

Hogg, Margaret H

JAN., 1921.



No. 1.

# ECONOMICA

ISSUED TERMINALLY BY THE  
London School of Economics and  
Political Science

## Contents :

	PAGE
1. FOREWORD - - - - -	I
2. ECONOMICS AS A LIBERAL EDUCATION <i>Sir W. H. Beveridge, K.C.B.</i>	2
3. THE GROUP SYSTEM IN FRANCE - - <i>H. Finer</i>	20
4. BANK DEPOSITS - - - - <i>Prof. E. Cannan</i>	28
5. THE ECONOMICS OF EMPLOYMENT IN ENGLAND, 1660-1713 - <i>T. E. Gregory</i>	37
6. ASIATIC IMMIGRATION INTO AUSTRALIA <i>Miss P. Campbell</i>	52
7. THE NEW INTERNATIONAL FRONTIERS <i>E. W. Shanahan</i>	62
8. THE RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF CO-OPERATIVE AND OTHER RETAIL TRADERS - <i>Miss S. Bushell</i>	64
9. DEPENDANTS ON WOMEN WAGE EARNERS <i>Miss M. Hogg</i>	69
10. RECENT CONTRIBUTIONS TO POLITICAL SCIENCE <i>H. J. Laski</i>	87
11. SCHOOL NOTES - - - - -	92

331.  
42  
HOG

T. FISHER UNWIN LTD.  
1, ADELPHI TERRACE, LONDON

Pamphlet



FAWCETT LIBRARY  
27, WILFRED STREET,  
WESTMINSTER, S.W.1

OFFERS OF CONTRIBUTIONS to *ECONOMICA* by past and present students, or members of the staff of the London School of Economics should be sent to EDITOR, *ECONOMICA*, The London School of Economics and Political Science, CLARE MARKET, W.C. 2.

SUBSCRIPTIONS may be sent to SECRETARY, *ECONOMICA*, The London School of Economics and Political Science, CLARE MARKET, W.C. 2 ; or to the Publishers, T. FISHER UNWIN LTD., 1, Adelphi Terrace, London.

331.4

## Dependants on Women Wage-Earners

By MARGARET H. HOGG, *Assistant in the Statistical Department.*

THE question of women's wages and their relation to those of men is of vital importance, affecting an increasing number of industries directly, and all others indirectly. At the present day the tendency in fixing wages is to base them on the necessary expenditure of the recipient, and we find in consequence many statements of varying import about the demands usually made upon a woman's income, and especially the extent to which that income is partially expended on others. It can hardly be doubted that the range of cases, from the earner who has no need of any wage for himself to the one who has to support a large group of dependants, is of equal extent for both sexes, but the relative prevalence of different types of case is a point on which many opinions and but little data are found. Hence it seems desirable that any information on this subject which can be obtained should be gathered into serviceable form.

The Fabian Women's Group made an investigation into this subject in the course of their study of the economic position of women, and the material which they collected was published in 1915, in a pamphlet on *Wage Earning Women and their Dependants*, by Miss Ellen Smith. This material came from four sources ; from the enquiries made in Northampton, Warrington, Stanley and Reading, under the superintendence of Dr. A. L. Bowley, from information provided by two voluntary societies in Outer London, from an enquiry amongst married women workers in several large and smaller towns particulars of which were furnished by the Women's Industrial Council, and from 2,830 forms received from women workers in varied occupations in all parts of the country which were issued by the Fabian Women's Group themselves.

Mr. Seebom Rowntree instituted, in the autumn of 1919, a very detailed and careful inquiry in a considerable number of industrial towns into this same subject, the results of which will shortly be published. In his book, *The Human Needs of Labour*, he gives the results of a small preliminary enquiry in 1917-18. Answers to a questionnaire were then obtained from 516 organized women workers over the age of 18 taken quite at random, including women in lodgings as well as women living at home. From his description of the results it is evident that a larger majority of women were unmarried than in the present case, as might be expected from their being entirely "organized." In fact, in spite of the higher age



limit for women in Mr. Rowntree's enquiry, his percentage of married or widowed women included is 19 as against 23 in the present tabulation. His method also differs from this in estimating whether the worker was actually contributing to the maintenance of others, not whether she should have been if her wage allowed it. Thus only some of the cases dealt with in the present tabulation would be included in his.

The principal data for the present investigation have already been mentioned as the first source of the Fabian Women's information, except that figures for a fifth town, Bolton, of which the cards have since been tabulated, have here been added; the material has, however, been handled after a somewhat different plan, so that the result will be found at least partly new. Broadly speaking, the Fabian Women investigated what the woman earner's position as to the support of others or herself might be supposed to be, from the relation of her wage at the time to those of any other earners, and from the number of dependent children and adults in the household. The women have been tabulated as not wholly supporting themselves, just supporting themselves, or partially or wholly supporting others. If earning as much as 8s. a week, they have generally been regarded as at least self-supporting, and if the family earnings apart from theirs were sufficient to keep the family at a high standard of living, they have not been regarded as helping to support others. Between these two limits the criterion used for their division into the three groups named above has been the inferiority, equality or superiority of their wages to the average income per head of the family, obtained by dividing the total income of the family by the number of persons in it. Evidently this is an artificial method, supposing, as it does, that all members of a family have equal needs.

