

*Paper Prepared for the 28<sup>th</sup> General Conference of  
The International Association for Research in Income and Wealth  
Cork, Ireland, August 22 – 28, 2004*

**Session Time Use and Inequality**

**Poverty in Everyday Life. Some Aspects of Time Use  
and the 2001/02 German Time Use Survey**

by Erlend Holz

Translated by Michaela Weinz, Germany

For additional information please contact:

Author Name: Erlend Holz  
Author Address:  
Statistisches Bundesamt, Zweigstelle Bonn  
Federal Statistical Office, Bonn Branch Office  
Graurheindorfer Str. 198  
53117 Bonn  
Germany  
Author E-Mail: [erlend.holz@destatis.de](mailto:erlend.holz@destatis.de)  
Author Telephone: +49 (0) 1888 / 644 8802

## **1. Methodology and Definition**

How do families and households at risk of poverty organize their everyday life as compared to households that are not exposed to poverty risk? This question is being investigated on the basis of daily time use. The data used here are derived from the most recent time use survey (TUS),<sup>1</sup> carried out by the Federal Statistical Office in 2001 and 2002 by order of the Federal Ministry for Family Affairs, Senior Citizens, Women and Youth (Bundesministerium fuer

Familie, Senioren, Frauen und Jugend, BMFSFJ), with the assistance of the statistical offices of the Laender in a representative sample all over Germany. This contribution is based in part on an exposé to the Poverty and Wealth Reporting by order of the BMFSFJ. It looks at single mothers<sup>2</sup> as well as married and unmarried parent couples collectively. At least one of their children is under the age of 18, and if several daughters and sons are living in the household the oldest child is under the age of 25. All children are unmarried. There are no other relatives or persons living in the household.

An important question is the choice of the measure of poverty, according to which households are considered to be at risk of poverty. The aim of this contribution is it also to exemplarily show how the data provided by the time use survey serve to demonstrate the effects of poverty on selected aspects of the way the families concerned organize their everyday life, on the basis of the measures of poverty currently in use, the Laeken Indicators (in terms of the primary indicators), as used in the “National Action Plan against Poverty and Social Exclusion 2003-2005”<sup>3</sup> of the Federal Government as part of the European-wide action plans. Therefore in this contribution, households and people are considered as poor, if their disposable income is less than 60% of the median net income of all households in Germany. This includes state transfer payments of all kinds.<sup>4</sup> Another important choice concerns the equivalence weight that is used to take account of the varying size and composition of households: A multi-person household needs a higher household income than a single-person household, to be not exposed to the risk of poverty. The question is however, how much higher the income has to be. One option is the per capita distribution of income, what would mean that a 3-person family/a 3-person household may need an income that is three times higher than that of a single person. The common basic assumption is, however, that the increase in income does not need to be proportional to the size of the household, as expenditures are not incurred to the same extent by each member of the household individually, but an expenditure, once made, is at least to a certain degree for the benefit of all members of the household. A not uncontroversial but widely held assumption is that children have lower costs than adults, so that for example a couple with two children would need a lower household income as compared to a four-person household of adults. The equivalence

---

<sup>1</sup> “Zeitbudgeterhebung 2001/02 (ZBE)”.

<sup>2</sup> In all evaluations single fathers at risk of poverty are not taken into account due to a too small number of cases.

<sup>3</sup> See Deutscher Bundestag: Nationaler Aktionsplan für Deutschland zur Bekämpfung von Armut und sozialer Ausgrenzung 2003-2005, Unterrichtung durch die Bundesregierung, 15. Wahlperiode, Bundestagsdrucksache 15/1420, 10.07.2003 (German Bundestag: National Action Plan against Poverty and Social Exclusion 2003-2005, Federal Government Information, 15th legislative period, German Bundestag Printed Matter 15/1420, 10. July 2003).

weight used here is the „New OECD scale“ that is used in the National Action Plan for the Laeken Indicators, according to which the required household income is determined by assigning a weight of 1.0 to the head of the household, 0.5 to household members aged 15 or more and 0.3 to household members aged under 15.

