

Deutsches Institut für  
Wirtschaftsforschung

 **DIW** BERLIN

# Discussion Papers

# 999

Anzelika Zaiceva • Klaus F. Zimmermann

**Do Ethnic Minorities "Stretch"  
Their Time? – Evidence from the  
UK Time Use Survey**

Berlin, April 2010

Opinions expressed in this paper are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect views of the institute.

## IMPRESSUM

© DIW Berlin, 2010

DIW Berlin  
German Institute for Economic Research  
Mohrenstr. 58  
10117 Berlin  
Tel. +49 (30) 897 89-0  
Fax +49 (30) 897 89-200  
<http://www.diw.de>

ISSN print edition 1433-0210  
ISSN electronic edition 1619-4535

Available for free downloading from the DIW Berlin website.

Discussion Papers of DIW Berlin are indexed in RePEc and SSRN.  
Papers can be downloaded free of charge from the following websites:

[http://www.diw.de/de/diw\\_01.c.100406.de/publikationen\\_veranstaltungen/publikationen/diskussionspapiere/diskussionspapiere.html](http://www.diw.de/de/diw_01.c.100406.de/publikationen_veranstaltungen/publikationen/diskussionspapiere/diskussionspapiere.html)  
<http://ideas.repec.org/s/diw/diwwpp.html>  
[http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/JELJOUR\\_Results.cfm?form\\_name=journalbrowse&journal\\_id=1079991](http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/JELJOUR_Results.cfm?form_name=journalbrowse&journal_id=1079991)

## **Do Ethnic Minorities “Stretch” Their Time? Evidence from the UK Time Use Survey**

Anzelika Zaiceva (IZA and University of Bologna)

and

Klaus F. Zimmermann (IZA, Bonn University, and DIW Berlin)

### **Abstract**

This paper investigates the effect of ethnicity on time spent on overlapped household production, work and leisure activities employing the 2000-2001 UK Time Use Survey. We find that, unconditionally, white females manage to “stretch” their time the most by an additional 233 minutes per day and non-white men “stretch” their time the least. The three secondary activities that are most often combined with other (primary) activities in terms of time spent on them are social activities including resting, passive leisure and childcare. Regression results indicate that non-white ethnic minorities engage less in multitasking than whites, with Pakistani and Bangladeshi males spending the least time. The gap is present for both ethnic minority males and females, although females in general engage more in multitasking. The effect is also heterogeneous across different sub-groups. We then discuss several potential interpretations and investigate whether these differences in behavior may also relate to opportunity costs of non-market time, different preferences and tastes of ethnic minorities, integration experience, family composition, household productivity and other.

JEL Classification: J22, J15.

Keywords: time use, multitasking, ethnic minorities, UK

Corresponding author:

Anzelika Zaiceva

IZA

Schaumburg-Lippe-Str. 5-9

53113 Bonn, Germany

Tel: +49 22838940

E-mail: [zaiceva@iza.org](mailto:zaiceva@iza.org)

## 1. Introduction

Time pressure is a familiar phenomenon in the modern world and doing several activities at a time is one of the strategies to cope with it. Such multitasking emerges when cooking a meal and minding children, washing dishes and listening to the radio, or eating and reading a newspaper during a lunch break. Popular press and anecdotal evidence suggest it is a widespread experience (“Who can remember life before multitasking? These days we all do it.”, Rosen 2008, p. 105). This phenomenon, however, may differ, for instance, according to gender, age, education, job types or between the native population and immigrants or ethnic minorities. In this paper we are particularly interested in ethnic differences in multitasking.

Multitasking in home production can be viewed as an optimal choice of rational individuals to allocate effectively scarce time resources (Kalenkoski and Foster 2010). As such this choice may differ across different ethnic groups, reflecting among other things different opportunity costs of non-market time. Multitasking is also a potential response to time stress<sup>1</sup>, as it relaxes the time constraint (Ruuskanen 2004). Since ethnic minorities are likely to have different labor market work hours and earnings (a different shadow price of time), they are likely to experience different time pressure and thus multitasking behavior. Together with other assimilation time use activities (Hamermesh and Trejo 2010), multitasking can also constitute an additional assimilation channel for ethnic minorities. Hence, it is important to understand whether this is the case, what drives such behavior as well as its implications for home production, leisure and market work. This paper attempts to shed light on these issues by analyzing multitasking activities of natives and ethnic minorities in Britain.

Simultaneous activities (i.e. those performed in combination with the primary or main activity) in households are important. In Australia, about one third of waking hours are spent on simultaneous activities and at least one third of every activity episode recorded involves at least one other simultaneous activity (Ironmonger 2003; Floro and Miles 2003). In some countries, more than 90% of the households in the sample were found to engage in secondary activities (Ruuskanen 2004; Ironmonger 2003; Gronau and Hamermesh 2001). Incorporating such overlapping activities into the analysis provides a more accurate measure of individual economic contribution than the one based solely on primary activities, both to household production in general (Floro and Miles 2003; Apps and Rees 2005) and to childcare alone (Folbre and Yoon 2007; Kalenkoski, Ribar and Stratton

---

<sup>1</sup> See Hamermesh and Lee (2007) for a theoretical model of time stress and empirical evidence on the determinants of time stress for several countries. The authors note that “anything that makes the household more efficient in its home activities can be viewed as equivalent to an increase in effective time and should reduce the extent to which the time constraint binds.” (p. 375).

2005, 2007, 2009; Kalenkoski and Foster 2008, 2010). It has important implications for a better understanding of the intra-household bargaining models and the division of domestic chores, for productivity, gender roles and cultural norms as well as for the overall satisfaction and quality of life when one is able to or is constrained to “stretch” his or her time budget. On the other hand, it is also important to note that performing overlapping activities may lead to increased stress, diminished quality of work or less satisfaction from leisure.<sup>2</sup>

While multitasking has been widely analyzed in other disciplines, little research exists in economics, which is partly due to the data constraints. Psychologists and neurologists suggest that the brain works differently when multitasking (Rosen 2008) and even more differently for males and females (Gorski 1987). Sociologists emphasize the significance of gender divide when incorporating simultaneous activities into leisure time or home production time with women in general performing several activity simultaneously more than men (see, for example, Bittman and Wajcman 2000; Sullivan 1997). Anthropologists, social psychologists and sociologists argue that time perception is different in different cultures. They postulate that time is a social construction which can be viewed as monochronic (doing one thing at a time) or polichronic (using time for many activities simultaneously), and its perception vary across cultures (see Cotte and Ratneshwar 1999 and references therein).

There are reasons to believe that immigrants and ethnic minorities will have different time allocation decisions than natives. It is well documented in the literature that immigrants and ethnic minorities are often disadvantaged in the host country’s labor market and society in general, in particular in Europe, although some groups may perform relatively well. While white immigrants in the UK perform comparatively well or even better than the native-born whites, it is the ethnic minority immigrants who experience lower labor market outcomes than natives, such as employment probabilities, labor force participation and wages, with Pakistani and Bangladeshi (as well as Blacks) being the most disadvantaged groups (see among others Blackaby et al. 2002). And the employment rate of all ethnic minority women in the UK, in general, is much lower than for white natives. In addition, Muslims (Pakistani and Bangladeshi) in the UK were found to be “different” from other ethnic minorities in terms of gender gap in education, age at marriage, fertility and female employment, although convergence over time in behavior was also found and those born in Britain had often different behavior from those born in their country of origin (Georgiadis and Manning 2009). Finally, a considerable heterogeneity across non-white ethnic groups in terms of cultural preferences was also reported (Battu and Zenou 2010), and Pakistani and

---

<sup>2</sup> For example, Kalenkoski and Foster (2008) label secondary and multitasked childcare activities as a low-quality care. See also Coviello, Ichino and Persico (2010) for a theoretical model on multitasking at the workplace and evidence that parallel work increases time to complete the assignments and thus reduces productivity.

Bangladeshi were found to be extremely religious compared to other ethnic minorities (over 80% and 90%, respectively, report practicing religion) suggesting a persistent religiosity impact for these communities (Georgiadis and Manning 2009).