In undertaking the present tabulation, on the other hand, it has been thought advisable to keep the question whether or no there are dependants, for whose support a woman earner might be responsible entirely, distinct from all consideration of the adequacy of her wage, thus showing what wage she has need of rather than the adequacy or inadequacy of that actually received at the time, especially as the extent to which the wage was inadequate could not be inferred from tables such as those of the Fabian Women's enquiry. It might be argued that even to take into account the amount of any men-earners' wages in estimating the responsibility of women earners for the support of others is to introduce a disturbing factor, as any change in the men's wages would at once affect the result, but the influence of this factor may be estimated from Table II below, which shows the reasons for the women's responsibility. Emphasis must be laid on the fact that throughout this paper, in speaking of women's responsibility this term is used not as something that cannot be evaded, but rather to imply a generally recognized moral obligation.

The outcome of the difference in method may be exemplified by three hypothetical situations in which a woman would be classed

successively as helping to support others, self-supporting, and not self-supporting in the Fabian Women's tabulation, while in the present one she would uniformly have partial responsibility. In a household consisting of a man and wife and four children, two of school age and two younger, the man earns 16s. a week and the rent is 3s. a week. According to the Fabian Women's tabulation, if the woman earns 7s. the family wage is 23s., the average per head is 3s. 10d., and she is helping to support the family. If she earns 3s. 3d. she is just self-supporting, and if she earns 3s., the family wage is 19s., the average per head is 3s. 2d., and she is not self-supporting. According to the present tabulation, after paying the rent the man has not enough left to support himself and the children according to the minimum standard chosen, so that the woman has partial responsibility whatever her wage, owing to the inadequacy of his. On the other hand, supposing a man and wife to have two children of school age and one younger, the rent to be 4s., and the woman's wage 7s., whether the man's wage was 13s. or 23s. the woman would be helping to support the children according to the Fabian Women's tabulation (unless, indeed, in the latter case the man's wage was considered high enough to keep the family at a comparatively high standard of living, but about this standard no information was given). In the present tabulation the woman would be partially responsible in the first case, because her husband's wage would not pay the rent and adequately support himself and the children, but in the second case she would have no responsibility.

The contention of the Fabian Women's Group is that their method gives "a very accurate estimate of the part played by the woman as bread-winner in the family of which she forms a part." Does it not seem, however, that though the relationship thus obtained to the rest of the family may be accurate enough, when we proceed to collect women from different households so many variables come into play that the basis of comparison is very difficult to comprehend, if indeed it has any meaning.

Less fundamental differences in treatment between this tabulation and that of the Fabian Women's Group are that only women in working-class households are included here, and that in the Fabian Women's tabulation no woman has been regarded as the sole supporter if even a child was earning, while in this no earner under the age of 16 has been supposed to help in the support of anyone else. In connection with this supposition that earners under the age of 16 keep themselves and no more, it should be noted that in Bolton they were usually earning quite good wages, and might well in fact be contributing to the support of others. Hence, although the boys and girls earning good wages were not often found in the most necessitous families (possibly because boys and girls in these had a worse physique), the Bolton figures yet acquire a slightly different significance from those of the other towns.

To state in detail the two sources whence the material for investi-



gation with respect to the responsibility of women earners for the support of dependants has been drawn: the first is the cards of the Enquiries by Sample into the Economic Conditions of Working-Class Households in the five towns of Northampton, Warrington, Stanley, Reading and Bolton, described in *Livelihood and Poverty* (by A. L. Bowley and A. R. Burnett Hurst), and the second is extracts made in the Census Office from the sheets of the Census of Population in 1911, where in the seven boroughs of Bradford, Bristol, Leeds, Newcastle-on-Tyne, Bethnal Green, Shoreditch and Stepney one household in fifty was taken. In both these cases the towns were carefully chosen as representative of different types, hence their results may be expected to be fairly characteristic of industry as a whole in this country.

In the former, where a *Particular Classification* (see page 73) more sensitive than the *General* one (see page 74) for the other seven towns has been possible, we have a sample of one in twenty in the first four towns, and of one in ten in Bolton. The card for each household was filled in by the investigator, who noted the age, sex, and relationship to the head of the household of each member of it, the occupations, wages, and hours of work of the earners, the rent, any source of income other than wages, and any other salient information elicited. In all cases the description by the investigator of the relationships of the members of the household has been adhered to. This causes a slight lack of uniformity in the classification of members of households where the family relationships are of a complicated nature, and where it is not obvious who should be called the head of the family, but to co-ordinate all cases completely would be a laborious process, and the proportion of cases affected is small. Lodgers and domestic servants have not been included in the classification, as information is lacking as to any possible support given by them to others.