According to the National Action Plan for 2001 the equivalised poverty risk threshold, calculated from data of the SOEP (Socio-Economic Panel), is determined at 716,- EUR per month as 60% of the median net equivalised household income.<sup>5</sup> A single person is at risk of poverty if the income is below this threshold income, a single mother or a single father with one child under 15 is, after conversion according to the new OECD scale, at risk of poverty if the household income is below 930,- EUR per month and a parent couple with one child under 15 is at risk of poverty if the income is below 1288,- EUR. For comparison: A couple without children needs an income of 1074,- EUR, for them not to be considered as poor. In the same way the poverty risk threshold was calculated for all household constellations in the time use survey 2001/02.

In the time use survey the household members had the choice between two ways of providing information on their net household income: they could either state their exact income or, if they were not able or willing to do so, they had the option to choose an income group into which their income fell. The option to choose an income group was in particular in „critical cases“ helpful to obtain income data from the household after all. Anyhow 61 % of the households in the original sample of the time use survey stated their exact monthly net household income, 32 % indicated an income group and only 6 % did not furnish any income information at all. For households or household members, having stated their exact income, it is no problem to determine whether they are exposed to poverty risk using the method described above. But how is this possible for households with classified income information, as the poverty risk threshold in most cases is somewhere within the range of the income group? Excluding these households would not be appropriate for further analysis. A possible solution, chosen here as well, is provided by Strengmann on the basis of his approach to grouped income data within the scope of poverty analysis of the microcensus.<sup>6</sup> The

---

<sup>4</sup> For the calculation of the Laeken Indicators see EUROSTAT: The Methodology of Calculation of the Laeken Indicators of Monetary Poverty. Statistics on Income, Poverty and Social Exclusion, Unit E-2: Living conditions, ISG/2002/July 03 en.

<sup>5</sup> See Deutscher Bundestag: Nationaler Aktionsplan, loc. cit., table 1, page 28.

<sup>6</sup> See Strengmann-Kuhn, Wolfgang: Armutsanalysen mit dem Mikrozensus? In: Lüttinger, Paul (Editor): Sozialstrukturanalysen mit dem Mikrozensus, ZUMA-Nachrichten Spezial, Volume 6, Mannheim [1999], pp. 376-402.

determination whether a household is at risk of poverty or not is made depending on the “proximity“ of a poverty risk threshold to the upper- and lower limits of an income group.<sup>7</sup>

### 3. Basic figures of daily time use

The following section looks at the basic figures of daily time use of poor and not poor families with regard to:

- personal activities/rest and leisure time,
- housekeeping,
- child care,
- social participation.<sup>8</sup>

If the time is included that fathers and mothers in poor families devote to employment related activities in general, that means not only for the ones actually being in gainful employment, these figures are significantly lower than in families that are not at risk of poverty. In the case of single mothers at risk of poverty the average daily time devoted to gainful employment or related activities is 1 hour and 10 minutes, for those not at risk of poverty it is 3 hours and 22 minutes per day. In the case of poor parent couples this time is only a little bit more than 3 hours (3 hours and 9 minutes) for fathers and about 1 ¼ hours (1 hour and 18 minutes) for mothers. Couples not at risk of poverty devote on average significantly more time to employment related activities. About 5 ¼ hours (5 hours and 18 minutes) for fathers and two hours for mothers. These figures are not really surprising but they are reflecting that gainful employment often is decisive for whether families are exposed to a risk of poverty or not. In the final analysis we in a sense have to compare “apples and oranges“, i.e. as a rule families not at risk of poverty with at least one parent in (full-time) employment have to be compared with families at risk of poverty with no parent in employment. Comparing poor households not in gainful employment with not poor households not in gainful employment is, in my opinion, of no advantage, – most of the parents considered are in working age between 25 and

---

<sup>7</sup> The poverty risk threshold can always be determined precisely for each household, since the amount of 716,- EUR is weighted according to the composition of the household, using the new OECD scale. If for example the upper limit of the income group indicated by the household, representing its maximum possible income, is too far above its calculated poverty risk threshold, this household could be classified as poor, although – according to the definitions chosen – it is not. According to the approach chosen this household would not be considered as poor. This would only be the case, if the household had indicated an income group instead, that is below the income group that contains the poverty risk threshold of this household. This approach is further supported by looking at households having stated their exact income. Their incomes are for the most part well above the poverty risk threshold within the comparable income group.

