The COVID-19 pandemic of 2020–2021 has impacted all Utahns in profound ways. Yet, a host of national and global reports have argued that women’s employment and careers have been disproportionately impacted during this time. For example, a McKinsey & Company and Lean In report stated that women are more likely to have been laid off or furloughed, leading to greater financial instability and stalled careers. The Institute for Women’s Policy Research reported that women, and particularly women of color, have unduly experienced job losses and have had greater struggles with managing paid work, caregiving responsibilities, and other types of unpaid work obligations. And the United Nations asserted that the COVID-19 pandemic has deepened pre-existing inequalities across every sphere, including a global economy.

Although the experiences of Utah women tend to be similar in many ways to those of women across the United States, the Utah Women & Leadership Project (UWLP) has found in past research that women in the state do experience at least some challenges differently. To better understand Utah women’s experiences specifically, UWLP researchers conducted an extensive, in-depth survey focusing on the impacts of COVID-19 on women and work. The survey was opened for data collection in January 2021 to all Utah women aged 20 or older who were either currently employed or who were unemployed due to the pandemic. The aim was to understand more clearly the experiences of Utah women as they have navigated paid work during the pandemic. This comprehensive study included the collection of data on a wide variety of topic areas and included both quantitative and open-ended questions to capture participants’ perceptions and experiences. This brief is the first in a series of related reports that will be released in upcoming months. Based on a review of the literature, to date we believe this study is the nation’s largest and most comprehensive statewide study.

This research and policy brief will highlight the results of the survey related to the following:

1) Changes in employment status and reasons for the changes from March 2020 (pre-pandemic impact) to January 2021;
2) Changes in work situations and related impacts on emotional wellbeing;
3) Different experiences for entrepreneurs versus other women in the workforce;
4) Types of special support offered by employers during the pandemic;
5) Food, housing, and financial uncertainty among working women; and
6) Additional findings related to mental health, domestic violence, and the benefits of further training or education.

Study Background

An online survey instrument was administered to a non-probability sample of Utah women representing different settings, backgrounds, and situations (i.e., age, education, race/ethnicity, marital status, socioeconomic, county/region, job type, sector/industry, hours worked per week, employment status, and workplace situation). A call for participants was announced through the UWLP monthly newsletter, social media platforms, and website. In addition, research team members worked closely with nonprofit organizations, chambers of commerce, government agencies, municipalities and counties, women’s networks and associations, multicultural groups, businesses, universities, churches, and volunteers who all assisted in disseminating the survey to their employees and contacts. Additionally, targeted recruitment efforts were made throughout the state to improve representation from women of different demographics and geography, including providing the survey in both English and Spanish (see additional design information in the endnotes).

Overall, 3,542 Utah women completed the survey. The demographics for survey respondents are summarized in Table 1. We note that the question about the number of children living at home was added to the survey in the middle of data collection, so the demographics listed for that question apply to the 1,300 women who responded after the question was inserted. All other questions were included prior to opening the survey in January. It is also important to note that this sample is not representative of the state in several respects. For example, when compared to overall state demographics, this study under sampled women of color, women with less formal education, women in lower income ranges, and women from certain industries.

