



**A 'queer' omission: What time use surveys might gain from asking about sexuality**

**Technical Paper 2014 – 3**

**Centre for Time Use Research  
University of Oxford, United Kingdom**

**Kimberly Fisher**, Centre for Time Use Research

**Yiu-Tung Suen**, Department of Sociology, The Chinese University of Hong Kong

**ABSTRACT:** By collecting accounts of daily behaviour, time diaries can make conditions of people whose interests have been ignored visible. Not surprisingly, time use surveys often have had an association with social justice, for poor working class families in industrialised countries, migrant communities, women, carers, people with disabilities, and those of advanced age. More recently, regional UN Economic Commissions have shown renewed interest in collecting time use surveys to track progress toward gender equality. Lesbian and gay communities, however, remain invisible, not just in time use research, but across the full range of official statistics. Very few national sample surveys ask any question about sexuality, and consequently the degree to which policies serve the needs of LGBTI people remain unknown. Time diary surveys offer a particularly fitting place for collecting information on LGBTI communities. Much of the lingering prejudice against LGBTI people manifests in daily routines, influencing where people go and when, and with whom they undertake which activities. Measuring the degree to which communities share use of civic spaces gives insight to the levels of social integration. We discuss methodological practicalities for including sexuality in time use surveys.

**KEY WORDS:** Surveys, Couples, Gender, LGBT, Time Use



## A 'Queer' Omission: What Time Use Surveys Might Gain from Asking Diarists Asking About Sexuality

The field of time use research historically has had an undercurrent of promoting social justice. This dimension dates back to early explorations in the field, from Maud Pember-Reeves use of diaries kept by working class women and George Bevans and use of diaries kept by working class men to debunk myths suggesting the poor lead idle lives without long hours of paid work. Pember Reeves (1913), Leeds (1917), Kneeland (1929), Reid (1934), and others demonstrated that women make significant contributions to the economic output of nations while undertaking unpaid domestic work which official national statistics and economic policies ignored. While it has taken decades for these early observations to gain widespread recognition, recent United Nations reports highlight the importance of collecting surveys of people's daily routines to promote gender equality, both by making women's full economic contributions visible and to formulate other gender equality promotion policies (United Nations 2005; UNECE 2013; Calderón Magaña 2013).

While gender equality for women has featured prominently in the time use research literature, the field offers potential to support a range of social justice agendas, as a basic principal of time use surveys is that the all behaviours of all peoples matter. As time use surveys collect data on activities that have received little research or policy attention and as these surveys collect diaries from of groups with limited social status, some activities which - and people who - have been invisible in policy debates become visible. This principal is not complete. Generally the sampling methodology of time use surveys has left out institutionalised people and populations whose transient accommodation makes them difficult to sample, including homeless people, residents of informal communities lacking legal recognition, or refugees and internally displaced persons. Additionally, some minority populations have been sampled, but not specifically identified, making analysis of time use by these groups challenging. We consider one set of such groups, people with minority sexual orientations and gender identities.

### **Why presence in surveys and statistics matters**

Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender and Intersex (LGBTI) studies began as an obscure branch of social science in the 1960s and 1970s, but more recently has moved into more mainstream academic research, though a majority of research has tended to be qualitative and small scale, with exceptions, such as Project Sigma (Coxon 1996), having a specific, often health-related, focus. In a number of countries, LGBTI people recently have made significant legal breakthroughs, though in some regions of the world, anti-homosexuality laws and attitudes have become more severe. In those countries where the legal status of LGBTI people has improved, few social surveys and official statistics identify LGBTI people as a separate community of research and policy interest.

Such social surveys that are available for LGBTI research mostly concentrate on same-sex couples, and more of these surveys have been collected in the USA than elsewhere. The state of California in the USA led the design of such surveys, where sexual orientation questions were included in a 2003 tobacco use survey and three waves of the mid-2000s California Health Interview Survey (CHIS), among others – not surprising as an estimated 15% of USA-based LGBTI people are suspected to live in that state (Carpenter and Gates 2008). More recently, the Gender and Generations<sup>1</sup> project, primarily conducted in European countries, has asked questions of sexual orientation and same-sex

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.ggp-i.org/>



couples as a part of tracking the transmission of gender identities and attitudes in families across generations.

In part, the relative invisibility of LGBTI people in official statistics arises from the on-going struggle to regularise the legal status of people with minority sexualities. Even in the more progressive or tolerant countries, change remains contested and controversial. Not all researchers have been keen to promote statistical analysis of LGBTI issues, arguing that small-scale qualitative research more accurately reflects the diversity in these communities, and that people who have had to fight so hard against mainstream prejudice should exercise research in their own way (Browne 2008). Mainstream researchers for their part have yet to embrace the need to consider sexuality as a dimension in social policy research, as the stunned silence that followed our initial presentation of this paper in the final plenary of the 2012 IATUR conference in Matsue, Japan, reflected.