<sup>8</sup> Travel times related to the activities are always included here.

55 – so that the question arises, what would be an adequate comparable group. Pensioners, mostly in older age groups with different needs would definitely not be suitable.

When summing up the time spent on personal activities and rest (this includes for example sleeping, eating, personal hygiene<sup>9</sup>) and on leisure activities<sup>10</sup>, it becomes apparent that mostly the differences between parents at risk of poverty and parents not at risk of poverty are relatively small (see table 1). These times usually range between 15 ½ hours per day on average. The differences are largest between mothers in families that are not at risk of poverty: here single mothers have 22 minutes less time than mothers living together with a partner. However in the case of parent couples at risk of poverty there are indeed significant differences between women and men with regard to the time spent on personal and leisure activities. It is true that there is virtually no difference between men and women in the case of parent couples not at risk of poverty but the difference between mothers and fathers at risk of poverty is substantial. Here fathers in families at risk of poverty do have with 17 hours about 1 ¾ hours more time per day as compared to their female partners but also as compared to fathers in families not at risk of poverty.

**Table 1: Basic figures in hours and minutes per day: Personal activities and leisure time  
Time Use Survey 2001/02**

	At risk of poverty	Not at risk of poverty
Single mothers	15:20	15:08
Parent couples:		
Mothers	15:23	15:30
Fathers	17:02	15:17

In the following, the category of “housekeeping“ is examined, that includes household- and handicraft activities, gardening and pet care, shopping in shops and on the internet and among other things also the related organisational work and dealings with the authorities as well as

<sup>10</sup> Different from the original definition used in the time use survey - following the Eurostat-Guidelines on Harmonised European Time Use Surveys – “personal activities/physiological regeneration“ is according to the definition here chosen not including “sick in bed“, whereas the activity “use of personal services“, such as a hairdresser, was incorporated here.

<sup>11</sup> This includes all activities of a leisure or recreational nature in the sense of social contacts (talks and telephone conversations, etc.), entertainment and culture (visiting cinema, theatre, sports events, going out to a cafe, disco, etc.), resting/bridging time, sports related activities, artistic and technical hobbies, playing games as well as the use of mass media (watching TV, reading, etc.) including certain activities on the computer/on the internet.

assistance and care of adult members of the household.<sup>11</sup> Time spent on child care including the related travel times will be looked at separately. Remarkable is, that single mothers in families not at risk of poverty devote with about 3 ½ hours on average per day one hour less to housekeeping activities, than the other mothers do, both single mothers at risk of poverty and mothers living together with a partner – in the case of the latter, irrespective of whether or not the household is at risk of poverty. It is true that between women in couple households at risk of poverty and those not at risk of poverty there is also the difference that mothers in poor families devote more time to housekeeping activities than mothers in families that are not poor; but here the difference is – with 20 minutes per day – not that significant (see table 2). In the case of fathers in couple households the risk of poverty is not reflected at all: Irrespective of whether they live in a household that is poor or not poor they only devote half of the time to housekeeping activities than their female partners do (about 2 hours and 10 minutes for men as compared to about 4 ¼ to 4 ½ hours for women).<sup>12</sup>

**Table 2: Basic figures in hours and minutes per day: Housekeeping without child care  
Time Use Survey 2001/02**

	At risk of poverty	Not at risk of poverty
Single mothers	4:35	3:34
Parent couples:		
Mothers	4:38	4:17
Fathers	2:07	2:10

When looking at the housekeeping activities separately<sup>13</sup> – preparation of meals, house and home cleaning, repair and care of textiles, gardening and pet care, handicraft activities, shopping in shops -, it becomes apparent that some of them take a few minutes more per day in poor families. But as a rule these times are similar for mothers and fathers in couple households, poor or not poor. The times in the case of single mothers in families at risk of poverty are also comparable with those of women living together with a partner. However,

<sup>11</sup> Different from the original definition of the category “housekeeping and family care“ the “use of personal services“ and “use of medical services“ is not included here. In general the average times spent on the care of adult members of the household are not significant when differentiating between poor and not poor families.

