0.147	0.082

Note: See Table A1.

Table A4. OLS regressions of expectations on COVID-19 and unemployment rates.

	Covid Vaccine (0-1)	Lockdown Again (1-4)	Covid Again (1-4)	Unemployment Rate Jun2020 (0-20)	Unemployment Rate Dec 2020 (0-20)	Unemployment Rate Jun2021 (0-20)
Female	0.030	0.135***	0.129***	0.548**	0.949***	1.175***
	(0.023)	(0.041)	(0.038)	(0.216)	(0.229)	(0.249)
Non-white	0.046	-0.040	-0.085	0.326	-0.018	-0.203
	(0.037)	(0.065)	(0.065)	(0.340)	(0.371)	(0.393)
Age group 18-24	-0.152***	-0.057	-0.114	0.735	-0.300	-1.324**
	(0.049)	(0.094)	(0.091)	(0.502)	(0.531)	(0.577)
Age group 25-34	-0.038	-0.048	-0.067	1.197***	-0.260	-1.208***
	(0.042)	(0.073)	(0.066)	(0.357)	(0.368)	(0.430)
Age group 35-44	0.005	0.031	-0.019	1.097***	0.636	-0.059
	(0.042)	(0.070)	(0.066)	(0.349)	(0.382)	(0.431)
Age group 55-64	-0.077**	-0.141**	-0.197***	-0.181	0.228	0.199
	(0.038)	(0.069)	(0.064)	(0.320)	(0.350)	(0.408)
Age group 65+	-0.069	-0.244***	-0.368***	0.343	-0.061	-0.518
	(0.045)	(0.077)	(0.075)	(0.411)	(0.444)	(0.503)
< 5 CGSE Levels	0.056	-0.123	0.078	2.349***	1.517	0.442
	(0.103)	(0.169)	(0.171)	(0.746)	(1.010)	(1.094)
5 + CGSE Levels	-0.051	0.038	0.082	2.685***	1.227	-0.156
	(0.098)	(0.161)	(0.165)	(0.666)	(0.980)	(1.059)
TTV training	-0.025	-0.098	0.024	1.910***	1.011	-0.117
	(0.098)	(0.161)	(0.164)	(0.633)	(0.961)	(1.035)
A-Levels	0.002	-0.086	0.095	1.575***	0.638	-0.642
	(0.096)	(0.157)	(0.160)	(0.608)	(0.938)	(1.009)
Bachelor's degree	0.011	-0.101	0.101	1.531***	0.610	-0.464
	(0.095)	(0.154)	(0.158)	(0.582)	(0.918)	(0.992)
Master's degree	0.002	-0.159	0.040	1.251**	0.705	-0.806
	(0.099)	(0.162)	(0.166)	(0.610)	(0.952)	(1.025)
Doct./Prof. degree	0.020	-0.127	0.096	1.441**	1.147	0.122
	(0.105)	(0.173)	(0.175)	(0.691)	(1.028)	(1.110)
Living with a partner	0.030	0.010	0.082	-0.299	-0.264	-0.285
	(0.030)	(0.052)	(0.050)	(0.314)	(0.313)	(0.329)
Living with others	-0.032	0.014	-0.078	0.109	0.401	0.026
	(0.038)	(0.064)	(0.061)	(0.386)	(0.370)	(0.408)
Log of income in 2019	-0.022	0.012	-0.037	-0.105	0.313	0.371
	(0.026)	(0.045)	(0.042)	(0.244)	(0.265)	(0.292)
Employed outside	0.013	-0.166***	-0.150***	0.182	0.554	0.192
	(0.034)	(0.064)	(0.057)	(0.356)	(0.382)	(0.412)
Employed home	0.035	-0.022	-0.101**	-0.071	-0.093	-0.143
	(0.032)	(0.055)	(0.051)	(0.300)	(0.319)	(0.363)
Unemployed	0.103**	0.016	-0.112	0.558	0.362	0.297
	(0.046)	(0.079)	(0.077)	(0.491)	(0.478)	(0.523)
Observations	1,458	1,458	1,458	1,458	1,458	1,458
R²	0.037	0.036	0.043	0.050	0.045	0.057

Note: See Table A1.