Nevertheless, visibility in official statistics matters. Public policies cannot cater for unknown needs. Evaluation of the success or failure of programmes requires reliable data on changes in those communities that policies aim to assist. Appearing in routine population statistics confirms regularisation of the legal and social standing of minority groups. Just as recognising the value of the unpaid domestic work of women has played a role in improving the status of women, presence in official population figures will have a role in improving the quality of life of LGBTI people. For this reason, Carpenter and Gates (2008) reflect a growing number of voices who “strongly urge researchers to more routinely include direct measures of sexual orientation identification on surveys”, not only by collecting whole household age/sex matrixes from large samples, but also asking more specific details about partners and partnership history.

Time diary surveys in particular offer the additional possibility of informing the way minority communities which have been ostracised alter their daily routines as they gain social acceptance (uses the same social spaces at different times, or taking longer routes to reach the same destinations). As even in their most quantitative and reduced form, time diaries collect narratives, the narrative component of time use surveys offers elements of resonance with the qualitative sexuality studies. On-going experiments with GPS and related devices tracking the location of diarists will enable future time use research to consider the more precise location of activities (in height and well as longitude and latitude), which may prove more useful if measuring differences in uses of social spaces.

### **Same-sex couples in time use surveys**

Some time use surveys offer the potential to explore the daily activities of same-sex couples. The United States Census, Current Population Surveys, and American Community Surveys collect data on couples in households, including collecting the age and sex of people who identify themselves as being married or living together as a couple. The American Time Use Survey samples a subset of the CPS. Similar possibilities arise in surveys following the Harmonised European Time Use Surveys guidelines, and collect detailed matrixes of household members mapping relationships between members.

As yet, the capacity to identify same-sex couples is incomplete. Many caveats deserve note. No currently released national sample time use survey explicitly asks participants about their sexuality (though this will change in 2015). Identification as being in a same-sex couple is a choice that diarists are not asked to make explicitly. Many people of minority sexuality, particularly those who are older, will have lived through less tolerant periods, and some will have witnessed or experienced persecution. Even where the legal status of LGBTI people has improved, not all occupation, religious and other groups are as accepting, and some people will face pressure from their families or other social connections, and may choose not to explicitly identify as being in a same-sex couple. Even



though these surveys offer confidentiality, people forced to live a closeted life may respond to surveys with the same public answers that they offer about their status. In some cases, some same-sex couples may maintain separate households to avoid complications with some social connections, and as time use surveys expressly concentrate on activities of household members, and rarely emphasise important personal relations with people from other households, such cases would be challenging to identify.

The authors understand that researchers in the United States are making more sophisticated use of the full range of materials from the US Current Population Survey to explore the time use of same-sex couples in the American Time Use Survey, and their research may reveal more sophisticated means of measuring same-sex couples. As this research is in the early phase, we adopted a basic definition of identifying how many time diaries included in the Multinational Time Use Study archive (Fisher and Gershuny 2013) are associated with people who, survey household grid information suggests, live in same-sex couples (an approach adopted by other research comparing the paid working hours of same-sex and mixed sex couples, summarised in Giddings et. al. 2014), shown in Table 1. We accept that this crude approach may capture some data errors where the sex of one person is recorded in error. In a majority of cases that we can identify, the age gap between partners is less than 10 years. In some cases, a more significant age gap between the partners appears, though these cases will not necessarily reflect an error of couple identification. Only eight of the over 60 surveys in the MTUS include any same-sex couples, only three have sufficient numbers of couples for independent analysis – but prospects for analysis do exist for Spain (HETUS surveys) and the USA (ATUS). We explore the Spanish surveys in separate research (where we compare the time use of both partners for the same days). In this paper, we concentrate on people living same-sex couples in the USA, where only one of the people in these couples completed one 24-hour diary.

