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## LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

United States Department of Labor,
Women's Bureat
Washington, August 14, 1929.
Sir: I have the honor to submit the report of this bureau's study of women in 5 -and-10-cent stores and limited-price chain department stores

In 18 State surveys in the past nine years information has been secured on the earnings, hours, and personal history of several thousand girls and women employed in these industries, and this is brought together and analyzed in the present bulletin. Because of the differences in date of the various surveys, the material on earnings has been supplemented by figures for a week in the closing months of 1928, more than 6,000 women being reported upon.
The cooperation of the employers and of the workers in supplying the information is gratefully acknowledged

The report has been written by Mary Elizabeth Pidgeon, assistant editor of the bureau.
Respectfully submitted.
Mary Anderson, Director.
Hon. James J. Davis,
Secretary of Labor.

## WOMEN IN 5-AND-10-CENT STORES AND LIMITEDPRICE CHAIN DEPARTMENT STORES

## PART I

## INTRODUCTION

An outstanding development that has taken place during recent years in the field of retail merchandising has been the organization and growth of the chain store, which is directed in policy from a central office through district managers, purchases in large quantities, and sells over a wide area at comparatively low prices.
One of the oldest and best-known types of chain is the 5 -and-10cent store, which began its rise 50 years ago and which, unlike most other large chains, did not originate in a large city, such as New York or Chicago, where it would be subject to higher rents and other costs greater than in smaller cities.
The rapid growth in the sales of 10 -cent chains, a growth that ordinarily outruns that in other lines of distribution, may be seen from figures published by the United States Department of Commerce. According to these, the increase in business from 1923 to 1924 was-

For wholesale trade
Per cent
9.7
For department stores
For 5-and-10-cent chains
From 1924 to 1925 the increase was almost negligible in wholesale trade; sales in the department stores increased 6.7 per cent and sales in the 10 -cent chains increased 16.7 per cent. ${ }^{1}$

From the same source may be obtained the figures of the monthly sales in four 10-cent chains up to 1923 and in five chains since that time and, in addition, index numbers that show the relation of the average monthly sales in each year to the average for 1919. The latter are comparable for the entire period, since allowance for the extra chain was made in the base beginning in 1923. A summary of the average monthly sales and of the index numbers relative to 1919 is as follows:

|  | Average monthly sales | Index |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1919 | \$17, 100 | 100 |
| 1920 | 20, 491 | 120 |
| 1921 | 21, 160 | 124 |
| 1922 | 23, 875 | 140 |
| 1923 | 28, 172 | 165 |
| 1924 | 31, 574 | 185 |
| 1925 | 35, 761 | 209 |
| 1926 | 39, 112 | 229 |
| 1927 | 43, 008 | 251 | 1926, p. 9.

i Ibid., February, 1928, Table 95, p. 118, and Table 96, p. 119

The per cent of increase, in thousands of dollars of sales, may be followed from year to year from the same source and thus summarized: ${ }^{3}$

1927 to Nov. 1, 1928, cumulative monthly
peak high prices

It will be seen that even from the year of peak high prices, 1920, to that of heavy depression, 1921, there was an increase in sales of 4.8 per cent. That the chain store is less subject to fluctuations due to business depression than are independent establishments is common business depression than are indepene since in hard times more are likely to patronize the knowledge, since in hard times more people are likely to patronize the
limited-price stores. In an investigation made by the New York limited-price stores. In an investigation made by the New York
State Department of Labor it was found that one of the chains State Department of Labor it was found that one of the chains
included had declared a special dividend on common stock in addiincluded had declared a special dividend on common stock in addi-
tion to its regular dividend in February, 1921, when the country was suffering from heavy business depression. ${ }^{4}$ In relation to the same period, a representative of a banking firm that has financed six large chains is quoted as having made this statement:
During the first half of 1921 the decrease in sales prices was so rapid that the problem was to take in enough for operating expenses * * *.
The price declines in 5 -and-10-cent stores have been nearly as drastic as in the grocery stores. By an increase in the rapidity of turnover, however, the 5 -andgrocery stores. have been able to side-step losses which occurred to others during the price decline. ${ }^{5}$
In this connection the fact must not be overlooked that only one arge chain was able to come through the war period and still maintain its 10 -cent price-limit.
A sales increase marvelous in its proportions is testified to by the figures published in the golden-anniversary booklet of the pioneer chain. These indicate that for this chain, in the years 1920 to 1927, inclusive, the increase was 93.6 per cent and in the period since 1912 it was 350.4 per cent. The book cites the existence of over 2,100 stores of this chain, located in 1,500 cities in five countries of the world, and claims a sales volume for 1927 exceeding the receipts of each of five large railroad systems, of a well-known mail-order house, and of each of three great manufacturing corporations. ${ }^{6}$
The explanation of the continuous growth in the profits of these Thedres stores includes savings in overhead and rapid sales limited-price stores includes savings in overhead and rapid sales turnover. Overhead savings are effected by centralized purchasing and quantity buying; by paying cash, which enables taking advantage of discounts; by selling for cash, which eliminates bad sales and makes drastic reductions in clerical forces; and by a
of delivery and much of the expense of advertising.
BIbid., March, 1922, p. 32; February, 1923, p. 40; February, 1924, p. 52; March, 1925, p. 44; March, 1926,

 Press (Inc.), 1929.

One of the telling maxims of Frank W. Woolworth was, "Small profits on an article will become big if you sell enough of the article." 7 His stores exemplify this principle, and it has been stated of them that -
in one year they sold nearly 90,000 pounds of candy, enough to fill a train of freight cars 24 miles long. This was not inferior candy. But the enormous volume of sales enabled the manufacturer to make a profit on pure candy even at the low prices. Illustrating this point further, in one year Woolworth sold more than $9,000,000$ yards of curtain material, 350,000 barrels of glassware, $20,000,000$ pieces of enamelware - enough to load a freight train $71 / 2$ miles long. In 1918, the year of the influenza epidemic, they sold $54,000,000$ handkerchiefs t the regular price limit. ${ }^{8}$
Many factors combine to produce these extensive sales, not the least of which is the choice of goods. It has been stated that over 90 per cent of the stock of such a store consists of everyday necessities. ${ }^{9}$ These include such staple articles as sewing thread, elastic, tape, pencils, screws, bolts, and nuts; goods of well-known and advertised brands, which may be manufactured under contract, such as certain tooth pastes, soaps, and facial creams; articles especially made to draw trade, such as kitchenware, china, or other things, giving the impression of a great deal for the money and proving a continual fascination and marvel to the consumer unacquainted with sales methods.

Another element conducive to the large sales of the limited-price store is the selection of a strategic location, usually in a recognized shopping center and often near a large department store or other point of attraction for many people.
In addition to choice of location, other methods that the limitedprice stores employ to attract the attention of possible buyers are in price stores ex a pearance, both external and internal. The stores usually are painted in brilliant colors and a similarity exists in those of the same chain in different cities. The windows are conspicuof the same chain in different cilies. the most telling location for different departments within the store is carefully studied, and goods are arranged on the counters in such a way as to meet the eye and thus to sell themselves.

All the factors just enumerated-type of goods, location, appearance, and manner of display-aid in producing the enormous sales of these well-known chains.
The 5 -and-10-cent store, and later the limited-price department store, usually has had to contend with inefficient sales forces. • The idea that the arrangement of goods was such that little skill in selling was required has, in the past, induced the payment of a low wage, with consequent lack of interest and high labor turnover. However, there are indications that this condition is improving in many chains. In the New York study already referred to ${ }^{10}$ it was found that-
Selection of the girls for the job was governed by what type of girl could be obtained at the particular time she was needed for the lowest wage the market could stand.
A few progressive local managers were trying out schemes of their own, however, even though no direct stimulus came from the central office.
$T$ Hayward, Walter S., and White, Percival. Chain Stores. McGraw-Hill Book Co. (Inc.), 1922, p. 144. 8 Ibid., p. 75.
8 Ibid., p. 106 .
10 New., York. State. Department of Labor. The Employment of Women in 5 and 10 Cent Stores, 1921,
10. pp. 13, 14, 15 .
$67294^{\circ}-30-2$

In two of the eight chains studied in New York it was found that effort was being made to teach salesmanship, and this "showed results at least in the prevailing spirit in their stores." In one of these the type of salesgirl "was strikingly higher than in any of the other stores visited." Of this chain it was stated in addition that-
The frank and open desire of the central executives and of the local managers in this chain to talk over their problems and to secure ideas from other progressive establishments on hours, wages, and methods of employment was in striking contrast to the hidebound overorganized spirit shown in some other instances.

## SCOPE AND METHOD OF INVESTIGATION

In studies of industries in 18 States, all but one of which were surveyed in the years 1920 to 1925, inclusive, the Women's Bureau has included investigation of 5,282 women in 253 limited-price department stores. Most of these were 5 -and-10-cent or 5 -10-and- 25 -cent chain stores, but a few were independent establishments and a few sold goods up to 50 cents or a dollar. Definite information as to numbers of employees, hour schedules, wages, and working conditions was recorded by investigators from interviews with employers and managers, from time-book records of hours worked and amounts and managers, from time-book records of hours worked and amounts paid, and from personal inspection of the plants. In order that com-
parable material should be secured, records ordinarily were copied parable material should be secured, records ordinarily were copied
directly from pay rolls by the agents of the Women's Bureau. In directly from pay rolls by the agents of the Women's Bureau. In
every store included the agent took down the actual amount paid to each woman employed in a week that fell within the same current month or season for all firms studied in the same State. Every effort was made to insure that the week taken represented normal business conditions and contained no holidays and that no unusual circumstances had affected earnings or time worked. Employees were asked to furnish information as to nativity, age, living condition, marital status, and experience in the trade. In some cases dition, marital status, and experience in the suplemented by facts obtained from home visits. The States included, dates of surveys, and numbers of establishments States included, dates of surveys, and
and of women studied were as follows:

| State | Year of | Number of- |  | State | Year of | Number of- |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Estab- } \\ \text { Lishb } \\ \text { ments } \end{gathered}$ | Women |  |  | ments | Women |
| All Stat | ${ }^{11920-1925}$ | ${ }^{2} 253$ | 5,282 | Kentucky <br> Baltimore <br> Mississippi <br> New Jersey <br> Ohio <br> Oklahoma <br> Rhode Island <br> Tennessee |  | 14141115206914 |  |
| Alabama | $\begin{gathered} 1922 \\ 1924 \\ 1922 \\ 19220 \text { d } \\ 192924 \\ 1920 \\ 1920 \\ 1920 \end{gathered}$ | ${ }_{11}^{24}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2106 \\ & 199 \\ & 596 \\ & 5258 \\ & 258 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  | 145 194 194 |
| Delaware |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4429 |
| Florida - ${ }_{\text {Ceorgia }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | ${ }_{420}$ |
| Illinois |  |  |  |  |  |  | ${ }_{213}^{314}$ |
| Kansas .----- |  |  | ${ }_{3}^{381} 20$ |  |  |  | ${ }_{3}^{207}$ |

[^0]The hours of work and the character of the personnel as regards nativity, age, marital and living condition, and experience in the nativity, age, marital and living condition, and experience factors that ordinarily differ but little during a period of
years. Earnings, on the other hand, are likely to show a considerable variation from year to year, though the chain stores are less subject to severe financial fluctuations than are most other industries. The data on earnings in any one State are comparable as far as that State is concerned, but various surveys were made over a period extending from 1920 to 1925, inclusive. ${ }^{11}$ For this reason the original data have been supplemented by securing a week's earnings in 1928. In most cases the week selected was in October. These figures were obtained for 6,061 women in 179 establishments in 18 States and 5 additional cities. Of the women reported, 3,387 were employed in the same States, and in most cases in the same cities, for which earnings had been taken at an earlier period, many identical establishments being included; the remaining 2,674 women were in States and cities not before surveyed by the bureau. In addition, earnings were ascertained for 1,776 women whose regular work was on Saturday only.
The following summary shows the States and cities included and the number of establishments and of women whose earnings were ascertained in 1928:

" In the case of Florida the State survey was made in 1928 , but its data on hours and personal informa


## SUMMARY OF OUTSTANDING FACTS

Scope.
$\qquad$States visited

The workers.

1. Nativity, reported by 2,946 women: Per cent American-born 2,046 women: Per cent
96.7 Foreign-born
2. Age, reported by 3,086 women:

Under 18 years.-. 28. 3
 25 years and over.
3. Living condition, reported by 3,047 women: Living with relatives
4. Marital status, reported by 2,938 women:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Single } \\
& \text { Married }
\end{aligned}
$$82. 1

11. 4
Widowed, separated, or divorced6. 5
12. Time in the trade, reported by 2,730 women:

Under 1 year-------
1 and under 2 years.
2 and under 3 years
4 and under 4 years
5 and under 10 year
10 years and over

Hours.

1. Daily hours, scheduled for 5,224 women:

| Under 8 |
| :--- |
| 8 hours |

8 hours 0 --
$\begin{array}{r}5.0 \\ 32.5 \\ \hline\end{array}$
32.5
32.0
3.
urday hours, scheduled for 5,219 women:
8 hours and under
9 hours 9 hours 9 a
10 hours.-
Over 10 and under 11 hours 11 and under 12 hours.
12 and under $12 \frac{1}{2}$ hours

Earnings-Continued
6. Week's earnings in 1928:

States in which week's earnings were taken_
Number
Additional cities in which week's earnings were taken
Establishments reporting -

$\$ 12$ Per cent of the women reported who earned under $\$ 10$ Per cent of the women reported who earned $\$ 15$ and over--. earned under $\$ 10$.States in which more than one-half of the women reported earned $\$ 12$ or over --.Cities in which more than one-half of the women reported States in which the $m$ of the womecluded fell (by median of the earnings of the women inmedian of their rates
median of their rates.---. per cent to 10 per cent) below the
were not related. The remaining 92 per cent lived with relatives, a proportion that is not surprising, since so many of the women were girls under 20. Some of the women lived with parents, sisters, or other relatives and some were married. The data for one State showed the relationship of the women to those with whom they lived and in this case more than 85 per cent of the girls with relatives were daughters living at home.

In this connection attention should be drawn to a matter recognized by economists-that it is very poor social economy to proceed on the theory that the unmarried woman at home should be paid a low wage because she can live more cheaply at home. While it is true that the family life can effect some saving, the amount thereof often is greatly exaggerated. To the extent that the employed girl is unable to maintain herself entirely she becomes dependent upon her family, and thus contributes materially to any precarious financial condition existing within the family while actually spending her time and energy in work that should afford her a living. More than this, in the case of the girl receiving somewhat more adequate return for her labor it has been shown repeatedly that a large majority of those living at home must contribute to the support of others besides themselves if the family is to be maintained above the subsistence level.
It is interesting to compare the proportions of the workers in the limited-price stores who lived with relatives with the proportions of the women in the same States who were in general mercantile establishments and who lived with relatives, women who tend to be somewhat older in years than those in the limited-price stores. The Women's Bureau studies include 16,003 women in general mercantile establishments in the 17 States under consideration, and in every State a larger proportion of those in the limited-price stores than of those in general mercantile establishments lived with relatives, the proportions differing by more than 10 per cent in Maryland, Illinois, and Kansas, and by more than 9 per cent in Missouri and Delaware. ${ }^{1}$
Of the total number of women in genera! mercantile establishments 84.5 per cent lived with relatives; in three States more than 90 per cent were with relatives.

## Marital status.

Of the 2,938 women who reported upon whether they were single or had been married, 82.1 per cent were single. Only 6.5 per cent were widowed, separated, or divorced. The largest proportions of single women were in New Jersey and in Kansas, in each of which more than 90 per cent were unmarried. Between 85 and 90 per cent were single in the States of Oklahoma, Delaware, Tennessee, Mississippi, Rhode Island, and Alabama, and between 80 and 85 per cent in Arkansas, Florida, and Maryland. Women who were or had been married predominated in no State, but the largest proportion was in Georgia, in which more than a third of those reporting had been Georgia, in which more In Ohio, Missouri, Kentucky, South Carolina, and Illinois approximately a fourth were or had been married. The marital status of the women reporting may be seen in Appendix Table III.
${ }^{1}$ In Alabama and Georgia women in all stores were included, those in 5 -and- 10 -cent stores being thrown 1 In Alabama and Georgia women in all stores were included, th
with others. There were 1,253 women included in these States.

