

THE ECONOMIC & SOCIAL RESEARCH INSTITUTE

Views on Income Differentials and the Economic Situation

FINDINGS FROM A NATIONAL SAMPLE SURVEY

HILDE BEHREND
ANN KNOWLES
JEAN DAVIES

NOVEMBER 1970

PAPER No. 57

THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL RESEARCH INSTITUTE
COUNCIL 1969 - 70

- *G. O'BRIEN, D.LITT., LITT.D.,
President of the Institute and Chairman of the Council.
- T. J. BARRINGTON,
Director, Institute of Public Administration.
- *J. P. BEDDY, D.ECON.SC., LL.D. (H.G.)
Chairman, The Industrial Credit Co. Ltd.
- R. D. C. BLACK, PH.D.,
Professor, Department of Economics, The Queen's University, Belfast.
- *F. B. CHUBB, M.A., D.PHIL.,
Professor, Department of Political Science, Trinity College, Dublin.
- VERY REV. D. CREGAN, G.M.
President, St. Patrick's Training College, Drumcondra, Dublin.
- G. DEAN, M.D., F.R.C.P.
Director, Medico-Social Research Board.
- REV. PETER DEMPSEY, O.F.M.GAP., M.A., PH.D., D.D.,
Professor, Department of Applied Psychology, University College, Cork.
- *M. P. FOGARTY, M.A., D.POL.SOC.SC. (Louvain),
Director of the Institute.
- N. J. GIBSON, B.SC. (ECON.), PH.D.,
Professor, Department of Economics, The New University of Ulster, Coleraine.
- *W. A. HONOHAN, M.A., F.I.A.,
Secretary, Department of Social Welfare.
- *REV. JAMES KAVANAGH, M.A., S.T.L.,
Professor, Department of Social Science, University College, Dublin.
- IVOR KENNY, M.A.,
Director, Irish Management Institute.
- T. P. LINEHAN, B.E., B.SC.,
Director, Central Statistics Office.
- P. LYNCH, M.A.,
Chairman, Medico-Social Research Board.
- CHARLES MCCARTHY, B.L.,
Chairman, Human Sciences Committee.
- *M. D. MCCARTHY, M.A., PH.D., D.SC.,
President, University College, Cork.
- J. J. McELLIGOTT, M.A., LL.D.,
Past President of the Institute.
- G. A. MEAGHER, B.COMM., D.P.A.,
Deputy Secretary, Department of Local Government.
- *J. F. MEENAN, M.A., B.L.,
Professor of Political Economy, University College, Dublin.
- *C. H. MURRAY,
Secretary, Department of Finance.
- J. C. NAGLE, M.COMM.,
Secretary, Department of Agriculture.
- D. NEVIN,
Assistant General Secretary, Irish Congress of Trade Unions.
- RIGHT REV. MONSIGNOR J. NEWMAN, M.A., D.PH.,
President, St. Patrick's College, Maynooth.
- TADHG O CEARBHAILL,
Secretary, Department of Labour.
- REV. E. F. O'DOHERTY, M.A., B.D., PH.D.,
Professor, Department of Logic and Psychology, University College, Dublin.
- D. P. O'MAHONY, M.A., PH.D., B.L.,
Professor, Department of Economics, University College, Cork.
- LABHRAS O'NUALLAIN, D.ECON.SC.,
Professor of Economics, University College, Galway.
- *W. J. L. RYAN, M.A., PH.D.,
Professor of Political Economy, Trinity College, Dublin
- P. G. SHERRY, M.SC., PH.D.,
Federation of Irish Industries.
- T. WALSH, D.SC.,
Director, An Foras Talúntais.
- *T. K. WHITAKER, M.SC. (ECON.), D.ECON.SC.,
Governor, Central Bank of Ireland.

*Members of Executive Committee.

*Copies of this paper may be obtained from The Economic and Social Research Institute
4 Burlington Road, Dublin 4, price, 15/- a copy.*

Views on Income Differentials and
The Economic Situation

CONTENTS

Introduction	5
Chapter 1. Views on what would be fair pay for different occupations	6
Chapter 2. Views on the economic situation	31
Chapter 3. Interpretation of the term 'incomes policy'	38
Chapter 4. Respondents' perception of whether and how they could help the economic situation	45
Summary and Conclusions	55
Appendices A, B and C	66, 68, 69

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Our thanks are due to the Departments of Labour and Finance for sponsoring this research and providing funds for it to the Economic and Social Research Institute, and to officers in the Departments for information and advice. We are most grateful to Professor Michael Fogarty, Director of the Institute, for his support throughout the enquiry and to Professor Norman Hunt of Edinburgh University for his encouragement.

We would like to thank all the other members of the Institute staff who have given us help, in particular Professor Bertram Hutchinson for criticism and advice, Mr. Keith Wilson and Mrs. Eithne Colbert-Stanley of the Survey Research Unit for planning and supervising the fieldwork so efficiently, and Miss Gillian O'Donovan for her contribution to the categorisation of replies.

We would also like to acknowledge the contributions made to the work on the data and typescript by Mrs. Elizabeth Rose, Mrs. Emily Paterson and Mrs. Albury Sanders of the Edinburgh research team, and to thank the staff of the Edinburgh Social Science Research Centre for helping with data-processing and staff of the Edinburgh Regional Computer Centre for programming and tabulating the evidence.

Lastly we must thank our 1,084 respondents for agreeing to be interviewed and for expressing themselves so freely.

*Views on Income Differentials and
The Economic Situation*

*Further Findings from the National Sample
Survey Reported on in Paper No. 56*

HILDE BEHREND, ANN KNOWLES, JEAN DAVIES*

INTRODUCTION

THIS is the second report on an enquiry conducted by the Economic and Social Research Institute at the request of the Minister of Labour. The purpose of this investigation was to examine views on income differentials and income increases so as to provide material for an assessment of prevailing attitudes to questions of pay and their bearing on the development of an incomes policy. The enquiry consisted of a national sample survey which was conducted in the period 25th April to 6th May, 1969. The survey covered 1,084 male employees aged 21 years or over who were selected by a carefully designed multi-stage stratified random sampling procedure. The interviews, which lasted about half an hour, were carried out at the respondents' homes by trained interviewers.

