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## LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

United States Department of Labor,
Women's Bureau,
Washington, June 14, 1938
Madam: I have the honor to transmit a report on earnings and hours in the men's welt-shoe industry, one of the surveys made by this Bureau in order to present current wage data for the use of the Division of Public Contracts in determining prevailing minimum wages. Though the 13 men's-wear industries surveyed constitute a closely related group, printing of these data in several pamphlets has been decided upon as a measure of economy in distribution.

The report was written by Arthur T. Sutherland, of the editorial division.

Respectfully submitted.
Hon. Frances Perkins,
Hon. Frances Perkins,
Mary Anderson, Director.
Mary Andesor, Director.
-

# HOURS AND EARNINGS IN CERTAIN MEN'S-WEAR INDUSTRIES 

## WELT SHOES <br> INTRODUCTION

This survey of earnings and hours in the shoe industry formed one of the group in men's-wear industries made by the Women's Bureau in order to furnish wage and hour data to the Division of Public Contracts set up to administer the Public Contracts Act. The survey Contracts set up to administer the Public Contracts Act. The survey was limited to establishments whose only or major product was mens
welt shoes, as these are the only kind called for in United States welt shoes, as these are the only kind called for in United States
Government specifications. ${ }^{1}$ In a few establishments shoes made by Government specifications. ${ }^{1}$ In a few establishments shoes made by
the McKay or by the stitch-down process were a minor product, but the McKay or by the stitch-down process were a minor product,
in no case were they an important proportion of the production.
The Census of Manufactures for 1935 does not show the number of workers employed on each type of shoe production, but the total number employed in that year on all types of leather footwear avernumber employed in that year on all ty were reported for 32 States the most important States, on the basis of numbers employed, were he most important states, 22 percent) New York with were Massachusetts with over one-fifth ( 22 percent), New York with one-
sixth, and Missouri with about one-eighth of the workers. Other sixth, and Missouri with about one-eighth of the workers. Other
States with a substantial number of workers reported by the census States with a substantial number of workers reported by the census
were Illinois, New Hampshire, Maine, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and Wiswere Illinois, New Hampshire, Maine, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and Wis-
consin. The total value of shoes produced amounted to $\$ 641,463,847$; consin. The total value of shoes produced amounted to $\$ 641,463,847$;
the value of men's welt shoes was $\$ 163,762,625$, or just over onefourth of the total.
As shown in the scope table following, the Bureau's survey included establishments in each of the States listed in the preceding paragraph and also in several States-Indiana, Michigan, Tennessee, and Vir-ginia-in which the shoe industry is of less importance. Over one-ginia-in which the shoe industry is ol less importance. fourth ( 27 percent) of the 33,719 employees reported were in Massachusetts; this was followed by Wisconsin with approximately
one-seventh of the workers, and New Hampshire with just over one-one-seventh of the workers, and New Hampshire with just over oneeighth. Data for Indiana and Ohio are combined, as are those for Tennessee and Virginia, because too few est
uled in these States for separate tabulation.

Nearly two-fifths (39 percent) of the employees were women; by State, this proportion varied from 34 percent of the total in Michigan to 47 percent of that in Illinois. The number of employees reported in all branches of the industry by the Bureau of the Census, and the
1 A minimum-wage determination of the Secretary of Labor, which took effect January 5 , 1938, state contracts in the ments welt-shoe industry.
number recorded in the establishments covered in the survey, are as follows:

Table 1.-Number of men's welt-shoe establishments visited, number of men and women they employed, and number of wage earners in all shoe factories reported women they employed, and number of wage earners
by U.S.Census of Manufactures, 1935 , by State

| State | Number ofwage ofearnersreportedby Censusof Manu-factarus,1935 | Numberof estab-lishments | Women's Bureau survey ? |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Number of employees |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Total | Men | Women |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Number | Fercent of total |
| Total | 202, 113 | 111 | 33,719 | 20, 568 | 13, 151 | 39.0 |
| Mlinois-..- | 16,067315,44314,14743,95898724,36615,0353,05311,61113,16910,233513,443 |  | 1,51286112,1839,6656133,5214,4332,3261,2153,0214,949 | 8004831,3445,9174052,1502,7451,4267831,7072,808 | 7123788393,1482081,3711,7089904321,3142,141 | 47.143.938.434.733.938.938.438.735.643.543.3 |
| Indiana and Ohio Maine |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Massachusetts |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Michigan |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| New Hampshire |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| New York |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Pennsylvania- --. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Wisconsin. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other States.. |  |  |  |  |  |  |

${ }^{1}$ U. S. Bureau of the Census. Census of Manufactures: 1935. Leather and leather products, p. 10 Includes wage earners employed on all t
2 Includes only establishments whoses.
2 Shown or major product is men's welt shoes.
2. Shown separately by the census-Ohio 13,297 and Indiana 2,146.
STennessee only, Virginia is included in the residual group "other."
s Includes workers in 20 States.