Time in the trade.
The time 2,730 women reporting had worked in the trade appears in Appendix Table IV. Frequent change is indicated, since more than two-fifths had been in the trade for less than a year and nearly a fourth had worked for one and under two years. About a fourth of all the women reporting had been in the trade less than six months, and less than 10 per cent had worked for as much as five years.
In South Carolina and in Illinois the largest group of women, 33 and 29.5 per cent, respectively, had been in the trade for one and and under then for less than a year, and this group included more than half of the women reporting in Oklahoma, Maryland, and Kansas. In the last named, two women in three had been at work less than a year
and practically half the women reporting had less than six months' experience. More than 30 per cent of the women included in Maryland and Kentucky, more than 25 per cent of those in Oklahoma Rhode Island, Missouri, New Jersey, and Ohio, and more than 20 per cent of those in Arkansas, Mississippi, and Delaware had worked in these stores less than six months.

While such large proportions of the women studied had been in the trade for only a short time, in 3 States from 12 to 15 per cent and in 11 others from 5 to 10 per cent had been in the trade for 5 and under 10 years. In no State had more than two of the women studied been in the trade for as long as 15 years, and in only three States had as many as six women done such work for 10 years.

## SUMMARY OF PERSONAL DATA

Of 2,946 women reporting nativity 96.7 per cent were American brn In five States none were foreion born, and in each of the five States in which negroes were found they were few in number.
Of 3,086 women reporting age 82.9 per cent were under $25,56.6$ per cent under 20 , and 28.3 per cent under 18 . In each of 12 States more than half of the women and in each of 3 States almost half were under 20.

Of 3,047 women reporting living condition 92 per cent were with relatives. Only 8 in every 100 women were living independently.

Of 2,938 women reporting marital status more than 8 in every 10 were single. In two States over 90 per cent and in six other States pver 85 per cent were single. In one State over a third and in three Ster about a fourth were or had been married
Of 2,730 women reporting time in the trade 41.2 per cent had been in their trade for less than a year and practically a fourth for less than six months. In 15 States the largest group had worked less than a year and in no State had one-half of the women reporting worked for as much as two years.
$67294^{\circ}-30-3$

## PART III

## SCHEDULED HOURS

## Daily hours.

The regular schedules of working hours were reported for 252 establishments, employing 5,224 women. Three-eighths of these women, in nearly a third of the establishments, had a day of 8 hours or less. A 9-hour day was scheduled for about 30 per cent of the women, employed in almost half of the stores included. The remaining women had a day of over 8 and under 9 hours.
There was considerable difference among the States in regard to the proportion of women who had a day of 8 hours or less. Appendix Table shows by State the daily hours scheduled in the establishments and per cent of those in Delaware, over four-fifths of those in Ohio, about per cent of those in Delaware, over four-nifths of those in Ohio, about three-fourths of those in Illinois and Kentucky, and approximately two-thirds of those in Iowa, Maryland, New Jersey, and Rhode
Island had a schedule of 8 hours or less. A schedule of over 8 hours Island had a schedule of 8 hours or less. A schedule of over 8 hours
applied to all women in the States of Arkansas, Mississippi, Missouri, applied to all women in the States of Arkansas, Mississippi, Missouri,
Oklahoma, and South Carolina, and to the following respective proportions of those in Alabama, Georgia, Florida, Tennessee, and Kansas: 98.1, $91.9,90.5,84.2$, and 63.1 per cent. In all other States less than one-half of the women had hour schedules so long.

## Lunch period.

The time allowed for lunch and rest in the middle of the day was one hour for about 90 per cent both of the establishments and of the women studied. It was less than an hour in only 8 of the 218 establishments reported, running as short as 30 minutes in four of these, three of which were in Maryland and one in Oklahoma. The longest period was an hour and a half, allowed in two stores in Rhode Island. More than an hour was allowed by two other establishments in that State and by seven in other States. About 6 per cent of the women studied had less and 4 per cent had more than one hour for lunch.

## Saturday hours.

As mercantile establishments have shown a tendency to shorten their hours and to introduce a shorter Saturday in the summer, a very real problem has been created in the management of the limitedprice stores, for which Saturday is almost always the big trading day. While none of the women had a Monday-to-Friday schedule of over 9 hours, nearly 60 per cent of them, in about the same proportion of the establishments studied, had a schedule of more than 9 hours on Saturday. Table VI gives, by State, the Saturday hour schedules in the establishments studied and the number of women affected.

About a fourth, both of the establishments and of the women, had a schedule of 10 hours on Saturday; more than a fifth worked more than 10 but less than 12 hours. The women in 15 stores in four

States had a 12-hour day on Saturday and those in 8 establishments in two States a Saturday of over 12 and under $12 \frac{1}{2}$ hours.

As in the case of daily hours, there was considerable difference among the States in the proportions of women with a relatively long Saturday. In Ohio and Missouri, which showed a tendency to short daily hours for the larger groups, Saturday hours showed a similar tendency, and the same was true for the city of Baltimore. In Illinois, while considerable numbers of women had a Saturday of 10 hours, well over half had a shorter schedule. In Mississippi, Kentucky, and New Jersey most workers had a 10 -hour Saturday. While the women in Arkansas, Kansas, Missouri, and Oklahoma generally had more than an 8 -hour day, only one store reporting in these States had a Saturday of more than 9 hours. In three States in which many women had short daily hours-Delaware, Iowa, and Maryland-considerable numbers had long hours on Saturday. However, only one of the Baltimore stores reporting had a long Saturday. In Mississippi, while all had more than an 8-hour day and none had a Saturday shorter than 10 hours, a few had a schedule of more than 10 hours on Saturday. In Tennessee more than half the women had a Saturday longer than 10 hours. Daily hours were above the average and Saturday hours were very long for large groups in the States of Alabama, Florida, Georgia, and South Carolina.

## Weekly hours.

In any industry the total time worked during the week is perhaps of greater significance than is the length of the day. In the limitedprice department store this is of especial importance, because the Saturday hours ordinarily are longer than those on other days and give insufficient time for recuperation from fatigue. In addition, most of the workers in these stores are quite young, and, while their recovery from fatigue may for the time being appear more rapid, the constant drain on their physical powers is, because of their youth, more likely to be communicated to the race.
Appendix Table VII shows the weekly hour schedules applying to the stores and to the women studied. Only about 3 per cent of the women included had a weekly schedule of 48 hours, the equivalent of 8 hours on 6 days of the week; another group of almost the same size had a week shorter than 48 hours. Approximately 70 per cent of the women had a week of more than 48 and including 54 hours, roughly the equivalent of a 9 -hour day for $5 \frac{1}{2}$ or 6 days. For about a fourth of the women studied the weekly schedule was longer than 54 hours.
The proportions of women having reasonable schedules of weekly hours differed greatly among the States. All the women in Rhode Island, over 90 per cent of those in Baltimore, and more than threefourths of those in Ohio had a week of less than 50 hours. In Ohio and in Baltimore no woman had a schedule in excess of 50 hours. Other States in which the schedule for all was 54 hours or less are Arkansas, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, New Jersey, and Oklahoma. In Illinois and Kentucky between 70 and 80 per cent of the women had a week of 50 hours or less and in the former nearly 60 per cent had a schedule of less than 50 hours. In Iowa nearly 70 per cent had a schedule of less than 52 hours and nearly 60 per cent had one of less than 50. In Arkansas over nine-tenths of the women and in Okla-
homa about three-fourths had a schedule of 54 hours. From 60 to 100 per cent of those in Mississippi, Florida, Georgia, South Carolina, and Alabama had a week of more than 54 hours. In Mississippi over 90 per cent of the women had a schedule of 55 hours. In Florida more than 80 per cent, in South Carolina and in Alabama nearly 60 per cent, and in Georgia about 25 per cent of the women had a schedule of over 55 hours.

## Relation of hour schedules to hours legally permitted in States.

In spite of the somewhat difficult adjustment between the needs of its business and the shifting hour standards, the limited-price department store in many cases appears to have given employees the advantage of hours shorter than those legally permitted, even in respect to the Saturday schedule. Appendix Table VIII shows the number of women with schedules shorter than the legal maximum of daily and of weekly hours in 14 States in which standards had been established by law.
Of the 3,988 women studied in these States 86.7 per cent had daily, 36.6 per cent had Saturday, and 70.6 per cent had weekly hours shorter than the legal maximum. A number of these States allowed a day of 10 hours or more, but no store had hours in excess of 9 . Five States fixed a daily maximum of 9 hours and also a weekly limit, and of the 1,640 women reported in such States 67.6 per cent had a day, 62 per cent a week, shorter than the limit permitted. In the 9 -hour States 33.5 per cent of the women had a Saturday shorter than the legal day, and this was true of 27.1 per cent of those in the 10 -hour States. Thus, in 10 of the States under consideration the women in all the stores included had a daily-hour schedule shorter than that permitted by law. One of these, Ohio, had a legal limit of 9 hours, while seven fixed a 10 -hour limit and two permitted a day of longer than 10 hours.
It has been noted that Saturday tends to be the longest workday in the stores. About half of the establishments studied in Ohio, and about three-fourths of the women, had a Saturday hour schedule shorter than the legal limit of 9 hours. Of the women in the 10 -hour States none in Mississippi nor in New Jersey had less than 10 hours on Saturday; in one-half of the establishments in Illinois and Rhode Island the Saturday schedule was shorter than the legal limit; and a Saturday of less than 10 hours was scheduled for about nine-tenths of the Baltimore women, about a third of those in other Maryland towns, and about a tenth of those in Kentucky, and for a few women in Delaware. For the two States that allowed a day of more than 10 hours it will be seen that in Tennessee the Saturday schedule in about a third of the establishments was less than the $101 / 2$ hours allowed by law, affecting 43 per cent of the women studied, and in South Carolina somewhat more than a fourth of the women, in about half of the stores included, had a Saturday schedule of less than the 12 hours legally permitted.

When weekly hours are compared with the legal requirements in the various States it is found that many limited-price stores showed a tendency to be well ahead of the laws in the shortening of hours for their employees. In Ohio, where the legal maximum was 50 hours, 76.2 per cent of the women, found in slightly over one-half of the stores included, had a week of less than 50 hours. In the 54 -hour

States all the women in all stores included in New Jersey and Rhode Island, 93.4 per cent of the women in Missouri, 68.2 per cent of those in Kansas, 24.9 per cent in Oklahoma, and 6.7 per cent in Arkansas had a schedule of less than the legal maximum, and in Kansas and Missouri well over one-half of the establishments studied had adopted a shorter week than the law permitted. In Delaware 55 hours was the limit fixed, but the women in all but one establishment, 99 per cent in all, had a shorter week. The legal standard was 57 hours in Tennessee, 60 hours in the States of Kentucky, Maryland, Mississippi, and South Carolina, but every store included in these States had fixed a shorter schedule. The States of Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Iowa, and Illinois had no restriction on weekly hours in stores, although Illinois fixes a 10-hour day. A week of 54 hours or less was observed in all establishments in Iowa, in 17 of the 20 in Illinois, in 4 of the 13 in Alabama, in 2 of the 11 in Georgia, and in 2 of the 24 in Florida, 13 in Alabama, in 2 of the 11 in Georgia, and in 2 of the 24 in Florida, and this affected respectively $100,95.4,38.3,25.6$, and 15.5 per cent
of the women studied in these States. Both in Iowa and in Illinois of the women studied in these States. Both in Iowa and in Illinois
nearly 60 per cent of the women had a week of less than 50 hours, nearly 60 per cent of the women had a week of less than 50 hours,
although neither of these States fixes a legal limit to weekly hours and the 10 -hour daily limit in Illinois would admit of a 70-hour week.

## Hours in different chains

An explicit hour policy to be applied to all its branches is not fixed by the management of the limited-price-department-store chain, but hours differ somewhat with the locality and with other conditions. In some States all the stores in one or more of the cities showed the same hour schedule no matter what chain they belonged to, while those in other parts of the State, although belonging to the same chains, had different hours. Some variation among the different chains in the shortening of hours may be indicated by the table following, which also includes the independent stores and a few in smaller chains.

Table 1.-Scheduled daily and weekly hours, by chain or other class of store

| Chain or other class | Number of estabments | Establishments in which daily hours were- |  |  |  | Establishments in which weekly hours were |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | ${ }_{8}^{\text {Under }}$ | 8 | $\begin{array}{\|c} \begin{array}{c} \mathrm{Over} \\ 8 \text { and } \\ \text { under } \\ 9 \end{array} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 9 | $\begin{gathered} 48 \\ \text { and } \\ \text { under } \end{gathered}$ | Over 48 and under 50 | $\begin{gathered} 50 \\ \text { and } \\ \text { under } \\ 54 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 54 \\ \text { and } \\ \text { under } \\ 55 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 55 \\ \text { and } \\ \text { under } \\ 60 \end{gathered}$ |
| Chain I | ${ }^{1} 119$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Chain ${ }^{\text {Chain }}$ |  | ${ }_{2}^{2}$ | + ${ }^{3}$ | 16 | 36 | 2 | 3 | 12 | 22 | 18 |
| Chain IV |  |  | ${ }^{6}$ | 2 | 11 |  | 2 | 5 | 2 | $\overline{0}$ |
| Smaller chains and independent |  |  |  |  | 1 |  | 1 |  |  |  |
|  | 128 | 1 | 7 | 8 | 12 | 1 | 4 | 11 | 7 | 6 |

${ }^{1}$ Details aggregate more than total, because some firms appear in more than one hour group.
A daily schedule of 8 hours or less was the practice in more than 70 per cent of the stores in Chain III, in 60 per cent of those in V, in about 30 per cent of these in I and IV and the independent establishments, but in less than 10 per cent of those in Chain II. A day of 9 hours was the schedule in widely different degrees in the various chains,

64 per cent of the stores in Chain II having 9 hours, 58 per cent in IV, 46 per cent in I, 43 per cent in the independent stores, 20 per cent in Chain V, and only 4 per cent in III.

In weekly hours, also, the chains varied. The weekly schedule shows that less than 54 hours prevailed in 23 of 25 stores in Chain III, in 4 of 5 stores in Chain V, and in more than half the establishments in Chain I and the independent stores. A week of 55 hours ments in Chain I and the independent stores. A week of 55 hours and over was the schedule in more than a fourth of the establishments
in Chain I, in nearly a third in II, in more than half in IV, in more in Chain I, in nearly a third in II, in more than half in IV, in more
than a fifth in smaller chains and independent stores, but in no than a fifth in smaller chains and
establishment in Chains III and V.

A tendency in all chains to fix hours shorter than the maximum permitted by law is indicated in Table 2. In the establishments affected by legislation hours were shorter than the legal maximum in about 60 per cent of the stores in Chain II, in 70 and under 80 per cent of those in Chains I and V, and in 80 to 100 per cent of those in Chains III and IV. Both daily and weekly hours were shorter than the legal maximum in about three-fourths of the independent and smaller chain establishments affected by legislation.

Table 2.-Relation of daily and weekly hours to hours legally established, by chain or other class of store

| Chain or other class | $\begin{gathered} \text { Number } \\ \text { of estab- } \\ \text { lishments } \end{gathered}$ | Establishments for which daily hours were- |  |  | Establishments for which weekly hours were- |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $5 \begin{gathered} \text { Not } \\ \text { restrict- } \\ \text { ed by } \\ \text { law } \end{gathered}$ | Restricted by law |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Not } \\ \text { restrict- } \\ \text { ed by } \\ \text { law } \end{gathered}$ | Restricted by law |  |
|  |  |  | $\underset{\text { Ner }}{\text { Num- }}$ | Having <br> hours <br> shorter <br> thanlegal <br> maxi- <br> mum |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Num- } \\ \text { ber } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Having } \\ \text { hours } \\ \text { shorter } \\ \text { than legal } \\ \text { maxi- } \\ \text { mum } \end{gathered}$ |
| Chain I | 119 |  |  |  |  | 180 |  |
| Chain II | 56 <br> 25 | 13 4 4 | 43 <br> 21 | ${ }_{20}^{26}$ | ${ }_{8}^{14}$ | ${ }^{1817}$ | 14 |
| Chain IV.------------- | 19 | 10 | 9 | ${ }_{3}^{9}$ | 10 | ${ }_{4}^{9}$ | ${ }_{3}^{8}$ |
| Smaller chains and independent stores | 28 | 5 | 23 | 17 | 5 | 23 | 17 |

${ }^{1}$ Excludes 15 establishments in Illinois, in which the law limits daily hours only.
1 Excludes 15 establishments in Illinois,
2 Excludes 1 establishment in Illinois.
3 Excludes 4 establishments in Illinois.
As has been pointed out, most of the States in which these stores were located had a legal day of 10 hours or over; a few had no limit. In the five States that had a 9 -hour day and a 50 -hour or a 54 -hour week were 68 stores belonging to Chains I and II. Of those in. Chain I, somewhat less than half had a day shorter than the legal maximum and nearly three-fifths had a week shorter than was allowed by law. In Chain II, about two-fifths had both a shorter day and a shorter week than was permitted by law.