Table 1: Participant Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age: 20–29</td>
<td>(18.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age: 30–39</td>
<td>(29.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age: 40–49</td>
<td>(27.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age: 50–59</td>
<td>(17.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age: 60–69</td>
<td>(6.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age: 70+</td>
<td>(0.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status: married</td>
<td>(68.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status: separated/divorced</td>
<td>(8.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status: single</td>
<td>(16.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status: widowed</td>
<td>(1.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status: domestic partner</td>
<td>(5.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education: high school</td>
<td>(3.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education: some college</td>
<td>(15.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education: associate degree</td>
<td>(6.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education: bachelor’s degree</td>
<td>(35.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education: graduate degree</td>
<td>(39.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity: White</td>
<td>(90.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity: Hispanic/Latina</td>
<td>(6.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity: Asian</td>
<td>(2.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity: Pacific Islander</td>
<td>(1.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity: Black</td>
<td>(1.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity: American Indian</td>
<td>(1.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity: Other</td>
<td>(0.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Children Living at Home: none</td>
<td>(60.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Children Living at Home: 1</td>
<td>(0.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Children Living at Home: 2</td>
<td>(2.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Children Living at Home: 3</td>
<td>(17.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Children Living at Home: 4</td>
<td>(6.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Children Living at Home: 5</td>
<td>(5.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Children Living at Home: 6</td>
<td>(3.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Children Living at Home: 7+</td>
<td>(4.2%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COVID-19 impacted working women in Utah in a variety of ways. Approximately 15.9% of overall respondents had some sort of workplace withdrawal during the pandemic, including 2.4% leaving the workforce completely without returning, 2.8% taking a leave of absence, 4.9% moving from full-time to part-time work, 4.4% switching to less demanding jobs, and 1.4% moving from employee to independent contractor. Conversely, 12.2% took on additional responsibility, with 4.5% moving from part-time to full-time, and 7.7% taking on additional jobs.

Overall, 648 study participants indicated that they left the workforce during the pandemic (between March 2020 and January 2021), with many of those indicating that they were currently employed again when they took the survey in January 2021. The reasons why each of these women left the workforce are summarized in the first column of Appendix A, with a few findings highlighted here:

- **Furloughs:** 4.4 out of 10 women employees who left the workforce did so because their employer was financially impacted by pandemic restrictions resulting in business hardship or closure.
- **Care Work:** 1.4 out of 10 women employees who left the workforce did so to care for other people (children, elderly, or disabled).
- **COVID-19 Concerns:** 0.6 out of 10 women employees who left the workforce did so because they were sick with COVID-19 or they were afraid of contracting or spreading the virus.

Compared regionally, Northern Utah had a greater percentage (25.4%) versus the average of other counties (13.2%) of women who indicated that they left the workforce because they were sick or afraid of getting sick. Davis County had a greater percentage (45.3%) versus the average of other counties (39.3%) who indicated they left because their employer was impacted or closed due to pandemic restrictions. Percentages for other reasons were more comparable across counties or regions (see Appendix A for more details).

For those who said they were no longer working for pay during the pandemic, women between the ages of 60–69 commonly attributed their reason for leaving to either being sick with COVID-19 or being concerned about contracting or spreading it. Interestingly, 40–49-year-old women were second in this category, an age range where it would be common to have school-aged children in the home. Many women between the ages of 30–39 (25.3%) and 40–49 (21.2%) who left the workforce said they were not working for pay because they were caring for children not in school or daycare because of the pandemic. A significant percentage (between 23.1% and 42.9%) of women in all age categories who had left the workforce reported they were unemployed at some point during the pandemic because of employer adjustments. See Appendix B for additional age-range findings.

### Changes in Employment

**COVID-19 Concerns:** 0.6 out of 10 women employees who left the workforce did so because they were sick with COVID-19 or they were afraid of contracting or spreading it.

- **Care Work:** 1.4 out of 10 women employees who left the workforce did so to care for other people (children, elderly, or disabled).
- **COVID-19 Concerns:** 0.6 out of 10 women employees who left the workforce did so because they were sick with COVID-19 or they were afraid of contracting or spreading the virus.

Compared regionally, Northern Utah had a greater percentage (25.4%) versus the average of other counties (13.2%) of women who indicated that they left the workforce because they were sick or afraid of getting sick. Davis County had a greater percentage (45.3%) versus the average of other counties (39.3%) who indicated they left because their employer was impacted or closed due to pandemic restrictions. Percentages for other reasons were more comparable across counties or regions (see Appendix A for more details).

For those who said they were no longer working for pay during the pandemic, women between the ages of 60–69 commonly attributed their reason for leaving to either being sick with COVID-19 or being concerned about contracting or spreading it. Interestingly, 40–49-year-old women were second in this category, an age range where it would be common to have school-aged children in the home. Many women between the ages of 30–39 (25.3%) and 40–49 (21.2%) who left the workforce said they were not working for pay because they were caring for children not in school or daycare because of the pandemic. A significant percentage (between 23.1% and 42.9%) of women in all age categories who had left the workforce reported they were unemployed at some point during the pandemic because of employer adjustments. See Appendix B for additional age-range findings.