<sup>12</sup> See also Holz, Erlend: Zeitverwendung in Deutschland. Beruf, Familie, Freizeit (Time Use in Germany. Employment, Family, Leisure Time). Schriftenreihe Spektrum Bundesstatistik, Volume 13, 1., unveränd. Nachdruck, Stuttgart 2001, pp. 106 ff., for results of the 1991/1992 time use survey, for “Soziale Basisverpflichtungen /social basic obligations” and “Pseudo-Freizeit/pseudo-leisure time”.

exceptions are single mothers not at risk of poverty: They (have to) devote less time of the day to some activities. So mothers in couple households at risk of poverty or not as well as single mothers in poor families devote about 1 ½ hours on average per day to the preparation of meals, including dish washing, whereas for single mothers in families not at risk of poverty it is only just under one hour (see table 3). Similar however are the times that are possibly not (can not be) so much influenced by internal family structures and that are not dependent on these structures, such as shopping in the shop. Apart from that there are differences in the case of parent couples between fathers and mothers that reflect the traditional division of gender roles. Fathers in families who are not poor devote less than half an hour per day (22 min.) to the preparation of meals, in poor families it is even less than a quarter hour (13 min.). Men in couple households, whether at risk of poverty or not, devote about 20 minutes per day to house and home cleaning, for the women it is about one hour. Laundry care is also clearly divided between men and women. Two minutes per day for fathers, irrespective of whether they live in poor families or not, compared to half an hour for mothers. As far as handicraft activities are concerned it is exactly the other way round; less than 5 minutes per day for mothers and about half an hour for their partners.

---

<sup>13</sup> Without related travel times.

**Table 3: Times spent on selected housekeeping activities in hours and minutes per day**

**Time Use Survey 2001/02**

	At risk of poverty		Not at risk of poverty	
	Mothers	Fathers	Mothers	Fathers
Single parents:				
Preparation of meals	1:24	-*	00:55	-
House and home cleaning and comparable activities	1:06	-*	00:48	-
Care/repair/making of textiles	00:30	-*	00:23	-
Plant-, pet care/gardening	00:21	-*	00:20	-
Handicraft activities	00:03	-*	00:04	-
Shopping (in the shop)	00:29	-*	00:29	-
Parent couples:				
Preparation of meals	1:29	00:13	1:19	00:22
House and home cleaning and comparable activities	1:03	0:21	1:00	00:22
Care/repair/making of textiles	00:29	(00:02)**	00:32	00:02
Plant-, pet care/gardening	00:28	00:23	00:18	00:18
Handicraft activities	(00:02)**	00:26	00:04	00:25
Shopping (in the shop)	00:32	00:16	00:31	00:17

\* Too small number of cases. \*\* Relatively small number of cases.

Time spent on the care of children living in the household,<sup>14</sup> is significantly more for mothers in families at risk of poverty compared to mothers in families not at risk of poverty, almost irrespective of whether they are single mothers or living together with a partner in a common household. Single mothers and mothers living in couple households at risk of poverty devote more than two hours per day to child care as a main activity, whereas for mothers not at risk of poverty it is about 1 1/4 hours for single mothers and about 1 1/2 hours for mothers living together with a partner. Consequently, single mothers who are not poor devote more than one

<sup>14</sup> For children under the age of under 18. Child care includes activities like personal hygiene and supervision, homework supervision and giving instructions, playing and sportive activities, talks, reading/telling stories, cuddling, accompanying the child and attending appointments, looking after/caring for the child when sick, as well as – like in the previous evaluations on the other fields – the related travel times.



hour less to daily child care than poor single mothers do. For fathers – irrespective of whether they are poor or not – the results are less significant – they always devote notably less time to child care than mothers do and it is, especially in the case of fathers not at risk of poverty (39 minutes) less than one hour per day. Fathers at risk of poverty are doing a little bit more here (52 minutes, see table 4).