The foregoing discussion indicates that while there may have been some difference in the degree in which various chains were in advance of the legal standard in shortening their hours, all had introduced into many of their stores hour schedules shorter than the maximum permitted by law. This principle was applied even in the States in which legislation required hour schedules shorter than those per-
mitted in the majority of the States included, and in the State regulating daily hours but fixing no maximum for the week (Illinois) nearly 60 per cent of the women had a week of less than 50 hours.

## SUMMARY OF HOUR DATA

Scheduled hours were reported for 5,224 women, of whom 37.4 per cent had a day of 8 hours or less and 30.6 per cent a day of 9 hours; the remainder had a day of over 8 and under 9 hours. The lunch period was one hour for about 90 per cent of the women reported. About a fourth of the women had a Saturday schedule of 10 hours more than a fifth a schedule of over 10 and under 12 hours, and practically a twelfth a schedule of 12 to $12 \frac{1}{2}$ hours. The weekly schedule of about 70 per cent of the women was in the groups of over 48 and including 54 hours, and four-fifths of the remainder had hours longer than these.
In the States having legislation regulating hours 3,988 women were reported. The daily, weekly, and Saturday schedules were shorter than the legal maximum for, respectively, 86.7, 70.6, and 36.6 per cent of the women in these States. In five States in which the law restricted hours to 9 daily, with a weekly limit, 67.6 per cent the law restricted hours to 9 daily, with a weekly limit, 67.6 per cent of the women had daily, 62 per cent had weekiy, and 33.5 per cent
had Saturday hours shorter than the maximum permitted. The data show that all chains had introduced into many of their stores hour schedules shorter than those allowed by law.

## PART IV

## EARNINGS, 1920 TO 1925

## Week's earnings.

Week's earnings were ascertained for 3,444 women in States studied at some time from the second half of 1920 to early 1925, inclusive. The data for the stores in any one State are comparable, but figures for the various States can not be considered so, owing to differences in business conditions at the different dates and sometimes to other reasons as well
Table X in the appendix gives the median of the earnings of the women studied in each State, with year and month. The median means that one-half of the women included earned more and onehalf earned less than the figure given. The highest median - $\$ 11.90$ for 157 women in Rhode Island-was of earnings toward the end of 1920, just at the close of the postwar high-price period in Rhode Island and before the heaviest effects of the ensuing depression had been felt there. In September, 1922, when prices had again reached practically their 1919 level, 309 women in New Jersey had a median of $\$ 11.30$ and 420 women in Ohio had a median of $\$ 10.55$. In none of the other States was the median so high as $\$ 10$, although in seven of them practically all the women were full-time workers. In five States the medians were less than $\$ 9$. Three of these were based on earnings during the severe business depression in effect in these States in 1921 and early 1922. Mississippi's median was of earnings at the end of 1924 and practically all the women included were fulltime workers. The remaining median, that of Kansas, was based on the earnings of workers nearly 30 per cent of whom were not on full time.

## Earnings and rates of pay.

Obviously, the amount earned may differ from the rate of pay bargained for if overtime is worked or if time is lost through illness or other cause. During the 5 -year period both earnings and rates were reported for 3,051 women. The extent to which the amounts actually earned by these women varied from their rates may be seen from Tables IX and X in the appendix. In every State but one the median of earnings was below that of rates, the variation ranging from 1.1 per cent in South Carolina to 7.8 per cent in Georgia.

The highest median of rates was that of $\$ 12.30$ in Rhode Island, where wages were secured at the end of 1920 . In New Jersey, surveyed in September, 1922, when business recovery from depression was practically complete, the median for 281 women was $\$ 12.25$. The median of the actual earnings of the Rhode Island women fell 3.3 per cent below that of their rates, that of the New Jersey women 3.7 per cent below their rates. The lowest median of rates was $\$ 8.20$, that of 193 women in Mississippi, at the end of 1924, and the median

$$
67294^{\circ}-30-4
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of their earnings was 2.4 per cent above this figure though below earnings in every other State except one studied early in 1922 while still suffering from the effects of depression.

## Proportions of women earning certain amounts.

Even more telling than the medians of earnings discussed in the foregoing are the proportions of women who earned certain amounts or who had certain rates. The distribution of women at the various ranges of earnings and of rates in 13 States may be seen from Table IX in the appendix.
Of the 3,051 women included only 14 had rates of as much as $\$ 20$. These were distributed among 10 States, 2 of them being in each of the States of Kentucky, Missouri, New Jersey, and Rhode Island. Three of these women had rates as high as $\$ 25$. There were 38 women who had rates of $\$ 18$ or over. These included 2.5 per cent of those who had rates of $\$ 18$ or over. These included 2.5 per cent of those in New Jersey and in Rhode Island and 1 per cent or more of those in each of six other States. Altogether, 151 women had rates of $\$ 15$
or over. Neither Delaware nor Mississippi had any women earning so much, but in the other States the proportions ranged from less than 2 per cent in Tennessee, Alabama, and Oklahoma to 8 per cent in Ohio and New Jersey and 12.1 per cent in Rhode Island.

In eight States more than half of the women had rates less than $\$ 10$. There were 343 women with rates less than $\$ 8$ and 52 in nine States with rates below $\$ 7$. In the remaining five States more than half of the women included had rates of $\$ 10$ or over. These were in New Jersey, Rhode Island, Ohio, Georgia, and Missouri, in which respectively $92.9,80.3,71.4,55.7$, and 53.2 per cent of the women had such rates. 92.9, $80.3,71.4,55.7$, and 53.2 per cent of the women had such rates. In New Jersey 59.8 per cent and in
the women had rates of $\$ 12$ or over.
As is generally the case, larger numbers of women had low earnings than had low rates. In every State but two, in one of which the numbers were equal, more women earned under $\$ 10$ than had rates as low as this. The proportion having earnings of less than $\$ 10$ exceeded by more than 10 per cent the proportion having rates of less than $\$ 10$ in Georgia, New Jersey, Ohio, and Oklahoma.
Rates and earnings each less than $\$ 10$ applied to over 90 per cent of the women studied in Mississippi, to over 80 per cent of those in Alabama, and to over 70 per cent of those in South Carolina. Figures for the last two States were taken in a period of depression. Rates for the last two States were taken in a period of depression. Rates and earnings each $\$ 10$ or more applied in Ohio to over 60 per cent
of the women included, in Rhode Island to over 70 per cent, and in of the women included, in Rhode Island to over 70 per cent, and in
New Jersey to over 80 per cent. Rates for nearly 60 per cent of the New Jersey to over 80 per cent. Rates for nearly 60 per cent of the
women and earnings for nearly 50 per cent were $\$ 12$ or above in New Jersey and Rhode Island, and both rates and earnings of over a third of the women in Ohio were $\$ 12$ or more.
Of all the women for whom rates and earnings were obtained just over one-half had rates of less than $\$ 10$, but about 57 per cent had earnings that fell below that figure.

## Earnings and time in the trade.

It is of interest to know to what extent the women who had remained in the limited-price stores for a considerable time received higher wages than were paid to those who had worked for shorter periods. Earnings and time in the trade as reported for 2,065 women in 14 States are given in Tablo XI in the appendix.

In 11 States enough of the women included had worked for as much as two years to make possible a comparison of their medians with those of women having less experience. In nine of these there was a continuous increase in the medians with increased time in the trade. In three States a general increase up to 10 years of service was indicated. In four States the medians of the earnings of women who had been in the trade for one and under two years were 13 per cent or more above those of women who had worked less than a year.

It is of especial importance to consider the earnings of women who had been in the trade 5 and under 10 years in relation to those of women with experience of less than a year. The former represent the more stable workers and those who might be expected to receive the highest payments made, while the latter include the beginners. In Table XII in the appendix may be found data for such a comparison.

Of the 2,065 women for whom earnings and time in the trade were reported, 872 , or about 42 per cent, received $\$ 10$ or over, and 69 , or about 3 per cent, received $\$ 15$ or more. In no State did any woman who had been in the trade less than a year receive as much as $\$ 15$, and in two States no woman in this service group received as much as $\$ 10$. Of the remaining 824 , in 12 States, who had been in the trade less than a year, about a fourth received as much as $\$ 10$; of these none received as much as $\$ 15$. Of the 165 who had been in the trade 5 and under 10 years more than three-fourths received at least $\$ 10$ and nearly a fifth received as much as $\$ 15$.
Of 28 women who had been in the trade for 10 years or longer more than half earned at least $\$ 12$ and a fourth earned as much as $\$ 15$. Eight earned less than $\$ 10$, the rate in some cases running down to $\$ 9$ or less.

In 12 of the 14 States for which earnings and time in the trade were reported the highest earnings in each case went to the women who had worked 5 and under 10 years, although in 4 of these States other women who had worked for shorter periods earned the same amounts. The largest sum paid for a week's work was $\$ 25$, earned by a woman in South Carolina in 1921; a woman in Kentucky in the same year received over $\$ 24$. Both of these workers had been in the trade 5 and under 10 years. The largest sum earned by any woman who had been in the trade for less than a year was $\$ 14$ and under $\$ 15$, and such an amount was received by five women in three different States in 1920 or in 1922.
Earnings in limited-price stores compared to those in other industries.
A study of the earnings of women in limited-price stores in comparison with those of women in other industries may be made from the data in Table 3.

Table 3.-Relation of median earnings in limited-price stores to those in other industries, by State

| State | Number of women reported in limitedprice stores | Median of the earnings in limitedprice stores | Per cent by which median in limitedprice stores- |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Was below highest median for other studied | Was above lowest median for other industries studied | Number of industries studied | Rank of limitedprice stores |
| Rhode Island | 157 <br> 309 <br> 40 <br> 420 <br> 516 <br> 440 <br> 99 <br> 137 <br> 340 <br> 190 <br> 317 <br> 155 <br> 215 <br> 194 <br> 237 <br> 194 | \$11.90 |  |  |  |  |
| New Jersey |  | 11.30 | 50.9 | 8.4 | 31 | 29th. |
| ${ }_{\text {Ohio }}$ Florida 2 |  | 10.55 | 46. 2 | 1.9 | ${ }_{24}^{64}$ | ${ }_{\text {23d. }}$ |
| Missouri |  | 10.05 9.80 | 44.5 38.4 | 7.5 | 8 | 7th. |
| Delaware- |  | 9.75 | 40.5 |  | 14 | 11th. |
| Oklahoma |  | 9.50 9.45 | 39.3 46.6 | 11.8 | 10 | 8th. |
| Georgia ${ }^{3}$ |  | 9. 25 | 46.6 41.8 |  | 9 | 9th. |
| Tennessee |  | 9. 20 | 42.9 | 10.8 | 97 | ${ }_{\text {2thd. }}$ |
| South Carolina |  | 8.90 | 42.6 | 17.1 | 9 | 8th. |
|  |  | 8.75 <br> 8.40 <br> 8 | $\begin{array}{r}37.7 \\ 43 \\ \hline\end{array}$ | ${ }^{16} 7$ | 18 | ${ }^{17 \text { th. }}$. |
| Kansas--.--- |  | 8.40 <br> 8.10 | 43.6 53.7 | 20.9 | 8 | ${ }^{\text {6th }}$, |
| Alabama |  | 8.05 | 53.5 | 17.5 | 10 | 7th. |

${ }^{1}$ See also Ceorgia.

1. See also Georgia.
2 FForida is in included in this table of the comparison of industries, but earnings in Florida are discussed
in general only in the section on earnings in 1928. in generia ons included in the section table of the comparis earnings in 1928 .
B Excludes Atlanta, which see.

Median earnings in limited-price stores fell below the highest median in other industries in the samelocality by from 32 to nearly 54 per cent, in other industries in the same locality by from 32 to nearly 54 per cent, in 3 States and in Atlanta, printing and publishing in 3 States, cigars in 2 , clothing in 3, and metal, electrical appliances, rubber, and meat packing in 1 State each.
In the 11 States in which the median for women in limited-price stores was not the lowest in the State it rose above the lowest by from about 1 to about 21 per cent. These lowest industries were candy in 2 States, some branch of textiles in 3, one of the wood industries in 2, one of the clothing industries in 2, and miscellaneous groups in the other 2 States.
The medians of women in limited-price stores were lower than those in any other industry in four States and in Atlanta and next to the lowest in five States. Only in three States were there more than two industries with medians below those in the limited-price stores, and in each of these well over half the industries in the State had higher medians.
Since every industry has problems peculiar to itself and in some cases inherent in the industry, comparisons can not always be oxact, but there is no question that the standards of payment discussed in the foregoing are very low indeed in comparison with those in other industries, in whatever State studied and regardless of the degree of business prosperity at the time of study. In considering them attention must be paid to various factors that may explain the reason for such low standards, that may mitigate this condition in the lives of the workers, or that may point out possibilities for improvement.

In a discussion of the low wage scale it must be remembered that in the limited-price stores goods often of a high grade are sold at a very low price, and this in itself forms a considerable service to the community, provided that it can be done without taking the legitimate profits of the business out of the pay envelopes of the employees. The great majority of the girls working in these stores are young and inexperienced, and it is possible that in many cases they could find other employment with difficulty. Since it must contend with a high labor turnover and often with poor salesmanship, the management is not unlikely to consider the low wage a sufficient payment where so little sales ability and initiative is required. The managers of the single stores in the chain have a responsible job and often they are well paid for it, but women were not found in these positions. Where the heads of companies have been able to rise by their own initiative from small financial beginnings, their experiences have accustomed them to the strict personal and business economies that were necessary for their advance. Therefore, it is not unnatural for them to consider that their employees can live as cheaply to-day as they themselves did at the time of their start. These are factors particularly characteristic of this industry that may offer some explanation of the low wage paid.
On the other hand, attempts are being made to mitigate the low wage by the installing of a form of bonus plan or vacation system, and a very real pride is taken by some chains in the success of such plans. These systems supplement, in a small degree, the low earnings of some of the workers, and undoubtedly could be extended with profit to employees in health and to employers in the good will and renewed effort created
The successful existence of limited-price stores is due in large part to the rapid turnover of enormous quantities of goods and to various economies of organization, the payment of a wage below that paid in most other industries being only a contributing factor. The financial reports of these chains usually show very high profits. This would indicate the possibility of paying a considerably better wage and of improving the selling standards within the business without raising the price of the goods. That at least one chain is making efforts in this direction is evidence of its practicability.

## Year's earnings.

More significant than the earnings during a single week are those during a 12 -month period, since the expenses of the worker continue throughout the year whether or not she receives normal payments every week. Medians of the year's earnings of women in 14 States may be seen in Table $X$ in the appendix.

In every State but one the earnings for the 52 -week period preceding the week for which current earnings were reported were taken for a representative number of employees in each establishment. ${ }^{1}$ To be included the women must have worked during at least 44 of the 52 weeks. On the whole, the earnings of these women may be considered the best possible ones in the limited-price stores in the State and period in which taken, since they are the earnings of the steadier and

1 A very few establishments that had been operating for less than a year were omitted. The exceptional
State was Kansas, in which the figures taken were based on 50 or more weeks instead of a 52 -week period and, consequently, are not entirely comparable with those in other States.
more responsible workers. The medians rose highest, $\$ 613, \$ 622$, and more responsible workers. The medians rose highest, $\$ 613, \$ 622$, and
$\$ 667$, in Ohio, Missouri, and New Jersey, respectively. Since these $\$ 667$, in Ohio, Missouri, and New Jersey, respectively. Since these States were studied just after an abnormal business period, a good
deal of the time included in these figures was during the depression, but deal of the time included in these figures was during the depression, but
business fluctuations appear to influence a high or low wage in the business fluctuations appear to influence a high or low wage in the
limited-price department chain, and, in fact, in all chain stores, less limited-price department chain, and, in fact, in all chain stores, less
than they do in many other industries. The medians in seven States ran from $\$ 506$ to $\$ 604$, and of these two were surveyed in 1920 , two in 1921, two in 1924, and one in 1925. The States having the lowest medians of earnings for the 52 -week period were Mississippi, Alabama, and Arkansas, and in these one-half of the women included received more, one-half less, than $\$ 431, \$ 438$, and $\$ 496$, respectively. The year for which earnings were taken in Alabama and Arkansas ended early in 1922 and thus included the depressed time of 1921; that for eary in 1922 and thus included the depressed time of 1921; that or
Mississippi closed at the end of 1924 and the figure, therefore, is based Mississippi closed at the end
on earnings for that year.