**Table 1: Number of Diaries from People Living With a Same-Sex Partner in the Multinational Time Use Study (MTUS) Archive**

	Number of couples	Total diaries	Types of couples
Austria 1992	1	2 (1 per person)	1 “gay” couple
Germany 1991-92	3	12 (2 per person)	3 “lesbian” couples
Israel 1991-92	6	29 (1 per person in 1 case; 2 per person in 2 <sup>nd</sup> case; 3 per person in 3 cases; 3 by one partner, 2 by the other last case)	6 “gay” couples
Spain 2002-03	111	222 (1 per person)	55 “gay” couples 56 “lesbian” couples
UK 2000-01	1	4 (2 per person)	1 “gay” couple
USA 1975-76	6	20 (1 per person in 3 couples; 2 per person in 2 couples; 3 per person in 1 couple)	2 “gay” couples 4 “lesbian” couples
USA 1985	2	4 (1 per person)	1 “gay” couple 1 “lesbian” couple
USA 2003-10*	285	285 (1 diary from one person per household)	130 diaries from “gay” men 155 diaries from “lesbians”

\*Many surveys in the MTUS collected diaries from both partners. The ATUS (2003-2010) only collected one diary per household, thus we only have the diary from one of the two partners.



In Table 2, we offer some basic descriptive statistics comparing same-sex and mixed-sex couples in the American Time Use Survey (MTUS version). These figures relate to the diarist who completed the ATUS survey, though some elements apply equally to both partners. Roughly half of all ATUS diarists in couples are women. People in same-sex couples are slightly younger, a lower proportion of these people live in rural areas, and generally they have greater social and monetary capital resources. This most basic comparison suggests sampling bias which we cannot wholly eliminate in modelling. As we have no reliable statistics for the total same-sex couple population, precisely disentangling this potential bias is difficult.

**Table 2: Basic Demographic Characteristics of Diarists in Same-Sex and Mixed-Sex Couples in the American Time Use Survey (Multinational Time Use Survey version)**

Basic demographic characteristics of diarists	Same-Sex Couples	Mixed-Sex Couples
% of diarists who are women	49.2%	48.2%
Mean age of diarists	42	<b>46</b>
% of diarists who live in a rural area	7.9%	<b>19.3%</b>
Couple lives with a child aged <5 years	13.2%	<b>27.1%</b>
Diarist is a citizen of the USA	<b>94.7%</b>	91.3%
% of diarists working full-time	<b>77.1%</b>	58.9%
Diarist holds managerial or professional job	<b>39.3%</b>	26.5%
Household in top 25% of income distribution	<b>46.4%</b>	33.4%
Diarist has post-secondary education	<b>78.9%</b>	62.4%
Household rents accommodation	<b>24.1%</b>	16.3%

Given the long history of limiting access to adoption and fertility treatment and the very recent legal recognition of same-sex couples in many US states, the lower percentage of couples living with young children is not surprising. Giddings et. al. (2014) have observed that as more same-sex couples gain children, the proportion of couples where one partner does not engaged in paid labour or works part-time hours has moved in the direction of the pattern of mixed-sex couples with children, though partners in mixed-sex couples remain more likely than partners in same-sex couples to specialise into one working for pay and one performing a majority of unpaid domestic work and care.

Qualitative research comparing same-sex and mixed-sex couples suggests that the absence of established cultural narratives defining roles for domestic arrangements means same-sex couples enjoy more freedom to experiment and invent roles their roles (Shipman and Smart 2006; Smart 2008). Peplau and Cochran (1990) and Chan et. al. (1998) found that LGBT couples place high value on domestic and paid work equality. Totenhagen, Butler, and Ridley (2012) found that perceived equality improves LGBT couples chances of remaining together, capacity to cope with stressful situations and general relationship satisfaction. Kurdek (2007) likewise found that Lesbian and Gay couples were more likely to stay together when both parties were satisfied with the division of domestic and paid work. The possibility that more people in LGBTI couples work full time may reflect this more widespread interest in domestic equality. Other stark differences in the basic distributions are more difficult to explain, though higher levels of education in same-sex compared to mixed-sex couples has been observed before (Shipman and Smart 2006; Smart 2008). It may well be that Lesbians and Gay men with more social standing (reflected by the employment status, income and education) may feel more able to openly acknowledge their sexuality and to choose to form partnerships in keeping with their identities.

The way LGBTI people structure daily routines is a new area in the time use research field. In a small-scale survey of parents, Chan et. al. (1998) observed no difference in the time investments Lesbian and straight parents devote to raising children. While conducting in-depth interviews with ageing gay



men in the UK, Suen (2012) recorded many instances where these men recalled needing to use caution with the timing certain activities as well as taking care in choosing the place of some common-place activities, like eating out, in order to avoid trouble.

The MTUS harmonises time use surveys post-collection. This process involves translating original activity codes into a set of 69 harmonised time use activities (Fisher and Gershuny 2013). As a point of initial exploration, we selected those ATUS (MTUS version) diarists who completed good quality diaries and who live in a couple, and ran simple 1-way Anova tests of time in all 69 of these activities comparing the mean daily minutes spent in each activity by same-sex and mixed-sex couples; then by same-sex couples with and without children, and mixed-sex couples with and without children. Of these 69 activities, only 21 showed significant to marginally insignificant variation (Appendix 1) in total minutes spent in each activity per day across the two then the four couple groups<sup>2</sup>, though as we have very small samples across pooled years of the American Time Use Survey of same-sex couples, these numbers are not necessarily meaningful. We collapsed these 21 activities into 15 categories for further analysis (shown in the Appendix 2).