The definition of a woman earner presents some difficulties, as in some cases wives are recorded as earning very little, in one only 9d. a week. The course followed has been to include all women earning at all, thus adopting the principle of deciding a woman earner's responsibility from the circumstances of her family apart from all consideration of the adequacy of her wage, but to keep a separate count of those earning less than 7s. a week, who were certainly not in a position to support more than themselves. The separate record of those earning less than 7s. gives a general indication of the extent to which women's wages were inadequate, although the cases of wives who have no responsibility for the support of others and who are earning less than 7s. have no direct bearing on the question of the adequacy of women's earnings, since as they have no necessity to earn anything it is probable that they are not earning as much as they could if they wished.

As in the original tables in *Livelihood and Poverty*, earners temporarily unemployed through illness or any other cause are regarded as earners, not dependants, and their wages are counted in the

family income, except in a few cases where the investigator departed from this rule, and the earner temporarily unemployed was classed as a non-earner. Earners less than 16 years of age are regarded as supporting themselves, but as never having any responsibility for the support of others, it being supposed that they earn their keep, but do not contribute to the rent and other general expenses of the household. Sons and daughters over sixteen years of age who are earning are supposed, beyond supporting themselves, to contribute 1s. a week each towards rent and other general expenses, so that before deciding whether the householder's wage is adequate for the support of his dependants, 1s. is subtracted from the rent for each son or daughter over 16 who is earning. Non-earners in receipt of any pension or allowance (other than Poor Relief, which is only allowed when the wages of the earners are insufficient), or possessed of private means, are not regarded as dependants, even if the pension or allowance is not really adequate for their support by the standard adopted.

As regards support given by members of one household to persons living in another, which is not recorded, there will be few cases of it among women earners, except among domestic servants and lodgers, whom we have excluded. The obvious possibilities are a wife contributing from her earnings to the income of her father's household although having one of her own, or women earners of a family helping a married member of it living elsewhere. There is no means of finding them, but cases of regular and considerable remittances of this kind will not be numerous, and there is in them a lesser degree of obligation than that in the cases dealt with in this classification. Regular remittances from members of the family away from home are recorded on some of the cards, and where this is the case, and a woman is the sole earner in the household she has been reckoned as having only partial responsibility.

Women earners have been classified as:

- w ... wives or widows.
- d ... daughters over 16.
- f ... other women over 16.

These have been grouped again according to their responsibility for the support of dependants, i.e., as having:

- a ... total responsibility.
- β ... partial responsibility.
- γ ... no responsibility.

a. Where only one earner over 16 is recorded, the total responsibility for the support of dependants rests on him or her.

β. (i) Women earners over 16 in households where the father or husband is not earning, but in which there are other earners over 16, have partial responsibility for the support of dependants.

β. (ii) Women earners over 16 in households where the father or husband does not earn enough to support the dependants (according to the Minimum Standard described in *Livelihood and Poverty*), or



where he is away from home and does not contribute enough, have partial responsibility.

$\gamma$ . (i) If the father or husband is earning, women earners have no responsibility for the support of dependants except in the case  $\beta$ . (ii).

$\gamma$ . (ii) Earners under 16 have no responsibility for the support of dependants.

In the cases of partial or total responsibility each class of woman earner (w, d, or f) has been tabulated:

(i) According to the number of adults and children to be supported.

(ii) According to the cause of responsibility.

(a) Death of father or husband.

(b) Permanent unemployment of father or husband.

(c) Inadequacy of wage of father or husband, or inadequacy of support sent by him if away from home.

In the case of towns where the data are taken from the Census, the material is inadequate for the production of tables similar to those just described, and the tables given are not comparable with the former group. The only facts here relevant extracted were for each person in the household, the age, sex, whether occupied or not, while the apparently principal wage-earner and his wife were distinguished. Consequently it has been necessary to assume that in every case where there is a man over 20 years of age earning, women earners have no responsibility for the support of dependants; that if there is no man over 20 earning, and there is more than one earner over 16, each such earner has partial responsibility; and that if there is one sole such earner, he or she has total responsibility for the support of dependants. Hence in this general classification many women are recorded as having no responsibility where in the former particular one they would have been partially responsible owing to the inadequacy of the man's wage, or owing to the death of the father where a son over 20 is earning. In order to show how far the two methods differ, the details for the five towns have also been tabulated in exactly the same way as was necessary with the Census extracts. While in the Special Classification about 28 per cent. of all women earners have partial responsibility, in the General Classification the percentage is only 8. For total responsibility the percentages are practically the same according to both classifications.

As in the case of the other towns, earners under 16 are regarded as supporting themselves but having no responsibility for the support of others, and any non-earners said to have private means, or any pension or allowance other than poor relief, are not regarded as dependants. As, however, private means or pensions are recorded only as alternatives to occupation, there will be cases where such exist but are not recorded. It is probable that in the *Livelihood and Poverty* enquiries income from such sources sometimes escaped the investigator, although the error so caused will be less than that in the tables given from the Census material.