A first report on this enquiry, published in August 1970,¹ presents the findings with regard to respondents' views on pay-increases, fringe benefits and low pay. It also contains technical details of the enquiry, including a copy of the interview schedule and tables showing the personal characteristics of the sample. The present report examines further evidence relevant to the development of an incomes policy.

Since the enquiry was first commissioned, inflationary pressures in many parts of the world including Ireland have increased, giving new impetus to

*The authors are on the staff of the University of Edinburgh. Their enquiry was carried out in collaboration with the Institute, which has accepted their paper for publication. The authors are responsible for the contents of the paper, including the views expressed therein.

¹See Hilde Behrend, Ann Knowles and Jean Davies, *Views on Pay Increases, Fringe Benefits and Low Pay*, Paper No. 56, Economic and Social Research Institute, Dublin, August 1970.

discussions on incomes policy. Thus the National Industrial Economic Council once again in February 1970 raised the need to develop an incomes policy as a matter of urgency in its report on incomes and prices policy.² An Employer-Labour Conference was then established and discussed, but failed to agree on proposals for a national framework for a pay agreement which would lay down guidelines for the next wage-round. In October the Government announced its intention to set compulsory limits to increases in pay, prices, dividends, rents, and professional fees.

Acceptance of proposals for an incomes policy (whatever form they take) will depend on how people see the issues involved, and on how much consensus there is on the objectives. Do people accept the existing income-structure or do they feel it needs to be changed? Do they realise the nature of Ireland's economic problems? And do they appreciate what part they can play in reducing them? It is this kind of question on which light is thrown in this second report which deals with respondents' perception of the pay-structure and of the economic situation, with their comprehension of the term "incomes policy" and with the contribution they thought they could make to the Irish economy. The detailed evidence, including all the major tables and their evaluation, is presented in Chapters 1 to 4, while the final section summarises and highlights the most important findings and points up implications of evidence significant for incomes policy.

CHAPTER 1. VIEWS ON WHAT WOULD BE FAIR PAY FOR DIFFERENT OCCUPATIONS

Three well separated and rather lengthy sets of questions were used to explore respondents' ideas of fair pay, the first of the topics to be taken up in this report. One of these was concerned with views on differentials for broad occupational groups, another with views of appropriate pay for different occupations, and a third—more personal—with the respondent's views on whether there were people at his place of work who were underpaid.

The broad occupational comparison was introduced by a question which served the function of focussing the respondent's attention on the differentials issue by asking whether clerical workers should be paid more, the same, or less than skilled manual workers.³ The interviewer defined clerical workers as "lower grade (clerical) workers and office staff." Two more specific questions on the same issue followed, namely: "*How much do you think skilled manual workers should be paid per week?*" and "*How much do you think clerical workers should be paid per week?*" In answering these two questions 38 respondents

²*Report on Incomes and Prices Policy*, Report No. 27, National Industrial Economic Council, Stationery Office, Dublin, February 1970.

³For methodological purposes the order was reversed in half the questionnaires so as to ask whether skilled manual workers should be paid more, the same or less than clerical workers.

apparently changed their mind (or contradicted themselves) by giving a higher figure for skilled workers although previously they had said that clerical workers should receive more than (or the same as) skilled workers, and in our analysis the second verdict will be taken as their final response.⁴ Two similar questions followed as to how much should be paid to semi-skilled and unskilled workers and all four sets of answers are presented in Table 1. Percentages in all tables are given to one decimal point, but have been rounded off in the text to the nearest whole number for ease in reading.

It should be noted that in answering the four questions the respondents had to consider first what *level* of income they thought should be paid to skilled manual workers and then whether people in the three other types of occupation should receive a higher, the same or a lower amount. Respondents gave amounts in round figures but in the following discussion statistical measures for the distributions of these figures are given to two decimal points, as will be the practice after currency decimalisation. The measures have been calculated to one decimal point, and a nought added for the second decimal place to help readers to think in terms of either system, that is of £0·10 as equal to 2/- or as £0·50 as equal to 10/-. It should be noted that in the context of respondents giving figures to the nearest £, only differences of above £0·50 can be considered as of possible significance.

The main statistical measures used in this report may be defined as follows:

The arithmetic mean is the sum of the amounts named divided by the number of observations.

The median is the value of the item in the distribution which has half of the observations below it and half of them above it.

The lower quartile is the value of the item in the distribution which has one quarter of the observations below it and three quarters of them above it.

The upper quartile is the value of the item in the distribution which has three quarters of the observations below it and one quarter of them above it.

Table 1 shows that the answers as to what the four types of occupations should be paid per week cover a wide range of figures from below £10 to above £25. However, if one ignores the "straggling tails" of the four distributions, due in some cases to one or two individuals giving an exceptionally high or low figure (the highest being a man who gave £60 for a skilled worker and the lowest one who gave £6 for an unskilled worker), it is found that the middle 50 per cent of each set of answers (the interquartile range) is represented by a much narrower range, namely:

	<i>Interquartile range</i>	<i>Interval</i>
Skilled workers	£18·20 to £22·00	£3·80
Clerical workers (lower grades)	£15·90 to £20·50	£4·60
Semi-skilled workers	£15·10 to £18·50	£3·40
Unskilled workers	£13·70 to £16·60	£2·90

⁴A further 24 men opted out of giving figures for both groups.