Table A5. OLS regressions of NHS perceptions and donations to charities.

	NHS is crucial (1-4)	Food charity donation (0-50p)	NHS charity donation (0-50p)	Amount not donated (0-50p)
Female	0.056**	5.130***	-1.130	-3.999***
	(0.024)	(0.944)	(0.940)	(1.031)
Non-white	-0.051	-0.787	-0.408	1.195
	(0.041)	(1.422)	(1.431)	(1.684)
Age group 18-24	-0.001	-3.163	4.409**	-1.246
	(0.057)	(2.000)	(1.995)	(2.336)
Age group 25-34	-0.083**	-3.548**	3.930***	-0.382
	(0.042)	(1.574)	(1.501)	(1.782)
Age group 35-44	-0.001	-3.413**	3.203**	0.211
	(0.038)	(1.525)	(1.491)	(1.742)
Age group 55-64	-0.008	-1.591	2.041	-0.450
	(0.036)	(1.501)	(1.446)	(1.606)
Age group 65+	-0.024	0.417	-1.492	1.074
	(0.054)	(1.963)	(1.851)	(1.979)
Fewer than 5 CGSE/O-Levels	0.040	-3.044	3.730	-0.686
	(0.101)	(4.559)	(4.293)	(5.057)
5 or more CGSE/O-Levels	0.023	-1.156	-1.745	2.901
	(0.104)	(4.526)	(4.196)	(4.999)
Trade/technical/vocational training	-0.002	-2.240	2.365	-0.124
	(0.103)	(4.453)	(4.149)	(4.924)
A-Levels	0.024	1.100	-1.158	0.058
	(0.097)	(4.398)	(4.037)	(4.813)
Bachelor's degree	0.013	4.026	-3.809	-0.216
	(0.097)	(4.355)	(3.973)	(4.764)
Master's degree	0.016	2.335	-5.372	3.037
	(0.101)	(4.529)	(4.152)	(5.003)
Doctoral or Professional degree	-0.002	4.334	-4.427	0.093
	(0.107)	(4.685)	(4.363)	(5.111)
Living with a partner	0.009	1.935	0.436	-2.371
	(0.030)	(1.195)	(1.184)	(1.349)
Living with others	-0.002	-1.611	-1.268	2.879
	(0.039)	(1.577)	(1.567)	(1.664)
Log of income in 2019	-0.049	-1.576	1.637	-0.061
	(0.028)	(1.074)	(1.077)	(1.108)
Employed working outside home	-0.035	-1.192	-0.328	1.519
	(0.040)	(1.498)	(1.493)	(1.609)
Employed working from home	0.011	1.039	-0.618	-0.421
	(0.034)	(1.373)	(1.327)	(1.386)
Unemployed	-0.042	2.210	-3.467**	1.257
	(0.052)	(1.823)	(1.708)	(2.025)
Observations	1,458	1,458	1,458	1,458
R²	0.025	0.059	0.048	0.029

Note: See Table A1.

Table A6. OLS regressions of employment and job characteristics.