**Table 4: Basic figures in hours and minutes per day: child care including travel times**  
**Time Use Survey 2001/02**

	At risk of poverty	Not at risk of poverty
Single mothers	2:18	1:12
Parent couples:		
Mothers	2:08	1:34
Fathers	00:52	00:39

The definition of “social participation“ as used in this contribution includes activities related to training and continuing education (catchword: “lifelong learning”<sup>15</sup>)<sup>16</sup>, giving informal help to other households and voluntary work/honorary functions as well as participation in social, religious and political events and meetings.<sup>17</sup> All these activities enable or improve the chances to participate in social life and to represent one’s own interests. Mutual help and assistance as well as contacts, and resulting “relationships“, can be helpful to participate and assert oneself in social life. As a rule mothers and fathers devote on an average about half an hour per day to activities related to social participation, irrespective of whether they are at risk of poverty or not. This is true for single mothers as well. However there is one exception: Mothers in poor couple households only devote a quarter of an hour to social participation activities whereas for the fathers it is half an hour, the same time as for the others (see table 5). This is also reflected in the participation rate: 14 % of the mothers in poor couple households devote themselves daily to activities related to social participation, whereas it is one-fifth of the mothers living together with a partner in a household that is not poor. For fathers it is per day just under one-fifth as well (18% in each case), irrespective of whether the

<sup>15</sup> See also Holz, Erend: Zeitverwendung in Deutschland, loc. cit.

<sup>16</sup> Activities related to continuing education during working hours are not included.

<sup>17</sup> According to the original definition used in the time use survey the category of participation in events also includes prayers and meditation. But as opposed to church attendance it is rather unlikely for contacts to arise here incidentally or intentionally

family is poor or not. For single parent families the situation looks different. One-fifth of the single mothers who are not poor and even one-fourth of the poor single mothers are daily involved in activities here defined as social participation (see table 6).

**Table 5: Basic figures in hours and minutes per day: Social participation**

**Time Use Survey 2001/02**

	At risk of poverty	Not at risk of poverty
Single mothers	00:27	00:33
Parent couples:		
Mothers	00:15	00:26
Fathers	00:28	00:26

**Table 6: Daily participation rate in per cent: Social participation**

**Time Use Survey 2001/02**

	At risk of poverty	Not at risk of poverty
Single mothers	26 %	21 %
Parent couples:		
Mothers	14 %	20 %
Fathers	18 %	18 %

The upshot: A risk of poverty increases the difference between men and women in couple households. Lower or none working hours of men as a result of the abolition of the traditional division of gender roles, i.e. no longer only men are mainly engaged in gainful employment, are not counterbalanced by spending more time on housekeeping activities, except for a slight increase in the time spent on child care, but mean more time for men for rest and leisure. Time spent on social participation is relatively evenly divided between parents at risk of poverty and parents not at risk of poverty as well as between men and women. An exception however is, that mothers in poor couple households devote less time to these activities, both from a gender specific point of view, as compared to their partners, as well as compared to mothers living in couple households that are not poor.

---

as it is the case when parishioners meet for divine service. Therefore prayers and meditation are not considered as social

#### **4. Access to new information technologies – use of computer and internet**

In the following section the question is examined whether parents living in households at risk of poverty have the same access to new information technologies – computer and internet – as parents who are not at risk of poverty. To this aim the times were summed up that were spent on the computer as well as on the internet, for purposes of training and continuing education (incl. during working hours),<sup>18</sup> for e-banking and internet shopping, for computer activities during leisure time for purposes of research, communication, programming and for playing games. The activities per se are not important but to have the opportunity – and time – to use the technologies, irrespective of whether doing internet research for a seminar paper, or for a holiday trip. In general these times are relatively low. The daily participation rate is highest among fathers living in couple households that are not poor. One-fourth of them is sitting at the PC every day or uses the internet outside the actual working hours. With 17 % the daily participation rate of fathers in poor households is somewhat lower. The rates of poor and of not poor single mothers are in the same order of magnitude as well (see table 7). Far behind, in particular compared to the men, are both mothers in poor and mothers in not poor couple households. Only 8 % of the mothers in poor families and 11 % of the mothers living in not poor families use the PC or the internet every day for various reasons (except for professional use), this is just about the half of the rate of their partners.