TABLE 1: Respondents' views on what skilled manual workers, clerical workers (lower grades), semi-skilled and unskilled manual workers should be paid per week*

Amounts per week	Skilled manual workers		Clerical workers (lower grades)		Semi-skilled manual workers		Unskilled manual workers	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
£9 and below	—	0.0	2	0.2	3	0.3	15	1.4
£10	2	0.2	17	1.6	9	0.9	36	3.4
£11	1	0.1	5	0.5	10	0.9	27	2.5
£12	11	1.0	34	3.3	51	4.8	121	11.4
£13	—	0.0	13	1.3	39	3.7	86	8.1
£14	15	1.4	49	4.7	105	10.0	175	16.4
£15	77	7.3	143	13.8	213	20.2	244	22.9
£16	74	7.0	132	12.8	158	15.0	133	12.5
£17	49	4.6	76	7.4	105	10.0	49	4.6
£18	128	12.1	131	12.7	157	14.9	96	9.0
£19	26	2.5	19	1.8	20	1.9	9	0.8
£20	385	36.5	238	23.0	130	12.3	59	5.5
£21	15	1.4	6	0.6	2	0.2	—	0.0
£22	51	4.8	41	4.0	15	1.4	2	0.2
£23	9	0.9	9	0.9	6	0.6	1	0.1
£24	12	1.1	6	0.6	3	0.3	2	0.2
£25	138	13.1	71	6.9	21	2.0	6	0.6
£26 and over	61	5.8	42	4.1	8	0.8	4	0.4

*30 respondents did not give a figure for skilled manual workers, 50 for clerical workers, 29 for semi-skilled manual workers and 19 for unskilled manual workers. The percentages for each occupation are calculated out of the total number of figure answers.

Details of statistical measures for this table are presented in Appendix B.

This finding is particularly interesting, considering the very wide range of pay which sometimes exists in practice for these occupations. For example, a recent study⁵ of 48 firms revealed that the earnings for a normal working week excluding overtime of 620 maintenance craftsmen in January 1970 varied from £19 to £32 per week, the interquartile range being £22 to £28 per week.

Another interesting finding is that the arithmetic means and medians for the four types of occupation as well as the lower and upper quartiles all come out with the same rank order: the figures are highest for the skilled workers, second come the clerical workers, third the semi-skilled and fourth the unskilled, which is why the occupations are given in this order in the table. The arithmetic means are slightly higher than the medians, but rounded off to the nearest 10/- (£0.50) or £ they are the same for three of the four occupational groups, and enable us to deduce the average differentials between the groups, which were as follows:

	Mean and median Amounts per week	Differential	
		Means	Medians
Skilled workers	£20	£2	£2
Clerical workers (lower grades)	£18		
Semi-skilled workers (Mean) £16 10s. (Median) £16		£1 10s.	£2
Unskilled workers	£15	£1 10s.	£1

One further interesting feature to note in Table 1 (as well as in Table 4) is the point that certain figures are found to be more popular than others; particularly 15 and 20, but also 14, 16, 18 and 25.⁶ Thus the mode, the most frequent single figure given in the four distributions, was £20 for both skilled and clerical workers, and £15 for semi-skilled and unskilled workers. But only in the case of the skilled workers was it given by more than a quarter of the sample, namely by 37 per cent, a figure suggesting a considerable agreement on £20 for skilled workers, especially as this figure coincided with the mean and the median.

Did all the respondents hold the same view as regards the relative positions of the four occupational groups? To find out, paired comparisons of the views on fair pay for the four occupational groups were carried out by computer which examined for each respondent whether he had given a greater, the same, or a lower amount as appropriate pay for occupation 1 as compared with occupation 2, and the numbers falling into each category were then counted. Since the questions asked how much the workers in each of the four types of

⁵Basil Chubb, *Final Report of the Commission set up in accordance with the settlement terms of the maintenance craftsmen's dispute*, March 1969, mimeographed copy, June 1970, p. 6.

⁶Compare similar findings discussed in the first report, *op. cit.*, p. 58.

occupation should be paid per week, this analysis fulfilled the objective of dividing the respondents into those who considered that the comparison group should receive more pay, the same pay or less pay per week than the reference group. It thus provided the same type of information as the question as to how many respondents considered that clerical workers should be paid more, the same or less than skilled manual workers, which had been used in the first instance to focus the respondents' attention on the differentials issue. However, this approach also provided comparative material for other occupations.

In this connection the fact that 557 respondents indicated that skilled workers should get more than clerical workers means of course that 557 thought that clerical workers should get less than skilled workers. It is therefore not necessary to reproduce the "less" answers so that Table 2(a) shows the percentage of respondents who gave higher figures for fair pay for one occupation compared with another (that is the "more" entries), and Table 2(b) completes the picture by showing the percentage of respondents who gave the same figure for fair pay for any two groups.

TABLE 2: Analysis of the comparison of the amounts named as appropriate pay for skilled manual workers, clerical workers (lower grades), semi-skilled and unskilled manual workers

(a)

Column I Occupational Group	Percentage of respondents indicating that the occupational group in Column I should get MORE pay than the occupational groups mentioned below:			
	Skilled workers	Clerical workers	Semi-skilled workers	Unskilled workers
Skilled workers	% *	% 51.4	% 88.1	% 90.8
Clerical workers	7.6	% *	60.2	76.6
Semi-skilled workers	0.6	13.5	% *	75.8
Unskilled workers	0.3	5.3	1.6	% *

(b)

Column I Occupational Group	Percentage of respondents indicating that the occupational group in Column I should get the SAME pay as the occupational groups mentioned below:			
	Skilled workers	Clerical workers	Semi-skilled workers	Unskilled workers
Skilled workers	% *	% 36.0	% 8.0	% 5.8
Clerical workers	SEE	% *	21.2	13.3
Semi-skilled workers	FIGURES ABOVE	FIGURES ABOVE	% *	19.8
Unskilled workers	FIGURES ABOVE	FIGURES ABOVE	FIGURES ABOVE	% *

Table 2 reveals with one exception a very high level of consensus on the relative positions in the pay structure of the four occupational groups. Thus the vast majority of the sample were agreed that skilled workers should get more pay than semi-skilled workers or unskilled workers; and that lower grade clerical and semi-skilled workers should get more than unskilled workers. However, there was considerable dissension over the position of the clerical workers. Only just over half the respondents (51 per cent) held the view that skilled workers should get more pay than clerical workers; 36 per cent of the sample considered that they should get the same amount and a minority of 8 per cent held that clerical workers should get more than skilled workers. There appeared also some doubt as to how semi-skilled workers should stand in relation to clerical workers, although a majority of 60 per cent placed clerical workers first.