Economic integration goes hand-in-hand with social or cultural integration (Constant and Zimmermann 2009; Constant, Nottmeyer and Zimmermann 2009). Ethnic and cultural identity was found to influence labor market behavior in a number of recent studies (see, for example, Battu and Zenou 2010; Constant and Zimmermann 2008; although Casey and Dustmann 2010, find no effect). The extent of self-identification with the country of ancestry, its culture and religion as well as preferences for ethnic “goods” depends on a number of factors, including family background and structure, social environment, immigration and naturalization experience, experiences of racial harassment and language, neighborhood effects and socio-economic factors (Battu and Zenou 2010; Bisin et al. 2008; Akerlof and Kranton 2000). Whatever the factors, however, ethnic and cultural identities were found to be extremely strong. For example, Battu and Zenou (2010) report that over 80% of each of ethnic minority groups in the UK think of themselves in terms of their own ethnic group (p. F59). Bisin et al. (2008) find that Muslims (Pakistani or Bangladeshi) in the UK integrate less and more slowly than non-Muslims and report that a Muslim born in the UK and who has spent more than 30 years there is comparable to a non-Muslim who has just arrived in the country in terms of religious identity (p. 445). In this context, an individual’s use of time can be viewed as constituting another dimension of individual manifestation of his or her ethnic identity. And as such, it is expected that there will also be differences between whites and non-whites (and between different non-white minorities) in their choices of the allocation of non-market time. Thus, it is important to understand how immigrants and ethnic minorities decide on their time budgets, including their multitasking decisions. Since ethnic minorities are likely to have different cultural norms and preferences, as well as different costs, including the opportunity costs of non-market time, it is also likely that they will have different time allocation and multitasking behavior.

This paper focuses on ethnicity in the analysis of multitasking by investigating whether and to what extent native and ethnic minority men and women spend their time on the overlapped (secondary) activities. We document the incidence of such activities by ethnic status and gender employing the 2000-2001 UK Time Use data. We then analyze the effect of ethnicity on each of the secondary activities in order to identify those which are most likely to be combined with the primary activities by ethnic minorities.

Our main findings are as follows. We find that non-white ethnic minorities in the UK engage less in multitasking activities than whites. The gap is present for both ethnic minority males and females, although females in general tend to engage more and to spend more time on

simultaneous activities. There are, however, important differences among ethnic minority groups with Pakistani and Bangladeshi males spending least time on secondary activities, *ceteris paribus*. The effect is also heterogeneous across different sub-groups, and suggests several potential interpretations in terms of the opportunity costs of non-market time, different preferences and tastes of ethnic minorities, integration, family composition, household productivity and other.

The rest of the paper is structured as follows. Section 2 briefly presents theoretical literature on the allocation of time and reviews relevant empirical studies. Data and descriptive evidence are provided in Section 3 and Section 4 follows with the presentation and discussion of estimation results. Section 5 concludes.

## **2. A framework for analyzing time allocation, home production and multitasking**

The theoretical literature on the allocation of non-working time and household production goes back to the seminal work of Gary Becker (1965), in which households are viewed as both producers and consumers. Households use market goods and time as inputs in their production function to produce commodities that enter their utility function; they then maximize this utility subject to budget and time constraints. Becker also notes that foregone earnings are primarily determined by the use of time, but that the opportunity costs of time differ for different commodities and time periods (weekends and evenings vs. weekdays) and are less for commodities that (indirectly) contribute to productive effort and earnings. His analysis provides important insights in terms of the shadow price of time and productivity of consumption time. Although multitasking is not directly analyzed in his original model, it may enter via relaxation of the time constraint or increasing the productivity of non-market time (see studies below). The model also seems to imply that if a shadow price of time is high, there will be more multitasking as an attempt to optimize time spent out of the market. Thus, if ethnic minorities have lower opportunity costs of non-market time and their time constraint is less binding, they will engage less in multitasking behavior.

Multitasking behavior may be explicitly generated by the notion of joint production of commodities in the household. Pollak and Wachter (1975) criticize Becker's model and allow for non-constant returns and joint production. They argue that households derive utility not only from commodities produced using time input, but also directly from using this time, which gives rise to joint production in their framework. Since household time spent on different activities is a direct source of utility (or disutility), household decisions about the allocation of time "reflect not only production considerations but also direct household preferences as to the use of time" (p. 271). Although this requires abandoning commodity shadow prices, "if people prefer to spend their time

in some activities rather than others, then the household technology exhibit joint production” (Pollak 2003, p. 122). Thus, in this framework tastes and preferences for time use matter. For the purpose of our paper, it implies that cultural roles, identities, preferences and tastes of different ethnic minorities are important. Gronau (1977) in line with Mincer (1962) emphasizes the importance to distinguish between leisure and home production and presents a model that generates different implications for these activities. Williams and Donath (1994) incorporate simultaneous uses of time and derive a household production function of the Cobb-Douglas form. In their model, the input hours variables are a weighted average of primary and secondary time use.

Pollak (1999) notes that simultaneous activities (multitasking) can be incorporated by treating each of the combinations as a single “compound” activity, which would greatly expand the number of activities. In this sense, simultaneous activities could then be treated in the “variety” framework of Gronau and Hamermesh (2008). Their theoretical Beckerian model is based on differences in time costs of different activities and differences in reservations prices. The former differ with a households’ efficiency in home production and market time needed to purchase market inputs; the latter varies with income. The model leads to several empirical implications which are then supported by the data: there is a positive income (and wage) effect on the demand for variety, and schooling increases the number of non-work activities.

In recent work, Kalenkoski and Foster (2010) develop a formal model that incorporates multitasking activities by treating time spent on childcare as sole-tasked or multitasked with other household production activities. In their model, the child production function and household production function consists of sole-tasked time devoted only to this activity and multitasked time spent in both childcare and household activities. Households then maximize their utility subject to the time constraint, which is the sum of sole-tasked time spent on childcare, sole-tasked time spent on household production and multitasked time spent on both. The model renders several predictions about the relationships between the household productivity factors and multitasked time, which are then tested empirically. In particular, an increase in multitasked activity productivity would increase time spent on multitasking.

A multitude of empirical studies have investigated time allocation and home production in households. However, only few of them focus on ethnicity. Zaiceva and Zimmermann (2007) using the UK Time Use Survey and looking at the primary activities, find the existence of an ethnic divide in such “traditional” activities as childcare, food management and religious practices. The authors show that, *ceteris paribus*, non-white females spend more time on religious activities and, to some extent, on food management than do white females. A recent paper by Hamermesh and Trejo (2010) develops a two-period model of time use of immigrants and tests it empirically. Their theory



is based on the fact that certain activities entail fixed costs, such as learning language or becoming accustomed with the host country culture. It predicts that immigrants will be less likely than natives to engage in these activities, but once engaged will spend more time on them. The authors find support for their theory when analyzing time spent on education, purchasing and market work, i.e. what they call “assimilation activities”, using American and Australian Time Use Surveys. Neither of the papers, however, examined simultaneous use of time, i.e. overlapping activities. In this paper, we turn to the analysis of such multitasking behavior.

A few economic studies have investigated the multitasking behavior of households, and the majority of them focuses on childcare (Kalenkoski, Ribar and Stratton 2005, 2007, 2009; Kalenkoski and Foster 2008, 2010). Floro and Miles (2003) employ the Australian Time Use data to study the incidence and determinants of overlapping activities, differentiating between (household and market) work and non-work activities. They show, among other results, that individuals who speak a language other than English at home are less likely to perform overlapped work activities. They also find that education, employment status, income, household life cycle and composition matter. In addition, women were generally shown to “stretch” their time budget more than men. Ruuskanen (2004) builds on Hamermesh and Lee’s (2007) model of time stress and finds some evidence of the positive impact of general rush and time pressure on multitasking behavior of Finnish households, although in many cases, the feeling of being rushed during the day had a negative impact. This paper is closest in spirit to Floro and Miles (2003) in analyzing the determinants of multitasking, however, it focuses on ethnicity, uses dataset for the UK and suggests several potential channels for observed differences in behavior between natives and ethnic minorities.

### **3. Data and descriptive evidence**

Our empirical analysis employs data from the 2000 UK Time Use Survey (UKTUS), a representative survey of households and individuals in the UK. This detailed household survey was conducted in 2000-2001 and measures the amount of time spent by the UK population on various activities, with around 250 activity codes. This dataset is particularly suited for the purpose of our analysis, since it includes respondents’ secondary activities that are performed simultaneously with a main activity.<sup>3</sup> Moreover, together with a rich set of demographic and socio-economic variables,

---

<sup>3</sup> Secondary activities were recorded for all primary activities, with the exception of sleep, work or study as a primary activity. In the case of labor market work, however, if the primary activity was lunch or coffee breaks during work, secondary activities were recorded.

the survey contains information on respondents' ethnicity (white, black Caribbean, black African, Indian, Pakistani, Bangladeshi and Chinese).