## SUMMARY OF EARNINGS, 1920 TO 1925

Week's earnings were ascertained for 3,444 women in 14 States studied from 1920 to 1925 , inclusive. The highest median was $\$ 11.90$, and in 11 States the median was less than $\$ 10$. In one State earnings were above rates; in all others they fell below by from 1.1 to 7.8 per cent. In eight States more than half the women had rates of less than $\$ 10$; only 151 women had rates of $\$ 15$ or over. The median of the earnings ordinarily showed an increase with length of service, although in most cases the proportion of increase was not continuous in relation to the time worked. Of those who had been in the trade less than a year none received as much as $\$ 15$ and all but about a fourth were paid less than $\$ 10$. Of those in the trade 5 and under 10 years, nearly a fifth earned $\$ 15$ or more and more than three-fourths received at least $\$ 10$. The median of the year's earnings ranged from $\$ 667$ to $\$ 431$.
In 4 of 15 States the median of the week's earnings was lower than that in any other industry surveyed; in 5 it was next to the lowest and in the remaining 6 it was from 8 to 21 per cent above the lowest median for any industry. ${ }^{2}$ In each State the median for women in limited-price stores fell from about 38 to about 54 per cent below the highest median in any other industry. It was 32.4 per cent below in the city of Atlanta.
2 See Table 3 and footnote 2, p. 22

## PART V

## EARNINGS IN 1928

## Week's earnings.

While giving a true picture of the situation in any one place at the time taken, the earnings discussed in the foregoing section are not necessarily representative of present conditions. For this reason the earnings of women during a week in the last quarter of 1928 were secured for limited-price stores in 18 States and 5 additional cities. ${ }^{1}$ These data, covering 6,061 women in 179 establishments, are shown in Table XIV in the appendix
One-half of the women included received less than $\$ 12$, one-half received more, for the week's work. The medians differed considerably in the different States. The lowest was that for 97 women in five establishments in Maryland, and was $\$ 8.80$; over a third of these women earned less than $\$ 8$. The median was $\$ 9$ in the six States of Alabama, Georgia, Kansas, Mississippi, South Carolina, and Tennessee. The State having the highest median was California, and the figure was $\$ 16$, which is the minimum permitted by law for experienced workers. The median in Michigan was $\$ 15$, that in Kentucky was $\$ 14$, but in each of these States the stores included were located in the largest cities. Of the separate cities studied Boston had the lowest median, $\$ 12$, and this was based upon 376 women in three stores. In New York City the median for 380 women in seven stores was $\$ 14$. The highest was in Chicago and was $\$ 18$. While this was based upon but two stores, they were of different chains and employed 223 women, and the figures may be taken as representative.

In every locality but Georgia, Rhode Island, and South Carolina there were women whose earnings for this week were less than $\$ 5$ as many as 21 in one State and 14 to 16 in several others. At the other end of the scale, two saleswomen in Boston earned $\$ 40$, and a floor woman in Ohio $\$ 45$ three women in Chicaco received $\$ 35$ or more, and three each in Michigan, Boston, and Chicago earned $\$ 30$ or more. These very low or very high figures, however, were exceptional. The highest amount earned in any other State was under $\$ 30$; in nine States it was under $\$ 18$, in four of these under $\$ 15$, in Georgia under $\$ 14$, and in Mississippi under $\$ 12$.

Of the women studied only 7 per cent earned as much as $\$ 18$ 70.2 per cent earned less than $\$ 15,44.1$ per cent less than $\$ 12$, and 25.6 per cent less than $\$ 10$.

## Earnings and days worked.

More than 80 per cent (81.8) of the women studied had worked the full week of 6 days, and more than 85 per cent had worked on $5 \frac{1}{2}$ or 6 days. While the median for all women reported was $\$ 12$, it was $\$ 13$
for those working 6 days. The following summary shows the days worked during the week and the medians of the women's earnings:

| Number of days worked | Number of women reported | Median of the earnings | Number of days worked | Number reported | Median of the earnings |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total | 6,036 | \$12.00 |  | $\begin{array}{r} 36 \\ 138 \\ 60 \\ 374 \\ 213 \\ 4,937 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 7.00 \\ 8.05 \\ 9.00 \\ 10.05 \\ 11.00 \\ 13.00 \end{array}$ |
|  | $\begin{gathered} 71 \\ 13 \\ 76 \\ 14 \\ 104 \end{gathered}$ | 2.00 |  |  |  |
| 2 |  | 4.00 |  |  |  |
| 3 |  | 6. 00 |  |  |  |

The foregoing shows a fairly regular progression of earnings with number of days worked. However, women who had worked on 4 or 5 days had a median slightly more than four or five times that for 1 day, and those who had worked on 6 days had a median six and a half times as great as that for the 1-day workers and considerably above that of the $51 / 2$-day workers. In effect, this puts the premium of an additional half-day's pay upon work during a week that lacks an afternoon of freedom.
For each State or city the proportion of women who had worked on 6 davs and their respective earnings may be considered from Table XIII in the appendix. In Rhode Island 93.2 per cent of tle women had worked on 6 days. In 4 other States over 85 per cent of them, in 8 States and 3 cities 80 to 85 per cent, and in 5 States and 2 cities less than 80 per cent had worked on 6 days. In States in which 6-day workers formed the largest proportions their medians were not necessarily closer to the medians of all workers than were those in States having smaller proportions of 6-day workers. In 11 States and 4 cities the median was the same for all women and for those working on 6 days; in 7 States and 1 city those working on 6 days had higher medians than had the total number of women, usually by the amount of $\$ 1$.
Since those who had worked on 6 days may be considered the steadiest and most responsible workers, the amounts they received may be taken as representative of the best actual earnings in a State or city. In each of 7 States the largest group of these 6-day workers earned less than $\$ 10$. The range in the proportions of women having such low earnings ran from 47.9 per cent in Kansas, through South Carolina, Tennessee, Georgia, Maryland, and Mississippi, to 85.8 per cent in Alabama. In 4 States Oklahoma, Arkansas, Florida, and Rhode Island-the largest groups of 6-day workers earned $\$ 10$ and under $\$ 12$. In Florida the proportion was 42 per cent, and nearly as many earned less than $\$ 10$. In five States-Kentucky, nearly as many earned less than $\$ 10$. In five States-Kentucky,
Missouri, New Jersey, Ohio, and Delaware the largest group of 6 -day workers earned $\$ 12$ and under $\$ 15$. In Michigan 55.9 per cent and in California 77.6 per cent earned $\$ 15$ and under $\$ 18$. The State in which the largest proportion of the women who had worked on 6 days received $\$ 18$ or over was Michigan, and these formed 28.4 per cent of the total in that State, in which, it will be remembered, all the stores surveyed were in large cities.

Except a very few women in New York, none of the 6-day workers in the separate cities earned under $\$ 10$; none in Milwaukee and Indianapolis and only a few in the other cities received less than $\$ 12$. In Boston 81 per cent, and in all other cities but one the largest group, earned $\$ 12$ and under $\$ 15$. In Chicago 62.5 per cent received $\$ 18$ and over

The heavy trading on Saturday in the limited-price stores and the consequent long hours on that day often make it necessary to employ extra help for Saturday only. Earnings were ascertained for 1,776 women whose regular work was on Saturday only. The largest group of these - 23 per cent-earned $\$ 1.50$ for Saturday work, 18.9 per cent earned $\$ 2,11.6$ per cent $\$ 2.50,9.5$ per cent $\$ 1.25$, and 8.4 per centwomen who were in California, Michigan, Missouri, New Jersey, Ohio, and Chicago-received $\$ 2.67$ or more, 2 women in Chicago being paid as much as $\$ 3.50$. The remaining 28.6 per cent had earnings scattered in various ranges, 23 women in Maryland, Missouri, and Tennessee earning as little as $\$ 1$ each. No women in any of the 5 cities were paid less than $\$ 1.75$ for their Saturday's work, and most of these earned $\$ 2$ to $\$ 2.50$.

## Earnings and rates of pay.

Both actual earnings and rates of pay were secured for 6,001 women. In the main, the rates fixed may be expected to correspond quite closely to the earnings that have been discussed for women who had worked on 6 days. The medians of both rates and earnings are shown by State or city in Table 4.
Table 4.-Medians of the weekly rates and of the week's earnings, by State or city1928 figures


The median of the rates of all the women included was $\$ 13$, but the median of the earnings fell 7.7 per cent below this. Rates and earnings medians were the same in all but four cases, the exceptions being ings medians were the same in all but four cases, the exceptions being Carolina, by 6.3 per cent in Michigan, and by 2.2 per cent in MaryCarolina, by 6.3 per cent in Michigan, and by 2.2 per cent in Mary-
land. The relative proportions of women having rates and earnings in the highest range and in ranges considerably lower may be seen from the following:

| Range of payment | Women having- |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Rates as specified |  | Earnings as specified |  |
|  | Number | Per cent | Number | Per cent |
| Under 88. | $\begin{gathered} 101 \\ \left.\begin{array}{c} 1,03 \\ 3,924 \\ 3,924 \\ 224 \end{array}\right) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.7 \\ & \left.\begin{array}{c} 175 \\ 65.7 \\ 6.7 \end{array}\right) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 487 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

From the foregoing it appears that the proportion of women having rates of $\$ 20$ and over is similar to that of women having earnings in the same range - in both cases less than 4 per cent of the total. While 17.5 per cent of the women reported had rates below $\$ 10$, considerably more- 25.3 per cent-had earnings as low as this.
The highest or lowest rates fixed for individual workers are of less importance than is the foregoing consideration of groups of women earning certain amounts, and they have little value as representing earning certain amounts, and they have fit the value as representing numbers of women; nevertheless, it is of interest to notice their in-
dications as to the differences among States in earning possibilities dications as to the differences among States in earning possibilities
for the lowest paid and for the exceptionally well paid. The entire for the lowest paid and for the exceptionally well paid. The entire
range of the rates set ran from under $\$ 6$ to $\$ 45$. The lowest rate ranged from less than $\$ 6$ for a woman in Ohio (although only one other woman in that State had a rate below \$8) and from less than $\$ 7$ in Tennessee and Florida to $\$ 11$ and under $\$ 12$ in California and Kentucky of the States, and to $\$ 12$ and under $\$ 13$ in Indianapolis and $\$ 13$ and under $\$ 14$ in Milwaukee of the cities. The lowest rate was as much as $\$ 10$ in only four States; it was below $\$ 10$ in only one city, New York
In seven States and two cities 10 per cent or more of all the women reported had actual earnings below the lowest rates fixed. Table 5 shows the lowest rate found in each State and city and the number and per cent of women who earned less than this.
actual earnings were less t

| Amount at or above which all rates fell | State or city ${ }^{1}$ | Women whose earnings wereless than lowest rate reported |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Number | Per cent |
| $\$ 5$ - | Ohio -.... | 12 16 | 2.0 |
|  | Florida | 22 | 4.3 |
|  | Alabama | 15 | 10.4 |
|  | Delaware. | 3 | 9.6 |
|  | Kansas | ${ }_{13}^{21}$ | 10.2 |
|  | Mississippi. | 4 | 8.9 |
| \$8 | Georsia | 30 5 5 | 5.8 |
|  | Oklahoma | 36 | 10.4 |
|  | South Carolina- |  | 9.0 |
|  | Michigan ....-- | 28 | 5.1 |
|  | New Jersey-...-- | ${ }_{37}^{23}$ | 14.3 |
|  | Chicago--------- | 6 | 2.8 |
|  | California | ${ }_{7} 6$ | 6.7 |
|  | Indianapois. Milwaukee | 11 | 13.1 |
| \$13 | Milwaukee | 11 | 24.4 |

${ }^{1}$ In Rhode Island no earnings fell below the lowest rate, which was $\$ 7$.
At the other end of the scale, in every State but one and in every city, the highest earnings found equaled but did not exceed the highest rate. In Kansas the highest rate was under \$18, in Delaware and Oklahoma under $\$ 17$, in Alabama, Georgia, and South Carolina under \$16, in Maryland and Arkansas under \$15, and in Mississippi under $\$ 12$. In every other State some women had rates of $\$ 20$ or over; in five States and four cities some had rates of $\$ 25$ or over. Table 6 shows the numbers of women having rates and earnings of $\$ 20$ or over and the highest ranges of rates and earnings found.

Table 6.-Highest rates and earnings, by State or city-1928 figures

| State or city | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Number } \\ & \text { of women } \\ & \text { reported } \end{aligned}$ | Women having rates and earnings of |  | Highest rates and earnings above $\$ 25$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\$ 20$ or over | \$25 or over |  |
| State: <br> California $\qquad$ | 916 |  |  | Rate and earnings, $\$ 27.50$ for 1 woman, $\$ 26.50$ for 1. |
| Florida <br> Kentucky <br> Michigan | $\begin{array}{r} 516 \\ 65 \\ 549 \end{array}$ |  |  |  |
|  |  | Rate 66 | Rate 10. | 1 woman had a rate of $\$ 33$, earnings of $\$ 34.73$; 1 a rate of $\$ 30$, earnings of \$30.63. |
|  |  | Earnings 63 | Earnings 9-... |  |
| Missouri | 521 | Rate 19.-.....-- | 4--.-....-.-....-- |  |
| New Jerse | 161 | Rate 8 <br> Earnings 7 $\qquad$ | 2------------------- | Rate and earnings, $\$ 26$ for 1 forelady and for 1 woman selling music. Rate and earnings, $\$ 45$ for 1 floorwoman, who also did selling. |
| Ohio | 598 | Earnings 7.-.-. <br> 13. | Rate 3 Earnings 5 |  |
| Rhode Island.- | 73 317 |  |  |  |
| City: $\qquad$ | 376 |  |  | Rate and earnings for 2 saleswomen, $\$ 40$; for $3, \$ 30$. <br> 7 floor women had rates and earnings ranging from $\$ 28$ to $\$ 39$; the bighest for any saleswoman was $\$ 27$. |
| Chicago.- | 210 | Rate 81 <br> Earnings 78.... | Rate 20 Earnings 21 $\qquad$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Milwaukee..-- | 49 380 |  |  |  |

## Rates by size of town or city.

Up to this point the discussion has taken account of the differences in payment in the various States or large cities and the differences between rates and earnings, but there has been no general consideration of the variations in rate according to size of town or city. The data are arranged in such a manner in Table XVI in the appendix. The medians in this table, which show wide variations in the rates The medians in this table, which show wide variations in the rates for women working in places of different sizes, are as follows:
fixed for

| Size of town or city | Number of - |  | Median of the rates |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Stores | Women |  |
| All places | 179 | 6,001 | \$13.00 |
| Under 10,000 |  | ${ }_{771}^{332}$ |  |
| 10,000 and under 25,000 | ${ }_{22}^{52}$ | 580 | 10. 00 |
| 50,000 and under 100,000 | 26 20 | 944 | 10. 00 |
| 100,000 and under 500,000 | 27 16 | 1, 1,474 | 13.00 |
| 500,000 and under $1,000,000$... <br> $1,000,000$ and over |  | 1,470 |  |

This summary shows that the median of the rates was the same for women in towns having fewer than 10,000 inhabitants as in those having 10,000 and under 25,000 . It was a little more than 5 per cent higher for women in places of 25,000 and under 50,000 , and was the same here as in places of 50,000 and under 100,000 . In cities of 100,000 and under 500,000 the median rose above that of the class just below by 30 per cent, and in those of 500,000 and over it rose above the class below by 15 per cent. In the largest cities the median of the rates was 57.9 per cent higher than in towns of under 25,000. of the rates was 57.9 per cent higher than in towns of under 25,000 .
In towns of less than 25,000 population the highest rate was under In towns of less than 25,000 population the highest rate was under
$\$ 19$, in those of from 25,000 to 500,000 the highest rate was $\$ 27.50$, $\$ 19$, in those of from 25,000 to 500,000 the highest rate was $\$ 27.50$,
and in the largest cities a few women had higher rates. The proportions of women having rates of $\$ 15$ or over, according to size of place, were as follows:

| Size of town or city |  | Per cent <br> of women <br> with rent <br> of $\$ 15$ or <br> over |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

The foregoing summary shows quite clearly that much larger proportions of women had rates above $\$ 15$ in the larger cities than in the smaller towns. While the proportion advanced somewhat with each successive group of the population classification, the greatest increase came between the class 100,000 and under 500,000 and the class 500,000 and under $1,000,000$.