The MTUS offers more blunt location information – in part because most historical time use surveys tend either to have very simple location information (at home or not at home), or time spent in a limited number of specified locations. The MTUS also makes maximum attempt of available original survey information to identify activities that take place inside buildings, outside in the open air or inside vehicles, though this latter concept is incomplete for many of the surveys included in the MTUS, as well as offering a limited range of other context variables. We tested three additional basic concepts regarding location and timing in the same way as we initially examined the 69 activity categories – total minutes of leisure time in the day spent with the spouse or partner; total minutes per day away from home, and total minutes per day away from home after 18:00. In simple one-way Anova tests, the four groups of couples appear to vary, but again as the numbers of same-sex couples are small, these variations are not necessarily meaningful.

We then followed up the total minutes per day spent in these 18 groups of activities which appeared to show some differences using a simple OLS model, controlling for:

- sex, age, age<sup>2</sup>;
- citizenship;
- undertook post-secondary education;
- lives in a household in the highest 25% income band;
- holds employment in a managerial or professional job;
- works full-time;
- lives with a child aged <13 in household;
- rents accommodation; and
- living in rural area
- living in a same-sex couple.

We opt for this most basic of models, in part as this paper offers an initial overview of what might be possible in this area, and in part as the numbers of same-sex couples is too small to permit many more

---

<sup>2</sup> We subsequently analysed these 12 MTUS activity categories independently: 9: Time in second or other jobs not at home; 16: Homework (for education and training); 33: Voluntary, organisational and civic activities; 34: Worship and religion; 37: Cinema, theatre, opera, concerts; 39: Restaurant, café, bar, pub; 42: General sport or exercise; 43: Walking; 46: Gardening, pick mushrooms; 47: Walking dogs or other pets; 59: Watch TV, video, DVD; 61: E-mail, surf internet, computing. We combined time in these two, 48: Receive or visit friends and 49: Conversation (in person or on phone) into a single social activity. We combined these three into a single housework activity: 18: Food preparation and cooking; 19: Set or clear table / put away dishes; and 21: Ironing, laundry, clothing repair. We combined these four childcare activities: 28: Physical and medical child care; 30: Read to, talk with or play with children; 31: Supervise or accompany child and other child care; and 66: Travel related to childcare, with the fifth MTUS childcare activity, 29: teach a child a skill or help with homework, that did not show as significant in the 1-way Anova distributions, to make a single childcare time variable.





sophisticated approaches. While there are some diarists in couples who have no time recorded in one or more of these activities, as people do not undertake every potential activity every day, these 0 observations reflect real behaviours over the 24-hour diary observation windows. The results appear in the Appendix 2 (though we include only total minutes away from home after 18:00 and not also total minutes away from home and total leisure time with the partner at the coefficients for these three categories are very nearly identical as well as not significant).

Once some consideration is made for basic person and household demographics, same-sex couples appear to undertake only four of these activities differently from mixed-sex couples. Same-sex couples spent roughly four extra minutes per day walking dogs; 10 more minutes per day using the internet as well as going out to cinemas, theatres or concerts; and half an hour additional time visiting and in conversation with others. The extra internet and cultural performance time may reflect what appears to be a sample bias, as those same-sex couples with more income, education and higher status jobs may well be over-represented. We suspect that the higher social time same-sex couples enjoy, both with pets and with other people, may prove noteworthy in follow-up research. The limited range of differences in time use, all of which do not fall in the paid work realm, is consistent with the increasingly similar working time arrangements Giddings et. al. (2014) have observed comparing same sex and mixed-sex couples.

The non-significant results, however, also have meaning. We replicate the finding of Chan et. al. (1998) that same-sex couples make the same time investments in their children. As time with children, time contributing to wider social good through organisational and voluntary activities, and time in religious activities reflect some of the contested ground in policy debates over the legal rights and social status of people with minority sexualities, finding no difference between same-sex and mixed-sex couples behaviour reinforces arguments that protecting the civil rights of minorities poses no threat to the majority population.

### **Wider considerations and future research potential**

Such contemporary concerns as work-life balance or the impact of behaviour on the environment matter for people of minority as well as majority sexualities. Minority groups can face particular circumstances requiring policy attention, and while this is not always the case, policy research should consider the prospects for such differences. As visibility in social statistics affects the representation of minority social groups in policies promoting fairness of opportunities and access to services, time use surveys have particular relevance for collecting some of this baseline social data.