Some of the women classified as earners in the five towns might have returned themselves as non-earners in the Census, so that a slight disparity between the results of the two groups may have crept in, but this will not in any case be very large.

The re-tabulation of the women earners in the former five towns according to the general less sensitive classification makes possible a general view of an aggregate of the women earners in all the towns included, covering by sample 230,000 women earners. Account has been taken in this aggregate of the sizes of the samples in the various enquiries, so that each town might have representation proportional to the number of women earners which the sample leads us to infer in the town. (For Tables see end of article.)

Of the tables given here, Tables I, II, III, and V deal with the particular classification, Table IV deals with the particular and general classifications contrasted, and Tables VI and VII deal with the general classification.

Table I gives the number having each degree of responsibility of each of the three groups of women, and Table II the cause of such responsibility. In Table III we have the prevalence of different groups of dependants in the five towns, on all women earners, and on wives and widows only, and in Table IV the average number of adults and children dependent according to each classification. Table V shows the percentages of women in the four towns and in an aggregate of the five having various degrees of responsibility according to the special classification, and Table VI those in all the towns, and in an aggregate of them all according to the general classification. (As Stanley has too few cases to yield percentages it is only included in the aggregate in these two tables.) Table VII gives the number of women having the different degrees of responsibility, and the average number of adults and children dependent on those partially and wholly responsible, in all the towns and in an aggregate of them according to the general classification. The two classifications are contrasted in Table IV and in Tables V and VI. As has already been said, in the cases of total responsibility the figures resulting from the two methods correspond closely, while in the cases of partial responsibility the average numbers of dependants diverge somewhat more, and the percentages having partial responsibility are utterly incomparable, the number in the particular classification being on the whole three times that in the general one.

Under the particular classification, at least half the cases of partial and of total responsibility are where there are no children dependent. Under the general classification the Metropolitan Boroughs are sharply differentiated from the rest, as in them more than half the cases are where children only are dependent, while in the other eight towns (excluding Stanley, where the cases are very few) at least half the cases are where adults only are dependent. The different situation in the Metropolitan Boroughs may be accounted for by their high birth-rate and short span of life.



From the particular classification it appears that the commonest case of a woman's responsibility is where the father or husband is dead, and she has one adult to support partially, and that one-third of the women earners have some degree of responsibility for others. It may be well to show here the proportion of earners to all women of 16 years and over; to the nearest tenth these are: Stanley, .1; Warrington, .2; Reading and Newcastle, .3; Northampton, Bolton, Bristol, Bradford, .4; Stepney, Bethnal Green and Shoreditch, .5; and Leeds, .6. For the aggregate it is .4.

Comparing the results obtained by the particular tabulation with those of the Fabian Women's Group, we may see that from the four towns for which the results are based on the same material, the proportion of women earners having some degree of responsibility is roughly the same. In the aggregate containing also the three other enquiries, however, the proportion obtained is entirely different, as more than half of the women earning are helping at least to support others. This great difference is probably due more to the relative weight of the results of the various enquiries than to the difference of the criteria in the individual cases. In the main tables drawn up from the Fabian Women's own enquiry, the majority of the women included were in professional not industrial employment, and as this enquiry contributed more than half of the total, the professional women would seem to be disproportionately well represented. Secondly, one may suppose that a fair proportion of married women are included in the other investigations, whence the inclusion of an enquiry exclusively amongst married women which contributes over one-sixth of the aggregate would give them an undue preponderance. It is questionable, thirdly, whether Outer London is not also given an excessive weight, yielding as it does nearly one-seventh of the cases, while one would expect that group to have quite peculiar characteristics. In these three enquiries the resulting proportion of women having responsibility is strikingly greater than that in the four common towns, and as in our general classification the seven boroughs agree fairly well with the five towns, one would be inclined to expect, in absence of other evidence, that they would agree in other methods of tabulation too.

From these several considerations one may argue that the result of the Fabian Women's enquiry is not representative of the country as a whole, and that their figure of 51 for the percentage of women earners supporting others in part or entirely is too large for an estimate of the general situation.

It will be seen that the present tabulation has taken a middle way, for turning now to Mr. Rowntree's preliminary enquiry we find there one woman earner in six partially or wholly maintaining others (14.3 per cent. partially and 2.5 per cent. totally). The proportion is only half that reached in the present tabulation, and the causes of the discrepancy are not in this case so easy to trace as in that of the Fabian Women's enquiry. The information gathered from the