All but 15 establishments, with 3,200 employees, stated whether or not they were operating under union contracts; 24 of them- 18 in Massachusetts, 4 in Wisconsin, and 1 each in Illinois and Pennsyl-vania-were operating under such contracts, and 72 establishments were nonunion plants, 35 of the latter being in the 4 States in which union plants were reported. The union plants had 6,604 employees and the nonunion had 23,905

## EARNINGS AND HOURS

## Week's earnings, all employees.

The actual week's earnings were reported for 32,892 employees20,068 men and 12,824 women. The average earnings of the entire group, without regard to the number of hours worked, were $\$ 21.55$ group, without regard to the number of hours worked, were $\$ 21.55$. As shown in table 2, the highest average was that of the workers in
New York ( $\$ 26.30$ ), while somewhat lower, but still above the average New York ( $\$ 26.30$ ), while somewhat lower, but still above the average
for the entire group, were New Hampshire ( $\$ 23.80$ ), Wisconsin ( $\$ 22.65$ ), and Massachusetts (\$22.25). Relatively low earnings were received by the workers in Maine, Tennessee and Virginia, and Pennsylvania, where the average varied from $\$ 18.75$ to $\$ 16.20$. The three States with the largest numbers of workers reported (Massachusetts, Wisconsin, and New Hampshire) each had earnings above the average.

Table 2.-Average and distribution of week's earnings, by State-All employees

| State | Number ployee | Average week's earn- engs <br> ings ${ }^{1}$ | Percent of employees who earned- |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Under | $\begin{gathered} \$ 5, \\ \text { under } \\ \text { undor } \\ \text { and } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c} \$ 10, \\ \text { under } \\ \text { uncr } \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \$ 15, \\ \text { under } \\ \text { undor } \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 20, \\ \text { under } \\ \text { und } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 25, \\ \text { } \\ \text { under } \\ \$ 30 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 30, \\ & \text { under } \\ & \$ 35 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c} \$ 35, \\ \text { } \\ \text { under } \\ \$ 40 \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 40 \\ \text { and } \\ \text { over } \end{gathered}$ |
| Total | 32, 892 | \$21. 55 | 0.9 | 3.7 | 18.1 | 25.9 | 20.9 | 14.9 | 8.9 | 4.5 | 2.2 |
| Illinois | 1,420 | 21. 70 | 1.3 | 2.0 | 18.5 | 30.0 | 19.3 | 12.3 | 7.3 | 5.2 | 2 |
| Maine | + ${ }_{2} 124$ | 19.50 | 1.5 | 7.5 | ${ }_{22.3}^{24.6}$ | ${ }_{31}^{25.7}$ | ${ }_{21.6}^{17.3}$ | ${ }_{11}^{13.6}$ | 7. 4 | 3. 1 |  |
| Massachusetts | 8,909 | 22. 25 | . 9 | 3.7 | 14.6 | 25.0 | ${ }_{21.6}$ | 17.0 | 10.5 | 4.4 | 2.3 |
| Michigan | ${ }^{567}$ | ${ }^{21.05}$ | . 4 | 4.2 | 16. 2 | 23.3 | 25.7 | ${ }^{21.5}$ | 7.6 | 1.1 |  |
| Missouri | 3,482 | 19.40 | 1.2 | 4. 7 | 28.5 | ${ }_{22}^{26.8}$ | 15.6 | 13.5 | ${ }_{6}^{6.8}$ | 2.9 | 9 |
| New York----- | - ${ }_{2}^{4,247}$ | 26.80 230 | 1 | 1.0 | 11.6 | 22. ${ }^{22.2}$ | 24.4 | 17 | 11.7 16.6 | 70.4 | 3.9 5.4 |
| Pennsylvania | 1,169 | 16. 20 | 1.8 | 8.9 | 34. 4 | 31.3 | 17.1 | 6.0 | , | ${ }^{\text {. }} 2$ |  |
| Tennessee and Virginia | 2,955 | 18.15 | 1.6 | 5.7 | 30.5 | 29.9 | 17.3 | 8.2 | 5.0 | 1.6 |  |
| Wisconsin.- | 4,727 | 22.65 | . 2 | 1.3 | 13.8 | 28.6 | 24.2 | 14.8 | 9.2 | 5.2 | 2. 8 |


The distribution of week's earnings had a very wide range in each of the States, though the most common earnings were \$10 and under $\$ 25$ in every State but New York, where they were $\$ 15$ and under $\$ 30$. On the basis of $\$ 5$ intervals, the largest groups in Michigan ( 26 percent) and New York ( 24 percent) were at $\$ 20$ and under $\$ 25$, and in Illinois ( 30 percent), Indiana and Ohio ( 26 percent), Maine ( 31 percent), Massachusetts ( 25 percent), New Hampshire (22 percent), and Wisconsin ( 29 percent) they were at $\$ 15$ and under $\$ 20$. The largest groups in Missouri (29 percent), Pennsylvania (34 percent), and Tennessee and Virginia (31 percent) had low earnings, $\$ 10$ and under $\$ 15$, though in each case nearly as large proportions earned $\$ 15$ and under $\$ 20$. A substantial proportion of employees, ranging from 7 percent in Pennsylvania and 15 percent in Tennessee and Virginia to 52 percent in New York, had earnings of $\$ 25$ or more. In addition to New York the States with three-tenths or more of
their workers receiving earnings as high as $\$ 25$ were Michigan, Wisconsin, Massachusetts, and New Hampshire
A small proportion of the workers had earnings of less than $\$ 10$; 5 percent of all workers, but 11 percent of those in Pennsylvania, 8 percent in Indiana and Ohio and in Maine, and 7 percent in Tennessee and Virginia, had such earnings. However, the proportion with earnings of less than $\$ 15$ was very large in several States 45 percent in Pennsylvania and from 30 to 40 percent in Maine, Indiana and Ohio, Missouri, and Tennessee and Virginia. In contrast, less than one-tenth of the workers in New York had earnings below $\$ 15$