### Income, Work Hour Changes, and Emotions

Participants were asked to share the industry in which they worked, their household income in 2019 and in 2020, the approximate number of hours they worked for pay before the pandemic, and their level of agreement regarding concern about money, their experiencing of increased burnout, and their levels of hope. Since a decrease in pay and an increase in work hours could lead to more mental and emotional stress, these data were summarized together. Table 2 provides the associated statistics.

First, household income levels were measured in categories as described in Table 1. Income loss, between 2019 and 2020, was determined by comparing 2019- and 2020-income levels and then cross-tabulating to determine differences by industry (Table 2) and county (Table 3). The resulting percentages of women who experienced a decrease by industry are listed in the first data column in Table 2. Second, the categorical answers for number of hours worked (see Table 1 for categories) was compared for 2019 and 2020 to determine which individuals worked a higher number of hours in 2020 versus 2019. The resulting percentages of women who experienced that increase are listed by industry in the second data column in Table 2. And third, the numbers in the last three columns (burnout, hope, and money concern) relate to emotions impacts of the pandemic and are statistical means, with 1 being “strongly disagree,” 4 being “neutral,” and 7 being “strongly agree” on the survey scales.

On average, at least in this sample, a large percentage of women working in food services had decreases in income but worked an increased number of hours (see Table 2). A large percentage of women in both manufacturing and hospitality/tourism also had decreases in income but an increase in the...
number of hours worked, though the increase was not as large as that for food services. In contrast, those working in construction, trade/utilities/transportation, and community/non-profit organizations saw the smallest percentage of workers who experienced decreases in income (5.1%, 6.1%, and 8.7%), but they had a larger percentage of women who experienced an increase in working hours (13.6%, 13.5%, and 15.5%). For community/nonprofit organizations and some businesses, this decrease could have been related to the influx of 2020 CARES Act funding.

Table 2. Income, Hour Changes, Burnout, Hope, and Money Concerns by Industry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>% Had Income Decrease</th>
<th>% Had Hours Increase</th>
<th>Mean of 7-Point Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Burn-out Hope Money Concern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>5.5 5.0 3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Services</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td>6.0 4.1 5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitality &amp; Tourism</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>5.2 4.8 4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>5.6 4.7 4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthcare &amp; Medical</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
<td>5.5 4.9 3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Business</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>5.5 5.1 3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>5.6 4.9 3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Govt./Public Admin.</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>5.5 5.0 3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Technology</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>5.4 5.1 3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
<td>5.1 4.9 3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-profit/Community</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>5.7 4.8 3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade, Transport, Utilities</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>5.1 5.1 3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>5.4 4.9 3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>5.5 4.9 3.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In terms of the emotions that could result from decreased income and increased work hours, the respondents indicated feeling burnout at levels that were greater than the levels of hope across industries, except for Trade, Transport, and Utilities, where they are equal. Utah women as a whole reported “some” hope for the future. In response to the question, “I am regularly worried about money,” most women responded with “neutral,” or they slightly disagreed. There is a wide standard deviation, which means that most responses were between 2.5 and 4.7 on the 7-point scale.

Data on income and work-hour changes by geographic region are found in Table 3. The counties with the greatest percentage of women experiencing income loss during the pandemic were Utah and Salt Lake, while the areas that saw the lowest percentages of women experiencing a decrease in income included Tooele and the grouping of Kane, Iron, Beaver, and Garfield counties. The average levels of agreement regarding burnout ranged from 5.1 to 5.7 across all counties. Washington County participants responded in less agreement regarding increased burnout than other counties or regions, with Salt Lake and Tooele participants responding with the highest agreement levels.