forms included the wage earned, whether the earner was married, single or widowed, whether she lived at home, whether her parents were alive, the wages and ages of other members of the household, the rent, the money paid by her for board, lodging and laundry, and other payments to dependants with particulars of those dependants. Account was also taken of separation allowances and payments by husbands engaged in civil work away from home. With respect to the use of this material, Mr. Rowntree writes: "With a knowledge of the usual charges paid by working girls for board and lodging in different types of working-class houses, and with answers to the above questions, it was possible to ascertain quite definitely whether a worker was or was not partially or entirely responsible for the maintenance of others." Details of the course adopted in making this classification are not given, but it is evident, although the age limit of 18 instead of 16 has no doubt some modifying influence, that the more important cause of divergence is the different conception of responsibility underlying the tabulation. For Mr. Rowntree has regarded as responsible for others the women earners who were economically in a position to shoulder such responsibility, not all those whose family circumstances made dependants need help from them. Thus women whose households were in the same necessitous condition might some be responsible and others not, according as they received more or less than a living wage according to his criteria. Mr. Rowntree's numbers are rather small to allow of comparisons of the proportions in subdivisions, but the most common case of support, a woman earner partially supporting one adult, comprises in his enquiry 11 per cent. of the cases and in the present tabulation 13 per cent. While, owing to the smallness of the numbers in Mr. Rowntree's enquiry, it is possible that the closeness of this agreement is owing to an accident of the sampling, a lesser dissimilarity might be expected in this case than in the whole enquiry, when one reflects that where a woman has one adult, usually a parent, partially dependent, she is more likely to have attained her full wage, and thus to be able to contribute support, than where there are young children. For the proportion of earners who are wives or widows is small, and if an unmarried woman is found in a family with children dependent she is usually their sister, and will probably be young too, and not have reached her full industrial value. Hence more cases caught in the present tabulation would slip through in Mr. Rowntree's where there are children dependent than where there are only adults. No similar comparisons can be carried out in other cases of responsibility to develop this argument, as the numbers in them become too small.

Whatever the comparative merits of these two ways of approaching the question of women earners' liability, both have their interest and value, and there is room for much work in the subject in all its aspects. Mr. Rowntree's more recent enquiry, larger in its scale than the preceding ones, must be a valuable contribution to the study of the question, and we await its publication with interest.



In the following Tables women earners over 16 only are included:

w is used to denote wives or widows;  
 d „ „ „ daughters over 16;  
 f „ „ „ other women over 16.

For definitions of Partial and Total Responsibility, see p. 72.

### NORTHAMPTON

#### Particular Classification

TABLE I.—DEGREE OF RESPONSIBILITY OF WOMEN EARNERS.

Degree of Responsibility.	w.	d.	f.	Total.	Proportion.
No Responsibility (All) ... ..	<b>66</b>	<b>162</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>246</b>	<b>.70</b>
(Earning less than 7s.) ... ..	26	10	1	37	
Partial Responsibility (All) ... ..	<b>9</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>.27</b>
(Earning less than 7s.) ... ..	6	5	—	11	
Total Responsibility (All) ... ..	<b>6</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>.03</b>
(Earning less than 7s.) ... ..	2	1	—	3	
Total Earners ... ..	<b>81</b>	<b>250</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>351</b>	<b>1.00</b>
(Earning less than 7s.) ... ..	34	16	1	51	.14

TABLE II.—CAUSE OF RESPONSIBILITY OF WOMEN EARNERS HAVING  
 (i) *Partial Responsibility*

Cause of Responsibility.	w.	d.	f.	Total.	Proportion.
Death of father or husband ... ..	3	25	—	28	.29
Unemployment of father or husband	1	33	1	35	.37
Inadequate wage of father or husband	5	27	—	32	.34
From All Causes ... ..	9	85	1	95	1.0

(ii) *Total Responsibility*

Cause of Responsibility.	w.	d.	f.	Total.	Proportion.
Death of father or husband ... ..	4	1	1	6	.6
Unemployment of father or husband	2	2	—	4	.4
From Both Causes ... ..	6	3	1	10	1.0

### WARRINGTON

#### Particular Classification

TABLE I.—DEGREE OF RESPONSIBILITY OF WOMEN EARNERS.

Degree of Responsibility.	w.	d.	f.	Total.	Proportion.
No Responsibility (All) ... ..	<b>28</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>130</b>	<b>.65</b>
(Earning less than 7s.) ... ..	10	22	1	33	
Partial Responsibility (All) ... ..	<b>9</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>.32</b>
(Earning less than 7s.) ... ..	8	15	1	24	
Total Responsibility (All) ... ..	<b>2</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>—</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>.03</b>
(Earning less than 7s.) ... ..	—	1	—	1	
Total Earners ... ..	<b>39</b>	<b>155</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>199</b>	<b>1.00</b>
(Earning less than 7s.) ... ..	18	38	2	58	.29

TABLE II.—CAUSE OF RESPONSIBILITY OF WOMEN EARNERS HAVING  
 (i) *Partial Responsibility*.

Cause of Responsibility.	w.	d.	f.	Total.	Proportion.
Death of father or husband... ..	1	30	3	34	.54
Unemployment of father or husband	4	4	—	8	.13
Inadequate wage of father or husband	4	17	—	21	.33
From All Causes ... ..	9	51	3	63	1.0

(ii) *Total Responsibility*.