Time diaries were collected for individuals older than eight, and contain information about the nature of the activities, the location of each activity, and who else was present during each activity for every 10-minute interval over two days, one weekday and one weekend day, as well as diaries for both partners in the household. Overall, the UKTUS has 20,981 time diaries from 11,664 people from 6,414 households. For our analysis, we construct a general sample of adults with time diary information, excluding individuals who are younger than 18 and older than 65 years old, as well as pensioners, full-time students, the long-term sick and disabled and those for whom the data on the key variables are missing.

In order to understand the patterns of multitasking, we first present the incidence of multitasked activities broken down by different characteristics (see Table 1). Around 93% of all households in the sample report being engaged in multitasking activities, i.e. spending a positive amount of time on secondary activities, and the difference between a weekday and a weekend day is small. Consistent with existing literature, there are gender differences in the propensity to multitask, with females engaging more in overlapped activities than males. In line with other studies, higher educated, married, those with children and individuals under time stress (those who “feel rushed”) report higher incidence of multitasking. The largest differences, however, are by ethnicity, with roughly 93% of whites and only 78% of non-whites reporting multitasked behavior. This divide is also present when disaggregating between housework and leisure activities, with white men and women having higher incidence of multitasking than non-whites in both (not reported, but available upon request).

We thus turn to the analysis of the total time respondents spend on all secondary activities, broken down by gender and ethnicity. Figure 1 plots the amount of minutes spent per day<sup>4</sup> on 13 secondary activities of interest recorded in the time use diary.<sup>5</sup> The figure shows that the greatest amount of multitasked time is spent on social activities and resting and passive leisure, followed by childcare. These three activities are mostly combined with other (primary) activities. The figure also suggests that while there are differences by ethnicity for men and women for the former two secondary activities (with whites spending more time multitasking than non-whites of the corresponding gender), it is rather gender that matters for the childcare.

---

<sup>4</sup> Note that here we pool together diaries for a weekday and a weekend day because of the small differences between the activities of interest. In the econometric analysis below, however, we distinguish between a weekday and a weekend day.

<sup>5</sup> We broadly follow Floro and Miles (2003) and Zaiceva and Zimmermann (2007) when defining these activities. Travel time is included in the “other” category. Note also that we give equal weight to primary and secondary activities throughout the analysis.

Figure 2 explores further the differences between non-white ethnicities in the three largest multitasking activities. Following the literature and due to the small number of observations, we pool Pakistani and Bangladeshi into one group, and all Blacks into another. As can be seen from figure 2, the ethnic minorities who least “stretch” their time are Pakistani and Bangladeshi men. It also shows that the largest amount of time spent on secondary childcare activities is by Chinese women, on passive leisure by Chinese men and on social activities by Black men. The different situation of Pakistani and Bangladeshi with respect to multitasking mirrors their differences in other outcomes found in the literature (see Section 1) and suggests that it is important to differentiate between ethnic minorities.

Table 2 shows the number of minutes per day (pooling again a weekend day and a weekday) spent on primary and secondary activities and the three main corresponding secondary or primary activities combined with them. The main facts to note are as follows. First, white females manage to “stretch” their time the most by additional 233 minutes per day (almost 4 hours), which means that they try to squeeze 28 hours of activities into a 24-hour day (see also Ironmonger 2003). On the other hand, non-white men “stretch” their time the least (by 116 minutes), less than non-white females (157 minutes), and both groups less than white men (186 minutes).

Second, as we have already seen above, social activities (including rest) and passive leisure are mostly combined with other primary activities in terms of minutes spent for all groups. Females, however, spend more minutes in such “combined” leisure activities than men of the corresponding ethnicity. However, when we look at primary activities with which these secondary activities are most often combined, we see that it is mainly other leisure, sleep or personal care, and other domestic work for females (other/travel activities are also sometimes mentioned). For men on the other hand, other domestic work is the third combined activity only for passive leisure and only for white men. This partly supports the findings of sociologists that leisure of women is of a worse quality than of men due to its combination with other primary activities, as men enjoy more “pure” and “uncontaminated” leisure than women (see, for example, Bittman and Wajcman 2000). It also suggests that it is important to see which activities secondary leisure is combined with, as it can be combined with leisure itself.

Third, consistent with the literature, we find that the large amount of time spent on childcare is via secondary childcare activities. Moreover, these overlapping activities constitute the third largest category in terms of time spent for females, and the difference is large between the genders. For example, while white females spend around 39 minutes on childcare as a primary activity, they spend an additional 32 minutes combining childcare with other activities (the corresponding numbers are 55 and 30 minutes for non-white females). White men, on the other hand, spend only

16 and 13 minutes on primary and secondary childcare activities (non-white men 29 and 14 minutes). When looking at which primary activities childcare is combined with, we see that for both white and non-white females it is mainly other domestic work and food management (together with passive leisure for non-white and eating/personal care for white women). The picture for other home production activities is similar to that of childcare: women spend more time on primary activities and also “stretch” their time more than men, with white women “stretching” their time the most. Finally, the largest number of minutes spent on overlapped labor market work and related activities (lunch and coffee breaks) is for white men (7.5 minutes), followed by white women (5 minutes), while non-white men and women spend 4 and 3 minutes, respectively. Interestingly, while these activities are mainly combined with eating/personal care and social/resting as primary activities by all individuals, men also combine them with passive leisure and women with shopping or travel activities.

Overall, the descriptive evidence presented in this section suggests that non-white ethnic minorities, especially Pakistani and Bangladeshi men, engage less in multitasking activities. This may be due to different observable characteristics of these groups, such as human capital endowments, employment status or family composition. It may also reflect different cultural preferences or costs, including opportunity costs, of engaging in multitasked non-market activities. The following section explores these issues and attempts to suggest several potential channels.

#### 4. Estimation strategy and results

The descriptive statistics presented above suggest that non-white ethnic minorities in Britain do less multitasking than whites. Moreover, there are differences among the non-white minorities, with Pakistani and Bangladeshi men engaging the least in overlapped activities. In this section, we first examine whether this relation still holds after having controlled for other observable characteristics and analyze other determinants of multitasking behavior. We then explore several potential avenues of this effect.

We employ a simple Tobit model of the following specification:

$$y_i^* = e_i\beta + x_i\gamma + \varepsilon_i$$

$$y_i = \begin{cases} y_i^* & \text{if } y_i^* > 0 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

where  $y_i^*$  is a latent variable for multitasking capacity of individual  $i$ ,  $y_i$  is the observed time spent on overlapped activities,  $e_i$  is the ethnicity variable equal to 1 for non-white individuals,

$x_i$  is the vector of explanatory variables (individual and household), and  $\varepsilon_i \sim N(0, \sigma^2)$ . Our main coefficient of interest is  $\beta$ . We also estimate a specification substituting our single ethnicity variable with a vector of dummies for different non-white ethnicities. We report mainly marginal effects for the probability of  $y$  being uncensored and for the expected value of  $y$  conditional on  $y$  being positive.

Table 3 shows the determinants of multitasked behavior, where the dependent variable is either all secondary activities or the secondary home production activities only (household work and family care, including childcare).<sup>6</sup> The most extended model is presented, which includes household income and employment status variables. Clearly, the findings using these variables are subject to potential endogeneity and simultaneity problems and therefore have to be interpreted as a descriptive exercise. Eliminating them from the model, however, does not change the qualitative interpretation of our results (available upon request).