Table 3. Income, Hour Changes, Burnout, Hope, and Money Concerns by Location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>% Had Income Decrease</th>
<th>% Had Hours Increase</th>
<th>Mean of 7-Point Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Burn-out Hope Money Concern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>5.4 4.9 3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt Lake</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>5.7 4.8 3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Box Elder, Cache, Rich</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>5.6 4.8 3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juab, Millard, Piute, Sanpete, Sevier, Wayne</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>5.1 5.1 4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbon, Emery, Grand, San Juan</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>5.6 4.7 4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weber</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>5.5 4.9 3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis, Morgan</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>5.3 4.9 3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>5.0 5.1 3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summit, Wasatch</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>5.5 5.1 3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daggett, Duchesne, Uintah</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>5.3 5.1 3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kane, Iron, Beaver, Garfield</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>5.6 5.0 4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tooele</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>5.7 4.8 4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>5.5 4.9 3.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall, the lower concern levels about money could be attributed to the fact that, by January 2021, most women had regained employment (if lost), felt supported from the CARES Act or other types of resources, or did not feel as impacted because of the strong Utah economy.

The financial worries of Utah women by race/ethnicity and income level were also examined, finding the following levels of agreement on the 7-point scale previously outlined: American Indian (3.4), Asian (4.2), Black (3.9), Hispanic (3.9), Pacific Islander (4.5), and White (3.6). Overall, White women reported less financial worry than women of color. However, a strong but expected finding was the difference in women’s levels of agreement about worry when examined by household income level. Essentially, there is a general trend of more cases of financial worry at lower levels of income. For example, the statistical mean for Hispanic women in households making less than $25,000 annually was 6.8, with other race and ethnic groups as follows: Asian (6.6), American Indian (6.5), and Pacific Islander (6.0). No Black women who participated in the survey reported having household income in that category. On the 7-point agreement scale, Asian and Pacific Islander women reported the highest worry levels at
6.0 in the $25,000–$35,000 category as well, with White women substantially lower (5.0) in that same category.

Impact on Women-Owned Businesses

There were 85 respondents who indicated, “I have my own business/freelanced and I employ other people,” and another 109 who indicated, “I have my own business/freelance, but I do not employ other people.” We classified these 194 women as entrepreneurs. Entrepreneurs might have a different level of potential risks and rewards compared with those working for an employer. Comparing entrepreneurs to company employees reveals differences among a variety of financial and emotional stressors, as shown in Table 4 (1=strongly disagree, 4=neutral, 7=strongly agree).

Table 4. Mean Scores of Entrepreneurs vs. Company Employees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Employ Self</th>
<th>Employ Others</th>
<th>Work for Company</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regularly worried about money</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expect income loss in next 3 months</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More burned out than before pandemic</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhausted from more home responsibilities</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Struggling more to balance work-life</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are lots of ways around any problem that I am facing now.</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If in a jam could think of ways to get out</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Believe they will be financially stable after pandemic is over.</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As a group, women entrepreneurs on average were slightly above neutral on the statement, “I am regularly worried about money,” whereas the larger sized group of women who are employed by others slightly disagreed with the statement. Women who work at companies (not entrepreneurs) disagreed with the statement (2.0 on the 7-point scale) that they are likely to lose employment income in the next three months, whereas women entrepreneurs on average were closer to neutral (3.1). Burnout, exhaustion, and struggles with work-life balance are all problems—and near equivalent—across the three groups, with burnout being the most prominent among these concerns.

Pandemic-Specific Support by Employers

Another important element of understanding Utah women’s perceptions and experiences during the pandemic was to study what policies and practices organizations implemented to provide support to their employees. Table 5 outlines what percent of organizations provided various types of support to Utah employees. For additional information, research on this topic was published recently in a UWLP research and policy brief entitled “Flexible and Family-Friendly Policies at Utah’s “Best Places to Work.”