Cause of Responsibility.	w.	d.	f.	Total.	Proportion.
Death of father or husband... ..	1	2	—	3	.5
Unemployment of father or husband	1	2	—	3	.5
From Both Causes ... ..	2	4	—	6	1.0



STANLEY

*Particular Classification*

TABLE I.—DEGREE OF RESPONSIBILITY OF WOMEN EARNERS.

Degree of Responsibility.	w.	d.	f.	Total.	Proportion.
No Responsibility (All) ... ..	2	9	—	11	.7
(Earning less than 7s.) ... ..	1	5	—	6	
Partial Responsibility (All) ... ..	2 <sup>1</sup>	—	1 <sup>2</sup>	3	.2
(Earning less than 7s.) ... ..	2	—	1	3	
Total Responsibility (All) ... ..	1 <sup>2</sup>	—	—	1	.1
(Earning less than 7s.) ... ..	1	—	—	1	
Total Earners... ..	5	9	1	15	1.0
(Earning less than 7s.) ... ..	4	5	1	10	.7

<sup>1</sup> Responsibility owing to unemployment of father or husband.  
<sup>2</sup> Responsibility owing to death of father or husband.

READING

*Particular Classification*

TABLE I.—DEGREE OF RESPONSIBILITY OF WOMEN EARNERS.

Degree of Responsibility.	w.	d.	f.	Total.	Proportion.
No Responsibility (All) ... ..	53	90	8	151	.65
(Earning less than 7s.) ... ..	39	43	2	84	
Partial Responsibility (All) ... ..	18	41	5	64	.28
(Earning less than 7s.) ... ..	11	12	1	24	
Total Responsibility (All) ... ..	10	6	—	16	.07
(Earning less than 7s.) ... ..	2	2	—	4	
Total Earners... ..	81	137	13	231	1.00
(Earning less than 7s.) ... ..	52	57	3	112	.48

TABLE II.—CAUSE OF RESPONSIBILITY OF WOMEN EARNERS HAVING

(i) *Partial Responsibility.*

Cause of Responsibility.	w.	d.	f.	Total.	Proportion.
Death of father or husband ... ..	7	16	4	27	.42
Unemployment of father or husband	6	7	—	13	.20
Inadequate wage of father or husband	5	18	1	24	.38
From All Causes ... ..	18	41	5	64	1.0

(ii) *Total Responsibility.*

Cause of Responsibility.	w.	d.	f.	Total.	Proportion.
Death of father or husband... ..	5	5	—	10	.62
Unemployment of father or husband	5	1	—	6	.38
From Both Causes ... ..	10	6	—	16	1.0



BOLTON

*Particular Classification*

TABLE I.—DEGREE OF RESPONSIBILITY OF WOMEN EARNERS.

Degree of Responsibility.	w.	d.	f.	Total.	Proportion.
No Responsibility (All) ... ..	311	809	233	1,353	.67
(Earning less than 7s.) ... ..	53	10	13	76	
Partial Responsibility (All) ... ..	54	463	38	555	.27
(Earning less than 7s.) ... ..	17	5	—	22	
Total Responsibility (All) ... ..	41	63	17	121	.06
(Earning less than 7s.) ... ..	3	3	—	6	
Total Earners... ..	406	1,335	288	2,029	1.00
(Earning less than 7s.) ... ..	73	18	13	108	.05

TABLE II.—CAUSE OF RESPONSIBILITY OF WOMEN EARNERS HAVING

(i) *Partial Responsibility.*

Cause of Responsibility.	w.	d.	f.	Total.	Proportion.
Death of father or husband ... ..	37	303	35	375	.676
Unemployment of father or husband	5	102	2	109	.196
Inadequate wage of father or husband	12	58	1	71	.128
From All Causes ... ..	54	463	38	555	1.0

(ii) *Total Responsibility.*

Cause of Responsibility.	w.	d.	f.	Total.	Proportion.
Death of father or husband... ..	37	50	15	102	.84
Unemployment of father or husband	4	13	2	19	.16
From Both Causes ... ..	41	63	17	121	1.0



TABLE III.—AGGREGATE OF NORTHAMPTON, WARRINGTON, STANLEY, READING, AND BOLTON.<sup>1</sup>

*Particular Classification.*

NUMBERS OF ADULTS AND CHILDREN DEPENDENT

(a) *On All Women Earners having*

*Partial Responsibility.*

*Total Responsibility.*

Dep'ds over 14.	Dependants under 14 years.							Totals.	Dep'ds over 14.	Dependants under 14 years.						Totals.
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6			0	1	2	3	4	5	
0	—	39	13	7	8	2	2	71	0	—	12	9	3	—	—	24
1	232	34	18	18	16	11	7	336	1	45	2	3	2	2	2	56
2	42	13	15	6	7	4	—	87	2	11	1	—	1	—	—	13
3	7	1	1	—	—	—	—	9	3	1	—	—	—	—	—	1
88 Totals...	281	87	47	31	31	17	9	503	Totals ...	57	15	12	6	2	2	94

(b) *On Wives and Widows having*

*Partial Responsibility.*

*Total Responsibility.*

Dep'ds over 14.	Dependants under 14 years.							Totals.	Dep'ds over 14.	Dependants under 14 years.						Totals.
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6			0	1	2	3	4	5	
0	—	19	7	4	6	1	2	39	0	—	10	7	4	—	—	21
1	14	—	1	2	2	2	1	22	1	11	—	2	—	3	1	17
2	—	1	3	—	—	—	—	4	2	2	—	—	—	—	—	2
Totals...	14	20	11	6	8	3	3	65	Totals...	13	10	9	4	3	1	40

<sup>1</sup> The Bolton figures have been halved before addition, as the sample there was 1 in 10.