The huge gap in knowledge relates to minority sexuality people who are not in couples. Again, this case has a parallel in the wider time use research literature, as comparatively few articles consider the time use of single people separately, and many which do are relatively recent.

The 2015 Canadian General Social Survey, which will include a 24-hour mixed-method interview time diary, also will ask **all** participants a basic question about their sexuality (shown below). This question will add clarity (or perhaps open new research investigations) into the number of same-sex couples and the suitability of using household matrices to find such couples. More intriguingly, this question will identify some LBTBI people who are not in couples, albeit using categories covering a limited range or orientations. Though not all people will feel empowered or inclined to answer this question, leaving some concern with sampling bias, this question nevertheless represents an advance.



Do you consider yourself to be? Interviewer to read categories to respondent:	Vous considérez-vous? Intervieweur lire les catégories au répondant
1) Heterosexual (sexual relations with people of the opposite sex)	1) Hétérosexuels (relations sexuelles avec des personnes du sexe opposé)
2) Homosexual, that is lesbian or gay (sexual relations with people of your own sex)	2) Homosexuels, c'est-à-dire lesbienne ou gai (relations sexuelles avec des personnes du même sexe)
3) Bisexual (sexual relations with people of both sexes)	3) Bisexuels (relations sexuelles avec des personnes des deux sexes)

Having a larger sample of non-straight diarists holds out the prospect for more detailed consideration of the timing of activities and structuring of days. One possibility suggested by this initial review is that differences in the lifestyles of same-sex and mixed-sex couples are subtle, and identification of these differences may require more sophisticated use of time diary components, which in turn requires necessitates larger samples of same-sex couples. The daily routines of LGBTI people merit further research – particularly those people who do not live in couples. We hope more future surveys may build on the 2015 Canadian example.

## References

Bevans, George E. (1913) *How working men spend their spare time* New York, Columbia University Press.

Browne, Kath. (2008) "Selling my queer soul or queerying quantitative research?" *Sociological Research Online* 13(1): 11.

Calderón Magaña, Coral (ed). (2013) *Redistributing care: the policy challenge*, Santiago, CEPAL.

Carpenter, Christopher, and Gary J. Gates (2008) Gay and lesbian partnership: evidence from California, in: *Demography*, Vol. 45, No. 3, 573-590.

Chan, Raymond W., Risa C. Brooks, Barbara Raboy, and Charlotte J. Patterson. (1998) "Division of labor among lesbian and heterosexual parents: associations with children's adjustment" *Journal of Family Psychology* 12(3): 402-419.

Coxon, Anthony Peter Macmillan. (1996) *Between the sheets: sexual diaries and gay men's sex in the era of AIDS (sexual politics)* London, Continuum International Publishing Group Ltd.

Fisher, Kimberly, and Jonathan Gershuny. (2013) *Multinational Time Use Study user's guide and documentation* Oxford, Centre for Time Use Research.

Giddings, Lisa, John M. Nunley, Alyssa Schneebaum, Joachim Zietz. (2014) "Birth cohort and the specialization gap between same-sex and different-sex couples" *Demography* 51(2): 509-534.

Kneeland, Hildegard. (1929) "Woman's economic contribution in the home" *Annals of the American Academy for Political and Social Science* 143: 33-40.





Kurdek, Lawrence A. (2007) "The allocation of household labor by partners in gay and lesbian couples" *Journal of Family Issues* 28(1): 132-148.

Leeds, John Bacon. (1917) *The household budget: with a special inquiry into the amount and value of household work* Political Science, New York, Columbia University Press.

Pember-Reeves, Maud. (1913, reprint 2008) *Round about a pound a week*, London, Persephone Books.

Peplau, Letitia Anne, and Susan D. Cochran (1990) "A relationship perspective on homosexuality" *Homosexuality/heterosexuality: Concepts of sexual orientation*: 321-349.

Reid, Margaret Gilpin. (1934) *Economics of household production* London, Chapman and Hall.

Shipman, Beccy and Carol. Smart. (2006) 'It's made a huge difference': recognition, rights and the personal significance of civil partnership, in: *Sociological Research Online*, Vol. 12, No. 1, doi:10.5153/sro.1340

Smart, Carol. (2008) "'Can I be bridesmaid?' combining the personal and political in same-sex weddings" *Sexualities* 11(6): 763-778.

Suen, Yiu-Tung. (2012) *Older single gay men: questioning the master narrative of coupledness* Oxford, University of Oxford.