The proportion of women having rates of $\$ 20$ or over was nearly 10 per cent greater in cities of $1,000,000$ and over than in cities of

500,000 but under $1,000,000$. However, there was much less difference than this between the cities last mentioned and those of 100,000 and under 500,000

In connection with these differences in rate of payment it should be remembered that the cost of living ordinarily is much higher in the larger places.

## Rates in various chains.

In addition to differences in locality and in size of city a factor that may affect payments is the possibility of variation in the standards of the employing chains. A basis for the indication of such ards of the employing chains. A basis for the indication of such
variation may be found in Table XV in the appendix, which shows variation may be found in Table XV in the appendix, which shows
by size of place the rates of the women in each of five chains. Many by size of place the rates of the women in each of five chains. Many
of the women reported in Chains I and II were in California, and of the women reported in Chains I and II were in California, and
this State differs from every other included in having a legal provision for a minimum wage. Because of this, rates in California are, from a reason aside from the standards of payment that may exist elsewhere in these two chains, higher than in other States, except for some instances in the very large cities. In Table XV, therefore, figures both including and omitting the women who worked in California are given.

Table 7, taken from the appendix table cited, shows the number and the median rates of the women in the various chains, by size of place and both including and excluding California.

Table 7.-Number of women in the various chains and the medians of their rates, by size of town or city and both including and excluding California-1928 figures

| Size of town or city | In all States reported |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | In States exclusive of California |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Chain I |  | Chain II |  | Chain III |  | Chain IV |  | Chain V |  | Chain I |  | Chain II |  |
|  | Number of women | Median of the rates | Number of women | Median of the rates | Number of women | Median of the rates | Number of women | Median of the rates | Number of women | Median of the rates | Number of women | Median of the rates | Number of women | Median of the rates |
| All places <br> Under 10,000 | 956 | \$14.00 | 1,885 | \$10.00 | 2,088 | \$14. 50 | 506 | \$11.00 | 329 | \$12.00 | 500 | \$12.00 | 1,460 | \$10.00 |
|  |  | 9.00 | 94 | 12. 00 |  |  | 107 | 9. 00 |  |  | 89 | 9.00 | 47 | 9.00 |
| 10,000 and under 25,000 | 114 85 | 16. 00 | 555 | 9.00 | 44 | 10. 50 | 53 <br> 86 | 10. 00 | 26 |  | 107 | ${ }^{(1)} 11.00$ | 513 127 | 9.00 9.00 |
| 550,000 and under 100,000 | $\begin{array}{r}85 \\ 192 \\ \hline 180\end{array}$ | 13. 00 | 196 | 10.00 | 31 16 | 13. 00 | 86 37 | 19.00 | 99 | 11. 00 | 14 | 9. 00 | 496 | 10.00 |
| 100,000 and under 500,000 | 155280 | 12. 00 | 199 | 10.00 | 899 | 13. 00 |  |  | 23 | 11. 00 | 136 | 12. 00 | 134 | 10.00 |
| 500,000 and under $1,000,00$$1,000,000$ and over...---- |  | 16.00 | 86 143 | 16. 00 | 898 200 | 15. 00 18.00 | 223 | 14.00 | 157 24 | 12. 00 14.00 | 115 | 14.00 | 143 | 15.00 |
|  |  |  | 143 | 10.00 | 20 | 18.00 |  | 14.0 | 24 |  |  |  |  |  |

${ }^{2}$ Not computed, owing to small number involved.

The chains having the highest rates reported, according to size of city, were as follows:

| Size of town or city |  | Chain having highest <br> median rate- |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| All places |  |  |

${ }^{1}$ Includes no stores of Chains III and V
${ }_{2}$ The median rate in towns under 10,000 was the same in all chains.
${ }^{3}$ Includes no stores of Chain V
${ }_{4}$ The indication is that Chain $\dot{I}$ had the highest rates, but the median was not computed, owing to the small number involved.
${ }_{5}$ Includes no stores of Chain IV.
${ }^{6}$ Includes no stores of Chain IV and, in California, none of Chain II.
${ }^{7}$ Includes no stores of Chain I.
The foregoing shows that, in general, with the exclusion of the California figures, Chain III had the best median rates wherever this chain was found, the only exception being the cities in the second and third groups. In the smallest towns included in the study no stores of Chain III were found, and the median rates were alike in the other chains located in these places. When the California figures are included the definite influence of the minimum wage appears and the median rates in Chains I and II in cities of certain sizes rise to a point above the rate in Chain III-a chain that has no stores in California.

Omitting the California figures, the size of city in which each chain paid best was as follows:

| Chain number | Size of city in which median rate was- |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Highest | Next to highest |
| I | 500,000 and under $1,000,000 \ldots$ |  |
| III |  | 50,000 and under 100,000 and 100,000 and under 500,000 . 500,000 and under $1,000,000$. |
| VV. |  | 10,000 and under 25,000 and 25,000 and under 50,000 . |
| V | do. | 500,000 and under $1,000,000$. |

[^1]Table 8.-Proportions of women with rates in the various ranges, by chain and both including and excluding California-1928 figures

| Chain number | Chains I and II in all States reported |  |  |  |  | In States exclusive of California |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number of women | Per cent of women who had weekly rates of - |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Num- } \\ & \text { ber of } \\ & \text { women } \end{aligned}$ | Per cent of women who had weekly rates of - |  |  |  |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Un- } \\ & \text { der } \\ & \$ 10 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 10 \text { and } \\ & \text { under } \\ & \$ 15 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 15 \\ \text { and } \\ \text { over } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 20 \\ \text { and } \\ \text { over } \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Un- } \\ & \text { der } \\ & \$ 10 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c} \$ 10 \text { and } \\ \text { under } \\ \$ 15 \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 15 \\ \text { and } \\ \text { over } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 20 \\ \text { and } \\ \text { over } \end{gathered}$ |
| II | 956 1,885 | $\begin{aligned} & 11.6 \\ & 34.3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 42.5 \\ & 42.4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 45.9 \\ & 23.2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r}1.7 \\ .2 \\ \hline\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 500 \\ 1,460 \\ 12,088 \\ 506 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 2.2 \\ 44.2 \\ 18 \\ 28.9 \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 63.0 \\ 48.9 \\ \text { BN. } \\ 55.5 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 14.8 \\ 6.8 \\ 49.7 \\ 15.8 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1.4 \\ 9.2 \\ 9.2 \\ 1.2 \end{array}$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

1 Of these women, 9.6 per cent were in Chicago, and a number in that city were highly paid, some being
floor women. If the Chicago rates be excluded from this chain, 44.3 per cent of the remaining women floor women. If the Chicago rates be excluded from this chain, 44.3 per cent of the remaining women
had rates of $\$ 15$ or over and 55.7 per cent had rates of $\$ 10$ and under $\$ 15$; the median for all women in the
chain would then be $\$ 14$.

The proportions of women in the various chains who had rates falling in the different ranges are shown in Table 8. From this it will be seen that, considering the group from which California figures are excluded, practically half the women in Chain III had rates of $\$ 15$ or over, while the corresponding figure was 15 or 16 per cent in Chains I and IV and 7 or 8 per cent in Chains II and V. The largest proportion of women with rates below $\$ 10$ was in Chain II. Chain III thus appears to rise rather considerably above the other four and Chain II to pay rather below the remaining three. With the omission of the Chicago women having high rates in Chain III, the proportion having rates of $\$ 15$ or over still was 28.5 per cent higher than in the chain having the next high proportion with rates of $\$ 15$ or over-Chain IV
To estimate somewhat more definitely the influence upon rates of siz̀e of city or of employer's policies, a more detailed study may be made of different chains and of towns of different size in certain States the data from which lend themselves to such a study. In each of five States studied over 500 women were included. In two of these, Florida and Ohio, the women studied were in cities of four of these, Florida and Ohio, the women studied were in cities of four or more classifications as regards size and in stores in four chains.
These States, therefore, furnish a basis for the somewhat more These States, therefore, furnish a basis for the somewhat more
detailed study of the possible effect of size of city or of difference in chain upon the standard of rates of payment to the women employed.
Table 9.-Median rates in Florida and in Ohio, by size of town or city and by chain-1928 figures

FLORIDA

| Size of town or city | Chain I |  | Chain II |  | Chain IV |  | Chain V |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Num- ber of women | $\left\lvert\, \begin{gathered} \text { Median } \\ \text { of the } \\ \text { rates } \end{gathered}\right.$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Num- } \\ & \text { ber of } \\ & \text { women } \end{aligned}$ | $\left\lvert\, \begin{gathered} \text { Median } \\ \text { of the } \\ \text { rates } \end{gathered}\right.$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Num- } \\ & \text { ber of } \\ & \text { women } \end{aligned}$ | Median of the rates | Num- ber of ber of women wom | Median of the rates |
| All places | 172 | \$9.00 | 111 | \$10.00 | 184 | \$10.00 | 49 | \$11.00 |
| Under 10,000 | 89 | 9. 00 |  |  |  | 9.00 |  |  |
| 25,000 and under 50,000 |  |  | 26 | ${ }_{8.00}$ | 52 | 11. 00 |  |  |
| 50,000 and under 100,000- | 31 | 9.00 | 45 | 10.50 | ${ }_{37}$ | 9.00 | 49 | 11.00 |

Table 9.-Median rates in Florida and in Ohio, by size of town or city and by chain-1928 figures-Continued

оніO

| Size of town or city | Chain I |  | Chain III |  | Chain IV |  | Chain V |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Num- } \\ & \text { ber of } \\ & \text { women } \end{aligned}$ | $\left\|\begin{array}{c\|} \text { Median } \\ \text { of the } \\ \text { rates } \end{array}\right\|$ | Num- <br> ber of <br> women | $\begin{gathered} \text { Median } \\ \text { of the } \\ \text { rates } \end{gathered}$ | Number of women | Median of the rates | Numwomen | Median of the rates |
| All places | 328 | \$12.00 | 214 | \$13.00 | 17 | \$9. 00 | 26 | \$10. 25 |
| 10,000 and under 25,000 | $\begin{array}{r} 9 \\ 55 \\ 13 \\ 136 \\ 115 \end{array}$ | 12.7511.0011.0012.0014.00 |  |  | 17 | 9.00 |  |  |
| 25,000 and under 50,000 50,000 and under 100,000 |  |  | 31 | 10.00 |  |  | 26 | 10. 25 |
| 100,000 and under 500,000 |  |  | 183 | $13.00^{-}$ |  |  |  |  |
| 500,000 and under $1,000,000$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

According to Table 9, no chain in Florida showed regular progression of payment according to size of city. The highest median, $\$ 11$, was found in three chains, Nos. II, IV, and V, in each case in a city of a different size. The lowest, $\$ 8$, was in Chain II; the same chain paid a rate more than a third higher than this in a small town. Chain IV had a low rate in cities of three sizes, Chain I in cities of two sizes.
In the State as a whole 41.3 per cent of the women had rates below
\$10. In Chains I, II, and IV the respective proportions having rates of less than $\$ 10$ were 58.7 per cent, 30.6 per cent, and 42.4 per cent. No women in Chain $V$ had earnings below $\$ 10$, but this chain was found only in cities of the largest class in the State. In cities of the largest size Chain II likewise had no women with rates below $\$ 10$, and Chains I and IV had, respectively, 83.9 per cent and 16.8 per cent with such rates. In cities next smaller in size these low rates applied to no women in Chain IV, to 23 per cent in Chain I, and to most of those in Chain II.

Only 5.2 per cent of the women reported in Ohio had rates below $\$ 10$. The lowest median rate was in Chain IV. Chain I usually had rates high as compared to those of other chains in cities of the same size. No women in Chain IV and very few in Chain V had rates of $\$ 15$ or over, though in Chain III 17.5 per cent and in Chain I 21.6 per cent had such rates.
In cities of 25,000 and under 50,000 in Ohio no women in Chain III and very few in Chains $I$ and $V$ had rates of as much as $\$ 15$. In cities of 100,000 and under $500,000,14.7$ per cent of those in Chain I and 26.2 per cent of those in Chain III had rates of $\$ 15$ or more.

From the foregoing consideration of conditions in two States having considerable numbers of women reported from several chains in cities of several different sizes, no generalizations can be made as to the effect on rates of size of city or of difference in chain. This does not mean, however, that there are no indications of the effect of such factors within any one State.

## Earnings in 1928 compared to those in earlier years.

The earlier studies were taken in 1920 to 1925, inclusive, a period of great business fluctuation. The number of women studied in any one year was too small to warrant comparison with the data for 1928, except in the case of 1922, a year following great depression and conditions within certain months of which could not be taken as representative of normal times. In 1928 it was not always possible to secure data for the same establishments or even the same cities as
those surveyed in earlier years; in some cases additional cities were taken to give a more accurate picture for 1928 . Owing to these and other factors (see footnote 2, Appendix Table XIV), it is not possible to make adequate general comparisons of the 1928 figures with those secured earlier.
An interesting condition is found in South Carolina, where the median of earnings in 1928 was 10 per cent below that of rates, though in 1921, a year of depression, earnings and rates were practically the same. In 1928 the median rate was about 11 per cent higher than the 1921 figure. In this State the stores in Chain II, taken in the same 1921 figure. In this State the stores in Chain 11, taken in the same women included as having rates and earnings in the groups specified:

| Year | Per cent of women having - |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Under \$10 as - |  | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 10 \text { and under } \$ 15 \\ & \text { as }- \end{aligned}$ |  | \$15 or over as- |  |
|  | Rate | Earnings | Rate | Earnings | Rate | Earnings |
| ${ }_{1}^{1921} 1$ | 54.5 31.1 | 56.3 37.7 | 36.4 68.9 | 33.3 62.3 | 9.1 | 10.4 |

Of the women working in Chain II in these cities nearly 20 per cent more in 1921 than in 1928 had earnings below $\$ 10$ and over 30 per cent more in 1921 than in 1928 had rates so low; but while some had rates and earnings of $\$ 15$ or over in 1921-ranging as high as $\$ 25$ for one woman - none in 1928 had either rates or earnings of as much as $\$ 15$. Thus, while the proportion of women paid at the lowest rates was smaller in 1928 than in 1921, no woman in 1928 was paid so high as were about 10 per cent of the women in 1921, a year of depression.
The greatest difference between the median rate for an early year and that for 1928 occurred in Kentucky, another State that was studied in the depressed year of 1921. The stores surveyed in 1928 were in two large cities, and Chain III was studied in these cities in both years. For this chain the figures were as follows:

| Year | Number of women | Median of |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 74 65 | [ $\begin{aligned} & 10 \\ & 14\end{aligned}$ |

In 1928 the median in this chain for stores located in these two cities was 40 per cent above the 1921 figure. Nearly a fourth of the women had rates and actual earnings of $\$ 16$ or over in 1928 and only three had rates so high in 1921.

In Tennessee rates were ascertained for exactly the same number of women (317) and in the same cities in 1925 and 1928. The median of the rates was in the same range in the two years, and in each year only one woman earned as much as $\$ 20$. The following gives the proportions of women having rates in the lowest ranges in the two years for which figures were obtained in Tennessee.

| Amount | Per cent of women who had rates specified in- |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1925 | 1928 |  |
| Under ${ }^{\text {S }} 10$ | ${ }_{93.1}^{63.1}$ | ${ }_{92.1}^{57}$ | ${ }_{92.7}^{61.2}$ |

The foregoing shows that in this State the proportions of women with rates below $\$ 10$ and below $\$ 12$ were smaller in 1928 than in 1925.

## SUMMARY OF 1928 FINDINGS

## Median of the earnings.

In 1928 the median of the week's earnings of 6,061 women studied in 179 stores in 18 States and 5 additional cities was $\$ 12$. The medians for the various States ranged from $\$ 8.80$ in Maryland to $\$ 16$ medians for the various States ranged from $\$ 8.80$ in Maryland to $\$ 16$ in California. In every locality but Georgia, Rhode Island, and
South Carolina some women earned less than $\$ 5$. The highest earnings in a State ranged from less than $\$ 12$ in Mississippi to $\$ 45$ in Ohio.