TABLE IV.

*Particular and General Classification.*

AVERAGE NUMBERS OF ADULTS AND CHILDREN DEPENDENT ON WOMEN EARNERS HAVING

(i) *Partial Responsibility.*(ii) *Total Responsibility.*

	Particular Classification.		General Classification.		Particular Classification.		General Classification.	
	Adults.	Children.	Adults.	Children.	Adults.	Children.	Adults.	Children.
Northampton ... ..	1.1	1.1	1.2	.8	.8	.7	.8	.7
Warrington... ..	1.1	1.6	1.1	1.3	1.1	.5	1.2	.5
Reading ... ..	.9	1.6	.7	.9	.7	1.2	.8	1.4
Bolton ... ..	1.1	.8	1.0	.5	.9	.7	.7	.9
Aggregate of Five Towns <sup>1</sup> ...	1.1	1.1	1.0	.7	.9	.8	.9	.8

<sup>1</sup> Stanley has been included, and the figures for Bolton halved before addition.



TABLE V.—PARTICULAR CLASSIFICATION. Percentages.  
*Degree of Responsibility of Women Earners.*

	No Responsibility.	Partial Responsibility.	Total Responsibility.
Northampton ... ..	70	27	3
Warrington... ..	65	32	3
Reading ... ..	65	28	7
Bolton ... ..	67	27	6
Aggregate of Five Towns <sup>1</sup>	67	28	5

TABLE VI.—GENERAL CLASSIFICATION. Percentages.  
*Degree of Responsibility of Women Earners in All Towns.*

	No Responsibility.	Partial Responsibility.	Total Responsibility.
Northampton ... ..	90	7	3
Warrington... ..	91	6	3
Reading ... ..	84	10	6
Bolton ... ..	81	13	6
Aggregate of Five Towns <sup>1</sup>	84	11	5
Bradford ... ..	90	7	3
Bristol ... ..	89	6	5
Leeds ... ..	91	4	5
Newcastle-on-Tyne ... ..	89	5	6
Bethnal Green ... ..	90	6	4
Shoreditch ... ..	89	6	5
Stepney ... ..	84	9	7
Aggregate of All Towns <sup>2</sup> ...	88	7	5

<sup>1</sup> Stanley has been included, and the figures for Bolton halved before addition.

<sup>2</sup> On account of the different sizes of samples, the Bolton figures have been halved, and those of the seven boroughs multiplied by 2.5, before addition, in order to secure uniform representation of the several towns.



TABLE VII.

*General Classification.*

DEGREE OF RESPONSIBILITY OF WOMEN EARNERS IN ALL TOWNS, WITH AVERAGE NUMBERS OF ADULTS AND CHILDREN DEPENDENT.

	Adult Women Earners having			Average Number of Dependants supported			
	No Responsibility.	Partial Responsibility.	Total Responsibility.	Partially		Wholly	
				Adults.	Children.	Adults.	Children.
Northampton ... ..	315	26	10	1.2	.8	.8	.7
Warrington ... ..	182	11	6	1.1	1.3	1.2	.5
Stanley ... ..	11	3	1	[1.0]	[3.0]	[1.0]	[—]
Reading ... ..	194	24	13	.7	.9	.8	1.4
Bolton ... ..	1,640	266	123	1.0	.5	.9	.7
Aggregate of Five Towns <sup>1</sup> ...	1,522	197	92	1.0	.7	.9	.8
Bradford ... ..	773	60	24	1.0	.4	1.1	.2
Bristol ... ..	630	44	34	.7	1.0	.8	1.2
Leeds ... ..	884	40	53	1.0	.5	1.0	.5
Newcastle-on-Tyne ... ..	339	19	24	1.0	.3	.7	.9
Bethnal Green ... ..	329	22	13	.3	1.1	.5	1.5
Shoreditch ... ..	287	21	16	.4	1.3	.7	1.1
Stepney ... ..	487	50	41	.6	1.1	.5	1.4
Aggregate of All Towns <sup>2</sup> ...	10,844	837	604	.8	.6	.8	.8

<sup>1</sup> The figures for Bolton have been halved before addition.<sup>2</sup> On account of the different sizes of samples the Bolton figures have been halved, and those of the seven boroughs multiplied by 2.5, before addition, in order to secure uniform representation of the several towns.