	Lost job COVID (0-1)	Furloughed COVID (0-1)	Healthcare Worker (0-1)	NHS Worker (0-1)	Key Worker (0-1)	Full time (0-1)	Physically closeness job (1-5)	Disease exposure job (1-5)
Female	0.036***	0.046	0.044***	0.043***	0.023	-0.196***	0.359**	0.395
	(0.013)	(0.025)	(0.017)	(0.015)	(0.028)	(0.027)	(0.140)	(0.215)
Non-white	-0.049**	-0.001	0.060**	0.038	-0.026	0.004	0.265	0.408
	(0.020)	(0.040)	(0.028)	(0.026)	(0.038)	(0.039)	(0.224)	(0.343)
Age group 18-24	0.026	0.126	-0.038	-0.024	0.016	0.052	0.680**	-0.402
	(0.037)	(0.067)	(0.036)	(0.030)	(0.067)	(0.076)	(0.282)	(0.441)
Age group 25-34	-0.018	0.038	0.018	0.040	0.016	0.183***	0.189	0.088
	(0.020)	(0.040)	(0.028)	(0.027)	(0.045)	(0.039)	(0.222)	(0.349)
Age group 35-44	0.000	-0.011	-0.007	-0.011	0.015	0.056	-0.252	-0.771**
	(0.020)	(0.039)	(0.023)	(0.022)	(0.042)	(0.040)	(0.219)	(0.323)
Age group 55-64	0.020	-0.008	0.010	-0.003	-0.070	-0.092**	0.395**	-0.227
	(0.021)	(0.038)	(0.025)	(0.022)	(0.042)	(0.045)	(0.193)	(0.330)
Age group 65+	-0.011	-0.072	-0.050**	-0.038**	-0.139**	-0.266***	-0.583	-0.979
	(0.035)	(0.046)	(0.022)	(0.019)	(0.067)	(0.084)	(0.422)	(0.603)
< 5 CGSE/O-Levels	0.048	0.211***	-0.044	-0.030	-0.011	-0.056	0.361	-0.405
	(0.053)	(0.075)	(0.038)	(0.035)	(0.167)	(0.173)	(0.523)	(1.411)
5+ CGSE/O-Levels	0.087	0.162**	-0.014	-0.008	0.069	-0.059	0.236	-0.183
	(0.052)	(0.068)	(0.038)	(0.032)	(0.163)	(0.169)	(0.508)	(1.409)
TTV training	0.109**	0.162**	0.091	0.031	0.065	-0.236	0.393	-0.239
	(0.054)	(0.066)	(0.047)	(0.039)	(0.163)	(0.169)	(0.490)	(1.386)
A-Levels	0.093	0.167***	0.062	0.030	0.123	-0.214	0.616	0.054
	(0.050)	(0.059)	(0.042)	(0.036)	(0.160)	(0.166)	(0.493)	(1.385)
Bachelor's degree	0.109**	0.094	0.076	0.064	0.105	-0.156	0.588	-0.197
	(0.050)	(0.053)	(0.039)	(0.034)	(0.159)	(0.164)	(0.495)	(1.389)
Master's degree	0.119**	0.057	0.062	0.034	0.107	-0.135	0.797	-0.359
	(0.053)	(0.058)	(0.041)	(0.036)	(0.160)	(0.166)	(0.519)	(1.377)
Doct./Prof. degree	0.094	0.011	0.126**	0.117**	0.150	-0.228	0.516	0.051
	(0.053)	(0.061)	(0.054)	(0.052)	(0.164)	(0.171)	(0.548)	(1.420)
Living w/ partner	0.022	-0.041	0.016	0.025	0.035	0.059	-0.121	-0.238
	(0.020)	(0.035)	(0.023)	(0.020)	(0.035)	(0.038)	(0.179)	(0.282)
Living w/others	-0.004	0.031	-0.009	-0.050	-0.033	-0.066	0.088	0.111
	(0.025)	(0.042)	(0.030)	(0.028)	(0.046)	(0.048)	(0.236)	(0.360)
Log of inc. 2019	0.005	0.021	0.005	0.041**	0.001	0.197***	0.166	0.408
	(0.018)	(0.030)	(0.019)	(0.017)	(0.031)	(0.036)	(0.155)	(0.251)
Employed outside	-0.036	0.228***	0.149***	0.102***	0.376***	-0.059		
	(0.029)	(0.043)	(0.023)	(0.021)	(0.033)	(0.032)		
Employed home	-0.044	0.065						
	(0.028)	(0.037)						
Unemployed	0.372***	0.054						
	(0.059)	(0.057)						
Observations	1,134	1,099	916	916	916	916	308	308
R²	0.219	0.096	0.115	0.096	0.176	0.202	0.178	0.128

Note: See Table A1.

Table A7. OLS regressions of labour market time and changes, and protective behaviours at work.