Totenhagen, Casey J., Emily A. Butler, and Carl A. Ridley. (2012) "Daily stress, closeness, and satisfaction in gay and lesbian couples" *Personal Relationships* 19(2): 219-233.

United Nations. (2005) *Guide to producing statistics on time use: measuring paid and unpaid work* New York, United Nations.

United Nations Economic Commission for Europe. (2013) *Guidelines for harmonizing time-use surveys* Geneva, UNECE.

## Appendix 1

	Mean minutes per day	1-way Anova significance		Mean minutes per day	1-way Anova significance
Main 9: Second other job, not at home					
Mixed-sex couple	6.8 min	.068	Mixed-sex couple - no child	5.8 min	.000
			Mixed-sex couple - with child	7.4 min	
Same-sex couple	12.2 min		Same-sex couple - no child	5.2 min	
			Same-sex couple - with child	28.3 min	
Main 16: Homework					
Mixed-sex couple	3.3 min	.002	Mixed-sex couple - no child	2.8 min	.000
			Mixed-sex couple - with child	3.6 min	
Same-sex couple	9.4 min		Same-sex couple - no child	5.1 min	
			Same-sex couple - with child	19.3 min	



Main 18: Food preparation, cooking					
Mixed-sex couple	29.1 min	.062	Mixed-sex couple - no child	26.9 min	.000
			Mixed-sex couple - with child	30.6 min	
Same-sex couple	23.8 min		Same-sex couple - no child	22.3 min	
			Same-sex couple - with child	27.3 min	
Main 19: Set/clear table, wash, put away dishes					
Mixed-sex couple	9.1 min	.001	Mixed-sex couple - no child	8.1 min	.000
			Mixed-sex couple - with child	9.7 min	
Same-sex couple	4.8 min		Same-sex couple - no child	3.3 min	
			Same-sex couple - with child	8.4 min	
Main 21: Ironing, laundry, clothing repair					
Mixed-sex couple	13.3 min	.045	Mixed-sex couple - no child	12.7 min	.009
			Mixed-sex couple - with child	13.6 min	
Same-sex couple	8.2 min		Same-sex couple - no child	7.0 min	
			Same-sex couple - with child	11.1 min	
Main 28: Physical, medical child care					
Mixed-sex couple	16.8 min	.005	Mixed-sex couple - no child	0.0 min	.000
			Mixed-sex couple - with child	28.3 min	
Same-sex couple	7.6 min		Same-sex couple - no child	0.0 min	
			Same-sex couple - with child	25.1 min	
Main 30: Read to, talk with, play with child					
Mixed-sex couple	15.5 min	.024	Mixed-sex couple - no child	0.1 min	.000
			Mixed-sex couple - with child	26.1 min	
Same-sex couple	8.9 min		Same-sex couple - no child	0.0 min	
			Same-sex couple - with child	29.4 min	
Main 31: Supervise child, accompany child, other child care					
Mixed-sex couple	12.0 min	.002	Mixed-sex couple - no child	0.1 min	.000
			Mixed-sex couple - with child	20.1 min	
Same-sex couple	5.2 min		Same-sex couple - no child	0.0 min	
			Same-sex couple - with child	17.3 min	
Main 66: Supervise child, accompany child, other child care					
Mixed-sex couple	11.7 min	.005	Mixed-sex couple - no child	6.2 min	.000
			Mixed-sex couple - with child	15.5 min	
Same-sex couple	6.8 min		Same-sex couple - no child	3.5 min	
			Same-sex couple - with child	14.4 min	
Main 33: Voluntary, organisational or civic activity					
Mixed-sex couple	10.4 min	.096	Mixed-sex couple - no child	10.6 min	.274