# BROADWAY HOUSE

**THE INDUSTRIAL AND COMMERCIAL REVOLUTIONS IN GREAT BRITAIN DURING THE NINETEENTH CENTURY.** By L. C. A. KNOWLES, Litt.D. pp. xii, 420. Cloth, 6s. 6d. net. [This day.

Part I.—Introduction. II.—The Industrial Revolution caused by Machinery. III.—Industrial and Commercial Policy. IV.—The Commercial Revolution caused by Mechanical Transport. V.—Development of Mechanical Transport and the Problem of State Control of Transport. VI.—The Industrial and Commercial Revolutions and the New Constructive Imperialism. VII.—Effect of the Development of Mechanical Transport on British and Irish Agriculture.

**ECONOMICS FOR BEGINNERS.** By M. C. BUER, B.Sc. (Econ.), with diagrams in the text. Cloth, 4s. 6d. net.

An absolutely elementary and sound *introductory* book, covering a very wide field.

**THE INEQUALITY OF INCOMES IN MODERN COMMUNITIES.** By HUGH DALTON, M.A., Cassel Reader in Commerce in the University of London. 8vo. 10s. 6d. net.

**INTRODUCTION TO SOCIAL ETHICS: The Social Conscience in a Democracy.** By PROFESSOR J. M. MECKLIN, Ph.D. Large 8vo. 18s. net.

A discussion of social ethics for the general reader, which may also be used as a text-book in colleges. After an analysis of the nature and functions of public sentiment and of the factors which control it, follows a psychological analysis of the Social Conscience in its relation to social progress. Upon this basis the author discusses such institutions as the Family, the Church, and Private Property as agencies in moulding the moral sentiments in men and women, and lays a foundation for a scientific approach to the great problems involved in the existing social order.

**A JACOBAN LETTER-WRITER: The Life and Times of John Chamberlain.** By COMMANDER E. P. STATHAM. 12s. 6d. net.

The Letters of John Chamberlain (1553-1627) form a running Commentary on his time and on persons—from Royalty to the humblest—who came under his observation. They contain a host of amusing anecdotes, with shrewd remarks on public events and international amenities.

**SANITY IN SEX.** By W. J. FIELDING. 10s. 6d. net.

A profound contribution to a subject which is now engaging the attention of all thoughtful people. Frank, clear and strong.

**BIBLIOGRAPHY OF INDUSTRIAL EFFICIENCY AND FACTORY MANAGEMENT.** (3,500 entries, annotated and classified under 63 Subjects). By H. G. T. CANNONS. With Indexes of Authors and of Subjects. 4to. 10s. 6d. net; Interleaved, 14s. net.

**THE HUMAN MOTOR AND THE SCIENTIFIC FOUNDATIONS OF LABOUR.** By JULES AMAR, D.Sc. 30 Illustrations. Large 8vo. 30s. net.

The only work which sums up all the scattered information and theory on the important topics of Industrial Fatigue, Efficiency, and Scientific Management, and applies the principles to a large number of industries. It will take rank as THE LEADING BOOK ON ITS SUBJECT.

**THE SOCIAL DISEASES: Tuberculosis, Syphilis, Alcoholism, Sterility.** By DR. J. HERICOURT. Translated by BERNARD MIALL. 7s. 6d. net.

A highly important treatise on the four great scourges from which all modern societies are suffering, but which threaten more particularly the oldest civilizations. In each case the Causes, Forms, Consequences and Remedies are considered.

**THE WORKING LIFE OF ENGLISHWOMEN IN THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY.** By ALICE CLARK. 8vo. 10s. 6d. net.

**STUDIES IN CONTEMPORARY METAPHYSICS.** By R. F. A. HOERNLE, Professor of Philosophy in Armstrong College, University of Durham. 8vo. 16s. net.

---

GEORGE ROUTLEDGE & SONS, Ltd.  
KEGAN, PAUL, TRENCH, TRUBNER & Co., Ltd.  
BROADWAY HOUSE, 68-74, CARTER LANE, LONDON, E.C.



## *The High-Class Literary Character*

---

---

of the "Saturday Westminster" has made this journal foremost in the ranks of the review and magazine weeklies. Its price is 2d.; and it has all the interest, all the charm of a magazine, and all the information of a review three times its price. It is a literary education. Its special articles on the Latest Novels, on Art and Scientific Works, on Belles Lettres, Politics, and the News of the Day, will appeal to the discriminating tastes of the literary minded. Short stories and sketches from the pens of some of the best writers of the day, poetry, chess, gardening, special problems and prizes, in addition to cartoons by "F.C.G." are included in the weekly features provided by

---

---

## *The "SATURDAY WESTMINSTER."*

---

---

**PRICE TWOPENCE.**

On Sale Friday at all Newsagents and Booksellers.

*Send a Postcard for specimen copy to THE PUBLISHER,  
Tudor House, Tudor Street, London, E.C. 4.*