Table 5. Organizational Support During the Pandemic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Support Given</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increased flexibility in work location</td>
<td>54.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased flexibility in working hours</td>
<td>41.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free mental health counseling</td>
<td>27.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased paid sick leave</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal well-being and enrichment program</td>
<td>18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health checks and healthcare services</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased paid family leave</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased paid time off</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job training and re-skilling</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changed performance review process</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased unpaid time off/job protection</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased unpaid sick leave</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stipends to offset costs of working from home</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased unpaid family leave</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parenting and homeschooling resources</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional childcare support or resources</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional caregiver support or resources</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency loan grants</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bereavement counseling</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The flexible work location and flexible hours are important workplace accommodations. Approximately 95.0% of respondents indicated they were working prior to March 2020, and, of that group, approximately one-third indicated they had to adjust their schedule of activities because children in their household had to attend school online from home during 2020.

Food, Housing, and Money Uncertainty

There are many other worries that impact working women, including concerns around food, housing, and uncertainty about money. It is important to note that although we attempted to recruit participants of all income levels, the Utah women who are in the direst need of assistance most likely did not take part in this study. As to the financial impact of the pandemic on women who took the survey and their families (see Table 1 for a reminder of participant demographics), we found the following:

- 4.3 out of 10 women indicated they have been regularly worried about money.
• 1.6 out of 10 women have been worried about having enough food for themselves and their families.
• 1.6 out of 10 women have been worried about having appropriate housing for themselves and their families.

Looking at all the responses on the three types of worry across all levels of household income, the numbers indicate that worry about money, food, and housing do not always go hand in hand. For example, 13.7% were worried about money and food, 27.9% were worried about money but not food, and 2.5% worried about food but not money. Looking at the possible combination of worry related to food and housing, 9.1% were worried about both food and housing, 6.3% were worried about food but not housing, and 6.5% were worried about housing but not food.

Again, as expected, when examining the three sources of worry across income groups, it is apparent that a much larger percentage of women with lower household income are more worried about money, food, and housing than those with larger household income. However, this does not mean that there is no worry within higher income groups. There were still women in higher income groups that have been worried about money, food, and/or housing during the pandemic (see Table 6). Perhaps this reflects a trend that individuals with higher incomes have proportionately higher debt (e.g., mortgages, vehicles). Future research to examine if that is the case is needed.

Table 6. Money, Food, and Housing Worries by Income Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household Income</th>
<th>Money Worry</th>
<th>Food Worry</th>
<th>Housing Worry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than $25K</td>
<td>80.1%</td>
<td>45.6%</td>
<td>53.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25K to $34.9K</td>
<td>70.1%</td>
<td>35.2%</td>
<td>38.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$35K to $49.9K</td>
<td>62.7%</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50K to $74.9K</td>
<td>55.4%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$75K to $99.9K</td>
<td>43.9%</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100K to $149.9K</td>
<td>30.9%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$150K to $199.9K</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$200K or more</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Surveyed</td>
<td>42.7%</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mental Health, Violence, and Education

The survey also gathered data on work location (home, on-site, or a mix) and three more areas of focus that will be addressed in this final section: mental health, domestic violence, and beliefs about the value of pursuing additional certifications or further education. First, women who now work from home because of the pandemic or work both from home and their place of work (a mix) more strongly agree (1=strongly disagree, 4=neutral, 7=strongly agree) that their mental health has declined versus women who continued to work at an on-site location. However, the more burned out now versus before the pandemic is high across all locations, including those who work on-site. Overall, there is stronger agreement with increased burnout than exhaustion because of additional responsibilities at home. It is important to note that the exhaustion question refers specifically to “I am exhausted because of my additional responsibilities at home.” It does not capture exhaustion from existing responsibilities at home or responsibilities from other commitments such as work. Thus, the additional burnout (higher scores than exhaustion) is likely coming from other sources as well (this will be explored in upcoming briefs).

Table 7. Work Relocation to Home and Health Effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Location</th>
<th>Mental Health Decline</th>
<th>More Burned Out</th>
<th>More Exhausted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>On-site</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At home (both before and now)</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Now at home</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Now mix (home and on-site)</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Surveyed</strong></td>
<td><strong>5.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>5.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>4.4</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Second, in terms of increased violence in the home, 262 (9.2%) out of the 2861 of survey participants who answered the question about domestic violence agreed at some level with this statement: “I am concerned about the onset of or increase in violence in my home since the pandemic began.” We found that the percentages are consistent across all levels of education and that the percentage is slightly higher among Hispanic and Latino women (11.4%, 21 of 183 indicated concern) versus White women (8.7%, 228 of 2621 indicated concern).