The main conclusion from this table is that ethnicity matters, *ceteris paribus*, and non-white minorities are less likely to engage in and spend fewer minutes on overlapping activities. The marginal effects of the non-white variable for the “unconditional” expected value of  $y$  were negative and highly significant (not reported, but available upon request). On weekdays, non-white individuals are 17 percentage points less likely to multitask and those who do spend on average 67 minutes fewer on such activities than whites. This negative effect is smaller in absolute terms for weekends. The same holds true for housework activities only. Moreover, the magnitude of the effect suggests that it is also economically significant, being the largest in absolute terms in the regressions for all secondary activities and one of the largest effects (together with children and gender impacts) for household work activities. Regarding other determinants, females are more likely to engage in and, conditional on engaging, spend more minutes on multitasking than males, which is consistent with other studies. On the other hand, there is no evidence of a significant age effect for all secondary activities, and age is positive and significant in the equation for household production activities suggesting that housework activities increase with age, which is also in line with Floro and Miles (2003). Household composition matters particularly for household work activities: the effects of being married and the number of children are positive and the effect of other adults in the household is negative; while marital status and the number of children 10-15 years old and 5-9 years old (in the equation for weekends) are not significant in the regressions for all secondary activities. Moreover, as expected, the number of pre-school children has the larger effect and is most important in the equation for household work activities, among which childcare

---

<sup>6</sup> We have also experimented with the so-called “work” activities (labor market work, household work and family care and volunteer work and meetings) as in Floro and Miles (2003). The results were qualitatively the same, with the only difference for age effect: it became insignificant in the equation for weekdays.

constitutes the majority. The income effect is captured by the total household income variable. It is negative and significant only for the lowest income category in the equation for all secondary activities. Since this negative effect is not significant for housework activities it seems to originate from leisure activities and suggests that household income negatively affects the incidence and the amount of overlapped leisure activities for the poorest households. One of the potential reasons could be that these households engage less in market work and thus their time constraint is less binding and they do not feel a need to multitask by combining leisure activities with something else.

The employment effect is negative, which is somewhat surprising, however, it may reflect the larger propensity to outsource services in the market instead of performing them and combining household work activities. It may also indicate lower utility when engaging in secondary leisure activities that are combined with other primary activities when not working in the market. In any case, such a negative employment effect is also in line with Floro and Miles (2003). Finally, regarding human capital and consistent with Floro and Miles (2003), having a higher education degree has a positive impact on performing overlapped activities and it matters both for the extensive and the intensive margin. Potential explanations for this effect include higher time constraints and larger opportunity costs of non-market time for these individuals as individuals with a high shadow price of time should experience more time stress and in an attempt to extend the available time would engage more in multitasking (Hamermesh and Lee 2007; Ruuskanen 2004). It is also consistent with the higher demand for “variety” by more skilled individuals reported by Gronau and Hamermesh (2008).

A further analysis of secondary housework activities by gender (not shown here) reveals several additional interesting facts. First, the negative employment effect is attributable exclusively to females, as it is insignificant in all equations for males. This reinforces our interpretation above and also seems to point towards the bargaining power model, i.e. employed females have a higher influence in household decision making and are better able to bargain on the division of household tasks.<sup>7</sup> Thus, there is less pressure for such females to multitask home production activities. Second, the effect of higher education is stronger for females (for males it is smaller in magnitude and becomes insignificant for weekends), which is also in line with our interpretations of higher time constraints and larger opportunity costs of non-market time for higher educated females.

Existing research suggests there are substantial differences among ethnic minorities in Britain (see Section 1). We explore this issue in Table 4, where the same regressions as above were

---

<sup>7</sup> Ideally, we would need to have each spouse’s contribution to the total household income, i.e. earnings. However, linking spouses and keeping only those with valid earnings information reduces the sample even more, which becomes prohibitively small for the analysis of non-white minorities. Nevertheless, we do experiment with individual earnings below.

estimated disaggregating by ethnic minority and gender. These results, however, have to be interpreted with caution, since the number of non-whites decreases further when disaggregating by ethnic groups, gender and weekday and weekend diaries. The regression results confirm a descriptive picture above: Pakistani and Bangladeshi men are least likely to engage in and spend the least time on overlapped activities. Compared to whites, they are 37 and 29 percentage points less likely to perform secondary activities, and once engaged in them, they spend 93 and 75 minutes less on weekdays and weekends, respectively. There is also a strong negative effect for Indian men. Regarding females, three ethnic groups (Blacks, Pakistani/Bangladeshi and Indian) have a strong negative effect relative to whites (the effect for Indian females is insignificant for weekends). The largest negative effects for females are for Indians for weekdays and for Pakistanis and Bangladeshis for weekends. Note also that the effect for Chinese men is positive in the equation for weekends, however, the overall non-significance of the results for Chinese is most likely attributable to the very small sample size for this group.

When disaggregating further by different overlapped activities, the large negative effect for Pakistani and Bangladeshi men is attributable mainly to the large negative effect for secondary leisure activities, but it is significant although smaller in absolute terms also for secondary housework and all work activities (as well as for personal care activities, not shown). The effect for Indian men becomes insignificant at the 5% level in the equations for household work activities and it is the largest in the equation for leisure, suggesting that the overall negative effect comes mainly also from leisure activities. It also suggests that for Indian men, apart of leisure activities, it is not housework that contributes to the overall negative effect, but rather voluntary work and meetings (including religious activities) as well as personal care activities (not shown). For females, the large negative effect for Indians on weekdays seem to be attributable mostly to the large negative effect on secondary leisure activities (but it is also significant in the equations for other activities). On the other hand, the large negative effect for Pakistani and Bangladeshi women on weekends is attributed exclusively to leisure activities as it is insignificant in the equations for housework and all work (and the effect is significant, but small in the equation for personal care activities, not shown).

Overall, we have documented the existence of a gap in multitasking behavior (i.e. time spent on overlapped/secondary activities) between the white majority and non-white minority in the UK. The gap is present for both ethnic minority males and females, although females in general tend to engage more and spend more time on simultaneous activities. There is also heterogeneity among ethnic minorities, with Pakistani and Bangladeshi males having the largest gap, *ceteris paribus*, and it is most pronounced for secondary leisure activities (but also significant for housework and all

work activities). The question that arises next is whether this effect is distributed equally across different groups and if not, what are the potential sources of these differences?

Table 5 shows the effect of non-white ethnicity on total time spent on all secondary activities for different subsamples. These are the marginal effects from the Tobit regressions for the expected value of  $y$  conditional on positive values, and the rest of the controls are as above (here we once more combine weekday and weekend diaries together to increase the sample size and include an additional dummy for a weekday diary). We first look at citizenship as one potential channel. The intuition is that if citizenship is a proxy for integration and acculturation, naturalized ethnic minorities would not be different from the majority. This, however, is not necessarily the case for multitasking behavior. As can be seen from the first two rows of Table 5, among citizens, non-white ethnicity has a significant negative impact on the time spent on secondary activities, while the effect is insignificant for male non-citizens. Nevertheless, the effect for females is larger in absolute terms for non-citizens than for citizens, suggesting some role of integration, lower assimilation costs, learning and convergence towards the majority's behavior.

Given the literature on "time stress" and multitasking as a response to it, we then split our sample into a group that reports always feeling rushed and into a group that does not. Although the effect of non-white ethnicity is significant in all groups, the gap is larger in absolute terms for the former group for both genders. This implies that even in the group that is subject to time stress, ethnic minorities "stretch" their time budgets less than whites.

We then look at the opportunity costs of non-market time. The literature suggests that individuals with high shadow price of time should experience more time stress and in an attempt to extend the available time would engage more in multitasking (Hamermesh and Lee 2007; Ruuskanen 2004). For this purpose, following the literature, we first estimate the regression of individual hourly earnings and predict the earnings for the whole sample.<sup>8</sup> We then split the sample into a group that has higher opportunity costs of non-market time (predicted earnings are larger than the sample's mean) and into a group with lower opportunity costs. The results show that the gap between whites and non-whites is smaller in the sub-sample with lower shadow price of time. This suggests that ethnic minorities with lower opportunity costs are closer to whites with low opportunity costs, although the gap still exists.

The next potential channel is the differences in tastes and cultural attitudes towards housework and chores. In the survey, individuals are asked if they like doing certain housework activities. Based on this information, we split our sample into two groups: one in which respondents reply that they like doing at least two of the following chores – cooking, shopping for food,

---

<sup>8</sup> The regressors include gender, ethnicity, age and its square as a proxy for labor market experience, marital status, number of children and adults, education levels and region fixed effects.



cleaning, washing clothes and ironing; and another group in which respondents do not report to enjoy doing at least two of these activities. The intuition is that if an individual enjoys doing housework (derives utility from performing this activity, i.e. a joint production framework of Pollak and Wachter 1975) she would probably spend more time on this activity alone, and vice versa: those who do not enjoy housework would try to combine these activities with each other or with something else which would result in more multitasking. For the latter group, the role of ethnicity is lower for males and insignificant for females. The negative and significant ethnicity effect for the former group may also indicate higher cultural preferences of non-white ethnicities for monochronic behavior.