To ascertain who were the dissentient groups the answers were related to social grade,⁷ which is at the same time an indicator of respondents' income level, and the findings are presented in Table 3.

This table shows that the vast majority of the respondents in the four social grades were agreed that skilled workers should get more pay than semi- or unskilled workers and that clerical and semi-skilled workers should get more than the unskilled.

By contrast, in the comparison between skilled and lower grade clerical workers we find that in social grade C2 (representing mainly skilled workers) a majority of 61 per cent gave higher figures for pay for skilled men, and in social grade C1 (intermediate non-manual workers) there was a split, 41 per cent of the men were in favour of skilled workers getting more and another 41 per cent indicated that they should get the same amount; interestingly enough only a minority thought they should receive less. In social grades AB and DE there was also lack of agreement in that just over half in each group thought skilled men should get more and just under half the same or less. As regards the position of the clerical workers *vis-a-vis* the semi-skilled, it emerges that the majority awarding the clerical workers more was greatest in the non-manual social grades (just under 70 per cent) and smallest for social grade DE where the majority was only 53 per cent.

Further information on views about differentials was obtained from a question put later in the interview. This question asked for views on fair pay for eleven occupations; a list of these occupations with instructions and spaces for filling in answers was handed to the respondents by the interviewer who

⁷A description of the method of social grading used in this survey, as well as particulars of the income classification, is given in Appendix A, also a table showing the relation of the two variables to each other. This illustrates clearly for instance that 80 per cent of the respondents who earned more than £30 belonged to social grade AB and 86 per cent of the respondents who earned less than £12 per week belonged to social grade DE.

TABLE 3: Respondents' social grade related to the comparisons of the amounts named as appropriate pay for the four occupational groups

	Social grade			
	AB N=168	C1 N=168	C2 N=258	DE N=490
Figure given for skilled workers	%	%	%	%
MORE than clerical workers*	51.2	41.1	60.5	50.2
SAME as " "	32.7	41.1	32.2	37.3
LESS than " "	10.7	12.5	3.5	7.2
Don't know	5.4	5.3	3.8	5.3
	100%	100%	100%	100%
Figure given for skilled workers				
MORE than semi-skilled workers	92.8	90.5	92.2	83.5
SAME as " "	1.8	5.3	6.2	11.8
LESS than " "	0.0	0.0	0.4	1.0
Don't know	5.4	4.2	1.2	3.7
	100%	100%	100%	100%
Figure given for skilled workers				
MORE than unskilled workers	94.6	91.6	94.5	87.1
SAME as " "	0.6	4.2	4.0	9.2
LESS than " "	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.6
Don't know	4.8	4.2	1.5	3.1
	100%	100%	100%	100%
Figure given for clerical workers*				
MORE than semi-skilled workers	69.6	68.4	62.0	53.3
SAME as " "	16.1	16.1	20.5	25.1
LESS than " "	8.3	10.7	14.0	15.9
Don't know	6.0	4.8	3.5	5.7
	100%	100%	100%	100%
Figure given for clerical workers*				
MORE than unskilled workers	86.3	83.8	78.0	70.0
SAME as " "	7.1	6.0	13.5	17.8
LESS than " "	1.2	6.0	4.5	6.7
Don't know	5.4	4.2	4.0	5.5
	100%	100%	100%	100%
Figure given for semi-skilled workers				
MORE than unskilled workers	85.1	83.3	79.8	68.0
SAME as " "	10.1	13.7	17.1	26.7
LESS than " "	0.6	0.0	1.9	2.2
Don't know	4.2	3.0	1.2	3.1
	100%	100%	100%	100%

*Clerical workers (lower grade).

also repeated the instructions verbally. The list and instructions are reproduced below.

“Here is a list of occupations, could you write in how much *you* think a man aged 40 should be paid per week. I mean, if you had a say, what do you think would be fair?”

<i>Occupation</i>	<i>Amount per week, before tax and deductions</i>		
	<i>£</i>	<i>s.</i>	<i>d.</i>
Building labourer		
ESB clerk		
Car assembly worker		
Electrician		
Manager of a factory (employing about 100 people)		
Bus conductor		
Shop assistant		
Hotel waiter		
Railway porter		
Agricultural labourer		
School teacher (National)		

The occupations in this list were chosen in consultation with Irish experts in industrial relations as representative of certain types of job, for instance of skilled or unskilled work, but also as of particular interest in the context of pay negotiations. A second criterion which had to be applied was to select occupations with which respondents were acquainted; this restricted the possible choice for instance as regarded professional work, where the job of school teacher seemed to meet the need most adequately. In the list the occupations were deliberately not in any rank order, and respondents were asked to think of a man aged 40, so that for men on salary-scales it could be assumed that they had reached the top of their scale. Respondents were allowed ample time to fill in their answers.

It is worth pointing out that the response to this question (which required considerable readiness to co-operate) was very good. Only nine respondents opted out of the exercise completely, and the percentage of "don't know" answers for individual occupations was remarkably low—ranging from 5.8 per cent for the ESB clerk to 1.5 per cent for the building labourer. Differences in style of approach found expression mainly in the number of distinctions which respondents made between the eleven occupations. Some did indeed give eleven different figures, but many decided to give the same figure for two or three occupations and sometimes even for more, and some equated several sets of occupations. They also differed in the frequency with which they gave round figures such as 20, 25 and 30, these figures apparently being used most often where people knew little about actual levels of pay for the occupations: this was presumably a way of giving occupations an approximate position in the pay-structure—a ranking *vis-a-vis* others.

The distribution of the answers is set out in Table 4, in which the occupations have been arranged in order of the descending size of the sample averages (medians and means) for fair pay for the eleven occupations. This rank order may thus be considered as representative of the views of the pay-hierarchy of the sample as a whole. From Table 4 the medians for the views for fair pay for the different occupations have been derived and also the numerical differences between them (that is, the average differential between them) and these are set out in Table 5. In studying this table account has to be taken of the different distances between the levels of the occupations in the list. Only two of the occupations, the factory manager and the school teacher, belong to social grade AB; the clerical worker belongs to grade C1 and the electrician to C2; while as many as seven occupations are in grade DE, the group comprising mainly semi-skilled and unskilled workers.