## Earnings of 6-day workers.

More than 80 per cent of the women studied in 1928 had worked on 6 days during the week; the highest proportion in any one State was 93.2 per cent, the figure for Rhode Island. In seven of the States studied considerable proportions of the 6-day workers earned less than $\$ 10$, these per cents ranging from 47.9 in Kansas to 85.8 in Alabama. In the large cities studied no women received so little as this, except a very few in New York. In four States the largest groups of 6 -day workers earned $\$ 10$ and under $\$ 12$, in five States $\$ 12$ and under $\$ 15$, and in two States $\$ 15$ and under $\$ 18$. In four cities the largest groups earned $\$ 12$ and under $\$ 15$, and in one $\$ 18$ and over.

## Earnings of Saturday workers.

In addition to the 6,061 women who form the basis for the 1928 study 1,776 women were scheduled who worked only on Saturday. Their earnings for this day ranged from $\$ 1$, received by some women in Maryland, Missouri, and Tennessee, to $\$ 3.50$ received by two women in Chicago.

## Median rates of pay.

The median of the weekly rates for all women reported in 1928 was $\$ 13,7.7$ per cent above the median of their earnings. In 14 States and 5 cities the median of the rates was the same as that of the earnings; it was above that of the earnings in 4 States, in 2 of these by as much as 10 per cent. The lowest rates ranged from $\$ 5$ and under $\$ 6$ in Ohio to $\$ 11$ and under $\$ 12$ in California and Kentucky; in cities, from less than $\$ 10$ in New York to as high as $\$ 13$ in Milwaukee. In every State but one and in every city some women earned less than the lowest rates, the proportions of the total ranging from 2 per cent in Ohio to 24.4 per cent in Milwaukee. No woman had earnings in excess of the highest rate fixed.

## Rates of pay in relation to size of town or city.

While much larger proportions of the women in the larger cities than of those in the smaller towns had high rates, and while the women in each group of cities showed some advance above those in the group of cities next smaller in size in the proportion having the higher rates, the greatest increase came between the classes of 100,000 and under 500,000 and those of 500,000 and under $1,000,000$ population. The median of the rates for cities in the classes up to 100,000 varied by no more than 6 per cent, in those over that figure by about 15 per cent, but between the class containing cities of 50,000 and under 100,000 and that containing cities of 100,000 and under 500,000 there was a difference of 30 per cent. It must be remembered that living costs usually are higher in the larger than in the smaller cities.

## Standards of rates of pay in different chains.

From the figures available there appeared to be some variation in the standards of the rates paid by different chains, those in Chain II showing some tendency to be low and those in Chain III to be high. Earnings in 1928 compared to those in earlier years.

In most cases such factors as the differences in identity of establishments, of chains, or of cities, or the difficulty of measuring business fluctuations in the different years of study, made it impossible to give accurate comparisons, on any wide scale, of earnings in 1928 with those in earlier years.

Of 13 States for which it is possible to make the comparison 10 had rates higher in 1928 than at the earlier survey.

Three somewhat small and scattered cases offer definite bases for comparisons of 1928 with earlier years. In one State in which an identical chain was studied in the same three cities in 1921, a year of depression, and in 1928, smaller proportions of the women studied of depression, and in 1928, smaner proportions of the 1921 had very low rates and earnings, in 1928 than of those studied in 1921 had very low rates and earnings,
but no women in 1928 had earnings so high as had over 10 per cent but no women in 1928 had earnings so high as had over 10 per cent
of the women in 1921. In another State in which an identical chain of the women in 1921. In another State in which an identical chain
was studied in the same two cities in 1921 and in 1928 the median rate in 1928 was 40 per cent above that in 1921, and in 1928 nearly a fourth of the women had both rates and earnings at a figure attained by only three of the women studied in 1921. In the State in which the same number of women (317) were studied in identical cities in 1925 and in 1928 the median of the rates showed little change; fewer women in 1928 than in 1925, by about 9 per cent, had rates below $\$ 10$.

These rather fragmentary and scattered cases in which valid comparisons are possible indicate some decrease in the proportions of women paid at the lowest rates, but give no positive indication of any general increase in the groups having rates or earnings in the highest ranges.

## APPENDIX.-GENERAL TABLES

Table I.-Age of women employees who supplied personal information, by State

| State | $\left.\begin{array}{\|c} \text { Number } \\ \text { of women } \\ \text { report- } \\ \text { ing } \end{array} \right\rvert\,$ | Number of women whose age was- |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Under } \\ & \text { ner } \\ & \text { years } \end{aligned}$ | 16 and ander years | $\begin{aligned} & 18 \\ & \text { and } \\ & \text { under } \\ & \text { years } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 20 \\ & \text { and } \\ & \text { und } \\ & \text { yer } \\ & \text { year } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 25 \\ \text { and } \\ \text { under } \\ \text { years } \end{gathered}$ | 30 and under years | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 40, } \\ & \text { und } \\ & \text { sider } \\ & \text { seara } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 50 \\ & \text { and } \\ & \text { and } \\ & \text { yer } \\ & \text { fear } \end{aligned}$ | (ex $\begin{gathered}\text { years } \\ \text { yand } \\ \text { over }\end{gathered}$ |
| Per cent dill ditas | (3,086 | 31 1.0 | $\begin{aligned} & 873 \\ & \hline 27,3 \end{aligned}$ | 874 28.3 | 809 26.2 | ${ }_{8.3}^{256}$ | ${ }_{5.6}^{174}$ | 2.5 | 0.6 | . 2 |
| ${ }_{\text {Alabama }}^{\text {Ald }}$ |  |  | 38182677713112044642094434520473757 |  | 32 <br> 46 <br> 29 <br> 102 <br> 32 <br> 67 <br> 49 <br> 39 <br> 22 <br> 40 <br> 56 <br> 31 <br> 64 <br> 67 <br> 22 <br> 29 <br> 82 | $\begin{array}{r} 13 \\ 11 \\ 18 \\ 27 \\ 24 \\ 28 \\ 17 \\ 17 \\ 15 \\ 17 \\ 17 \\ 12 \\ 25 \\ \hline 7 \\ 18 \\ 10 \\ 10 \\ 9 \\ 6 \\ 21 \end{array}$ | 15 <br> 17 <br> 7 <br> 16 <br> 16 <br> 16 <br> 16 <br> 21 <br> 28 <br> 2 <br> 14 <br> 12 <br> 19 <br> 19 <br> 7 <br> 7 <br> 5 <br> 11 <br> 11 | $\begin{array}{r} 1 \\ 1 \\ \hdashline-6 \\ \hline 14 \\ \hline 18 \\ 7 \\ 3 \\ 5 \\ 4 \\ 7 \\ \hline \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 1 |  |
| Dela |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Georraia- Ilinois. |  | 7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Kansas |  | 11 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3 |  |
| Kentucky |  | 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mississippi- |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Newsoursey-1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Okilahoma--- |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Rhode Island |  | 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5 |  |
| Tennessee |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table II.-Living condition of women employees who supplied personal information, by State


Table III.-Marital status of women employees who supplied personal information, by State

| State | Number of women reporting | Number of women who were - |  |  | Per cent of women who were single |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Single | Married | Widowed, separated, or divorced |  |
| All States | 2,938 | 2,411 | 335 | 192 | 2,411 |
| Per cent distribution | 100.0 | 82.1 |  |  | 82.1 |
| Alabama. | 131 | 112 | 10 |  | 85.5 |
| Arkansas | $\begin{array}{r}111 \\ 84 \\ \hline\end{array}$ | 94 74 | 9 6 | 8 | 84.7 88.1 |
| Delaware | 84 | 74 | 6 | 4 | 88.1 |
| Florida-- | 325 | 262 | 44 | 19 | 80.6 |
| Georgia... | 132 | 87 | 28 | 17 | 65.9 |
| Kllinois | $\begin{array}{r}231 \\ 285 \\ \hline\end{array}$ | 178 | 18 | 26 8 | 77.1 90.9 |
| Kentucky | 150 | 113 | 21 | 16 | 75.3 |
| Maryland | 144 | 116 | 21 | 7 | 80.6 |
| Mississippi | 110 | 96 | 9 | 5 | 87.3 |
| Missouri | 256 | 190 | 47 | 19 | 74.2 |
| New Jersey... | 118 | 109 | 7 | 2 | 92.4 |
| Ohio | 193 | 142 | 31 | 20 | 73.6 |
| Oklahoma | 199 | 179 | 13 | 7 | 89.9 |
| Rhode Island | 112 | 97 | 10 | 5 | 86.6 |
| South Carolina | 100 257 | 77 226 | 15 19 | 8 12 | 77.0 87.9 |
| Tennessee | 257 | 226 | 19 | 12 | 87.9 |

Table IV.-Time in the trade of women employees who supplied personal information, by State


Table V.-Scheduled daily hours, by State

| State | Number reported |  | Number of establishments and number of women whose daily hours were - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Es-tab-lishments | Women | Under 8 |  | 8 |  | Over 8 and under 9 |  | 9 |  |
|  |  |  | $\left.\begin{gathered} \text { Es- } \\ \text { tab- } \\ \text { lish- } \\ \text { ments } \end{gathered} \right\rvert\,$ | Women | Es-tab-lish- ments | Women | Es-tab-lishments | Women | Es-tab-lishments | Women |
| All States <br> Per cent distribution | ${ }^{1} 252$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5,224 \\ & 100.0 \end{aligned}$ | 12 | $\begin{aligned} & 259 \\ & 5.0 \end{aligned}$ | 65 | $\begin{array}{r} 1,697 \\ 32.5 \end{array}$ | 60 | 1,670 32.0 | 116 | $\begin{array}{r} 1,598 \\ 30.6 \end{array}$ |
| Alabama. | ${ }^{1} 13$ | 206 | 1 | 4 |  |  | 3 | 79 | 10 | 123 |
| Arkansas | 11 | 163 |  |  | 4 | 92 |  |  | 10 2 3 | 154 |
| Florida-- | 24 | 516 |  |  | 1 | 49 | 2 | 47 | 21 | 420 |
| Georgia. | 11 | 258 |  |  | 1 | 21 | 6 | 171 | 4 | 66 |
| Illinois.- | 20 | 546 | 2 | 38 | 7 | 364 | 7 | 109 | 4 | 35 |
| Iowa-. | 9 | 256 |  |  | 5 | 176 | 4 | 80 |  |  |
| Kansas | ${ }^{3} 34$ | 274 | 2 | 16 | 10 | 85 | 7 | 84 | 15 | 89 |
| Kentucky | 9 | 236 |  |  | 5 | 185 | 2 | 30 | 2 | 21 |
| Maryland | 8 | 64 | 1 | 10 | 5 3 | 32 <br> 82 | 1 | 14 | 1 | 8 |
| Baltimore | 4 | 145 | 1 | 63 | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mississippi..-- | 14 | 194 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 14 3 | 194 |
| Missouri | 11 | 442 309 | 1 | 48 | 7 | 149 | 5 | 112 | 3 | 29 |
| Ohio Jersey. | 15 | 420 |  |  | 14 | 345 | 1 | 75 |  |  |
| Oklahoma | 20 | 341 |  |  |  |  | 2 | 81 | 18 | 260 |
| Rhode Island | 6 | 213 | 4 | 80 | 1 | 64 | 1 | 69 |  |  |
| South Carolina | 9 | 207 |  |  |  |  | 3 7 | 83 214 | 6 5 | 124 |
| Tennessee-.--- | 14 | 335 |  |  | 2 | 53 | 7 | 214 | 5 | 68 |

[^2]Table VI.-Scheduled Saturday hours, by State

| State | Number reported |  | Number of establishments and number of women whose Saturday hours were- |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Under 8 |  | 8 |  | Over 8 and under 9 |  | 9 |  | Over 9 and under 10 |  | 10 |  | Over 10 and under 11 |  | 11 |  | Over 11 and under 12 |  | 12 |  | Over 12 and under $121 / 2$ |  |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Z } \\ & \text { \# } \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { g } \\ & \text { \# } \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | squamus!iqeast | $\begin{aligned} & \text { I } \\ & \text { İ } \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { g } \\ & \text { \#̈ } \\ & 3 \end{aligned}$ |  | E 吕 \% |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { g } \\ & \text { E } \\ & 0 \\ & 3 \end{aligned}$ | Establishments |  |  | 픠 \# B |  | g \# \% |  | \# <br> \# <br> \% |  | g \# \% |  |  |
| All States <br> Per cent distribution..- | ${ }^{1} 251$ | $\begin{gathered} 5,219 \\ 100.0 \end{gathered}$ | 2 | 16 0.3 | 6 | 188 <br> 3.6 | 23 | $\begin{array}{r}941 \\ 18.0 \\ \hline\end{array}$ | 70 | $\begin{array}{r}1,038 \\ 19.9 \\ \hline\end{array}$ | 14 | 224 <br> 4.3 | 61 | 1,259 <br> 24.1 | 18 | 381 7.3 | 12 | 262 5.0 | 27 | $\begin{aligned} & 497 \\ & 9.5 \end{aligned}$ | 15 | 262 5.0 | 8 | 151 2.9 |
| Alabama | 13 | 206 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 24 | 2 | 44 | 8 | 122 |  |  |  |  |
| Arkansas | ${ }^{1} 11$ | 163 9 |  |  | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 10 | 161 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 44 | 8 | 122 | 2 | 16 |  | --- |
| Florida. | 24 | 516 |  |  |  |  | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 |  |  | 4 | 92 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Georgia | 11 | 258 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 49 | 2 | 59 | 3 2 | 89 | 9 2 | 226 | 7 | 90 | 4 | 62 89 |
| Illinois... | 20 19 | 546 256 |  |  | 1 | 98 | 1 | 168 | 3 | 37 | 5 | 64 | 10 | 179 | 2 | 59 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  | $4$ | $89$ |
| Kansas... | 19 23 | 256 | 2 | 16 | 1 | $\begin{array}{r}54 \\ 8 \\ \hline\end{array}$ | $\stackrel{2}{3}$ | 74 46 | 1 25 | 18 195 |  |  |  |  | 1 | 12 | 1 | 46 | 4 | 52 |  |  |  |  |
| Kentucky | 9 | 236 |  | 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 4 |  |  |  |  |
| Maryland ${ }^{\text {B }}$ Baltimore | 8 4 | 64 145 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3 | 21 | 2 | 20 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 12 |  |  | 1 | 8 |  |  |
| Mississippi | 14 | 194 |  |  |  |  | 3 | 132 |  |  |  |  | 12 | 13 178 |  |  | 2 | 16 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Missouri...- | 11 | 442 |  |  |  |  | 2 | 127 | 9 | 315 |  |  |  | 178 |  |  | 2 | 16 |  |  |  |  |  | - |
| New Jersey | 13 | 309 420 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 13 | 309 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Oklahoma | ${ }^{1} 20$ | 341 |  |  | 1 | 27 | 7 2 | 305 18 | 1 | 15 |  |  | 7 | 100 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Rhode Island.........-- | 6 | 213 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 89 | 3 | 55 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| South Carolina--.......- | - | 207 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | - |  |  |  |  | 1 | 7 | 3 | 52 | 5 | 148 |  |  |
| Tennessee | 14 | 335 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5 | 144 | 9 | 191 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

${ }_{2}^{1}$ Details aggregate more than total, because some establishments appear in more than 1 hour group.
: Excludes 2 establishments not reporting Saturday hours.