			Mixed-sex couple - with child	10.3 min	
Same-sex couple	5.4 min		Same-sex couple - no child	4.1 min	
			Same-sex couple - with child	8.3 min	
Main 34: Worship and religion					
Mixed-sex couple	8.5 min	.010	Mixed-sex couple - no child	9.5 min	.000
			Mixed-sex couple - with child	7.8 min	
Same-sex couple	2.8 min		Same-sex couple - no child	3.6 min	
			Same-sex couple - with child	1.0 min	
Main 37: Cinema, theatre, opera, concert					
Mixed-sex couple	2.4 min	.010	Mixed-sex couple - no child	2.6 min	.007
			Mixed-sex couple - with child	2.3 min	
Same-sex couple	5.4 min		Same-sex couple - no child	4.3 min	
			Same-sex couple - with child	8.0 min	
Main 39: Restaurant, café, bar, pub					
Mixed-sex couple	13.7 min	.090	Mixed-sex couple - no child	16.2 min	.000
			Mixed-sex couple - with child	12.0 min	
Same-sex couple	17.4 min		Same-sex couple - no child	22.6 min	
			Same-sex couple - with child	5.3 min	
Main 42: General sport or exercise					
Mixed-sex couple	10.1 min	.094	Mixed-sex couple - no child	10.1 min	.139
			Mixed-sex couple - with child	10.1 min	
Same-sex couple	14.1 min		Same-sex couple - no child	16.6 min	
			Same-sex couple - with child	8.1 min	
Main 43: Walking					
Mixed-sex couple	2.7 min	.068	Mixed-sex couple - no child	3.6 min	.000
			Mixed-sex couple - with child	2.1 min	
Same-sex couple	1.2 min		Same-sex couple - no child	1.6 min	
			Same-sex couple - with child	0.1 min	
Main 46: Gardening, pick mushrooms					
Mixed-sex couple	16.4 min	.043	Mixed-sex couple - no child	21.4 min	.000
			Mixed-sex couple - with child	13.0 min	
Same-sex couple	8.6 min		Same-sex couple - no child	10.3 min	
			Same-sex couple - with child	4.8 min	
Main 47: Walk dogs					
Mixed-sex couple	5.0 min	.000	Mixed-sex couple - no child	6.9 min	.000
			Mixed-sex couple - with child	3.7 min	
Same-sex couple	9.7 min		Same-sex couple - no child	10.6 min	



			Same-sex couple - with child	7.7 min	
Main 48: Receive or visit friends					
Mixed-sex couple	36.5 min	.056	Mixed-sex couple - no child	37.4 min	.019
			Mixed-sex couple - with child	35.8 min	
Same-sex couple	45.4 min		Same-sex couple - no child	45.2 min	
			Same-sex couple - with child	46.1 min	
Main 49: Conversation (in person or on phone)					
Mixed-sex couple	4.0 min	.006	Mixed-sex couple - no child	5.1 min	.000
			Mixed-sex couple - with child	3.2 min	
Same-sex couple	6.9 min		Same-sex couple - no child	7.7 min	
			Same-sex couple - with child	5.1 min	
Main 59: Watch TV, video, DVD					
Mixed-sex couple	141.9 min	.008	Mixed-sex couple - no child	175.1 min	.000
			Mixed-sex couple - with child	119.1 min	
Same-sex couple	118.3 min		Same-sex couple - no child	120.6 min	
			Same-sex couple - with child	113.1 min	
Main 61: E-mail, surf internet, computing					
Mixed-sex couple	9.7 min	.000	Mixed-sex couple - no child	11.9 min	.000
			Mixed-sex couple - with child	8.3 min	
Same-sex couple	17.9 min		Same-sex couple - no child	23.5 min	
			Same-sex couple - with child	5.0 min	
Total minutes of leisure time away from home spent with the spouse					
Mixed-sex couple	100.3 min	.794	Mixed-sex couple - no child	106.2 min	.000
			Mixed-sex couple - with child	95.8 min	
Same-sex couple	104.4 min		Same-sex couple - no child	102.8 min	
			Same-sex couple - with child	110.6 min	
Total minutes away from home					
Mixed-sex couple	526.4 min	.084	Mixed-sex couple - no child	511.3 min	.000
			Mixed-sex couple - with child	537.9 min	
Same-sex couple	587.1 min		Same-sex couple - no child	611.8 min	
			Same-sex couple - with child	495.8 min	
Total minutes away from home after 18:00					
Mixed-sex couple	149.4 min	.058	Mixed-sex couple - no child	145.1 min	.015
			Mixed-sex couple - with child	152.8 min	
Same-sex couple	187.3 min		Same-sex couple - no child	186.3 min	
			Same-sex couple - with child	190.9 min	



**Appendix 2**

	Time at cinema, theatre, opera		Restaurant, café, pub, bar		Watch TV, DVD, video		Use internet, chat, e-mail	
R <sup>2</sup>	.004		.013		.084		.017	
Diarist is a woman	1.74	.043	1.80	Ns	-33.70	.000	-3.66	.000
Age	-0.20	ns	-0.71	.003	-2.42	.000	0.12	ns
Age squared	0.00	ns	0.01	.001	0.03	.000	-0.00	ns
Diarist is a citizen	-0.81	ns	2.16	Ns	14.39	.004	-2.23	ns
Post-secondary education	3.88	.000	-0.93	Ns	-27.42	.000	5.46	.000
Top 25% household income	1.43	ns	5.40	.000	-10.46	.000	-0.12	ns
Manager or professional	-0.05	ns	0.93	Ns	-10.75	.000	-0.22	ns
Works full-time	-1.94	.051	0.67	Ns	-19.99	.000	-7.30	.000
Lives with child aged <13	-1.38	ns	-8.85	.000	-15.75	.000	-3.78	.000
Rents home	3.17	.017	1.31	Ns	10.92	.002	1.04	ns
Rural household	-1.88	.079	-3.28	.017	-1.68	ns	-2.34	ns
Same-sex couple	11.30	.037	0.01	Ns	-15.71	ns	10.13	.004
Constant	16.07	.001	72.81	.000	198.77	.000	15.69	.000