Table 5 shows clearly that from the figures given for fair pay the factory manager (described as employing about 100 people) comes out first in the pay hierarchy although the sum of £34 10/- per week, the median of the fair pay views expressed by the sample (equivalent to £1,774 per annum) cannot be said to represent exceptionally high earnings. £34 10/- however places the factory manager into the top income-group among the sample respondents, that is the 12 per cent who earned "£30 or over" per week. Comparison of the views on fair pay with the actual earnings of the sample respondents further shows that the median amounts named as fair for teachers and electricians fell into the "over £20 and up to £25" income-group, which represented the earnings of 14 per cent of the sample, while the median views on fair pay for the next five occupations fell into the sample's middle income group of "over £16 up to £20" with the bottom three occupations, at between £15 and £16, marginally below this. The average views for fair pay thus implied a shortening of the pay-structure based mainly on bringing the lower income-groups up to at least £15 per week.

TABLE 4: Respondents' views on what men aged 40 should be paid per week in eleven selected occupations*

Amounts per week	Factory manager		School teacher		Electrician		Car assembly worker		E.S.B. clerk		Bus conductor		Building labourer		Shop assistant		Hotel waiter		Railway porter		Agricultural labourer		Amounts per week
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
£9 and below	—	0.0	—	0.0	—	0.0	1	0.1	—	0.0	1	0.1	—	0.0	9	0.9	12	1.2	7	0.7	10	0.9	£9 and below
£10	1	0.1	2	0.2	2	0.2	2	0.2	7	0.7	3	0.3	4	0.4	31	2.9	36	3.5	10	0.9	37	3.5	£10
£11	—	0.0	—	0.0	1	0.1	1	0.1	2	0.2	3	0.3	3	0.3	9	0.9	10	1.0	12	1.1	13	1.2	£11
£12	1	0.1	6	0.6	4	0.4	5	0.5	21	2.1	15	1.4	33	3.1	72	6.8	105	10.2	81	7.7	120	11.2	£12
£13	—	0.0	5	0.5	1	0.1	2	0.2	15	1.5	9	0.9	22	2.1	27	2.6	35	3.4	43	4.1	52	4.9	£13
£14	—	0.0	11	1.1	2	0.2	20	1.9	33	3.2	54	5.1	77	7.2	90	8.6	99	9.6	130	12.3	157	14.7	£14
£15	2	0.2	24	2.3	19	1.8	67	6.4	96	9.4	148	14.0	218	20.4	169	16.1	168	16.3	238	22.6	239	22.4	£15
£16	1	0.1	25	2.4	28	2.7	114	11.0	117	11.5	169	16.0	159	14.9	161	15.3	135	13.1	166	15.8	144	13.5	£16
£17	1	0.1	18	1.7	38	3.6	74	7.1	64	6.3	102	9.7	87	8.1	70	6.7	57	5.5	66	6.3	45	4.2	£17
£18	7	0.7	64	6.1	126	11.9	169	16.3	159	15.6	207	19.6	175	16.4	177	16.8	131	12.7	134	12.7	110	10.3	£18
£19	1	0.1	9	0.9	20	1.9	20	1.9	19	1.9	24	2.3	14	1.3	13	1.2	5	0.5	11	1.0	6	0.6	£19
£20	38	3.7	192	18.4	330	31.3	316	30.4	214	21.0	222	21.1	216	20.2	160	15.2	154	14.9	121	11.5	105	9.8	£20
£21	3	0.3	12	1.2	19	1.8	6	0.6	6	0.6	2	0.2	4	0.4	2	0.2	2	0.2	2	0.2	3	0.3	£21
£22	10	1.0	39	3.7	91	8.6	66	6.4	51	5.0	27	2.6	14	1.3	13	1.2	14	1.4	9	0.9	9	0.8	£22
£23	6	0.6	17	1.6	29	2.7	18	1.7	14	1.4	12	1.1	4	0.4	5	0.5	7	0.7	3	0.3	3	0.3	£23
£24	6	0.6	29	2.8	37	3.5	21	2.0	17	1.7	8	0.8	5	0.5	10	1.0	3	0.3	4	0.4	—	0.0	£24
£25	128	12.4	215	20.7	184	17.4	84	8.1	97	9.5	35	3.3	27	2.5	21	2.0	38	3.7	8	0.8	9	0.8	£25
£26	6	0.6	13	1.2	16	1.5	—	0.0	8	0.8	2	0.2	1	0.1	1	0.1	2	0.2	1	0.1	1	0.1	£26
£27	6	0.6	13	1.2	9	0.9	8	0.8	11	1.1	2	0.2	—	0.0	—	0.0	—	0.0	—	0.0	1	0.1	£27
£28	18	1.7	16	1.5	21	2.0	7	0.7	8	0.8	4	0.4	1	0.1	3	0.3	2	0.2	1	0.1	1	0.1	£28
£29	5	0.5	4	0.4	3	0.3	1	0.1	3	0.3	—	0.0	—	0.0	—	0.0	—	0.0	—	0.0	—	0.0	£29
£30	255	24.7	159	15.3	60	5.7	30	2.9	45	4.4	2	0.2	4	0.4	7	0.7	14	1.4	4	0.4	2	0.2	£30
£31 and over	538	52.1	168	16.1	14	1.3	7	0.7	14	1.4	3	0.3	1	0.1	2	0.2	2	0.2	2	0.2	1	0.1	£31 and over

*The percentages are calculated out of the total number naming a figure for the particular occupation. The number of respondents who answered "don't know" was as follows:

Factory manager 51, school teacher 43, electrician 29, car assembly worker 45, ESB clerk 63, bus conductor 30, building labourer 15, shop assistant 32, hotel waiter 53, railway porter 31, agricultural labourer 16.

Details of statistical measures for this table are presented in Appendix B.