	Face covering at work (0-1)	Gloves at work (0-1)	Distance at work (0-1)	Hours of work	Hours of work Before COVID	Change in hours work	Income loss (0-1)
Female	0.027	-0.062	-0.013	-4.683***	-1.992	-2.691**	0.032
	(0.059)	(0.060)	(0.060)	(1.320)	(1.276)	(1.123)	(0.026)
Non-white	0.144	0.273***	-0.033	5.533**	3.002	2.531	0.092**
	(0.089)	(0.089)	(0.086)	(2.238)	(2.157)	(2.146)	(0.042)
Age group 18-24	0.031	-0.062	0.014	1.731	2.171	-0.440	0.026
	(0.127)	(0.120)	(0.130)	(2.480)	(2.954)	(2.806)	(0.061)
Age group 25-34	0.174	0.072	0.023	4.201	4.394**	-0.193	-0.026
	(0.089)	(0.093)	(0.095)	(2.381)	(2.084)	(1.857)	(0.045)
Age group 35-44	0.092	-0.126	0.116	1.605	3.217	-1.612	-0.073
	(0.088)	(0.088)	(0.082)	(2.377)	(2.104)	(1.983)	(0.045)
Age group 55-64	-0.057	-0.029	-0.058	-3.965	-3.081	-0.884	0.032
	(0.082)	(0.090)	(0.085)	(2.051)	(1.793)	(1.743)	(0.043)
Age group 65+	-0.205	-0.030	0.029	-3.973	-7.611***	3.638**	-0.119**
	(0.125)	(0.179)	(0.158)	(2.040)	(1.939)	(1.579)	(0.049)
< 5 CGSE/O-Levels	-0.168	-0.078	-0.028	-4.864	2.113	-6.977	0.123
	(0.297)	(0.261)	(0.288)	(3.367)	(2.955)	(3.586)	(0.106)
5+ CGSE/O-Levels	-0.237	-0.037	0.017	-1.370	2.542	-3.912	0.143
	(0.293)	(0.254)	(0.285)	(3.230)	(2.519)	(3.111)	(0.103)
TTV training	-0.387	-0.165	-0.135	-3.893	2.289	-6.182**	0.256**
	(0.284)	(0.252)	(0.279)	(3.199)	(2.497)	(2.905)	(0.102)
A-Levels	-0.349	-0.155	-0.143	-2.608	2.793	-5.401	0.161
	(0.286)	(0.251)	(0.281)	(3.028)	(2.354)	(2.893)	(0.099)
Bachelor's degree	-0.334	-0.125	-0.162	-1.462	2.227	-3.689	0.180
	(0.285)	(0.250)	(0.282)	(2.818)	(2.028)	(2.695)	(0.098)
Master's degree	-0.525	-0.171	-0.107	-0.751	4.323	-5.074	0.180
	(0.288)	(0.254)	(0.286)	(3.132)	(2.560)	(3.185)	(0.103)
Doct./Prof. degree	-0.174	-0.054	-0.039	0.194	1.284	-1.090	0.062
	(0.307)	(0.275)	(0.292)	(3.764)	(3.081)	(3.043)	(0.109)
Living w/ partner	-0.026	-0.030	0.058	1.137	-1.240	2.376	0.062
	(0.075)	(0.077)	(0.075)	(1.719)	(1.798)	(1.445)	(0.034)
Living w/others	0.148	0.138	-0.127	-1.215	1.209	-2.424	0.034
	(0.096)	(0.092)	(0.092)	(2.124)	(2.063)	(1.748)	(0.042)
Log of inc. 2019	0.154**	0.133	-0.108	2.753**	5.468***	-2.715**	-0.029
	(0.067)	(0.068)	(0.068)	(1.307)	(1.247)	(1.162)	(0.029)
Employed outside				25.024***	28.677***	-3.653**	0.236***
				(2.112)	(1.971)	(1.629)	(0.041)
Employed home				27.724***	28.686***	-0.962	0.168***
				(1.411)	(1.548)	(1.317)	(0.037)
Unemployed				-2.830**	8.747***	-11.577***	0.215***
				(1.409)	(2.917)	(2.640)	(0.052)
Observations	308	308	308	1,458	1,458	1,458	1,458
R²	0.154	0.121	0.078	0.313	0.349	0.054	0.083

Note: See Table A1.