## Week's earnings, by sex.

Women's earnings were much lower than men's, and the average earnings of all women ( $\$ 17.10$ ) were only 70 percent of the men's average earnings. In seven localities-New York, Illinois, Tennessee and Virginia, Wisconsin, Michigan, Indiana and Ohio, and Missourithe average earnings of women varied from 69 to 63 percent of the men's average. The least difference was in Maine, where the women's average earnings were 75 percent of the men's.
As shown in table 3, the average earnings of women ranged from $\$ 12.80$ in Pennsylvania to $\$ 20.65$ in New York. Lowest earnings, shown by averages of less than $\$ 15$, were in Pennsylvania, Missouri, Tennessee and Virginia, and Indiana and Ohio. New York was the only State in which the women averaged as much as $\$ 20$; others with averages above that for all States combined were New Hampshire \$19.45), Wisconsin (\$18), Massachusetts (\$17.75), and Illinois (\$17.55)
The most usual earnings of women were $\$ 10$ and under $\$ 20$, nearly two-thirds having such earnings, but a large number ( 26 percent) earned $\$ 20$ or more. In Indiana and Ohio, Tennessee and Virginia, Missouri, and Pennsylvania large proportions of the women, ranging from 56 to 75 percent, had earnings of less than $\$ 15$. In contrast to these proportions are those of Wisconsin, New Hampshire, and New York, where only 29,26 , and 16 percent, respectively, were paid such wages. In the remaining States, from one-third to nearly one-half of the women had earnings of less than $\$ 15$. In New Hampshire and New York, respectively 44 and 52 percent of the women were paid $\$ 20$ or more, and in Wisconsin, Illinois, and Massachusetts from 27 to 31 percent had such earnings. In no other State did so many as one-fifth of the women earn $\$ 20$ or more. In only four States-Illinois and Massachusetts (each 10 percent), New Hampshire (17 percent), and New York (20 percent)-were so many as one-tenth of the women paid $\$ 25$ or more

The range in the average week's earnings of men was from $\$ 18.05$ in Pennsylvania to $\$ 29.80$ in New York, the figure for all States combined being $\$ 24.40$. Averages of more than $\$ 25$ were found also in Illinois, Wisconsin, and New Hampshire; in the six other localities the averages were $\$ 20$ but under $\$ 25$. Much larger proportions of men than of women had earnings in the higher intervals; nearly onehalf of the men in New York and from one-fourth to just over onethird of those in Massachusetts, Wisconsin, Illinois, and New Hampshire earned $\$ 30$ or more. In the other States the proportion with such earnings was from 12 to 19 percent in Tennessee and Vir-
ginia, Michigan, Missouri, and Indiana and Ohio, but only 8 percent in Maine and only 1 percent in Pennsylvania.