TABLE 5: Median amounts named as fair pay per week for eleven occupations

Occupation	Median for men aged 40 years	Average differential between adjacent medians
	£	£
Factory manager	34.50	
School teacher	24.80	9.70
Electrician	20.40	4.40
Car assembly worker	19.60	0.80
ESB clerk	18.50	1.10
Bus conductor	17.60	0.90
Building labourer	16.70	0.90
Shop assistant	16.20	0.50
Hotel waiter	15.90	0.30
Railway porter	15.50	0.40
Agricultural labourer	15.10	0.40

Readers may find it interesting to compare these figures with the following rates⁸ which were current in April/May 1969 when the survey was carried out.

	£s per week
School teacher (married)	18.80 to 35.10
Electrician	18.00
Car assembly worker	15.50
ESB clerk	10.50 to 30.10
Bus conductor	14.20 to 14.90
Building labourer	12.00 to 14.30
Shop assistant	11.80 to 15.00
Hotel waiter	7.90 to 12.30
Railway porter	11.60 to 14.20
Agricultural labourer	11.60 to 12.00

⁸The figures for the school teacher and the ESB clerk represent salary scales; the other sets of figures represent the highest and lowest rates for each particular job in different locations and conditions. It should be remembered that these figures for weekly rates of wages are not necessarily much of a guide to actual earnings which are affected in many jobs by overtime, payment by results, shift allowances and various other factors.

This comparison with the current rates shows that for all but the salaried occupations the medians of the views for fair pay were higher than the then current rates, especially for locations outside of Dublin. As regards the salaried occupations, for married primary school teachers the salary-scale was £975 to £1,825 per annum, i.e. £18·80 to £35·10 per week in decimal currency, which means that the median of the views on fair pay of £24·80 fell below the middle of the scale, although respondents had been asked to think of a man aged 40, and therefore presumably at the top of his scale. Similarly for the ESB clerk the scale was £544 to £1,567 per annum, equivalent to £10·50 to £30·10 per week, and again the median of the views on fair pay fell below the middle of the current salary scales.

As regards the average differentials which emerge from the sample's views on fair pay for the eleven occupations, it can be seen that they amounted to a total difference of as little as £19·40 between the factory manager and the agricultural labourer. In addition, the smallness of the average differential between the shop assistant and hotel waiter, the latter and the railway porter, the railway porter and the agricultural worker, all below £0·50 (10/-), should be noted.

Comparison of respondents' views on fair pay for the four basic types of occupation with their views for a relevant specific occupation provides an interesting cross-check in this context, and the medians on fair pay for similar work are set out below:

		<i>Median</i>	
Comparison 1	Electrician	£20·40	difference £0·50
	Skilled worker	£19·90	
Comparison 2	ESB clerk	£18·50	difference £0·60
	Clerical worker (lower grades)	£17·90	
Comparison 3	Car assembly worker	£19·60	difference £3·50
	Semi-skilled worker	£16·10	
Comparison 4	Agricultural worker	£15·10	difference £0·30
	Unskilled worker	£14·80	

It can be seen that the differences are very small, nearer to 10/- than to £1 for all but the car assembly worker. The tendency to name a slightly higher figure for the named occupations than for the broad occupational groups is thus probably unimportant. In fact the consistency in the figures is striking, considering the two questions were well separated. In the case of the car assembly worker, respondents may have thought that these are skilled workers

or they may have been influenced by a belief that car workers generally receive high incomes, although the current basic rate for a 40-hour week for car assembly workers in Dublin was only £15.50.

We may ask next: how far did people in different social grades name different amounts as appropriate pay for the different occupations? To examine this issue the answers for each occupation were divided into amounts above the sample medians, amounts representing the medians and amounts below the medians, and related to social grade. The findings are presented in Table 6(a) for the eleven occupations and in Table 6(b) for the four broader occupational groups. In studying this table it should be remembered that social grade is at the same time an indicator of respondents' income level.

Table 6(a) shows a clear relation between respondents' social grade and the size of the amount named as fair pay for most of the eleven occupations. Overall, the higher the social grade the higher was the percentage giving amounts *above* the sample medians and, conversely, the lower the social grade the higher the percentage giving amounts *below* the median. Exceptions were a slight tendency for men in social grade AB to give lower figures for railway porters and building labourers than were given by men in grades C1 and C2, and the answers given by men in grade C2 for agricultural workers.

TABLE 6(a)*: Respondents' social grade related to the size of amounts named as fair pay for the eleven occupations

Occupation and size of amount regarded as fair pay for it	Social grade			
	AB N=168	C1 N=168	C2 N=258	DE N=490
	%	%	%	%
Factory manager (Median £35)**				
£34 and below	21.4	41.9	52.1	60.0
£35	11.7	12.3	16.1	13.9
£36 and above	66.7	45.6	31.3	25.8
Schoolteacher (Median £25)				
£24 and below	16.6	26.9	48.4	55.8
£25	13.0	23.3	21.2	22.1
£26 and above	70.4	49.5	30.4	21.9
Electrician (Median £20)				
£19 and below	18.5	19.9	18.8	27.4
£20	22.8	29.7	30.6	35.1
£21 and above	58.7	50.2	50.7	37.4
Car assembly worker (Median £20)				
£19 and below	40.3	39.5	48.8	48.1
£20	23.6	29.3	30.4	33.2
£21 and above	35.9	31.0	20.8	18.8