When looking at the times of the users, i.e. the persons actually using the new technologies, it becomes apparent that poor fathers but mothers as well, report longer times of use. The differences between single mothers are relatively small; single mothers at risk of poverty use the computer or the internet for a little more than one hour, single mothers not at risk of poverty for a little less than one hour (see table 8). The differences between parent couples are much more pronounced. In poor couple households the time mothers actually use the technologies is about 2 hours per day on average whereas fathers use the computer or the internet for about 2 1/2 hours per day. This is twice as long as for mothers (about 1 hour) and 1.7 times as long as for fathers (about 1 1/2 hours) in households that are not poor. The difference of half an hour between men and women in poor parent couples is the same as it is

---

participation.

<sup>18</sup> The general use of PC and internet during working hours was not surveyed, because there was no differentiation made with regard to working hours – except for breaks and for activities related to training and ongoing education.

in the case of parent couples who are not poor. As it turns out here, single mothers, notwithstanding their relatively high daily participation rate, devote less time to the use of the computer/internet than fathers in couple households do. None of the other user groups considered spends as much time on the computer or on the internet as fathers in poor couple households do.

The upshot: The (everyday) daily use of new information technologies is not so much a question of being poor or not, according to the criteria chosen here, but is connected with gender specific features. Above all in couple households the use of new technologies is rather a „man’s thing“. Without a partner in the common household the situation looks different. Single mothers use the new technologies for education, household and family as well as during their leisure time, irrespective of whether or not at risk of poverty, almost as often as men; however this is not reflected in a comparably long duration of use. In this connection it is just the group with the lowest participation rate of married or unmarried mothers living together with a partner in poor families, who devote much time to the use of computers and the internet.

***Table 7: Daily participation rate in per cent: Use of PC/internet for educational purposes, family/household and during leisure time***

**Time Use Survey 2001/02**

	At risk of poverty	Not at risk of poverty
Single mothers	17 %	15 %
Parent couples:		
Mothers	8 %	11 %
Fathers	17 %	21 %

**Table 8: Figures in hours and minutes per day of users: Actual use of PC/internet for educational purposes, family/household and during leisure time**

**Time Use Survey 2001/02**

	At risk of poverty	Not at risk of poverty
Single mothers	01:09	0:52
Parent couples:		
Mothers	1:58	1:03
Fathers	2:33	1:32

When looking only at the use of computers and internet during leisure time (not including computer games) the differences with regard to the actual length of time of computer and internet use are even somewhat larger. In this case fathers in poor couple households occupy themselves for almost three hours on the computer or on the internet with research, communication or programming; this is twice as long as fathers do in families who are not poor. The daily participation rate is for all parents somewhat lower than the rates according to the more comprehensive category of computer or internet use as shown above. This is true in particular for single mothers at risk of poverty (see table 9).

**Table 9: Daily participation rate in per cent: Use of PC/internet during leisure time (research, communication, programming)\***

**Time Use Survey 2001/02**

	At risk of poverty	Not at risk of poverty
Single mothers	10 %	11 %
Parent couples:		
Mothers	6 %	9 %
Fathers	14 %	18 %

\* Not including computer games.

## 5. Resume, outlook and data access for scientists outside Germany

This contribution looks at the aspects of poverty in everyday life. For this purpose the daily time use of families – single mothers and parent couples – at risk of poverty and not at risk of poverty<sup>19</sup> is compared on the basis of the data derived from the time use survey 2001/02. This contribution focuses on two main fields: in the first place on the daily basic figures of the time used for rest and leisure, housekeeping, child care and social participation and in the second place on the access and duration of use of new information technologies (computer and internet).