Table VII.-Scheduled weekly hours, by State

| State | Number reported |  | Number of establishments and number of women whose weekly hours were- |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Under 48 |  | 48 |  | Over 48 and under 50 |  | 50 |  | Over 50 and under 52 |  | 52 |  | Over 52 and under 54 |  | 54 |  | Over 54 and under 55 |  | 55 |  | Over 55 and under 60 |  |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { E } \\ & \text { \# } \\ & \text { B } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { g } \\ & \text { \# } \\ & 3 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { IJ } \\ & \text { g } \\ & B \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { g } \\ & \text { B } \\ & 3 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { g } \\ & \text { d } \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { g} \\ & \text { I } \\ & B \\ & B \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { g } \\ & \text { a } \\ & \text { B } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Ed } \\ & \text { d } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Id } \\ & \text { d } \\ & \text { B } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { g } \\ & \text { g } \\ & B \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { g } \\ & \text { \# } \\ & 3 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { g } \\ & \text { d } \\ & \text { B } \end{aligned}$ |
| All States <br> Per cent distribution.. | ${ }^{1} 252$ | $\left\{\begin{array}{l} 5,224 \\ 100.0 \end{array}\right.$ | 8 | 1468 | 4 | ${ }_{3.1}^{162}$ | 32 | $\begin{aligned} & 1,023 \\ & 19.6 \end{aligned}$ | 22 | $\begin{array}{r} 52 \\ 10.0 \end{array}$ | 30 | $\begin{array}{r} 763 \\ 14.6 \end{array}$ | 4 | $\begin{array}{r}79 \\ 1.5 \\ \hline\end{array}$ | 30 | $\begin{array}{r} 637 \\ 12.2 \end{array}$ | 49 | $\begin{array}{r}614 \\ 11.8 \\ \hline\end{array}$ | 8 | ${ }_{3.3}^{172}$ | 18 | 280 5.4 | 50 | $\begin{array}{r}826 \\ 15.8 \\ \hline\end{array}$ |
| Alabama | ${ }^{1} 13$ | 206 | 1 | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 27 |  |  |  |  | 10 | 123 |
| Arkansas -- | 11 7 | 163 99 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 99 |  |  | 1 | ${ }_{1}^{2}$ | 9 |  | 1 | 5 |  |  |  |  |
| Florida- | 24 | 516 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 49 |  |  |  |  |  | 45 | 1 | 31 | $\frac{1}{3}$ | 16 |  |  | ${ }_{4}^{21}$ | 420 66 |
| Georgia | 11 | ${ }_{546}^{258}$ | 1 | 17 |  | 98 |  | 202 | 4 | 85 | 2 | 23 | 1 | 14 | 4 | $\begin{aligned} & 45 \\ & 72 \end{aligned}$ |  | 10 | 1 | 64 6 | ${ }_{2}^{2}$ | 62 19 |  |  |
| Iowa- | 19 | 256 | 1 | ${ }^{2} 1$ | 1 | 54 |  | 92 |  |  | ${ }_{8}^{2}$ | 30 |  |  | 3 | 73 | 14 | 87 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Kansas | ${ }^{3} 34$ | ${ }_{236}^{274}$ | 2 | 16 | 2 |  | ${ }^{6}$ | ${ }_{24}^{58}$ | 3 | 161 |  |  |  |  | ${ }_{2}^{2}$ | 12 30 |  |  |  |  | 2 | 21 |  | -- |
| Maryland - | 8 | 64 |  |  |  |  | 3 | 21 | 1 | ${ }^{6}$ | 2 | 15 |  |  | 1 | 14 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 8 |
| Mississippi_--- | 14 | 194 | 1 | 63 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 12 | 178 | 2 | 16 |
| Missouri ${ }_{\text {New }}$ | 11 | 442 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ${ }_{2}^{7}$ | 405 51 | 3 | 65 | $\frac{1}{3}$ | 68 | 3 | 29 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| New Jersey- | 15 | 420 |  |  |  |  | 8 | 320 | 7 | 100 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Oklahoma | ${ }^{120}$ | 341 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3 | 85 | 18 | 256 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Rhode Island.--- | ${ }_{9}^{6}$ | ${ }_{207}^{213}$ | 2 | 45 |  |  | 4 | 168 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 16 | 1 | 16 | 1 | 51 |  |  | 6 | 124 |
| Tennessee --.....- | 14 | 335 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 24 | 2 | 47 | --.- |  | 5 | 166 |  |  | 1 | 30 |  |  | 5 | 68 |

${ }^{1}$ Details aggregate more than total, because some establishments appear in more than 1 hour group.
Details aggregate more than total, because some establishments appear in more than
This woman worked part time- 34 hours weekly, 5 hours daily. Other women in this firm worked 54 hours.
${ }^{3}$ Excludes 1 firm not reporting weekly hours.
4 Excludes Baltimore, which see.

Table VIII.-Relation of scheduled daily, Saturday, and weekly hours to hours legally established, by State

| State | Number reported |  | Daily and Saturday hours |  |  |  |  |  |  | Weekly hours |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Maxi- <br> mum daily hours permitted by law | Number having hours shorter than maximum permitted by law |  |  |  |  |  | Maxi-mumhours per-mittedby law | Number having hours shorter than maximum permitted by law |  |  |
|  | Estab-lishments | Women |  | Estab-lishments | Daily hours |  | Saturday hours |  |  |  | Estab-lishments | Women |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Women |  | Estab-lishments | Women |  |  |  | Number | Per cent |
|  |  |  |  |  | Number | Per cent |  | Number | Per cent |  |  |  |  |
| All States | 195 | 3,988 |  | 149 | 3,456 | 86.7 | 54 | 1,461 | 36.6 |  | 124 | 2,817 | 70.6 |
| Total in States fixing 9 hours and a weekly limit | 91 | 1 1,640 |  | 45 | 1,108 | 67.6 | 21 | 549 | 133.6 |  | 41 | 1,016 | 62.0 |
| Total in States fixing 10 hours and a weekly limit | 61 | 1,260 |  | 61 | 1,260 | 100.0 | 14 | 342 | 27.1 |  | 60 | 1,259 | 99.9 |
| Arkansas | 11 | 163 | 9 | 7 | 9 | 5.5 | 2 | 2 | 1.2 | 54 | 2 | 11 | 6.7 |
| Delaware | 7 | 99 | 10 | 7 | 99 | 100.0 | 3 | 7 | 7.1 | 55 | 6 | 98 | 99.0 |
| Illinois | 20 | 546 | 10 | 20 | 546 | 100.0 | 10 | 367 | 67.2 |  |  |  |  |
| Kansas... | ${ }^{2} 34$ | 274 | 9 | 19 | 185 | 67.5 | ${ }^{2} 7$ | ${ }^{2} 70$ | 26.0 | 54 | 20 9 | 187 | 68.2 |
| Kentucky ${ }^{\text {Maryland }}{ }^{\text {3 }}$ | 9 <br> 8 | 236 64 | 10 10 | 9 8 | 236 64 | 100.0 100.0 | 2 3 3 | $\begin{array}{r}24 \\ 21 \\ \hline\end{array}$ | 10.2 32.8 | 60 60 | 9 8 | $\begin{array}{r}236 \\ 64 \\ \hline\end{array}$ | 100.0 100.0 |
| Maryland ${ }^{\text {Baltimore }}$ | 8 4 4 | $\begin{array}{r}64 \\ 145 \\ \hline\end{array}$ | 10 10 | 8 | 64 145 | 100.0 100.0 | 3 3 3 | 21 132 | 32.8 91.0 | 60 | 8 | $\begin{array}{r}64 \\ 145 \\ \hline\end{array}$ | 100.0 100.0 |
| Mississippi... | 14 | 194 | 10 | 14 | 194 | 100.0 |  |  |  | 60 | 14 | 194 | 100.0 |
| Missouri | 11 | 442 | 9 | 8 | 413 | 93.4 | 2 | 127 | 28.7 | 54 | 8 | 413 | 93.4 |
| New Jersey | 13 | 309 | 10 | 13 | 309 | 100.0 |  |  |  | 54 | 13 | 309 | 100.0 |
| -Ohio .-. | 15 | 420 | 9 | 15 | 420 | 100.0 | 7 | 305 | 72.6 | 50 | 8 | 320 | 76.2 |
| Oklahoma--- | 20 | 341 | 9 | 2 | 81 | 23.8 | 3 | 45 | 13.2 | 54 | 3 | 85 | 24.9 |
| Rhode Island. | 6 | 213 | 10 | 6 | 213 | 100.0 | 3 | 158 | 74.2 | 54 | 6 | 213 | 100.0 |
| South Carolina | 9 | 207 | 12 | 9 | 207 | 100.0 | 4 | 59 | 28.5 | 60 | 9 | 207 | 100.0 |
| Tennessee...-. | 14 | 335 | 101/2 | 14 | 335 | 100.0 | 5 | 144 | 43.0 | 57 | 14 | 335 | 100.0 |

${ }_{1}^{1}$ Total for Saturday hours, 1,635 , owing to variation in Kansas. Per cent having shorter Saturday hours based on 1,635.
Saturday hours reported for 33 establishments, employing 269 women.
Excludes Baltimore, which see

Table IX.-Weekly rates and actual week's earnings, by State and year


1.This woman had a rate of $\$ 15$ a week and earned a $\$ 10$ commission.

Table X.-Median of the week's earnings, of the weekly rates, and of the year's earnings, by State and year

${ }^{1}$ Year's earnings were secured from 52 -week pay-roll records for all States except Kansas. In Kansas, records were for 50 or more weeks.
2 Month or other period including the week in which earnings were taken in most of the establishments visited.
3 No rates were reported for Kansas. There were 170 full-time workers and the median of their earnings was 49.15 .

- In this case earnings exceeded rates by the per cent reported

Table XI.-Median of the week's earnings and time in the trade, by State and year

| State and year | All women reported |  | Women who had been in the trade- |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Under 1 year |  | 1 and under 2 years |  | 2 and under 3 years |  | 3 and under 4 years |  | 4 and under 5 years |  | 5 and under 10 years |  | 10 and under 15 years |  | 15 years and over |  |
|  | $\underset{\text { Ner }}{\text { Num- }}$ | Median | $\underset{\text { ber }}{\text { Num- }}$ | Median | $\begin{gathered} \text { Num- } \\ \text { ber } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Medi- } \\ & \text { an } \end{aligned}$ | Number | Median | $\underset{\text { Ner }}{\text { Num- }}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Medi- } \\ \text { an } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Num- } \\ \text { ber } \end{gathered}$ | Median | $\begin{gathered} \text { Num- } \\ \text { ber } \end{gathered}$ | Median | $\begin{gathered} \text { Num- } \\ \text { ber } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Medi- } \\ & \text { an } \end{aligned}$ | Number | Median |
| Alabama, 1922 | 125 | \$8. 25 | 50 | \$7. 55 | 27 | \$8. 30 | 25 | \$8. 55 | 10 | (1) | 4 | (1) | 9 | (1) |  |  |  |  |
| Arkansas, ${ }^{\text {Delaware, }} 1922$ | 104 71 | 9.55 10.10 | 37 26 | 8.45 9.15 | 15 |  | 18 | ${ }_{\text {(1) }}^{10} 20$ | 12 | (1) |  | (1) |  | (1) |  |  | 1 | (1) |
| Georgia, 1920 and 1921 | 133 | 9.95 | 38 | 9.25 | 36 | 9. 20 9 | 23 | 10.50 | 16 | \$10.65 | 9 | \$10.75 | 9 | \$11.75 | 1 | (1) | 1 | (1) |
| Kansas, 1920 | 237 | 8.10 | 158 | 7.85 | 32 | 8.35 | 17 | 8.50 | 12 | ${ }_{(1)}^{(1)}$ | 5 | (1) | 11 | (1) | 1 | ${ }^{(1)}$ | 1 | (1) |
| Kentucky, 1921 | 139 | 9. 00 | 59 | 8. 45 | 30 | 8. 80 | 19 | 9.90 | 8 | (1) | 7 | (1) | 10 | (1) | 4 | (1) | 2 | (1) |
| Mississippi, 1924 | 103 | 8. 55 | 45 | 8. 20 | 25 | 8. 50 | 12 | ${ }_{10}{ }^{(1)} 9$ | 8 | ${ }^{(1)}$ | 7 | (1) | 24 | ${ }_{12}{ }^{(1)} 50$ | 4 | (1) |  | (1) |
| Missouri, 1922 | 255 143 | 10.20 12.05 | 115 58 | 9.55 10.80 | 39 28 | 10.30 12.20 | 40 | 10.90 12.25 | 24 10 | 12. 25 | 7 9 | (1) | 10 | 12. $1{ }^{12}$ | 2 | (1) | 1 |  |
| Ohio, 1922 | 179 | 10.45 | 74 | 10.10 | 33 | 10. 30 | 24 | 10.70 | 14 | (1) | 8 | (1) | 26 | 12.00 |  |  |  |  |
| Oklahoma, 1924 | 182 | 9. 45 | 104 | 8. 90 | 42 | 10. 10 | 13 | (1) | 10 | (1) | 3 | (1) | 8 | (1) | 1 | (1) | 1 | (1) |
| Rhode Island, 1920 | 113 | 12. 20 | 42 | 10. 55 | 19 | 12. 55 | 18 | 12. 00 | 8 | (1) | 7 | (1) | 16 | 15. 00 | 1 | (1) | 2 | (1) |
| South Carolina, 1921 | 103 | 9.00 | 28 | 8. 25 | 34 | 8.75 | 18 | 9. 75 | 6 | (1) | 8 | (1) | 8 | (1) | 1 | (1) |  |  |
| Tennessee, 1925 .-... | 178 | 9.40 | 63 | 8.65 | 51 | 9. 25 | 30 | 9.65 | 13 | (1) | 4 | (1) | 16 | 11.00 | 1 | (1) |  |  |

${ }^{1}$ Not computed, owing to small number involved.

Table XII.-Medzan earnings of all women and number of women receiving $\$ 10$ and over and $\$ 15$ and over, according to time in the trade, by State and year

| State and year | Median earnings | Number of women reporting | Number of women receiving- |  | Number of women who had been in the trade- |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | Under 1 year |  |  | 5 and under 10 years |  |  |
|  |  |  | $\$ 10$ and over | $\$ 15$ and over | Total | Number receiving |  | Total | Number receiving- |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | $\$ 10$ and over | $\$ 15$ and over |  | $\$ 10$ and over | $\$ 15$ and |
| Alabama, 1922 | \$8. 25 | 125 | 21 | 1 | 50 | 1 |  |  |  |  |
| Arkansas, 1922 | 9. 55 | 104 | 40 | 2 | 37 | 5 |  | 7 | 6 | 1 |
| Georgia, 1920 and 1921 | 10. 10 | 131 | 37 65 | 7 | 26 <br> 38 | 7 10 |  | 6 9 | 5 |  |
| Kansas, 1920 <br> Kentucky, 1921 | 8. 10 | 133 237 139 | 20 20 | 1 | $\begin{array}{r}38 \\ 158 \\ \hline\end{array}$ | 10 |  | 11 | 7 4 | 1 |
| Mississippi, 1924- | 9. 8.00 8.55 | 139 | 46 13 | 7 | $\begin{array}{r}59 \\ 45 \\ \hline\end{array}$ | 7 |  | 10 | 9 |  |
| Missouri, 1922 | 10. 20 | 125 | 139 |  | 115 |  |  | $\stackrel{5}{24}$ | 1 |  |
| New Jersey, 1922 | 12. 05 | 143 | 121 | 11 | $\begin{array}{r}115 \\ 58 \\ \hline\end{array}$ | 44 |  | 24 10 | 10 | 7 4 |
| Ohio, 1922-19 | 10. 45 | 179 | 114 | 3 | 74 | 40 |  | 26 | 21 | 3 |
| Rhode Island, 1920 | 9. 42. | 182 | ${ }_{6}^{65}$ | $\stackrel{2}{13}$ | 104 | 19 |  | 8 | 7 |  |
| South Carolina, 1921 | 12. 90 | 113 | 94 31 31 | 13 | 42 28 | 29 |  | 16 | 15 | 8 |
| Tennessee, 1925 | 9.40 | 178 | 66 |  | 63 | 15 |  | ${ }_{16}^{8}$ | 13 |  |