TABLE 6(a)—Continued

	Social grade			
	AB N=168	C1 N=168	C2 N=258	DE N=490
	%	%	%	%
ESB clerk (Median £19)				
£18 and below	30.0	35.4	54.0	60.9
£19	0.6	0.6	1.2	3.1
£20 and above	69.2	64.0	44.5	36.0
Bus conductor (Median £18)				
£17 and below	41.6	46.0	46.9	51.0
£18	15.3	18.8	20.9	20.8
£19 and above	42.8	35.0	32.3	28.1
Building labourer (Median £17)				
£16 and below	53.1	42.9	45.5	50.1
£17	7.4	9.7	7.8	8.1
£18 and above	39.4	47.2	47.0	41.9
Shop assistant (Median £16)				
£15 and below	26.9	28.3	34.3	48.6
£16	7.4	14.5	22.7	14.4
£17 and above	65.7	57.2	43.1	36.8
Hotel waiter (Median £16)				
£15 and below	28.9	37.2	45.5	53.1
£16	13.0	12.4	15.0	12.3
£17 and above	58.1	50.0	39.3	34.2
Railway porter (Median £16)				
£15 and below	50.7	43.1	44.9	53.7
£16	10.5	15.2	19.0	16.0
£17 and above	38.8	41.8	36.2	30.0
Agricultural labourer (Median £15)				
£14 and below	28.7	29.7	35.6	41.7
£15	28.2	29.7	14.8	21.9
£16 and above	42.8	40.6	49.8	36.3

*The answers in each group do not always add up to 100% as some respondents gave "don't know" answers.

**As stated earlier, respondents gave amounts in round figures, and for the purposes of this table therefore the medians have been rounded off to the nearest £ as reference points.

In the evidence for the broader occupational groups (Table 6 (b)), an additional factor can be seen to have influenced the answers; this was a tendency for respondents to name slightly higher amounts for their own or a kindred occupational group. Thus a higher percentage of men in social grade C1 (mainly intermediate non-manual workers) gave figures above the sample median for clerical workers. Men in social grade C2 (mainly skilled workers) and men in social grade DE (mainly semi-skilled and unskilled workers) gave slightly more favourable figures for unskilled workers. By contrast, social

TABLE 6(b)*: Respondents' social grade related to the size of amounts named as fair pay for the four occupational groups

Occupational group and size of amount named as fair pay for it	Social grade			
	AB N=168	C1 N=168	C2 N=258	DE N=490
	%	%	%	%
Skilled workers (Median £20)**				
£19 and below	31.8	32.2	28.3	43.3
£20	32.5	27.9	38.8	36.2
£21 and above	35.4	29.6	32.7	20.4
Clerical workers (lower grades) (Median £18)				
£17 and below	39.3	41.0	41.7	51.2
£18	13.1	6.2	14.5	13.8
£19 and above	47.4	52.8	43.7	34.9
Semi-skilled workers (Median £16)				
£15 and below	42.1	36.2	34.7	45.1
£16	12.4	12.3	15.2	16.6
£17 and above	45.3	51.5	50.1	38.3
Unskilled workers (Median £15)				
£14 and below	51.9	42.6	37.5	43.3
£15	29.0	23.8	21.1	21.5
£16 and above	19.1	33.5	41.5	34.9

*, **See footnotes to Table 6(a).

grade AB tended to give comparatively lower figures for semi-skilled and unskilled workers, which could be a sign of greater social and occupational distance or of greater inclination to reward training and skill.

Two separate sets of forces thus appeared to affect the answers given by the social grade sub-groups. Firstly, as regards the *level* of the figures in the hierarchy for fair pay there was a tendency for men in the higher social grades to think of higher figures as fair. Secondly, as regards *relative* position in the pay hierarchy there was a tendency to give somewhat higher figures for their own or kindred groups or to give lower figures for non-kindred groups, the latter tendency being particularly prevalent in social grade AB *vis-a-vis* unskilled work.

As pointed out, the "kindred type of work influence" was more noticeable in the social grade analysis for the answers with regard to the broad occupational groups. As regards the eleven specific occupations only very small numbers of respondents in the sample belonged to any of these occupations, the numbers ranging from one ESB clerk to forty-one building labourers (3.8 per cent). Their answers could thus make no significant difference to the

distributions. However, a check of the answers given by respondents for their own occupations was made and revealed no noticeable tendency towards big divergences from the median amounts named by the sample as a whole.

It must not be assumed that differences in the *level* of figures for fair pay given by sub-groups of the sample imply that these sub-groups are at the same time allotting different *relative* positions in the pay-structure. Two separate types of analysis are used to find out how much consensus there was on relative positions in the pay-structure. The first of these compares the rank-order and size of the median answers given by respondents in the four social grades for fair pay for the eleven occupations and the four occupational groups and these comparisons are set out in Table 7 (a) and (b).

As already pointed out Table 7 compares the order and size of the median answers given by respondents in the four social grades for fair pay for eleven occupations and four occupational groups. Taking first the question of the relative positions in the pay-structure allotted by the four sub-groups, the most interesting finding is the high average level of consensus on the rank-order. Only

TABLE 7 (a): Respondents' social grade related to the amounts named as fair pay for the eleven occupations—medians and differentials between adjacent medians.*

Occupation	Social grade			
	AB	C1	C2	DE
Factory manager	£40·50	£34·80	£30·90	£30·50
School teacher	£30·30	£25·50	£24·60	£22·30
Electrician	£22·30	£20·70	£20·70	£20·10
Car assembly worker	£19·90	£19·90	£19·50	£19·60
ESB clerk	£20·70	£20·60	£18·30	£17·90
Bus conductor	£18·00	£17·70	£17·70	£17·40
Building labourer	£16·30	£17·20	£17·10	£16·50
Shop assistant	£17·90	£17·40	£16·20	£15·60
Hotel waiter	£17·50	£16·50	£15·80	£15·30
Railway porter	£15·50	£16·00	£15·80	£15·30
Agricultural labourer	£15·30	£15·20	£15·50	£14·90
Total difference	£25·20	£19·60	£15·40	£15·60

*The differentials where the median amount for the second occupation in the comparison was higher than that for the first are underlined in this table, and thus highlight the important divergences of view between the social grades.