And finally, there were differences in respondents’ beliefs about the value of pursuing additional certifications or further education in the near future. Four in 10 women working in frontline positions (e.g., care provider, administrative assistant, janitor, driver, food server, trade worker, IT specialist) agreed that the pandemic had shown them they need further education (2 in 10 were neutral and 4 in 10 disagreed). Women team leads and supervisors shared views more closely aligned with those of women frontline workers. Two in 10 women working in executive positions agreed that they needed further education or training (1 in 10 were neutral and 7 in 10 disagreed). And professionals (e.g., attorney, consultant, CPA, financial advisor) shared views more closely aligned with executives. This may be attributable to the fact that women in professional, managerial, and leadership roles are more likely to have already obtained additional training and education. Overall, as their position in organizations rises, the percentage of women who believe they need further education decreases.

Conclusion

Overall, the data show that women in Utah have seen many changes as a result of COVID-19. Burnout levels were similar across many of the demographics (e.g., ethnicity, income, job industry, region), an indication that COVID has been dif-
difficult for most. Women in industries such as manufacturing, food services, hospitality, and sales have experienced some of the largest percentages of negative impacts to income and increases in hours worked. Entrepreneurs are especially concerned about negative outcomes of the pandemic (e.g., worry about finances and loss of income in the next three months), and women with lower household income tend to have more concerns about finances, food, and housing—but there are still groups experiencing concern across all income levels. Women working from home reported slightly greater agreement that they are experiencing mental decline, burnout, and exhaustion from additional responsibilities in the home than those working at their employers’ worksite. Again, more data are yet to emerge, as this brief is the first in a series of reports that will be released in upcoming months on a host of different topics.

Clearly, the COVID-19 pandemic has had a profound impact on women at work, the effects of which may be felt for years to come. Yet there are many interventions that can happen now to mitigate these negative outcomes. First, the responses shown in Table 5 indicate there is significant room for improvement in the support organizations offer their employees. For example, flexible work arrangements, leave policies, and childcare support could be especially useful to many employees experiencing increased family responsibilities. The need for these policies did not start with the pandemic but has heightened these needs. Research shows that offering family-friendly policies has a positive economic impact for the entire community, and it increases diversity, productivity, and job satisfaction for employees. Organizations can also actively recruit women who have left the workplace during the pandemic and implement longer-term strategies for recruiting women who are returning to the workplace after career breaks.

Second, in terms responses that could be initiated by nonprofit and other types of community organizations, 9.2% of women surveyed were concerned about domestic violence brought on by the pandemic. This is a sizeable number of women, and their concerns should be addressed. Government and law enforcement should do everything they can to ensure that women in Utah are safe. This should also include increasing resources for prevention education and support services for survivors of domestic and sexual violence. It is also important to expand public/private partnerships to address food insecurity, housing challenges, and short-term financial stress. Investing in longer-term programs for low-income women to rebuild financial stability and reverse the net-worth losses due to the pandemic over the long term is also critical.

Finally, Utah state and local governments can implement policies that benefit women’s recovery from the negative impact of COVID-19 and positively affect women in the future. These include public policies that focus on narrowing the gender pay gap; increasing investment in training and upskilling opportunities that support women, including return- to-work initiatives; providing incentives that encourage businesses to implement family-friendly and inclusive policies; and providing more support for childcare offices and programs around the state.