Table A8. OLS regressions of non-labour market time and changes.

	Hours childcare	Hours childcare before COVID	Change in hours childcare	Hours housework	Hours housework before COVID	Change in hours housework	Hours caring	Hours caring before COVID	Change in hours caring
Female	8.320***	4.451***	3.869***	8.712***	5.919***	2.793***	0.422	0.473	-0.052
	(1.464)	(1.077)	(1.010)	(1.473)	(1.147)	(0.961)	(0.740)	(0.666)	(0.320)
Non-white	2.739	1.803	0.936	7.891***	7.277***	0.614	0.406	0.936	-0.530
	(2.803)	(1.992)	(2.024)	(2.659)	(2.237)	(1.543)	(1.007)	(0.765)	(0.713)
18-24	-7.031***	-3.996	-3.036**	-2.539	-2.851	0.312	-2.002	-3.298**	1.296
	(2.685)	(2.415)	(1.505)	(3.194)	(2.392)	(2.114)	(1.684)	(1.374)	(0.740)
25-34	6.516**	4.937**	1.579	4.046	1.145	2.901	-2.423**	-1.750	-0.673
	(3.028)	(2.341)	(1.719)	(2.642)	(1.956)	(1.856)	(0.976)	(0.923)	(0.441)
35-44	14.496***	7.079***	7.417***	0.178	0.101	0.077	0.800	-0.110	0.910
	(3.026)	(2.104)	(2.136)	(2.250)	(1.754)	(1.579)	(1.424)	(1.201)	(0.666)
55-64	-9.272***	-5.916***	-3.356***	-0.673	-0.438	-0.235	1.154	0.751	0.402
	(1.972)	(1.530)	(1.040)	(2.289)	(1.717)	(1.553)	(1.378)	(1.225)	(0.578)
65+	-12.685***	-7.333***	-5.351***	-2.264	0.825	-3.089	-3.112**	-3.339***	0.228
	(2.331)	(1.913)	(1.181)	(2.816)	(2.392)	(1.689)	(1.335)	(1.216)	(0.546)
< 5 CGSE	-2.493	-3.082	0.588	3.299	-0.373	3.672	3.610	3.832**	-0.222
	(5.821)	(4.362)	(2.766)	(7.176)	(7.794)	(2.972)	(1.861)	(1.923)	(0.695)
5+ CGSE	-3.582	0.590	-4.172	0.023	-2.758	2.781	4.720***	5.296***	-0.576
	(5.578)	(4.668)	(2.678)	(6.806)	(7.676)	(2.585)	(1.803)	(1.901)	(0.665)
TTV training	0.700	-0.849	1.549	1.654	-2.752	4.405	3.983**	3.646**	0.337
	(5.631)	(4.387)	(2.559)	(6.847)	(7.731)	(2.286)	(1.886)	(1.558)	(0.764)
A-Levels	0.396	-0.544	0.940	-0.548	-4.180	3.632	2.170	1.992	0.179
	(5.533)	(4.351)	(2.446)	(6.623)	(7.516)	(2.165)	(1.243)	(1.149)	(0.393)
Bachelor's deg.	-3.258	-2.681	-0.576	-6.235	-7.769	1.534	3.259***	2.352**	0.907**
	(5.258)	(4.145)	(2.201)	(6.405)	(7.420)	(1.855)	(1.169)	(1.035)	(0.451)
Master's deg.	-6.294	-4.934	-1.359	-10.163	-10.685	0.523	1.794	1.507	0.287
	(5.564)	(4.295)	(2.401)	(6.607)	(7.580)	(1.923)	(1.085)	(1.019)	(0.392)
Doct./Prof. deg.	-4.822	-2.406	-2.416	-14.504**	-12.614	-1.890	3.554	3.727**	-0.172
	(5.924)	(4.652)	(2.748)	(6.450)	(7.466)	(1.900)	(2.076)	(1.728)	(0.892)
Living w/ partner	5.771***	2.937	2.833	2.555	2.747	-0.192	-0.846	-1.155	0.309
	(2.010)	(1.707)	(1.492)	(1.848)	(1.431)	(1.226)	(1.095)	(1.081)	(0.402)
Living w/others	3.490	3.042**	0.449	3.673	2.011	1.662	3.089***	2.910***	0.179
	(1.793)	(1.427)	(1.354)	(2.240)	(1.638)	(1.452)	(0.976)	(0.949)	(0.411)
Log of inc. 2019	-0.435	-1.485	1.050	-1.387	-2.127	0.740	-0.109	-0.143	0.034
	(1.697)	(1.177)	(1.088)	(1.694)	(1.320)	(1.159)	(0.867)	(0.748)	(0.385)
Employed outside	-5.783**	-4.165	-1.618	-3.873	-7.431***	3.557**	-2.420	-3.067**	0.647
	(2.757)	(2.328)	(1.452)	(2.566)	(1.914)	(1.762)	(1.644)	(1.398)	(0.697)
Employed home	-5.833**	-6.840***	1.006	-8.599***	-9.101***	0.502	-4.362***	-4.192***	-0.170
	(2.502)	(1.993)	(1.379)	(2.108)	(1.774)	(1.316)	(1.384)	(1.190)	(0.596)
Unemployed	-3.026	-2.828	-0.198	5.305	0.102	5.203**	-3.399**	-3.780***	0.381
	(3.243)	(2.679)	(1.759)	(3.539)	(2.868)	(2.307)	(1.525)	(1.245)	(0.694)
Observations	1,458	1,458	1,458	1,458	1,458	1,458	1,458	1,458	1,458
R²	0.134	0.088	0.081	0.104	0.110	0.044	0.043	0.054	0.025