Table 3.-Average and distribution of week's earnings, by State-Women and men

| Week's earnings | Total | Illinois | $\begin{array}{\|l\|l} \text { Indi- } \\ \text { ana } \\ \text { and } \\ \text { Ohio } \end{array}$ | Maine | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Mas- } \\ & \text { sachu- } \\ & \text { setts } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Michi- } \\ \text { gan } \end{gathered}$ | $\underset{\text { Mis- }}{\text { souri }}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { New } \\ \text { Hamp- } \\ \text { shire } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { New } \\ & \text { York } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Penn- } \\ \text { syll- } \\ \text { rania } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Ten- } \\ \text { nessee } \\ \text { nasd } \\ \text { Vir- } \\ \text { ginnia } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Wis- } \\ & \text { con- } \\ & \text { sin } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | WOMEN |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of employees Average earn ings ${ }^{1}$....... | $\begin{aligned} & 12,824 \\ & \$ 17.10 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 669 \\ \$ 17.55 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 365 \\ \$ 14.65 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 806 \\ \$ 15.55 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 3,080 \\ \$ 17.75 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 201 \\ \$ 16.00 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1,349 \\ \$ 14.25 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1,706 \\ \$ 19.45 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 865 \\ \$ 20.65 \end{array}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 1,271 \\ & \$ 14.40 \end{aligned}$ | $\left\lvert\, \begin{aligned} & 2,101 \\ & \$ 18,00 \end{aligned}\right.$ |
| Under $\$ 10$ $\$ 10$, under $\$ 15$ $\$ 15$, under $\$ 20$ $\$ 25$ and over | $\begin{array}{r} 7.7 \\ 31.7 \\ 34.4 \\ 17.7 \\ 8.6 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 4.9 \\ 31.4 \\ 34.8 \\ 19.3 \\ 9.6 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 14.0 \\ 41.9 \\ 31.5 \\ 10.4 \\ 2.4 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 13.9 \\ 35.1 \\ 31.8 \\ 14.0 \\ 5.2 \end{array}$ | Percent of <br> 7.8 <br> 25.5 <br> 36.2 <br> 36.3 <br> 20.4 <br> 35.8 <br> 10.1 <br> 1.4 |  | employees |  | $\begin{array}{r} 2.2 \\ \begin{array}{l} 13.5 \\ 31.9 \\ 32.7 \\ 19.7 \end{array} . \begin{array}{r} 7 \end{array}{ }_{2}^{2} \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 18.8 \\ 56.2 \\ 21.4 \\ 2.4 \\ 3.4 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 11.9 \\ 48.2 \\ \hline 1.5 \\ 6.3 \\ 2.1 \end{array}$ | 2.826.243.620.17.3 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ${ }_{50}^{11.0}$ | 4.9 21.2 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 31.1 | 30.2 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5.9 | 26.5 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Under $\$ 14$ Under $\$ 16$ Under $\$ 20$ | $\begin{aligned} & \begin{array}{l} 41.5 \\ \hline 77.9 \\ 61.9 \end{array} \\ & 7 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 48.8 \\ & 64.7 \\ & 76.4 \\ & 87.4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \begin{array}{l} 58.2 \\ 58.6 \\ 80.6 \end{array} \\ & 8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 27.7 \\ & 40.7 \\ & 56.3 \\ & 69.3 \end{aligned}$ | cmulative percents |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 11.2 \\ & 20.8 \\ & 33.8 \\ & 47.6 \\ & 52.4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 64.7 \\ 81.3 \\ 91.2 \\ 96.4 \\ 3.6 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 49.1 \\ 68.2 \\ 84.3 \\ 91.6 \\ 8.4 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 19.2 \\ & 37.5 \\ & 55.4 \\ & 72.6 \\ & 27.4 \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 36.3 55.2 | 50.9 71.9 | ${ }_{31.7}^{20.8}$ |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | ${ }_{72.6}$ | 86.2 | ${ }_{43}{ }^{3}$ |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 82.1 | 92.7 | 56.3 |  |  |  |  |
| \$20 and over | 26.2 | 28.9 | 12.6 | 19.2 | 30.5 | 17.9 | 7.3 | 43.7 |  |  |  |  |
|  | MEN |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of employees <br> Average earn ings ${ }^{1}$ | 20, 068 | 751 | 72 | 1,318 | 5,829 | 366 | 2,133 | 2,739 | 1,392 | 758 | 1,6 | 2, 626 |
|  | \$24.40 | \$25.45 | \$23. 20 | \$20. 70 | \$24. 60 | \$23.85 | \$22. 65 | \$26. 50 | \$29.80 | \$18.05 | \$20.95 | \$26. 35 |
| Under $\$ 15$ <br> $\$ 15$, under $\$ 20$ <br> $\$ 25$, under $\$ 30$ <br> $\$ 25$, under $\$ 30$ <br> $\$ 35$ and over.- | $\begin{aligned} & \begin{array}{l} 20.0 \\ 20.6 \\ 23.0 \\ 20.4 \\ 13.4 \\ 10.7 \end{array} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 8.9 \\ 25.9 \\ 25.7 \\ 15.3 \\ 12.6 \\ 17.6 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 14.6 \\ \begin{array}{l} 12.2 \\ 22.7 \\ 22.5 \\ 13.1 \\ 5.9 \end{array} \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 19.3 \\ 30.7 \\ 30.7 \\ 16.0 \\ 4.5 \\ 3.4 \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  | $\begin{array}{r} 2.7 \\ 5.5 \\ 19.3 \\ 23.4 \\ 24.4 \\ 24.7 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \begin{array}{r} 38.9 \\ 36.7 \\ 24.5 \\ 9.1 \\ .5 \\ .3 \end{array} \end{array}$ | 20.828.625.613.61.1.8.3.3a | 4.216.527. 622.515.514.0 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 19.8 | $\begin{array}{r}6.8 \\ 16.4 \\ \\ \\ \hline\end{array}$ | 24.0 | 8.3 17.3 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | ${ }_{22.2}^{22.3}$ | ${ }_{31}^{32.5}$ | $\xrightarrow{21.8}$ | ${ }^{19.1}$ |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | 14.8 | 11.5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | 14.8 9.8 | 1.1 | ${ }_{5.3}$ | 17.9 |  |  |  |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \begin{array}{l} 34.0 \\ 32.5 \\ 55.5 \\ 75.9 \end{array} . \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \begin{array}{l} 36.5 \\ 34.6 \\ 53.9 \\ 69.8 \end{array} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 27.1 \\ & 35.8 \\ & 58.5 \\ & 81.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 35.8 \\ & 50.0 \\ & 76.2 \end{aligned}$ | Cumulative percents |  |  |  | $\begin{array}{r} 5.4 .4 \\ 87.2 \\ 27.9 \\ 50.9 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 51.1 \\ & 65.6 \\ & 90.1 \\ & 99.2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 39.1 \\ & 49.5 \\ & 75.1 \\ & 88.2 \end{aligned}$ | 13.620.748.370.8 |
|  |  |  |  |  | ${ }_{30}^{22.4}$ | ${ }_{23}^{15.8}$ | ${ }^{31.4}$ | ${ }^{18.2}$ |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | 53.2 | 55.7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | 75.4 | 87.4 | 83.5 | 66.1 |  |  |  |  |
| \$30 and over. | 24.1 | 30.2 | 19.0 | 7.9 | 24.6 | 12.6 | 16.5 | 33.9 | 49.1 | 8 | 11.8 | 29.2 |

At the other end of the wage scale, from 3 or 4 percent in New York and Wisconsin to almost 30 percent in Pennsylvania were paid less than $\$ 15$.