Another important channel may be the availability of equipment which enhance household's productivity of multitasked activities (Kalenkoski and Foster 2010). To proxy for this, we use the availability of washing machine, tumble drier, dishwasher and microwave in a household. The results suggest that for males the negative effect of non-white ethnicity is smaller for those who have all these household appliances. For females, however, the negative effect is even larger in this subsample, pointing towards different preferences for the uses of time between white and non-white females, even conditioning on the availability of household productivity enhancing appliances. In the next rows, we add to our household productivity measures an indicator of whether a household has a computer and internet. For females, the difference between the groups increases, whereas for males, the effect switches, becoming larger for the group that possesses all this equipment.

We then add an indicator of whether an individual has or regularly uses a motor vehicle. Ethnic minorities, especially women may rely more extensively on public transportation, which in turn would may make their time constraint tighter and would suggest performing more multitasked activities. Using a car instead may lower the time costs and thus makes the time constraints less binding. However, although after conditioning on using a motor vehicle the effect of non-white ethnicity is still significant and negative for both males and females, in the group that does not use a motor vehicle, the effect for females is negative, significant and much larger. The effect for males in the latter group is not significant at the 5% level, which most probably reflects the small sample size for males who do not use motor vehicles.

Differentiating between employed and not-employed individuals renders the expected results. The gap is smaller in the subsample of employed individuals, indicating a smaller role of ethnicity when the amount of disposable non-market time is smaller and the opportunity costs of it are larger. When splitting the sample by the presence of small children in the household, gender differences become apparent. For males, the effect of ethnicity is larger in the households with children, while for females it is smaller and insignificant at the 5% level. This suggests that both

white and non-white females multitask more (see above) and spend a similar amount of time when they have small children. Regarding human capital, although having a higher education degree is associated with more multitasking (see above), the ethnicity gap is also larger for this group. This may reflect the fact that higher educated ethnic minorities have either more time than whites and thus can afford to multitask less (for example, due to lower labor market participation) or they choose to multitask less because of different preferences for non-market time use.

Finally, we also perform the following exercise. We estimate our baseline model for all secondary activities (pooling together weekday and weekend and including a dummy for the diary day) sequentially including into it several additional variables mentioned above and study the effect of the non-white dummy. When we include a citizenship dummy, the Tobit coefficient on non-white dummy remains significant and diminishes in size slightly (from -95.16 to -92.11), suggesting that at least part of the effect of ethnicity is attributable to differences in naturalization (and the effect of citizenship is marginally significant). Adding further the dummy for feeling rushed actually increases the gap slightly (to -92.60), while the rush dummy is negative and significant. Including then dummies for enjoying particular household chores (cooking, shopping for food, cleaning, washing clothes and ironing) reduces the gap between whites and non-whites further to -89.59 minutes.

The attitudes dummies were insignificant in the pooled equation, however, when disaggregating by gender enjoying cooking was positive and marginally significant in the equation for males and liking cleaning was negative and significant for females. This suggests that preferences and tastes for household activities and time spent on them matter (at least partly) for the explanation of the ethnicity gap. We then add our proxies for household productivity, i.e. dummies for having a washing machine, a tumble drier, a dishwasher and a microwave oven. The coefficient on dishwasher was positive and marginally significant and the coefficient on tumble drier was negative and highly significant reflecting the negative impact for males (for females, the impact of having washing machine and tumble drier was negative and marginally significant and having a dishwasher was positive and significant). Adding these variables, however, increases the gap to 90.98 minutes, implying that differences in household productivity enhancing equipment exacerbate, but do not diminish the ethnicity gap.

On the other hand, including in addition dummies for having a computer in the household and internet connection reduces the ethnicity gap to -89.30 minutes, while including a dummy for using a motor vehicle reduces it slightly further to -89.21 minutes, suggesting the potential role of additional skills or better English language ability for immigrants (Chiswick and Miller 2007), as well as reduced time costs. Finally, when estimating on the subsample of working individuals with

non-missing individual earnings without and with earnings as an additional variable in the regression, the coefficient on non-white ethnicity drops from -77.58 to -76.83, while the impact of earnings on multitasking, in line with theoretical models of household production and time stress, is positive and highly significant.<sup>9</sup>

## 5. Conclusions

Multitasking behavior is an integral part of everyday life and it can be very different for majority and minority groups. This paper investigates whether and to what extent native and ethnic minority men and women differ in terms of their time spent on overlapped/secondary activities employing the 2000-2001 UK Time Use data.

We find that non-white ethnic minorities in the UK engage less in multitasking activities than whites. Descriptive statistics show that, unconditionally, white females manage to “stretch” their time the most by an additional 233 minutes per day (almost 4 hours), meaning that they try to squeeze 28 hours of activities into a 24-hour day. On the other hand, non-white men “stretch” their time the least (by 116 minutes). The three secondary activities that are most often combined with other (primary) activities in terms of time spent on them are social activities including resting, passive leisure and childcare, and the ethnic differences are important for the leisure activities while gender matters for childcare.

Our regression results then show that the gap between whites and non-whites is present for both ethnic minority males and females, although females in general tend to engage more and to spend more time on simultaneous activities. There are, however, important differences among ethnic minorities groups, with Pakistani and Bangladeshi males spending the least time on secondary activities, *ceteris paribus*. The lower propensity of non-white minorities to engage in multitasking activities may reflect several reasons. First, consistent with the theoretical models of household production and time stress, if ethnic minorities have lower opportunity costs of non-market time (shadow price of time), they will engage less in multitasking behavior. Due to the lower engagement in the labor market, ethnic minorities are also likely to experience lower time pressure and their time constraint is less binding, resulting in less multitasking. Second,

---

<sup>9</sup> We have also performed the Oaxaca-Blinder decomposition for those who spend positive amount of minutes on secondary activities (available upon request). In our baseline model, the average gap between whites and non-whites was 48.19 minutes, the explained part (due to the differences in endowments) was equal to -12.25 and the unexplained part (due to the differences in coefficients) was equal to 60.42. This suggests that if the time returns to endowments were the same for both groups, non-whites would have spent more time on multitasking than whites. However, this effect is out weighted by the contribution of the unexplained (and unobserved) factors. Moreover, number of pre-school children, the employed dummy and the higher education dummy had a negative and significant (at the 5% level) contribution to the explained part (and not significant to the unexplained part), suggesting that they worked to reduce the gap in multitasking.


multitasking behavior can constitute an additional assimilation channel for ethnic minorities, implying that learning and convergence towards the native's multitasking behavior takes time and that such behavior may entail larger costs for ethnic minorities. Third, different uses of time may be a manifestation of ethnic identity and of different preferences of ethnic minorities. If ethnic minorities have higher preferences towards monochronic uses of time or uncontaminated activities and if they derive utility from performing certain activities per se (Pollak and Wachter 1975), they will spend fewer minutes on overlapping activities. On the other hand, the availability of productivity enhancing technology seems to constitute a valid channel only partially, since even conditioning on the availability of washing machine, tumble drier, dishwasher and microwave in a household, the effect of non-white ethnicity is even larger for females. The list of potential channels is, of course, not at all exhaustive, and more research on the causes of different multitasking behavior of ethnic minorities is needed in the future.