A risk of poverty increases the differences between fathers and mothers in couple households with regard to the daily basic figures. Less or none working hours of men as a result of the abolition or reduction of the traditional division of gender roles, i.e. no longer only men are mainly engaged in gainful employment, are not counterbalanced by spending more time on activities related to housekeeping, except for a slight increase in the time devoted to child care, but mean more time for men for rest and leisure. The latter is true not only when compared with their wives/female partners but also when compared with the other fathers. Mothers in families at poverty risk however devote significantly more time per day to the care of children living in the household than mothers in families not at risk of poverty do; almost irrespective of whether they are single mothers or living together with a partner in a common household. Single mothers in families not at risk of poverty on the other hand devote significantly less time to housekeeping activities than other mothers. Time spent on social participation is relatively evenly divided between parents at risk of poverty and parents not at risk of poverty as well as between men and women. However with the exception, that mothers in poor couple households devote less time to these activities, both from a gender specific point of view, as compared to their partners as well as compared to mothers living in couple households that are not poor. Possibly it is above all the mothers in poor couple households that in a sense suffer from “double poverty“, i.e. both from income- and from time poverty. It is true that they have the same amount of time for rest and leisure as the other mothers but not as their husbands/partners.

The (everyday) daily use of the new information technologies however is not so much a question of being poor or not, according to the criteria chosen here, but is connected with

---

<sup>19</sup> Use of the Laeken primary indicators and of the new OECD scales.

gender specific features. Above all in couple households the use of these technologies is rather a “man’s thing“. For those living without a partner in the common household the situation looks different. Single mothers, irrespective of whether or not at risk of poverty, use the new technologies almost as often as men, but this is not reflected in a comparably long duration of use.

This analysis shows clearly how important the investigation of time use is for a comparison of the everyday life of poor households with the everyday life of households that are not poor. It allows a look behind the monetary figures that are used to define poverty. Further research and analysis is planned on my part or in progress, e.g. concerning the daily time use of children and young persons in families at risk of poverty and not at risk of poverty, social life inside and outside families, consideration of other types of households, presence of unfavourable working hours, etc.

In the course of the year 2004 the microdata of the German time use survey 2001/02 will become available as a Public Use File for foreign users, as was already the case for the survey of 1991/92, with the help scientists and other interested persons outside Germany can do their own research and analysis.<sup>20</sup> The design of the survey 2001/02 follows EUROSTAT’s Guidelines on Harmonised European Time Use Surveys (HETUS). The author of this contribution will be pleased to be at your disposal for further information.

Mr. Erlend Holz

e-mail: [erlend.holz@destatis.de](mailto:erlend.holz@destatis.de)  
phone: +49 (0) 1888 644 8802

Statistisches Bundesamt, Zweigstelle Bonn  
Federal Statistical Office of Germany, Bonn Branch Office  
Graurheindorfer Str. 198  
53117 Bonn  
Germany

---

<sup>20</sup> See also Holz, Erlend: The 1991/92 German Time Use Microdata, European Data Watch, in: Schmollers Jahrbuch, Journal of Applied Social Sciences, 123. Jahrgang, 2003, Heft 2, pp. 315-327.

## 5. References

Deutscher Bundestag: Nationaler Aktionsplan für Deutschland zur Bekämpfung von Armut und sozialer Ausgrenzung 2003-2005, Unterrichtung durch die Bundesregierung, 15. Wahlperiode, Bundestagsdrucksache 15/1420, 10.07.2003 (German Bundestag: National Action Plan against Poverty and Social Exclusion 2003-2005, Federal Government Information, 15th legislative period, German Bundestag Printed Matter 15/1420, 10. July 2003).

EUROSTAT: The Methodology of Calculation of the Laeken Indicators of Monetary Poverty. Statistics on Income, Poverty and Social Exclusion, Unit E-2: Living conditions, ISG/2002/July 03 en.

Holz, Erlend: The 1991/92 German Time Use Microdata, European Data Watch, in: Schmollers Jahrbuch, Journal of Applied Social Sciences, 123. Jahrgang, 2003, Heft 2, pp. 315-327.

Holz, Erlend: Zeitverwendung in Deutschland. Beruf, Familie, Freizeit (Time Use in Germany. Employment, Family, Leisure Time). Schriftenreihe Spektrum Bundesstatistik, volume 13, 1., unveränd. Nachdruck, Stuttgart 2001.

Strengmann-Kuhn, Wolfgang: Armutsanalysen mit dem Mikrozensus? In: Lüttinger, Paul (Editor): Sozialstrukturanalysen mit dem Mikrozensus, ZUMA-Nachrichten Spezial, Volume 6:, Mannheim [1999], pp. 376-402.