## Hours worked.

Though some establishments kept no record of the time worked, particularly for piece workers whose wages depended on amount of production, hours worked were reported for 30,034 workers in 96 of the 111 establishments visited. In several States many employees worked 48 or 52 hours, but a week of 40 hours or less was reported for almost two-thirds of the employees, half of them working 40 hours and half working less than 40 . Only 1 percent of the workers in

Missouri worked more than 40 hours. The most unfavorable hours were in Maine, Michigan, and Indiana and Ohio, where from 59 to 73 were in Maine, Michigan, and Indiana and Ohio, where from 59 to 73 percent of the employees worked more than 40 hours; in fact, from
11 to 30 percent of the workers in these States worked 48 hours or more. The hours worked by employees in the week recorded were as follows:

Table 4.-Hours worked during the week, by State-All employees

| State | Number of employeeswith hours reported | Percent of employees who worked- |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Under 40 hours | 40 hours | Over 40, under 4 hours | 44, under 48 hours | 48, under 52 | $\begin{gathered} 52 \text { hours } \\ \text { and } \\ \text { over } \end{gathered}$ |
| Total | 30, 034 | 32.9 | 32.5 | 8.2 | 19.7 | 4.8 | 1.9 |
| Illinois. | 1,316 | 42.3 | 37.3 | 2.7 | 13.5 | 4.0 |  |
| Indiana and Ohio | ${ }_{1}^{836}$ | 18.5 | 8.9 | 12.7 | ${ }^{30.4}$ | 23.8 | 5. 7 |
| Massachusetts. | 8,219 | 33.7 | 25.0 | 9.0 | 24.9 | 6.0 | 1.4 |
| Michigan | ${ }^{388}$ | 18.6 | 13.9 | 28.9 | 22.7 | 9.0 | 7.0 |
| New Hampshire | 3,167 4 4 | ${ }_{22}^{59.1}$ | 40.1 | 5.1 | 29.8 |  |  |
| New York. | 1,718 | 8.0 | 68.2 | 4.9 | 15.2 | 3.3 | 5 |
| Pennsylvania | 1,138 | 48. 2 | 25.6 | 3.9 | 16.9 | 4.2 | 1.2 |
| Tennessee and Virginia | 2,939 4,714 | $\stackrel{42}{22.5}$ | 28.4 36.4 | 7.1 13.7 | +9.1 ${ }^{9} .1$ | 5. ${ }^{5} 5$ | 7.7 1.7 |

${ }^{1}$ Less than 0.05 percent.
In the majority of States there was very little difference in the hours worked by men and by women, but it is interesting to note that, in all States combined and in 8 of the 11 States or combinations of States, the proportion of women working more than 40 hours was larger than the proportion of men. The greatest difference was in Michigan, where 87 percent of the women, in contrast to only 58 percent of the men, worked over 40 hours, and the next largest was in Tennessee and Virginia, where the corresponding percentages were 35 and 25. Table 5 shows the proportion of women and of men who worked less than 40,40 , and over 40 hours in the week recorded.

Table 5.-Hours worked during the week, by sex and State

| State | $\begin{gathered} \text { Number } \\ \text { of } \\ \text { women } \\ \text { with } \\ \text { hours } \\ \text { worked } \\ \text { reported } \end{gathered}$ | Percent of women who worked- |  |  | Numberof menwithhoursworkedreported | Percent of men who worked- |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Under } \\ & \text { 40 } \\ & \text { hours } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 40 \\ \text { hours } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Over } \\ \text { 40 } \\ \text { hours } \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Under } \\ & \text { 400 } \\ & \text { hours } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 40 \\ \text { hours } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Over } \\ \text { 40 } \\ \text { hours } \end{gathered}$ |
| Total | 11,733 | 33.9 | 30.4 | 35.8 | 18,301 | 32.3 | 33.9 | 33.8 |
| Illinois. | 616 | 38.5 | 41.2 | 20.3 | 700 | 45.7 | 33.9 |  |
| Indiana and Ohio | ${ }_{465}^{365}$ | 21.6 | 10.1 | 68.2 | 471 | 16.1 | 7.9 | 76. 0 |
| Massachusetts | 2,866 2,866 | 35.9 33.4 | 24.9 | ${ }_{41.6}^{61.6}$ | -5,353 | 41.0 | 1.8 | ${ }_{41} 5$ |
| Michigan | 125 | 12.0 |  | 87.2 | ${ }^{263}$ | 21.7 | ${ }_{20} 2$ | 58.2 |
| Missouri | 1,204 | 67.4 | 31.1 | 1.6 | 1,963 | 54.1 | 45.5 | . 4 |
| New Hamps | 1,705 | 29.6 | 32. 4 | 37.9 | 2,738 | 18.4 | 44.8 | 36.8 |
| New York- | 643 | 11.2 | ${ }^{67.8}$ | 21.0 | 1,075 | 6.0 | 68.4 | ${ }^{25.6}$ |
| Tennessee and Virg |  | ${ }_{35.9}^{48.4}$ | ${ }_{29.4}^{23.1}$ | 28.6 34.7 | 1,739 1,670 | 48.2 47.5 |  | 24.9 24.8 |
| Wisconsin. | 2,095 | 23.2 | 34.0 | 42.8 | 2,619 | 22.0 | 38.3 | 39.7 |