## References


- Akerlof, G. A. & Kranton, R. E. (2000). Economics and identity. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 115, 715-753.
- Apps, P. & Rees, R. (2005). Gender, time use, and public policy over the life cycle. *Oxford Review of Economic Policy*, 21 (3), 439-461.
- Battu, H. & Zenou, Y. (2010). Oppositional identities and employment for ethnic minorities: Evidence from England. *Economic Journal*, 120, F52-F71.
- Becker, G. (1965). A theory of the allocation of time. *Economic Journal*, 75 (299), 493-517.
- Bisin, A., Patacchini, E., Verdier, T. & Zenou, Y. (2008). Are Muslim immigrants different in terms of cultural integration? *Journal of the European Economic Association*, 6 (2-3), 445-456.
- Bittman, M. & Wajcman, J. (2000). The rush hour: The character of leisure time and gender equity. *Social Forces*, 79 (1), 165-189.
- Blackaby, D. H., Leslie, D. G., Murphy, P. D. & O'Leary, N. C. (2002). White/ethnic minority earnings and employment differentials in Britain: Evidence from the LFS. *Oxford Economic Papers*, 54, 270-297.
- Casey, T. & Dustmann, C. (2010). Immigrants' identity, economic outcomes, and the transmission of identity across generations. *Economic Journal*, 120, F31-F51.
- Chiswick, B. R. & Miller, P. W. (2007). Computer usage, destination language proficiency and the earnings of natives and immigrants. *Review of Economics of the Household*, 5, 129-157.
- Constant, A. F. & Zimmermann, K. F. (2008). Measuring ethnic identity and its impact on economic behaviour. *Journal of the European Economic Association*, 6, 424-433.
- Constant, A. F. & Zimmermann, K. F. (2009). Migration, ethnicity and economic integration. IZA Discussion Paper No. 4620.
- Constant, A. F., Nottmeyer, O. & Zimmermann, K. F. (2009). Cultural integration in Germany. IZA Discussion Paper No. 4675.
- Cotte, J. & Ratneshwar, S. (1999). Juggling and hopping: What does it mean to work polychronically? *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 14 (3/4), 184-204.
- Coviello, D., Ichino, A. & Persico, N. (2010). Too many balls in the air. The impact of task juggling on workers' productivity. Mimeo.
- Floro, M. S. & Miles, M. (2003). Time use, work and overlapping activities: evidence from Australia. *Cambridge Journal of Economics*, 27, 881-904.

- Folbre, N. & Yoon, J. (2007). What is child care? Lessons from time-use surveys of major English-speaking countries. *Review of Economics of the Household*, 5, 223-248.
- Georgiadis, A. & Manning, A. (2009). Change and continuity among minority communities in Britain. *Journal of Population Economics* (forthcoming), DOI No. 10.1007/s00148-009-0288-x
- Gorski, R. A. (1987) Sex differences in the rodent brain: their nature and origin. In Reinsch, J.M. et al. (Eds.), *Masculinity and Femininity* (pp. 37-67). Oxford University Press.
- Gronau, R. (1977). Leisure, home production, and work – the theory of the allocation of time revisited. *Journal of Political Economy*, 85 (6), 1099-1123.
- Gronau, R. & Hamermesh, D. S. (2001). The demand for variety: A household production perspective. NBER Working Paper No. 8509.
- Gronau, R. & Hamermesh, D. S. (2008). The demand for variety: A household production perspective. *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 90 (3), 562-572.
- Hamermesh, D. S. & Lee, J. (2007). Stressed out in four countries: Time crunch or yuppie kvetch? *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 89 (2), 374–383.
- Hamermesh, D. S. & Trejo, S. J. (2010). How to assimilate? The time use of immigrants. Mimeo.
- Ironmonger, D. (2003). There are only 24 hours in a day! Solving the problematic of simultaneous time, *The 25th IATUR Conference on Time Use Research*, Brussels.
- Kalenkoski, C. M. & Foster, G. (2008). The quality of time spent with children in Australian households. *Review of Economics of the Household*, 6, 243-266.
- Kalenkoski, C. M. & Foster, G. (2010). The multitasking of household production. IZA Discussion Paper No 4845.
- Kalenkoski, C. M., Ribar, D. C. & Stratton, L. S. (2005). Parental child care in single parent, cohabiting and married couple families: Time diary evidence from the United Kingdom. *American Economic Review*, 95, 194-198.
- Kalenkoski, C. M., Ribar, D. C. & Stratton, L. S. (2007). The effect of family structure on parents' child care time in the United States and the United Kingdom. *Review of Economics of the Household*, 5, 353-384.
- Kalenkoski, C. M., Ribar, D. C. & Stratton, L. S. (2009). The influence of wages on parents' allocations of time to child care and market work in the United Kingdom. *Journal of Population Economics*, 22, 399-419.
- Mincer, J. (1962). Labor force participation of married women: A study of labor supply. In: Lewis, H.G. (Ed.), *Aspects of Labor Economics* (pp. 63-105). Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Pollak, R. A. (2003). Gary Becker's Contributions to Family and Household Economics. *Review of Economics of the Household*, 1, 111-141.
- Pollak, R. A. (1999). Notes on time use. *Monthly Labor Review* (August), 7-11.
- Pollak, R. A. & Wachter, M. L. (1975). The relevance of the household production function and its implications for the allocation of time. *Journal of Political Economy*, 83 (2), 255-278.
- Rosen, C. (2008). The myth of multitasking. *The New Atlantis* (Spring 2008), 105-110.
- Ruuskanen, O-P. (2004). More than two hands: Is multitasking an answer to stress? PhD Dissertation Chapter, Department of Economics, Helsinki School of Economics.
- Sullivan, O. (1997). Time waits for no (wo)man: an investigation of the gendered experience of domestic time. *Sociology*, 31 (2), 221-239.
- Williams, R. & Donath, S. (1994). Simultaneous uses of time in household production, *Review of Income and Wealth*, 40 (4), 433-440.
- Zaiceva, A. & Zimmermann, K. F. (2007). Children, kitchen, church: Does ethnicity matter? IZA Discussion Paper No. 3070.

**Fig. 1** Differences in “time stretching” by gender and ethnicity



**Fig. 2** Time spent on three largest secondary activities by ethnicity



**Table 1.** The incidence of multitasking. All secondary activities

	All	Males	Females	White	Non-white	Employed	Not employed	Feel always rushed	Do not feel rushed
All diaries	92.56	90.27	94.47	93.12	77.80	92.56	92.52	93.65	92.62
Weekday	93.63	91.53	95.39	94.27	76.74	93.68	93.33	95.24	93.39
Weekend	91.48	89.00	93.55	91.96	78.87	91.44	91.70	92.05	91.86
	Higher education and above	A, O levels, GCSE, vocational	Below GCSE, professional, other qualific.	No qualifications	Married	Not married	Have children	No children	
All diaries	95.59	92.89	92.09	89.53	92.83	91.71	93.37	91.88	
Weekday	96.37	93.91	94.30	90.68	93.96	92.61	94.73	92.72	
Weekend	94.80	91.86	89.87	88.38	91.70	90.80	92.00	91.05	

Notes: % of individuals which report engaging in at least one secondary activity during a diary day (weekday and weekend). Final sample used in the regressions.

**Table 2.** Time used on primary and secondary activities (in minutes per day) by ethnicity, men

Primary\Secondary	White				Non-white			
	Primary	Secondary	3 secondary activities combined with	3 primary activities combined with	Primary	Secondary	3 secondary activities combined with	3 primary activities combined with
LM work and related Household work	255.65	7.52	--	Sleep/eating/pers. care, leisure passive, social/resting	276.08	4.44	---	Sleep/eating/pers. care, social/resting, leisure passive
food management	29.55	1.47	Leisure passive, social/resting, childcare	Leisure passive, sleep/ eating/ pers. care, other dom. work	23.28	1.06	Leisure passive, sleep/ eating/ pers. care, childcare/dom. work	Other dom. work, sleep/eating/pers. care
childcare	16.02	13.35	Social/resting, leisure passive, childcare	Leisure passive, sleep/ eating/ pers. care, other dom. work	29.26	13.70	Leisure passive, social/resting, childcare	Leisure passive, other/travel, sleep/eating/pers. care
shopping	23.75	0.28	Social/resting, childcare, LM work and related	Other/travel, other dom. work, leisure active	25.82	0.21	Childcare, social/resting, LM work	Other/travel
other domestic work	68.06	3.28	Leisure passive, social/resting, childcare	Leisure passive, other dom. work, food mng.	39.26	1.80	Leisure passive, childcare, social/resting	Food mng., other dom. work, childcare
Voluntary work								
religious activities	2.90	0.08	Childcare, social/resting, other particip. Activities	Other partic. act., leisure active, other/travel	8.41	0.11	All equal: Social/resting, leisure passive, childcare, food mng.	Sleep/eating/pers. care, childcare
other participatory activities	8.98	1.18	Social/resting, leisure passive, sleep/eating/ personal care	Leisure passive, other/travel, sleep/eating/pers. care	2.28	0.26	Sleep/eating/personal care, social/resting	Other/travel, sleep/eating/pers. care
Leisure activities								
active	44.13	2.85	Social/resting, leisure passive, sleep/eating/ personal care	Social/resting, leisure passive, sleep/eating/pers. care	32.33	0.74	Social/resting, sleep/ eating /personal care, leisure active	Sleep/eating/pers. care, leisure passive
passive	170.99	62.25	Social/resting, sleep/ eating/ personal care, leisure passive	Sleep/eating/pers. care, other/travel, other dom. work	142.01	40.42	Social/resting, childcare, sleep/eating/personal care	Other/travel, sleep/eating/pers. care, social/resting
Other activities								
social and resting	80.96	75.22	Leisure passive, sleep/ eating/ personal care, social/resting	Sleep/eating/pers. care, leisure passive, other/travel	80.48	41.53	Leisure passive, sleep/ eating/ personal care, social/resting	Leisure passive, sleep/eating/pers. care, other/travel
education	5.14	0.11	---	Leisure passive, other partic. act., other/travel	4.13	0	---	---
sleeping, eating, personal care	624.31	17.61	Social/resting, leisure passive, LM work and related	Leisure passive, social/resting, leisure active	637.41	10.69	Social/resting, leisure passive, childcare	Social/resting, leisure passive, food mng.
Other	109.56	0.50	Leisure passive, social/resting, childcare	Social/resting, leisure passive, sleep/eating/pers. care	139.26	0.69	Leisure passive, social/resting, childcare	Leisure passive, social/resting
<b>Total</b>	<b>1440</b>	<b>185.70</b>			<b>1440</b>	<b>115.65</b>		
Observations			5102				189	

