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**Abstract:** McGill honours students Georgiana Costin and Samantha Wing, under the supervision of Catherine Fichten and the Adaptech Research Network team evaluated chronotype, sleep and well-being of Dawson faculty, non-teaching staff and students during COVID-19 remote and subsequent in-person semesters. The results show that participants with a morningness or intermediate chronotype slept better than participants with an eveningness chronotype and that all measures indicate better sleep and well-being during the remote than during the in person periods.

**Full Article:**

The COVID-19 pandemic and remote teaching, working and learning have resulted in a variety of sleep-related problems, as well as some favourable sleep-related outcomes. In a qualitative study, we recently conducted focus groups and interviews with members of the Dawson community and analysed the positive and negative impacts of the COVID-19 remote teaching/working period (from March 2020) as well as the return to in-person teaching/working (from Fall 2021) on sleep and well-being. Through group thematic coding, we categorised the responses from 22 Dawson faculty members and 21 Dawson non-teaching staff according to general sleep/well-being, anxiety/stress, commute, work and lifestyle. We found that faculty members experienced slightly more negative sleep outcomes during the remote teaching/worked period as opposed to staff members. However, overall, both faculty and staff members experienced more negative sleep and well-being outcomes during the return to in person teaching/working as opposed to during the remote teaching/working period. The highest number of participants commented on their well-being related to work, in almost evenly negative and positive ways for both the remote and in-person teaching/working formats. Overall, our study highlights the positive and negative impacts of both time periods on sleep and well-being. **Statistical analyses show significantly overall better sleep and well-being for both faculty and non-teaching staff during the remote period compared to the return to in-person**.

A comparison of faculty and non-teaching staff during the remote and the in-person periods is graphed below.

* As shown in the graphs below, not surprisingly there were exclusively positive impacts of commute on sleep during the remote period due to the lack of having to travel to work, and exclusively negative impacts with the return to in-person.
* More faculty members than non-teaching staff commented on the negative impacts of anxiety/stress as well as of work on their sleep and well-being for the remote period.
* Overall, there were more comments related to well-being as opposed to sleep experiences, with the highest number of participants commenting on positive well-being outcomes related to work during the return to in-person.
* However, overall there were more negative impacts on sleep and well-being as opposed to positive during the return to in-person work.



We also evaluated the effect of chronotype (preference for sleep and activity at certain times) on sleep quality during the COVID-19 remote period and the return to in-person semesters. In addition to the 22 Dawson faculty members and 21 non-teaching we also recruited 22 students and evaluated their chronotype as morningness, intermediate and eveningness types. In addition, two questions examined sleep quality during the COVID-19 remote and subsequent in-person semesters. The results show that participants with a morningness or intermediate chronotype slept significantly better than participants with an eveningness chronotype. We found no difference in sleep quality between faculty, non-teaching staff and students although we did find that **all groups slept significantly better during the remote than the in-person semesters**.