This brief has summarized survey results on the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on women in the workplace in Utah. It was written to provide information useful for Utah governments, businesses, families, and individuals, and should be beneficial as a benchmark for measuring improvement in years to come. It was also written as a call to action for Utah government, community, and business leaders to do more to understand the physical, behavioral, and emotional effects that Utah women are facing related to COVID-19. We encourage leaders to do more to implement strategies and facilitate communication to support the working women of Utah.
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## APPENDIX A

**Main Reasons Why Women in Utah Left the Workforce During the Pandemic by Location**

**Survey Question:** “If you are not currently working for pay or if you stopped working at any time after March 2020, what is/was your main reason for doing so?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Question</th>
<th>Salt Lake n=227</th>
<th>Utah n=126</th>
<th>Box Elder, Cache, or Rich n=71</th>
<th>Davis or Morgan n=64</th>
<th>All Other Counties Subtotal n=156</th>
<th>All Counties Total n=648</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am/was sick with coronavirus symptoms.</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was concerned about getting or spreading the coronavirus.</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>13.2%</strong></td>
<td><strong>13.2%</strong></td>
<td><strong>25.4%</strong></td>
<td><strong>14.1%</strong></td>
<td><strong>12.7%</strong></td>
<td><strong>14.5%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am/was caring for someone with coronavirus symptoms.</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am/was caring for children not in school or daycare.</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am/was caring for an elderly person.</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am/was caring for someone with a disability.</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>17.6%</strong></td>
<td><strong>16.7%</strong></td>
<td><strong>14.1%</strong></td>
<td><strong>21.9%</strong></td>
<td><strong>20.9%</strong></td>
<td><strong>18.5%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My employer experienced a reduction in business (including furlough) due to coronavirus pandemic.</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am/was laid off due to coronavirus pandemic.</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My employer closed temporarily due to the coronavirus pandemic.</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My employer went out of business due to the coronavirus pandemic.</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>38.3%</strong></td>
<td><strong>38.9%</strong></td>
<td><strong>28.2%</strong></td>
<td><strong>45.3%</strong></td>
<td><strong>39.2%</strong></td>
<td><strong>38.1%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I did not want to be employed at this time.</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am/was sick (not coronavirus related) or disabled.</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am retired.</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For other reasons.</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>30.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>31.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>32.4%</strong></td>
<td><strong>18.8%</strong></td>
<td><strong>27.2%</strong></td>
<td><strong>28.5%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Percentages may not add up to exactly 100% due to rounding.
APPENDIX B

Main Reasons Why Women in Utah Left the Workforce During the Pandemic by Age Range

Survey Question: “If you are not currently working for pay or if you stopped working at any time after March 2020, what is/was your main reason for doing so?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am/was sick with coronavirus symptoms.</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was concerned about getting or spreading the coronavirus.</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>14.1%</strong></td>
<td><strong>10.7%</strong></td>
<td><strong>17.5%</strong></td>
<td><strong>14.3%</strong></td>
<td><strong>25.7%</strong></td>
<td><strong>15.4%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am/was caring for someone with coronavirus symptoms.</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am/was caring for children not in school or daycare.</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am/was caring for an elderly person.</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am/was caring for someone with a disability.</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>10.8%</strong></td>
<td><strong>30.1%</strong></td>
<td><strong>24.1%</strong></td>
<td><strong>8.1%</strong></td>
<td><strong>8.6%</strong></td>
<td><strong>7.7%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My employer experienced a reduction in business (including furlough) due to coronavirus pandemic.</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am/was laid off due to coronavirus pandemic.</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My employer closed temporarily due to the coronavirus pandemic.</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My employer went out of business due to the coronavirus pandemic.</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>41.9%</strong></td>
<td><strong>37.7%</strong></td>
<td><strong>35.1%</strong></td>
<td><strong>38.7%</strong></td>
<td><strong>42.9%</strong></td>
<td><strong>23.1%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I did not want to be employed at this time.</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am/was sick (not coronavirus related) or disabled.</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am retired.</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For other reasons.</td>
<td>24.9%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
<td>32.7%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>33.4%</strong></td>
<td><strong>21.5%</strong></td>
<td><strong>23.4%</strong></td>
<td><strong>38.7%</strong></td>
<td><strong>22.9%</strong></td>
<td><strong>53.9%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Percentages may not add up to exactly 100% due to rounding.