Note: See Table A1.

Table A9. OLS regressions of protective behaviours.

	Hand sanitiser (0-1)	Face masks (0-1)	Gloves (0-1)	Socialising outdoors (0-1)	Meeting ≥ 7 people (0-1)
Female	0.084***	-0.070***	-0.016	0.070**	0.008
	(0.019)	(0.026)	(0.026)	(0.028)	(0.013)
Non-white	0.040	0.143***	0.151***	-0.175***	0.044
	(0.028)	(0.037)	(0.038)	(0.050)	(0.031)
Age group 18-24	0.042	-0.055	-0.009	-0.124	-0.019
	(0.041)	(0.057)	(0.060)	(0.065)	(0.031)
Age group 25-34	0.003	-0.098**	-0.012	-0.240***	-0.015
	(0.034)	(0.044)	(0.045)	(0.047)	(0.024)
Age group 35-44	0.047	-0.043	0.014	-0.106**	-0.015
	(0.031)	(0.043)	(0.044)	(0.046)	(0.025)
Age group 55-64	0.017	-0.032	0.107***	-0.058	-0.012
	(0.031)	(0.042)	(0.041)	(0.044)	(0.022)
Age group 65+	0.007	0.049	0.069	-0.110**	-0.009
	(0.038)	(0.050)	(0.050)	(0.056)	(0.025)
Fewer than 5 CGSE/O-Levels	0.089	-0.112	-0.169	-0.169	0.020
	(0.112)	(0.097)	(0.113)	(0.124)	(0.025)
5 or more CGSE/O-Levels	0.188	-0.130	-0.072	-0.090	0.029
	(0.106)	(0.095)	(0.110)	(0.120)	(0.021)
Trade/technical/vocational training	0.129	-0.140	-0.048	-0.028	0.025
	(0.108)	(0.093)	(0.108)	(0.117)	(0.019)
A-Levels	0.176	-0.113	-0.124	-0.064	0.040
	(0.104)	(0.090)	(0.105)	(0.115)	(0.021)
Bachelor's degree	0.129	-0.178**	-0.176	-0.033	0.052***
	(0.104)	(0.087)	(0.104)	(0.112)	(0.018)
Master's degree	0.110	-0.174	-0.156	0.056	0.035
	(0.106)	(0.092)	(0.108)	(0.116)	(0.023)
Doctoral or Professional degree	0.113	-0.177	-0.148	0.115	0.016
	(0.110)	(0.100)	(0.114)	(0.121)	(0.025)
Living with a partner	0.037	-0.025	0.033	0.080**	0.013
	(0.025)	(0.034)	(0.034)	(0.039)	(0.016)
Living with others	0.093***	0.076	0.131***	0.018	0.031**
	(0.034)	(0.043)	(0.043)	(0.051)	(0.013)
Log of income in 2019	-0.001	0.030	-0.030	-0.017	0.021
	(0.022)	(0.029)	(0.029)	(0.032)	(0.017)
Employed working outside home	0.029	0.020	-0.068	-0.030	0.015
	(0.027)	(0.041)	(0.038)	(0.045)	(0.022)
Employed working from home	-0.005	-0.031	-0.098***	-0.001	-0.005
	(0.026)	(0.037)	(0.035)	(0.038)	(0.019)
Unemployed	-0.068	-0.048	-0.151***	-0.049	0.027
	(0.042)	(0.053)	(0.053)	(0.062)	(0.029)
Observations	1,458	1,458	1,458	931	931
R²	0.059	0.054	0.067	0.108	0.029