	General sport and exercise		Walk as exercise or pleasure		Walk dogs		Gardening and foraging	
R <sup>2</sup>	.011		.013		.014		.029	
Diarist is a woman	-4.90	.000	-0.11	Ns	1.06	.025	-16.04	.000
Age	-0.18	.013	-0.00	Ns	0.40	.000	0.24	.037
Age squared	0.00	ns	0.01	.006	0.26	.000	-0.01	ns
Diarist is a citizen	2.33	.000	-1.62	.000	1.24	.000	3.38	.000
Post-secondary education	3.81	.000	0.56	.000	0.67	.000	-2.77	.000
Top 25% household income	4.32	.000	0.32	.019	0.48	.017	0.35	ns
Manager or professional	0.43	ns	0.11	Ns	-0.01	ns	-2.62	.000
Works full-time	-3.25	.000	-1.83	.000	-1.56	.000	6.78	.000
Lives with child aged <13	-1.71	.000	-0.30	.033	-3.93	.000	-2.55	.000
Rents home	-1.31	.007	0.45	.009	-1.49	.000	-9.40	.000
Rural household	-1.11	.007	-0.37	.012	1.62	.000	5.65	.000
Same-sex couple	2.52	ns	-1.19	Ns	3.89	.002	-4.38	ns
Constant	15.96	.000	3.45	.000	1.06	ns	19.63	.000

	Worship and religion		Voluntary, civic & organisational		Visit people & conversation		Time not home after 18:00	
R <sup>2</sup>	.008		0.010		.017		.025	
Diarist is a woman	1.50	.052	0.62	Ns	6.23	.000	-11.78	.000
Age	0.25	ns	0.51	.022	-0.27	ns	1.03	Ns
Age squared	-0.00	ns	-0.01	.071	0.01	ns	-0.02	.001
Diarist is a citizen	-4.59	.006	2.37	Ns	3.94	ns	10.51	ns



Post-secondary education	-2.12	.013	5.38	.000	-2.23	ns	6.21	.070
Top 25% household income	-3.65	.000	0.98	Ns	-0.31	ns	3.32	ns
Manager or professional	0.48	ns	-0.85	Ns	-4.29	.008	3.16	ns
Works full-time	-1.70	.057	-6.58	.000	-14.24	.000	21.22	.000
Lives with child aged <13	2.44	.005	1.80	Ns	-2.42	ns	-24.91	.000
Rents home	-0.03	ns	-5.15	.001	2.16	ns	7.21	ns
Rural household	1.32	ns	0.90	Ns	-0.32	ns	-0.57	ns
Same-sex couple	-5.09	ns	-7.55	Ns	34.63	.000	17.39	ns
Constant	6.64	ns	-4.82	Ns	57.30	.000	143.62	.000

	Homework		Second job		Housework		Child care	
R <sup>2</sup>	.012		.005		.125		.271	
Diarist is a woman	-0.47	ns	-2.62	.003	50.75	.000	20.18	.000
Age	-0.21	.018	0.33	.087	2.90	.000	0.62	.070
Age squared	0.01	ns	-0.01	.061	-0.03	.000	-0.01	.000
Diarist is a citizen	-0.39	ns	1.35	Ns	-8.11	.034	6.97	.043
Post-secondary education	1.99	.001	3.26	.001	-7.21	.000	10.46	.000
Top 25% household income	-0.93	ns	-0.99	Ns	1.90	ns	6.11	.000
Manager or professional	1.58	.013	-1.43	Ns	-6.14	.002	3.15	.073
Works full-time	-4.36	.000	3.33	.001	-22.46	.000	-30.82	.000
Lives with child aged <13	-2.90	.000	0.31	Ns	16.69	.000	76.43	.000
Rents home	1.03	ns	-2.02	Ns	-2.60	ns	-6.14	.012
Rural household	-0.15	ns	3.43	.002	0.43	ns	0.56	ns
Same-sex couple	4.58	ns	-2.28	Ns	-2.86	ns	-13.91	ns
Constant	17.18	.000	-4.62	Ns	-15.51	ns	13.72	ns