By State, the proportion of women who worked 40 hours or less varied from 13 percent in Michigan to 99 percent in Missouri, and it was over 50 percent in all localities but Indiana and Ohio, Maine, and Michigan. The proportions of men with such hours were very nearly the same; in three localities (Indiana and Ohio, Michigan, and Maine) 22,42 , and 43 percent, respectively, and in the remaining eight localities from 59 to practically 100 percent (99.6) worked 40 hours or less.

## Average hourly earnings.

For the 30,034 employees with hours worked reported, earnings have been reduced to an hourly basis. The average for all workers was 53.8 cents. By State the range was from 43.9 cents in Indiana and Ohio to 64.2 cents in New York. Next to New York the average was highest in New Hampshire ( 59.2 cents); somewhat lower, though still above or equal to the average for all workers, were Wisconsin (54.9 cents), Massachusetts ( 54.8 cents), Illinois ( 53.9 cents), and Michigan ( 53.8 cents). Averages of less than 50 cents were found in Pennsylvania, Tennessee and Virginia, and Maine, in addition to that in Indiana and Ohio.

In a comparison of men's and women's hourly earnings, men's average, for all states combined, was 43 percent higher than women's. In three of the localities (Indiana and Ohio, Pennsylvania, and Missouri) the men's average was from 50 to 54 percent above the women's

For all women combined, hourly earnings averaged 42.7 cents. The lowest averages, ranging from 34 to 35.7 cents, were in Pennsylvania, Indiana and Ohio, Maine, and Tennessee and Virginia. New York, with 49.8 cents, and New Hampshire, with 49 cents, had the highest averages

For all men the average hourly earnings were 60.9 cents. Averages for the States ranged from a low of 50.5 cents in Maine to a bigh of 72.7 cents in New York. Relatively high averages were found also for New Hampshire ( 65.6 cents), Wisconsin ( 63.7 cents), and Illinois ( 62.4 cents). In addition to Maine, the States with averages of less than 55 cents an hour were Tennessee and Virginia, Pennsylvania, and Indiana and Ohio

There was very little concentration of hourly earnings at any wage level, and the largest group in any 5-cent interval was only 13 percent of the total; these earned 35 and under 40 cents. In each of four intervals- 30 and under 35 cents, 40 and under 45 cents, 45 and under 50 , and 50 and under 55 -there were approximately one-tenth of the workers. As many as 15 percent, however, had earnings of 75 cents or more.

In four localities-Tennessee and Virginia, Pennsylvania, Maine, and Indiana and Ohio-from 10 to 20 percent of the workers had earnings of less than 30 cents; from 55 to 58 percent earned less than 45 cents. No other State had as many as 5 percent of its workers with earnings of less than 30 cents. At the other extreme of the wage scale were New Hampshire and New York, respectively 23 and 29 percent of their workers averaging 75 cents or more; Missouri, Massachusetts, Wisconsin, and Illinois had 13 to 18 percent with such earnings, and the five other localities had 3 to 7 percent.

Table 6 shows the average hourly earnings of all employees combined and of men and women.

Table 6.-Average and distribution of hourly earnings, by State-All employees and by sex

