



Early Examination of Daily Activities in the 2000-2001 Time Use Survey by Settlement Type

Michael Corey

Kimberly Fisher, Evrim Altintas, Thomas
Grund, and Qianhan Lin

Centre for Time Use Research
University of Oxford



Analysis of rural time use

- Many time use surveys include a rural / urban marker variable
- Limited published research makes use of the rural / urban variables in regression, but where used rurality seldom examined separately
- Most research on rural time focussed on specific populations or estimation of national accounts and non-market work in developing countries



Value of time use data for rural policy research

- Efficient collection of daily non-market and social activity, useful in assessment of skill development and social capital
- Measures variation in mode of transport / typical duration of journeys to types of activity
- Measure time in buildings at different times of year, useful for assessment of demand for energy use



Data

- National Time Use Study of UK (2000-2001) as part of Harmonised European Time Use Surveys (HETUS) project
- People recorded
 - main activity and simultaneous activity
 - location as well as who else present
- 10 minute time slots for 24 hours on a week day and 24 hours on a weekend day (4 AM to 4AM on the following day)



Data

- Additionally use the Multinational Time Use Study (MTUS) version of the UK HETUS survey
- Alongside the MTUS version of the Swedish (2000-2001) and French (1998-99) HETUS surveys
- MTUS includes 1=Urban 2=Rural variable
- Statistics Sweden uses a settlement-type rurality definition, INSEE uses a population density definition



		England	Wales
Sparse	urban	42	4
	town/fringe	87	72
	village	79	143
	hamlet	36	55
Not sparse	urban	12302	384
	town/fringe	1592	109
	village	1292	103
	hamlet	541	28
Total		15971	898



Comparative Analysis

- OLS regression, controlling for
 - Sex (male=reference)
 - Marital status (in couple=reference)
 - Employment status (full-time=reference)
 - Education (A-level/secondary=reference)
 - Age
 - Number of children in household
 - Household size
 - Rural (urban=reference)
- Separately over 10 activity categories



Comparative Analysis

Minutes per
day

UK

France

Sweden

unpaid work

β

14.0

21.6

27.8

significance

0.000

0.000

0.000

visit other people

not significant all countries



Comparative Analysis

Minutes per
day

UK

France

Sweden

commute

β

-2.6

-2.9

ns

significance

0.004

0.000

in-home leisure

β

ns

-24.4

-16.3

significance

0.000

0.000



Comparative Analysis

- No pattern in personal care, market work, volunteering, other travel, out-of-home leisure, and missing time
- Suggestion that analysis of rural time use matters, but any difference between the definition used by Statistics Sweden and that used by the ONS and INSEE masked by country differences



Definitions

- **Primary social time** – main or secondary activity which is clearly social (at party, entertain friends, play with children etc)
- If time slot not primary social time
- **Low intensity social contact** – in location around other people, ie in restaurant, shop
- **Voluntary social time** – voluntary activity with other people, civic meeting etc
- **Alone but using phone/e-mail**
- **With animals, though not with people**



Initial Results

- Report simple comparison of means / Anova
- Primary social time and low-intensity social contact not significant with the density definition of rural & urban areas



Initial Results

Primary Social Time

- **Sparse urban 10k**
 - Mean 3 hours 26 min
 - Median 3 hours
- **Sparse hamlet, isolated dwelling**
 - Mean 3 hours 5 min
 - Median 2 hours 30 min
- **Less sparse hamlet**
 - Mean 2 hours 51 min
 - Median 2 hours 20 min
 - $p < .016$

Low Intensity Contact

- **Sparse Urban 10k**
 - Mean 47 min
 - Median 40 min
- **Less sparse Urban**
 - Mean 40 min
 - Median 10 min
- **Town sparse & less**
 - Mean 36 min
 - Median 10 min
 - $p < .022$



Initial Results

Phone/e-mail time

- **Sparse town, fringe**
 - Mean 9 min
- **Sparse urban**
 - Mean 6 min
- **Sparse village & hamlet**
 - Mean 5 min
- **All less sparse**
 - Mean 4 min
 - $p < .011$

Rural time 1 min higher with density definition

With animals only

- **Sparse hamlet**
 - Mean 14 min
- **Sparse village**
 - Mean 11 min
- **Less sparse Town, village, hamlet**
 - Mean 7 min
- **Less sparse urban, town**
 - Mean 5 min
- **Sparse urban**
 - Mean 2 min
 - $p < .022$

Rural time 4 min higher with density definition



People with disabilities

Primary social time

- **Hamlet, sparse + less**
 - Mean 3 hours 40 min
 - Sparse urban higher, but 8 cases
- **Sparse village**
 - Mean 3 hours 10 min
- **Less sparse urban & village**
 - Mean 2 hours 50 min
- **Town sparse & less**
 - Mean 2 hours 30 min
 - $p < .020$
- Rural time not different with density definition

With animals only

- **Sparse hamlet**
 - 45% participate
- **Sparse village**
 - 30% participate
- **Less sparse hamlet**
 - 27% participate
- **Less sparse town**
 - 22% participate
- **Less sparse village**
 - 18% participate
- **Sparse town + less urban**
 - 13% participate
 - $p < .000$

Rural participation double with density definition



Adult in households with child aged <5

Primary social time

- **Sparse areas
(combined n=54)**
 - 98% participate on any given day
- **Less sparse town, village**
 - 93% participate
- **Less sparse urban**
 - 90% participate
- **Less sparse hamlet**
 - 81% participate

Social volunteering

- **Sparse areas combined**
 - 4% participate
- **Less sparse town, village and hamlet**
 - 10% participate
- **Less sparse urban**
 - 11% participate



Adult in households with child aged <5

Phone/e-mail time

- **Sparse areas (combined n=54) & non-sparse hamlet**
 - 1% participate on any given day
- **Less sparse town, urban**
 - 4% participate
- **Less sparse village**
 - 10% participate

Low intensity

- **Less sparse village**
 - 33% participate
- **Less sparse hamlet**
 - 40% participate
- **Less sparse town**
 - 48% participate
- **Sparse areas combined**
 - 51% participate
- **Less sparse urban**
 - 53% participate



Conclusions

- Rural communities have high levels of social participation, and these participation patterns differ from urban patterns
- The settlement-type variable produces more refined results than the population density variable
- More categories yield more detail, but simple break-points in population density do not account for all variations in time use



Conclusions

- Limited sample size for some settlement types for some groups at greater risk of social exclusion – might need an over-sample of some settlement types – or to include Scotland
- Electronic diary instruments which can be posted out/back may facilitate such over-sampling at a more reasonable cost
- **Time use data offers unexploited rural policy analysis potential**

Contact

- Please feel free to contact Kimberly Fisher for further information.
- Kimberly.Fisher@sociology.ox.ac.uk
- Other Time Use research is on the web
- <http://www.timeuse.org>