**Table 2 (cont'd).** Time used on primary and secondary activities (in minutes per day) by ethnicity, women

Primary / Secondary	White				Non-white			
	Primary	Secondary	3 secondary activities combined with	3 primary activities combined with	Primary	Secondary	3 secondary activities combined with	3 primary activities combined with
LM work and related Household work	150.26	5.18	---	Sleep/eating/pers.care, shopping, other/travel	105.40	3.22	---	Sleep/eating/pers. care, social/resting, other/travel
food management	68.75	3.47	Leisure passive, social/resting, childcare	Other dom. work, leisure passive, sleep/eating/pers. care	96.57	1.92	Leisure passive, social/resting, childcare	Food mng., sleep/eating/pers. care, other domestic work
childcare	39.43	31.54	Social/resting, childcare, leisure passive	Other dom. work, sleep /eating/pers. care, food mng.	54.56	30.46	Childcare, leisure passive, social	Leisure passive, food mng., other domestic work
shopping	39.23	0.32	Social/resting, childcare, LM work and related	Other/travel, shopping, leisure active	35.48	0	Social/resting, childcare, LM work and related	---
other domestic work	102.77	8.73	Leisure passive, childcare, social/resting	Leisure passive, food mng., other dom. work	85.98	4.44	Leisure passive, childcare, social/resting	Leisure passive, leisure active, food mng. (other dom. work)
Voluntary work								
religious activities	3.01	0.08	Social/resting, childcare, leisure active	Sleep/eating/pers. care, childcare, leisure passive	28.12	0.67	Childcare, social/resting, sleep/eating/pers. care	Leisure passive, food mng.
other participatory activities	13.30	2.70	Social/resting, leisure passive, other partic. act	Other/travel, leisure passive, sleep/eating/pers. care	9.16	1.84	Social/resting, other partic. act., sleep/eating/pers. care	Leisure passive, other partic. activities, sleep/eating/pers. care
Leisure activities								
active	23.94	1.95	Social/resting, leisure passive, childcare	Leisure passive, social/resting, sleep/eating/pers. care	19.25	0.88	Social/resting, leisure passive, other domestic work	Leisure active, social/resting
passive	143.22	72.89	Social/resting, sleep /eating/personal care, childcare	Sleep/eating/pers. care, other dom. work, other/travel	133.93	48.49	Social/resting, childcare, sleep/eating/personal care	Sleep/eating/pers. care, other/travel, other dom. Work
Other activities								
social and resting	93.64	87.73	Leisure passive, social/resting, sleep/eating/pers. care	Sleep/eating/pers. care, leisure passive, other/travel	79.33	58.28	Leisure passive, social/resting, childcare	Leisure passive, sleep/eating/pers. care, other/travel
education	5.83	0.10	---	Leisure active, sleep/ eating /pers. care, other partic. act.	11.13	0.04	---	---
sleeping, eating, personal care	650.00	17.15	Social/resting, leisure passive, childcare	Leisure passive, social/resting, food mng.	653.35	6.90	Social, leisure passive, childcare	Leisure passive
Other	106.64	0.85	Leisure passive, social/resting, childcare	Leisure passive, sleep /eating/pers. care, social/resting	127.74	0.33	Leisure passive, social/resting, childcare	Leisure passive, food mng., other dom. work
<b>Total</b>	<b>1440</b>	<b>232.69</b>			<b>1440</b>	<b>157.47</b>		
<b>Observations</b>			6076				239	

Notes: Means are reported. Time includes zero minutes. LM work and related activities include main job, second job and activities related to employment (lunch and coffee breaks etc.). Secondary activities for labor market work, sleep and study (education) are not recorded in the diary but are recorded for lunch and coffee breaks (e.g., for white men the only two secondary activities are social/resting and other/travel and no secondary activity is reported for non-white men). Final sample used in the regressions.



**Table 3.** Determinants of overlapping activities. Marginal Effects from Tobit model

	All secondary activities				Secondary housework activities			
	Weekday		Weekend		Weekday		Weekend	
	E(Y Y>0)	Pr(Y>0)	E(Y Y>0)	Pr(Y>0)	E(Y Y>0)	Pr(Y>0)	E(Y Y>0)	Pr(Y>0)
Non-white	-66.601*** (8.787)	-0.174*** (0.032)	-48.911*** (9.182)	-0.129*** (0.031)	-18.173*** (2.798)	-0.190*** (0.028)	-12.906*** (3.288)	-0.137*** (0.034)
Female	30.480*** (2.981)	0.054*** (0.005)	28.306*** (2.909)	0.057*** (0.006)	19.827*** (1.100)	0.200*** (0.010)	16.427*** (1.078)	0.172*** (0.011)
Age	-0.237 (0.183)	-0.0004 (0.0003)	-0.154 (0.171)	-0.0003 (0.0003)	0.158** (0.061)	0.002** (0.001)	0.104* (0.054)	0.001* (0.0006)
Married	-4.902 (4.885)	-0.008 (0.008)	-5.390 (4.749)	-0.011 (0.009)	6.580*** (1.617)	0.068*** (0.017)	7.409*** (1.505)	0.079*** (0.016)
No. of children 0-2 years old	20.262*** (5.824)	0.035*** (0.010)	12.635** (5.869)	0.025** (0.012)	25.040*** (2.142)	0.255*** (0.022)	20.044*** (1.858)	0.211*** (0.019)
No. of children 3-4 years old	15.239** (6.792)	0.026** (0.012)	23.636*** (7.018)	0.047*** (0.014)	19.128*** (2.319)	0.195*** (0.024)	20.673*** (2.253)	0.218*** (0.023)
No. of children 5-9 years old	7.500** (3.678)	0.013** (0.006)	-2.793 (3.680)	-0.006 (0.007)	13.773*** (1.192)	0.140*** (0.012)	12.108*** (1.148)	0.128*** (0.012)
No. of children 10-15 years old	1.242 (3.033)	0.002 (0.005)	-3.707 (3.038)	-0.007 (0.006)	9.356*** (1.023)	0.095*** (0.010)	7.086*** (1.143)	0.075*** (0.011)
No. of adults	-7.966*** (2.283)	-0.014*** (0.004)	-8.580*** (2.323)	-0.017*** (0.005)	-5.420*** (0.751)	-0.055*** (0.007)	-4.485*** (0.710)	-0.047*** (0.007)
Gross annual hh income<= 10,430	-22.531*** (8.733)	-0.043** (0.019)	-31.552*** (8.520)	-0.072*** (0.022)	-2.258 (2.963)	-0.023 (0.031)	-1.107 (2.801)	-0.012 (0.030)
Gross annual hh income> 10,430 and <=55,000	-4.379 (7.074)	-0.008 (0.012)	-9.089 (7.356)	-0.018 (0.014)	1.807 (2.345)	0.018 (0.024)	1.995 (2.166)	0.021 (0.023)
Employed	-30.138*** (5.979)	-0.046*** (0.008)	-26.576*** (5.672)	-0.047*** (0.009)	-8.774*** (2.168)	-0.087*** (0.020)	-7.335*** (1.976)	-0.076*** (0.020)
Higher education and above	41.329*** (5.076)	0.064*** (0.007)	40.936*** (4.836)	0.073*** (0.008)	9.442*** (1.849)	0.094*** (0.018)	6.843*** (1.650)	0.071*** (0.017)
A, O levels, GCSE and vocational education	16.281*** (4.643)	0.027*** (0.008)	17.084*** (4.264)	0.033*** (0.008)	4.426*** (1.627)	0.045*** (0.017)	3.475** (1.461)	0.036** (0.015)
Below GCSE, professional and other qualifications	14.131* (7.289)	0.023** (0.011)	6.108 (7.072)	0.012 (0.013)	-0.901 (2.428)	-0.009 (0.025)	-1.888 (2.319)	-0.020 (0.025)
Observations	5821		5785		5821		5785	

*Notes:* Standard errors corrected for intra-household correlation are reported in parentheses. \*\*\* significant at 1%, \*\*significant at 5%, \*significant at 10% level. Additional regressors include region, year and season dummies and a dummy for missing household income. Housework activities include household and family care (food management, household upkeep, making and care for textiles, gardening and pet care, construction and repairs, shopping and services, household management, childcare, helping an adult household member).