| Average hourly earnings (cents) | Total | Ilinois | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Indi- } \\ & \text { ana } \\ & \text { and } \\ & \text { Ohio } \end{aligned}$ | Maine | $\begin{array}{\|l\|l} \text { Massa- } \\ \text { chua- } \\ \text { setts } \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Mich- } \\ & \text { igan } \end{aligned}$ | Mis- souri | $\begin{gathered} \text { New } \\ \text { Hamp- } \\ \text { shire } \end{gathered}$ | New | $\begin{array}{\|c} \text { Penn- } \\ \text { sylva- } \\ \text { nia } \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|c\|} \hline \text { Ten- } \\ \text { nessee } \\ \text { and } \\ \text { Yir- } \\ \text { ginia } \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Wis- } \\ & \text { con- } \\ & \text { sin } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | ALL EMPLOYEES |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Employeeswith hours worked reported Average earn- | 30, 034 | 1,316 | 836 | 1,156 | 8,219 | 53 | 3,167 | 4,443 | 1,718 | 1,138 | 2,939 | 4,714 |
| Under 30 <br> 30 , under 40 <br> 50 , under 50 <br> 60 and over | $\begin{array}{r} 5.2 \\ 22.7 \\ 20.9 \\ 17.9 \\ 33.9 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1.7 \\ 30.5 \\ 18.7 \\ 15.7 \\ 33.2 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 20.6 \\ & 27.0 \\ & 19.8 \\ & 15.6 \\ & 17.6 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 18.6 \\ & 27.0 \\ & 21.4 \\ & 215 . \\ & 17.6 \end{aligned}$ | $P e$4.748.922.218.835.5 | $\begin{array}{r} \text { rcent of of } \\ 2.6 \\ 18.0 \\ 19.3 \\ 26.5 \\ 33.5 \end{array}$ | mployees |  | $\begin{array}{r} 2.5 \\ 7.6 \\ 14.8 \\ \hline 20.9 \\ 54.9 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 14.4 \\ & 29.9 \\ & 21.9 \\ & \begin{array}{l} 11.8 \\ 16.2 \\ 17.7 \end{array} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 10.9 \\ & 35.5 \\ & \text { 11. } \\ & \text { 14.3 } \\ & \text { 18. } \end{aligned}$ | 2.919.423.723.733.7 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2.0 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 30.9 22.5 | 18.8 17.9 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 14.7 | 17.8 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 31.7 | 43.4 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | mulatio | percent |  |  |  |  |  |
| Under 40- | 27.9 48.8 | 32.2 50.9 | 47.6 67.4 | 45.6 67.0 | 23.6 45.8 | ${ }^{20.6} \times$ | ${ }_{31.2}^{31.6}$ | 20.8 38.7 | 10.1 ${ }_{24}$ | 44.3 66.1 | 46. 4 | 22.3 46.0 |
| Under 60 | 66.7 | 66.8 | 82.9 | ${ }_{82.6}$ | 64.5 | 66.5 | ${ }_{68.3}$ | 56.6 | 45.8 | 82.3 | 81.8 | 66.7 |
| Under 70 | 79.8 | 77.1 | 93.3 | 91.6 | 80.0 | 86.3 | 80.7 | 71.2 | 62.9 | 90.6 | 89.8 | 79.4 |
| 70 and over...80 and over. | 20.2 10.8 | $\begin{array}{r} 22.9 \\ 14.4 \end{array}$ | 6.7 1.1 | $\begin{aligned} & 8.4 \\ & 4.7 \end{aligned}$ | 20.0 10.8 | $\begin{array}{r} 13.7 \\ 2.6 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 19.3 \\ 9.3 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 28.8 \\ & 1.8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 31.8 \\ & { }_{21}^{2} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 9.4 \\ & 5.4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10.2 \\ 4.3 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 20.6 \\ 10.5 \end{array}$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | wom | EN |  |  |  |  |  |
| Employeeswith hours worke Average ear ings ${ }^{1}$ (cents) | 11,733 | 616 | 365 | 446 | 2,866 | 125 | 1,204 | 1,705 | 643 | 399 | $\begin{array}{r} 1,269 \\ 35.7 \end{array}$ | 2,09544.0 |
|  | 42.7 | 44.2 | 34.3 | 35.3 | 44.0 | 40.5 | 39.6 | 49.0 | 49.8 | 34.0 |  |  |
| Under 20 20 , under 30 40 , under 50 50 and over | $\begin{array}{r} 1.5 \\ 8.0 \\ 38.8 \\ 27.2 \\ 24.6 \end{array}$ | 2.74.720.131.5 | $\begin{array}{r} 3.3 \\ 35.4 \\ 35.9 \\ 20.9 \\ 5.5 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 7.8 \\ 24.7 \\ 38.8 \\ 17.5 \\ 11.5 \end{array}$ | Percent of employees |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | 7.9 | 7.2 | 0.6 | 3.5 | 4.9 | 22.3 | 10.9 | 5.4 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 31.5 | 51.2 | 60.2 | 31.2 | 16.7 | 46.3 | 57.3 | 34.8 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 32.2 | 30.4 | 29.3 | 22.3 | 29.7 | 19.8 | 17.6 | 34.3 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 27.3 | 11.2 | 9.9 | 43.0 | 48.4 | 5.0 | 9.2 | 25.4 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | mulatio | percen |  |  |  |  |  |
| Under 30 <br> Under 40 | 9.94 ${ }^{9} 8$ | 2.7 47.9 | 74. 58 | ${ }_{71.3}^{32.5}$ | 9.1 40.5 | $\begin{array}{r}7.2 \\ 58.4 \\ \hline 8\end{array}$ | ${ }_{60.8}^{8}$ | 34.7 | 21.9 ${ }_{\text {5 }}$ | 28.8 75.2 | 15.9 | 5.5 40.3 |
| Under 50 | 75.5 | 68.4 | 94.6 | 88.8 | ${ }_{72.8}$ | 88.8 | 90.1 | 57.1 | ${ }_{51.6}^{21.6}$ | ${ }_{94.9}$ | 90.8 | 74.6 |
| Under 60 | 90.2 | 87.3 | 99.2 | 95.1 | 89.2 | 98.4 | 97.2 | 77.7 | 81.5 | 99.2 | 97.8 | 92.2 |
| 60 and over...- | 9.8 | 12.7 | . 8 | 4.9 | 10.8 | 1.6 | 2.8 | 22.3 | 18.5 | 8 | 2.2 | 7.8 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | ME |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Employeeswith hours worked reported Average earn-ings ${ }^{1}$ (cents). | 18,301 | 700 | 471 | 710 | 5,353 | 60.2 | $\begin{array}{r} 1,963 \\ 60.8 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 2,738 \\ 65.6 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1,075 \\ 72.7 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 739 \\ 51.7 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1,670 \\ 52.6 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 2,619 \\ 63.7 \end{array}$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 60.9 | 62.4 | 51.5 | 50. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Under 40 <br> 40 , under 50 <br> 60 , under 70 <br> 70 and over | $\begin{aligned} & 14.9 \\ & 17.0 \\ & 19.7 \\ & 177.9 \\ & 30.6 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 18.4 \\ & 17.0 \\ & 13.0 \\ & 11.7 \\ & 19.6 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 26.5 \\ & 19.8 \\ & 24.0 \\ & 17.8 \\ & 11.9 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 29.5 \\ & 23.8 \\ & 21.4 \\ & 12.5 \\ & 12.8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 14.5 \\ & 16.8 \\ & \begin{array}{l} 10.8 \\ 20.0 \\ 20.2 \end{array} \\ & 28.5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { cent of } \\ 2.7 \\ 14.1 \\ 34.6 \\ 28.9 \\ 19.8 \end{array}$ | mploy13.118.219.318.630.8 | $\begin{aligned} & 12.3 \\ & 15.0 \\ & 16.2 \\ & 16.6 \\ & 39.9 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 3.0 \\ 5.8 \\ 15.4 \\ 20.9 \\ 54.9 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 27.6 \\ & 23.0 \\ & 22.6 \\ & \text { 12. } \\ & 14.3 \\ & \hline 14.5 \end{aligned}$ | 26. 2319.712.812.717.6 | 7.915.323.319.134.5 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Under 50 Under 60 Under 70 Under 75 | $\begin{aligned} & 31.9 \\ & 51.6 \\ & 69.5 \\ & 76.9 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 35.45 \\ & 48.7 \\ & 60.5 \\ & 68.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 46.2 \\ & 70.3 \\ & 88.2 \\ & 94.7 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 53.3 \\ & 74.7 \\ & 87.2 \\ & 90.7 \end{aligned}$ | Cumulative percents |  |  |  | $\begin{array}{r} 8.8 \\ 24.3 \\ 45.0 \\ 55.7 \end{array}$ | 50.673.285.288.988.9 | 49.969.782.488.0 | 23.46.466.74.074.0 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 31.3 51.3 | 16.7 51.3 | 31.3 50.6 | ${ }_{43.5}^{27.3}$ |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | 71.5 | 80.3 | 69.2 | 60.1 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | 78.6 | 90.1 | 78.8 | 67.9 |  |  |  |  |
| 75 and over. | 23.1 | 32.0 | 5.3 | 9.3 | 21.4 | 9.9 | 21.2 | 32.1 | 44.3 | 11.1 | 12.0 | 26.0 |