Note: See Table A1.

Table A10. OLS regressions of behaviours when going out.

	Face covering (0-1)	Gloves (0-1)	Distance (0-1)	Wash hands (0-1)
Female	0.011	-0.018	0.006	0.043***
	(0.025)	(0.021)	(0.011)	(0.014)
Non-white	0.153***	0.142***	0.010	0.064***
	(0.040)	(0.036)	(0.018)	(0.015)
Age group 18-24	0.005	-0.085**	0.004	0.019
	(0.055)	(0.042)	(0.030)	(0.031)
Age group 25-34	-0.048	-0.045	0.004	-0.005
	(0.043)	(0.035)	(0.023)	(0.025)
Age group 35-44	-0.000	-0.025	0.041**	-0.005
	(0.043)	(0.035)	(0.018)	(0.024)
Age group 55-64	0.020	0.020	0.023	0.017
	(0.040)	(0.034)	(0.020)	(0.022)
Age group 65+	0.013	0.032	-0.005	0.018
	(0.051)	(0.042)	(0.025)	(0.025)
Fewer than 5 CGSE/O-Levels	-0.129	0.073	-0.040	-0.023
	(0.127)	(0.093)	(0.025)	(0.029)
5 or more CGSE/O-Levels	-0.150	0.095	-0.058**	-0.033
	(0.123)	(0.090)	(0.025)	(0.026)
Trade/technical/vocational training	-0.203	0.044	-0.081***	-0.060**
	(0.122)	(0.089)	(0.025)	(0.027)
A-Levels	-0.145	0.088	-0.064***	-0.075***
	(0.120)	(0.087)	(0.020)	(0.023)
Bachelor's degree	-0.142	0.053	-0.041***	-0.062***
	(0.118)	(0.085)	(0.016)	(0.020)
Master's degree	-0.142	0.025	-0.048**	-0.065**
	(0.123)	(0.089)	(0.021)	(0.026)
Doctoral or Professional degree	-0.090	0.144	-0.028	-0.028
	(0.127)	(0.097)	(0.022)	(0.025)
Living with a partner	0.023	0.006	0.012	0.025
	(0.032)	(0.026)	(0.017)	(0.019)
Living with others	0.090**	0.025	0.011	-0.008
	(0.041)	(0.034)	(0.022)	(0.024)
Log of income in 2019	-0.011	-0.011	0.001	-0.010
	(0.028)	(0.023)	(0.014)	(0.016)
Employed working outside home	-0.036	0.022	-0.026	-0.017
	(0.039)	(0.032)	(0.019)	(0.022)
Employed working from home	0.008	-0.010	-0.012	0.004
	(0.035)	(0.029)	(0.015)	(0.019)
Unemployed	-0.031	-0.017	-0.073**	-0.041
	(0.050)	(0.041)	(0.030)	(0.030)
Observations	1,458	1,458	1,458	1,458
R²	0.078	0.042	0.027	0.029

Note: See Table A1.