**Table 4.** The effect of non-white ethnicity on “time stretching” for different minority groups. Marginal Effects from Tobit model

	Males: Weekday		Males: Weekend		Females: Weekday		Females: Weekend	
	E(Y Y>0)	Pr(Y>0)	E(Y Y>0)	Pr(Y>0)	E(Y Y>0)	Pr(Y>0)	E(Y Y>0)	Pr(Y>0)
	All activities							
Black	-30.685 (36.622)	-0.081 (0.116)	0.917 (39.137)	0.002 (0.093)	-63.255*** (20.545)	-0.135** (0.062)	-56.657*** (15.084)	-0.134*** (0.048)
Pakistani/Bangladeshi	-92.789*** (9.850)	-0.365*** (0.059)	-74.982*** (12.409)	-0.285*** (0.067)	-65.780** (24.309)	-0.143* (0.077)	-67.881*** (19.356)	-0.172** (0.070)
Indian	-60.349*** (11.528)	-0.193*** (0.050)	-52.660*** (14.617)	-0.175*** (0.064)	-86.525*** (13.867)	-0.216*** (0.055)	-32.103 (22.653)	-0.065 (0.055)
Chinese	-21.880 (39.200)	-0.055 (0.112)	5.120 (34.674)	0.012 (0.077)	-54.971 (52.491)	-0.112 (0.145)	-28.631 (56.747)	-0.057 (0.133)
	Housework							
Black	-17.176* (8.914)	-0.183** (0.077)	3.000 (13.774)	0.032 (0.145)	-22.241*** (6.286)	-0.218*** (0.064)	-18.070*** (6.781)	-0.191*** (0.073)
Pakistani/Bangladeshi	-23.420*** (4.207)	-0.229*** (0.025)	-20.392*** (6.695)	-0.184*** (0.042)	-25.150*** (8.159)	-0.248*** (0.083)	-15.087 (9.604)	-0.159 (0.105)
Indian	-5.598 (4.256)	-0.065 (0.048)	-8.442* (5.060)	-0.086* (0.049)	-24.375*** (6.018)	-0.240*** (0.062)	-17.911*** (5.643)	-0.189*** (0.061)
Chinese	-8.559 (10.625)	-0.097 (0.115)	-8.845 (9.976)	-0.090 (0.095)	-2.837 (18.162)	0.026 (0.167)	-1.210 (17.428)	-0.012 (0.175)
	Leisure							
Black	-22.584 (28.620)	-0.085 (0.123)	-20.093 (22.715)	-0.079 (0.101)	-36.421** (16.883)	-0.120* (0.071)	-38.624*** (13.307)	-0.139** (0.060)
Pakistani/Bangladeshi	-63.834*** (10.504)	-0.309*** (0.068)	-56.040*** (11.227)	-0.274*** (0.072)	-36.362* (18.899)	-0.120 (0.079)	-58.030*** (14.290)	-0.237*** (0.080)
Indian	-41.322** (12.406)	-0.174*** (0.066)	-35.148** (14.155)	-0.152** (0.074)	-50.668*** (13.533)	-0.186*** (0.069)	-9.466 (22.882)	-0.028 (0.072)
Chinese	-0.285 (33.476)	-0.001 (0.109)	13.744 (24.661)	0.044 (0.072)	-37.755 (31.965)	-0.127 (0.138)	-27.895 (39.974)	-0.094 (0.159)
	All work							
Black	-15.850* (8.266)	-0.212* (0.111)	0.650 (14.867)	0.008 (0.179)	-25.537*** (6.323)	-0.249*** (0.068)	-21.029*** (6.533)	-0.214*** (0.071)
Pakistani/Bangladeshi	-20.682*** (3.947)	-0.275*** (0.049)	-16.693*** (5.611)	-0.208*** (0.067)	-20.068** (8.879)	-0.190** (0.093)	-8.507 (11.483)	-0.081 (0.116)
Indian	-12.079*** (3.904)	-0.161*** (0.053)	-11.187*** (4.204)	-0.140*** (0.052)	-25.981*** (6.055)	-0.254*** (0.066)	-17.682*** (6.451)	-0.178** (0.070)
Chinese	-16.398 (10.375)	-0.219 (0.138)	-8.205 (10.197)	-0.102 (0.129)	-7.652 (19.205)	-0.067 (0.178)	1.552 (17.659)	0.014 (0.156)

Notes: Standard errors corrected for intra-household correlation are reported in parentheses. \*\*\* significant at 1%, \*\*significant at 5%, \*significant at 10% level. Additional regressors are as in Table 3. “Time stretching” is the time spent on secondary activities. “All work” activities are defined as in Floro and Miles (2003) and include housework and family care, voluntary work and meetings and labor market work. Leisure activities include social life and entertainment, sports and outdoor activities, hobbies and games, mass media activities. The effects have to be interpreted with caution due to the very small number of observations for ethnic minority groups, especially for Chinese.

**Table 5.** The effect of non-white ethnicity on time spent on all secondary activities for different groups. Marginal effects  $E(Y|Y>0)$  from Tobit model

	Males	Females
Citizens	-55.547*** (11.016)	-62.339*** (10.822)
Non-citizens	1.079 (37.679)	-81.066*** (30.291)
Feel rushed always	-56.915*** (15.588)	-63.224*** (14.153)
Do not feel rushed	-49.775*** (13.934)	-60.096*** (13.700)
Predicted earnings $\geq$ mean	-55.872*** (16.993)	-64.462*** (18.158)
Predicted earnings $<$ mean	-47.874*** (11.338)	-55.060*** (13.241)
Like hh. Chores	-57.130*** (13.547)	-63.318*** (10.316)
Do not like hh. chores	-44.274** (18.598)	-1.361 (36.762)
Have hh. productivity increasing equipment	-44.379** (21.634)	-64.656*** (22.843)
Do not have hh. productivity increasing equipment	-53.585*** (11.206)	-58.233*** (11.494)
Have equipment + computer + Internet	-52.817** (26.102)	-74.100** (33.916)
Do not have equipment + computer + Internet	-50.811*** (10.868)	-57.831*** (10.956)
Use/have motor vehicle	-54.468*** (10.759)	-56.396*** (13.251)
Do not use/have motor vehicle	-45.656* (25.634)	-77.801*** (15.262)
Employed	-52.185*** (9.808)	-55.850*** (13.135)
Not employed	-63.212** (30.378)	-77.634*** (16.069)
Have children $<$ 4 y.o.	-59.320*** (16.218)	-47.504* (24.510)
Do not have children $<$ 4 y.o.	-50.237*** (12.98)	-66.857*** (11.713)
Have higher educ. degree and above	-58.965*** (20.309)	-69.694*** (17.71)
Do not have higher educ. degree and above	-51.213*** (9.878)	-61.167*** (12.474)

*Notes:* Standard errors corrected for intra-household correlation are reported in parentheses. \*\*\* significant at 1%, \*\*significant at 5%, \*significant at 10% level. Marginal effects from the regressions for non-white dummy only are reported. Additional controls include all the variables as in Table 3. “Like hh. chores” variable means a respondent replies “like a lot” at least two from the following household chores: cooking, shopping for food, cleaning, washing clothes, ironing. “Household productivity increasing equipment” variable equal to one if a respondent possesses a washing machine, a tumble drier, a dishwasher and a microwave.