Table XIII.-Earnings of women who worked on six days, by State or city-1928 figures


| Week's earnings | Number of women with earnings as specified in- |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { All } \\ & \text { places } \end{aligned}$ | Ala- bama | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Arkan- } \\ & \text { sas } \end{aligned}$ | California | Dela- | Florida | Georgia | Kansas | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Ken- } \\ & \text { tucky } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Mary- } \\ & \text { land } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Michi- } \\ & \text { gan } \end{aligned}$ | Mississippi |
| Number of establishments <br> Number of women reported <br> Median of the earnings ${ }^{2}$ <br> Per cent of women receiving - <br> $\$ 10$ and over. <br> $\$ 15$ and over _ $\qquad$ | $\begin{array}{r} 179 \\ \begin{array}{r} 16,061 \\ \$ 12.00 \\ \hline 74.4 \\ 29.8 \end{array} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 6 \\ 144 \\ \$ 9.00 \\ 12.5 \\ .7 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 6 \\ 114 \\ \$ 10.00 \\ 59.6 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 35 \\ 996 \\ \$ 16.00 \\ 95.1 \\ 70.4 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 4 \\ 46 \\ \$ 11.00 \\ 76.1 \\ 13.0 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 24 \\ \$ 16 \\ \$ 10.00 \\ 51.2 \\ 2.3 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 5 \\ 88 \\ \$ 9.00 \\ 34.1 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 13 \\ 295 \\ \$ 9.00 \\ 42.4 \\ 4.4 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 2 \\ 65 \\ \$ 14.00 \\ 92.3 \\ 36.9 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 5 \\ 97 \\ \$ 8.80 \\ 29.9 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 5 \\ 549 \\ \$ 15.00 \\ 94.9 \\ 71.2 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 3 \\ 45 \\ \$ 9.00 \\ 17.8 \end{array}$ |
| Under $\$ 5$ and under $\$ 6$ <br> $\$ 6$ and under $\$ 7$ <br> $\$ 7$ and under $\$ 8$ <br> $\$ 9$ and under $\$ 10$ <br> $\$ 10$ and under \$11 <br> $\$ 11$ and under $\$ 12$ <br> $\$ 12$ and under $\$ 13$ <br> \$13 and under \$14 <br> \$15 and under \$16 <br> \$16 and under \$17 <br> $\$ 17$ and under \$18 <br> $\$ 18$ and under \$19 <br> $\$ 19$ and under $\$ 20$ <br> $\$ 21$ and under $\$ 22$ <br> $\$ 22$ and under $\$ 23$ <br> $\$ 23$ and under $\$ 24$ <br> $\$ 24$ and under $\$ 25$ <br> $\$ 25$ and under $\$ 30$ <br> $\$ 35$ and under $\$ 40$ <br> $\$ 40$ and over | $\begin{array}{r} 174 \\ 68 \\ 68 \\ 96 \\ 163 \\ 381 \\ 670 \\ 749 \\ \hline 69 \\ 640 \\ 493 \\ 445 \\ 406 \\ 806 \\ 159 \\ 141 \\ 64 \\ 64 \\ 31 \\ 31 \\ 25 \\ 11 \\ 39 \\ 9 \\ 3 \\ 3 \end{array}$ | 9 2 4 19 24 68 11 3 1 1 1 1 | $\begin{array}{r} 4 \\ 5 \\ 2 \\ 6 \\ 2 \\ 27 \\ 27 \\ 30 \\ 16 \\ 9 \\ 11 \\ 2 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r}10 \\ 7 \\ 4 \\ 1 \\ 19 \\ 4 \\ 16 \\ 25 \\ 85 \\ 40 \\ 60 \\ 19 \\ 553 \\ 33 \\ 26 \\ 3 \\ 5 \\ 5 \\ -2 \\ \hline- \\ \hline\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ -3 \\ \hline \\ 5 \\ 6 \\ 8 \\ 9 \\ 3 \\ 3 \\ 3 \\ 3 \\ 3 \end{array}$ | 16 <br> 6 <br> 11 <br> 18 <br> 91 <br> 110 <br> 124 <br> 68 <br> 31 <br> 21 <br> 8 <br> 6 <br> 2 <br> 2 | $\begin{array}{r} 1 \\ 2 \\ 2 \\ 29 \\ 19 \\ 34 \\ 21 \\ 6 \\ 2 \\ 1 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 11 \\ 3 \\ 7 \\ 78 \\ 18 \\ 21 \\ 58 \\ 53 \\ 17 \\ 10 \\ 3 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \end{array}$ |  | $\begin{array}{r} 5 \\ 2 \\ 6 \\ 63 \\ 14 \\ 18 \\ 18 \\ 23 \\ 2 \\ 3 \\ \hline-1 \end{array}$ | 10 10 1 4 4 1 2 12 7 30 47 34 132 76 52 45 23 20 11 12 6 5 6 6 3 | $\begin{array}{r} 2 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 2 \\ 16 \\ 15 \\ 2 \\ 6 \end{array}$ |


| Week's earnings | Number of women with earnings as specified in- |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Missouri | $\begin{aligned} & \text { New } \\ & \text { Jersey } \end{aligned}$ | Ohio | Okla- homa | Rhode Island | South Carolina | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Tennes- } \\ & \text { see } \end{aligned}$ | Boston | Chicago | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Indian- } \\ & \text { apolis } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Mil- } \\ & \text { waukee } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { New } \\ & \text { York } \end{aligned}$ |
| Number of establishments Number of women reported Median of the earnings Per cent of women receiving- | $\begin{array}{r} 9 \\ 521 \\ \$ 13.00 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 4 \\ 1161 \\ \$ 13.00 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 18 \\ \begin{array}{r} 645 \\ \$ 12.00 \end{array} \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 11 \\ 347 \\ \$ 10.00 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} { }^{2} \\ \$ 11.00 \end{array}$ | 4100 $\$ 9.00$ | 8 317 $\$ 9.00$ | $\begin{array}{r} 3 \\ 376 \\ \$ 12.00 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 2 \\ \$ 18.00 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 2 \\ 814 \\ 813.00 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1 \\ 49 \\ 414.00 \end{array}$ | 380 $\$ 14.00$ |
| \$10 and over-..........---------- | 81.6 25.5 | $\begin{aligned} & 85.7 \\ & 21.1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 81.6 \\ & 17.7 \end{aligned}$ | 51.3 2.0 | 82.2 11.0 | 47.0 1.0 | 38.8 .9 | 90.2 15.4 | 97.3 84.3 | 91.7 27.4 | 89.8 24.5 | 90.5 37.1 |
| Under \$5 | 21336916413630616798484889482111 | 14 <br> 2 <br> 2 <br> 2 <br> 2 <br> 2 <br> 1 <br> 29 <br> 9 <br> 10 <br> 47 <br> 9 <br> 9 <br> 7 <br> 5 <br> 4 <br> 4 <br> 2 <br> 2 <br> 2 | 16 <br> 6 <br> 7 <br> 15 <br> 21 <br> 24 <br> 54 <br> 98 <br> 72 <br> 166 <br> 60 <br> 66 <br> 51 <br> 31 <br> 10 <br> 6 <br> 3 <br> 3 |  |  |  |  | 9 <br> 9 <br> 6 <br> 11 <br> 2 <br> 22 <br> 2 <br> 172 <br> 50 <br> 35 <br> 22 <br> 12 <br> 5 <br> 9 <br> 3 |  |  |  |  |
| \$5 and under $\$ 6$. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$7 and under $\$ 8$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$9 and under \$10- |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$10 and under \$11 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$11 and under $\$ 12$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$13 and under \$14 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$14 and under \$15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$16 and under \$17 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$17 and under \$18- |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$19 and under \$20 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$20 and under \$21- |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$23 and under \$24 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$30 and under $\$ 35$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$40 and over---- |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Excludes 1,776 women whose regular work was on Saturday only
For this reason the usual statistical formula for locating the median has not been used, as in the present survey had exactly the same earnings and were paid in even dollars. actual conditions. The median given here is the amount received by the middle woman or women in the group, one-half earning more and one-half less.

Table XV.-Weekly rates in the various chains, by size of town or

city and both including and excluding California-1928 figures ${ }^{1}$


[^3]
## PUBLICATIONS OF THE WOMEN'S BUREAU

| Weekly rate | places | Number of women with rate as specified in places of- |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Under | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 10,000 } \\ & \text { and } \\ & \text { and } \\ & 25,000 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { and } \\ & \text { and } \\ & \text { and } \\ & \text { andor } \\ & 50,000 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 50,000 \\ \text { and } \\ \text { ander } \\ 100,000 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 100,000 \\ & \text { and } \\ & \text { and } \\ & \text { son } \\ & 50,000 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 500,000 \\ \text { and } \\ \text { and } \\ 1,000,000 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1,000,000 \\ \text { and } \\ \text { over } \end{gathered}$ |
| Number of establishments Number of women reported Per cent distribution | $\begin{gathered} 179 \\ \text { on } 0.00 \\ \text { ono } \\ \text { s13.00 } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 272727 \\ \text { and } \\ \hline 59.50 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 52 \\ \hline 7.51 \\ \hline 728 \\ 89.50 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 22 \\ 580 \\ 580 \\ \$ 10.00 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 26 \\ 94 . \\ 15.7 \\ \text { Si0.0. } \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 27 \\ 1,27.4 \\ \text { 21.9 } \\ \text { si3.00 } \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 16,170 \\ & \text { 1.475.5 } \\ & \hline 2550 \end{aligned}$ |  |
|  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | ${ }_{198}^{112}$ | -190 | ${ }^{50}$ | ${ }_{12}^{12}$ |  |
|  |  |  |  | ${ }_{50} 5$ | ${ }_{97} 9$ | ${ }_{73}$ | 13 <br> 13 |  |
|  |  |  |  | ${ }_{30}^{44}$ | 82 | ${ }_{207}^{279}$ | 315 <br> 124 <br> 124 | 107 |
|  |  |  |  | ${ }_{6}^{18}$ | ${ }_{11}^{21}$ | 192 118 11 | $\underset{\substack{132 \\ 233 \\ 23}}{ }$ | ${ }_{128}^{98}$ |
|  |  |  |  | ${ }^{112}$ | ${ }^{146}$ |  | (128 | ${ }^{65}$ |
|  |  |  |  |  | ${ }^{\circ}$ | 18 18 18 |  | -36888 |
|  |  |  |  |  | $\frac{1}{4}$ | 5 <br> 17 | 38 <br> 25 | ${ }_{26}^{21}$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 14 14 14 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | - | $\stackrel{3}{3}$ |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | 2 |  | $\stackrel{2}{6}$ |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

[Any of these bulletins still available will be sent free of charge upon request]
No. 1. Proposed Employment of Women During the War in the Industries No. 2. Labor Laws for Women in 16 pp .1918.
No. 3. Standards for the Employment of Women in Industry. 8 pp. Third No. 4. Wages of Candy Makers in Philadelphia in 1919. 46 pp .1919. *No. 5. The Eight-Hour Day in Federal and State Legislation. 19 pp. 1919. No. 6. The Employment of Women in Hazardous Industries in the United
No. 7. Night-Work Laws in the United States. (1919.) 4 pp. 1920.
*No. 8. Women in the Government Service. 37 pp. 1920.
*No. 9. Home Work in Bridgeport, Conn. 35 pp. 192.
*No. 10. Hours and Conditions of Work for Women in Industry in Virginia. 32 No. 11. Women 1920.
*No. 11. Women Street Car Conductors and Ticket Agents. 90 pp .1921. No. 13. Industrial Opportunities and Training for Women and Girls. 1920
*No. 14. A Physiological Basis for the Shorter Working Day for Women. 20 pp No. 15. Some Effects of Legislation Limiting Hours of Work for Women. 2 No. 16. (See Bulletin 63. )
No. 17. Women's Wages in Kansas. 104 pp. 1921
No. 18. Health Problems of Women in Industry. 11 pp .1921.
No. 19. Iowa Women in Industry. 73 pp .1922.
No. 21. Nogro Women in Industry. 65 pp .1922.
*No. 21. Women in Rhode Island Industries. 73 pp . 1922.
No. 23. The 'Family Status of Breadwinning Women.
No. 24. The Family Status of Breadwinning Women. 43 pp .1922 No. 25. Women in the Candy Industries. 96 pp . 1922. No. 26. Women in Arkansas Industri in Chicago and St. Louis. 72 pp. 1923 No. 27. The Occupational Progress of W 86 pp .1923.
No. 28. Women's Contributions in the Field of Invention. 51 pp .1923 No. 29. Women in Kentucky Industries. 114 pp. 1923.
No. 30. The Share of Wage-Earning Women in Family Support. 170 pp No 31. What

1923 .
What Industry Means to Women Workers. 10 pp .1923
No. 32. Women in South Carolina Industries. 128 pp .1923.
No. 33. Proceedings of the Women's Industrial Conference. 190 pp. 1923.
No. 34. Women in Alabama Industries. 86 pp .1924.
No. 35. Women in Missouri Industries. 127 pp .1924
No. 36. Radio Talks on Women in Industry. 34 pp .1924.
No. 37. Women in New Jersey Industries.
No. 37. Women in New Jersey Industries. 99 pp . 1924.
No. 38. Married Women in Industry. 8 pp
1924
No. 39. Domestic Workers and Their Employment Relations. 87 pp. 1924 No. 40. (See Bulletin 63.)
No. 41. Family Status of Breadwinning Women in Four Selected Cities. 145 No. 42. List of 1925.
No. 42. List of References on Minimum Wage for Women in the United States No. 43. Standard and Scheduled 1925.
 No. 44. Women in Ohio Industries. 137 pp. 1925
No. 45. Home Environment and Employment Opportunities of Women in Coal-
No. 46. Facts about Working Women-A Graphic Presentation Based on
No. 47. Women in the Fruit- 64 pp. 1925
Washington. Fruit-Growing and Canning Industries in the State of

- Supply exhausted.
*No. 48. Women in Oklahoma Industries. 118 pp. 1926.
No. 49 Women Workers and Family Support 10 pp. 1925
No. 49. Women Workers and Family Support. 10 pp. 1925 . Opportunities of
American Women. 54 pp. 1926
No. 51. Women in Illinois Industries. 108 pp. 1926
No. 52. Lost Time and Labor Turnover in Cotton Mills. 203 pp .1926.
. 103 p 1926.

No. 54. Changing Jobs. 12 pp. 1926.
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { No. 55. Women in Mississippi Industries. } & 89 \mathrm{pp} . \\ \text { No. } 56 . \text { Women in Tennessee Industries. } & 120 \mathrm{pp} \\ 1927\end{array}$
No. 56. Women in Tennessee Industries. 120 pp .1927.
No. 58. Women in Delaware Industries. 156 pp . 1927.
No. 59. Short Talks About Working Women. 24 pp. 1927.
No. 60. Industrial Accidents to Women in New Jersey, Ohio, and Wisconsin.
No. 61. The Development of Minimum-Wage Laws in the United States, 1912
No. 61. The Devel. 635 pp. 1928. Price, 90 cents.
No. 62. Women's Employment in Vegetable Canneries in Delaware. 47 pp.
No. 63. State Laws Affecting Working Women. 51 pp. 1927. (Revision of Bulletins 16 and 40 .)
No. 64. The Employment of Women at Night. 86 pp. 1928.
No. 65. The Effects of Labor Legislation on the Employment Opportunities of No. 66. History of Labor Legislation for Women in Three States; Chronological Development of Labor Legislation for Women in the United States. 288 pp. 1929.
No. 67. Women Workers in Flint, Mich. 80 pp. 1928.
No. 68. Summary: The Effects of Labor Legislation on the Employment Opportunities of Women. (Reprint of Chapter II of Bulletin 65.) 22 pp. Causes of Absence for Men and for Women in Four Cotton Mills. No. 69. Causes of Absence for Men and for Women in
24 pp .1929 .
No. 71. Selected References on the Health of Women in Industry. 8 pp. 1929. No. 72. Conditions of Work in Spin Rooms. 41 pp. 1929. . (In press.)
No. 73. Variations in Employment Trends of Women and Men
No. 74. The Immigrant Woman and Her Job. 175 pp. 1929.
No. 75. What the Wage-Earning Woman Contributes to Family Support. 20
No. 76. Women in 5-and-10-Cent Stores and Limited-Price Chain Department
No. 77. A Study of Two Groups of Denver Married Women Applying for Jobs. Annual reports of the Director, 1919*, 1920*, 1921*, 1922, 1923, 1924*, 1925, Annual reports of the Dire
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- Supply exhausted.


[^0]:    See footnote on p. 5.
    Includes some stores
    In
    Excludess some satimores selling goods at 25 cents to a dollar.

[^1]:    ${ }^{1}$ The indication was that cities of 10,000 and under $25,000 \mathrm{had}$ the rate next to the highest, but the median was not computed, owing to the small number involved.

    Since no stores of Chain I were included in the largest towns, the foregoing shows that in every chain the highest rates prevailed in the largest cities in which the chain in question was found; the rates next to the highest were in the city next in size in Chains III and V, but were in the smaller towns in Chains II and IV.

[^2]:    ${ }^{1}$ Details aggregate more than total, because some firms appear in more than 1 hour group.
    3 Includes an establishment with 1 woman working 11 hours on 2 days in the week.
    ${ }^{8}$ Excludes 1 firm not reporting daily hours.
    Excludes Baltimore, which see.

[^3]:    ${ }_{2}$ Not computed, owing to small number involved.