Table A11. OLS regressions of the views on the effectiveness of masks.

	Masks effective not getting (1-4)	Masks effective not spreading (1-4)	Mask everybody, everybody protected (1-4)	UK Gov't encourages masks enclosed (1-4)	People wear masks enclosed (1-4)
Female	-0.031	-0.009	0.102**	0.114***	0.021
	(0.046)	(0.036)	(0.048)	(0.044)	(0.048)
Non-white	0.422***	0.088	0.336***	0.175**	0.147
	(0.076)	(0.061)	(0.081)	(0.069)	(0.078)
Age group 18-24	0.236**	0.157**	0.179	0.109	-0.078
	(0.101)	(0.079)	(0.106)	(0.096)	(0.101)
Age group 25-34	0.196**	-0.010	0.002	0.077	0.059
	(0.080)	(0.065)	(0.082)	(0.076)	(0.080)
Age group 35-44	0.117	0.014	-0.031	-0.036	-0.040
	(0.080)	(0.062)	(0.084)	(0.078)	(0.081)
Age group 55-64	0.076	-0.028	0.075	0.122	-0.026
	(0.076)	(0.061)	(0.079)	(0.072)	(0.077)
Age group 65+	0.086	-0.042	0.080	0.087	0.045
	(0.094)	(0.073)	(0.095)	(0.087)	(0.095)
Fewer than 5 CGSE/O-Levels	-0.085	0.023	-0.008	-0.136	0.255
	(0.214)	(0.135)	(0.210)	(0.195)	(0.217)
5 or more CGSE/O-Levels	-0.185	-0.020	-0.066	-0.178	0.178
	(0.207)	(0.127)	(0.202)	(0.185)	(0.212)
Trade/technical/vocational training	-0.226	-0.113	-0.133	-0.195	0.125
	(0.205)	(0.128)	(0.198)	(0.185)	(0.211)
A-Levels	-0.408**	-0.077	-0.190	-0.208	0.040
	(0.200)	(0.122)	(0.193)	(0.181)	(0.206)
Bachelor's degree	-0.452**	-0.054	-0.198	-0.237	-0.081
	(0.197)	(0.118)	(0.190)	(0.179)	(0.204)
Master's degree	-0.422**	-0.075	-0.238	-0.233	-0.152
	(0.207)	(0.126)	(0.199)	(0.185)	(0.213)
Doctoral or Professional degree	-0.438**	-0.062	-0.081	-0.249	-0.114
	(0.215)	(0.138)	(0.215)	(0.201)	(0.224)
Living with a partner	0.019	0.059	0.233***	0.031	0.055
	(0.060)	(0.048)	(0.060)	(0.057)	(0.059)
Living with others	0.069	0.048	-0.037	0.124	0.127
	(0.080)	(0.062)	(0.078)	(0.072)	(0.079)
Log of income in 2019	-0.017	-0.009	-0.045	0.020	0.004
	(0.054)	(0.041)	(0.055)	(0.050)	(0.054)
Employed working outside home	0.002	-0.098	-0.043	-0.019	0.036
	(0.072)	(0.057)	(0.077)	(0.067)	(0.071)
Employed working from home	0.093	0.020	0.021	-0.072	-0.037
	(0.066)	(0.049)	(0.068)	(0.059)	(0.067)
Unemployed	-0.009	-0.156**	-0.197**	-0.047	-0.009
	(0.095)	(0.075)	(0.096)	(0.085)	(0.091)
Observations	1,458	1,458	1,458	1,458	1,458
R^2	0.063	0.025	0.046	0.036	0.038

Note: See Table A1.