[^1]
## Hourly earnings in union and nonunion establishments.

Of the establishments reporting hourly earnings, 96 , with 29,868 employees, reported on union affiliation; 24 plants with 6,562 workers were operating under a union contract, and 72 with 23,306 workers were nonunion plants. Three-fourths of the union plants reported were in Massachusetts, probably the most important union center in were Massachetts, probably the wisconsin; and the remainder the shoe industry; one-sixth were in Wisconsin; and the remainder were in Illinois and Pennsylvania. Nonunion establishments were reported in each of the States visited.
It is apparent from the table following that earnings were substantially higher in the establishments operating. under union contracts. The average hourly earnings for the workers in all union plants combined were 57.5 cents, or 4.4 cents above the average of 53.1 cents of employees in the nonunion plants. Considering only the States with both union and nonunion plants reported, the difference in favor of the workers in union plants was 5 cents an hour, the average being 57.5 cents in the union plants compared to 52.5 cents in those nonunion.

Table 7.-Average and distribution of hourly earnings in establishments having and not having union contracts

| Hourly earnings (cents) | Establishments operating under union conStates) | Nonunion establishments |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | States with union and nonunion plants reported (4) | All States (13) |
| Number of establishments | 6, ${ }^{24}$ | 35 659 | 72 23,306 |
| erage earnings (cents). |  |  |  |
|  | Cumulative percents of employees |  |  |
| Under $30-$ | ${ }_{9.6}^{2.4}$ | ${ }^{6} 16.9$ | 17.1 |
| Under 40- | 19.2 | 30.2 | 30.4 <br> 41.1 <br> 1 |
| Under 45 | 30.4 41.4 | 42.6 52.7 | 51.0 |
| Under 55---------- | ${ }_{52.0}^{4.4}$ | 62.8 | 60.4 |
| Under 60---------------1. | 61.0 | 71.1 | 68.4 |
| 60 and over | 39.0 | 28.9 |  |
| 65 and over- | 31.3 | 21.8 | ${ }_{19}^{24.7}$ |
| 70 and over--- |  |  | 19.3 14.4 |
| 75 and over--- | 17.2 | 12.9 | 14.4 |

The mean-the simple arithmetic average,
The difference in the wage standards in union and nonunion establishments appears in this table. Considering only the four States Massachusetts, Wisconsin, Illinois, and Pennsylvania-with both union and nonunion plants reported, 30 percent of the workers in the nonunion group, in contrast to 19 percent in the union plants, had earnings below 40 cents, and 71 percent in the nonunion plants, in contrast to 61 percent in those with union contracts, averaged less than 60 cents. As many as 24 percent of the union workers, but only 17 percent of the nonunion workers, had earnings as high as 70 cents per hour.
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