TABLE 7(b): Respondents' social grade related to the amounts named as fair pay for the four occupational groups—medians and differentials between adjacent medians

Occupational groups	Social grade			
	AB	C ₁	C ₂	DE
Skilled workers	£20·10	£20·00	£20·10	£19·70
Clerical workers (lower grades)	£18·30	£19·50	£18·10	£17·30
Semi-skilled workers	£16·10	£16·60	£16·50	£15·80
Unskilled workers	£14·40	£14·80	£15·10	£14·80
Total difference	£5·70	£5·20	£5·00	£4·90

in the case of two occupations does a conflict in the rank-order emerge. This concerns the position of the ESB clerk *vis-a-vis* the car assembly worker, and the relative positions of the building labourer and the male shop assistant. The median amounts given by the four social grades as fair for the car assembly worker fell within eight shillings of each other but they differed markedly for the ESB clerk; the men in social grades AB and C₁ (both representing mainly non-manual workers) gave figures which ranked the ESB clerk above the car assembly worker, and the men in social grades C₂ and DE (both representing mainly manual workers) gave lower figures for the ESB clerk, thus placing him below the car assembly worker. For shop assistants the median amounts for fair pay given by social grades AB and C₁ were higher than those for building labourers, whereas the median amounts named by social grades C₂ and DE were lower for shop assistants than for building labourers. It also emerged that on average the men in social grade AB placed hotel waiters £2 above railway porters while the men in grades C₂ and DE did not make a distinction between the pay for these two occupations.

Scrutiny of the amounts of the median answers given by the respondents in the four social grades for the top and bottom occupations in the lists (and of the average differentials between medians) shows up interesting cases of agreement and disagreement. For instance, as far as the median views of the social grades were concerned there was a high level of consensus on the amount appropriate for the floor of the pay-structure, namely the unskilled workers and among them the agricultural labourers; for them the medians all fell within a few decimal points of each other, and overall £15 may be said to emerge as the average view of all social grades. On the other hand, the fair pay views for the occupations given top ranks in the pay-structure showed marked differences. For instance the median amount named as fair pay for the factory manager by men in social grade AB was £10 more than the median amount named by men in social grade DE, and for the school teacher it was £8 more. Correspondingly the differences between the medians tended to be

TABLE 8: Comparison of the amounts named as appropriate pay for the eleven occupations

(a)

<i>Should get more pay than</i>	→ <i>Factory manager</i>	<i>School teacher</i>	<i>Electrician</i>	<i>Car assembly worker</i>	<i>ESB clerk</i>	<i>Bus conductor</i>	<i>Building labourer</i>	<i>Shop assistant</i>	<i>Hotel waiter</i>	<i>Railway porter</i>	<i>Agricultural labourer</i>
↑	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Factory manager	*	76.1	91.6	92.1	91.4	93.7	93.9	93.8	92.7	93.6	94.3
School teacher	5.9	*	61.1	75.5	76.7	84.8	84.6	89.6	87.8	91.1	91.3
Electrician	0.9	18.4	*	59.1	61.4	83.2	87.3	88.8	85.1	91.0	92.5
Car assembly worker	0.8	8.4	3.8	*	35.0	55.3	64.3	69.8	68.6	77.0	80.8
ESB clerk	0.4	5.5	12.1	28.8	*	49.7	57.3	65.9	66.4	71.5	74.4
Bus conductor	0.3	4.4	3.3	11.7	20.1	*	40.4	46.6	51.5	59.8	67.5
Building labourer	0.5	5.1	1.9	8.7	17.5	22.6	*	40.6	44.8	48.2	56.5
Shop assistant	0.1	1.4	0.8	6.8	8.6	12.5	27.4	*	35.3	40.8	50.9
Hotel waiter	0.3	1.9	1.7	7.3	10.2	17.0	25.3	23.0	*	32.7	45.3
Railway porter	0.2	0.7	0.5	2.3	6.4	5.3	13.1	19.0	21.9	*	38.7
Agricultural labourer	0.2	1.8	0.5	3.4	7.4	7.7	7.1	19.1	23.4	19.4	*

higher, the higher the social grade. The overall effect is that the median views for fair pay of the respondents in the four social grades present pay-structures of different lengths. Thus while the difference in the medians for fair pay for the top and bottom occupations given by social grade AB amounted to £25, it was only just over £15 for social grades C2 and DE. The evidence suggests that the higher a person's income the greater are the differentials which he considers fair at the upper end of the income structure.

The second analysis to find out how much consensus there was on the relative positions of the eleven occupations in the pay-structure among individual respondents used again the method of paired comparisons described earlier. Table 8 (a) presents the percentage of sample respondents who gave a higher amount for fair pay for one of the occupations in the comparison, and Table 8 (b) gives the percentage of sample respondents who gave the same amount for fair pay for the two occupations which are being compared.

In Table 8(a) the percentages *above* the diagonal are the important ones—the higher they are, the higher is the degree of consensus on the relative pay positions of the two occupations. Thus the top horizontal line reveals that there was an extremely high consensus that the factory manager should be paid more than any of the other occupations. Except in the comparison with teachers, over 90 per cent of the respondents gave higher amounts as fair for him than for the other occupations. Consensus on the position of the teacher was also very high; over 75 per cent (except in comparison with the electrician) gave higher amounts as fair for him than for the other occupations. Thirdly, consensus was very high as regards the position of the electrician, although a third of the men in the sample gave the same amount as fair pay for him as for the car assembly worker.

As regards the remaining occupations and their relative positions, the table reveals evidence of lack of consensus, among them instances already identified. In particular there are twelve comparisons where the most frequent answers represented the views of less than half the sample (i.e. less than 50 per cent). The four occupations about whose relative pay there appeared to be least agreement were shop assistants, hotel waiters, building labourers and railway porters. For instance, 41 per cent of the respondents gave a higher figure for the building labourer than for the shop assistant, but 29 per cent gave the same figure and 27 per cent less, which means that overall only a minority put them higher. Again, 36 per cent gave the same amount as fair for the hotel waiter and the shop assistant and almost the same percentage (35 per cent) named a higher amount for the shop assistant. While 33 per cent gave a higher figure as fair for the hotel waiter than the railway porter, a higher percentage (40 per cent) gave the same figure for both. As regards railway porters and agricultural labourers, the same percentage gave a higher amount for railway porters as gave the same amount for both, namely 39 per cent. For shop assistants and railway porters the difference in numbers between those giving a higher amount and those giving the same amount was also

small. Among the more skilled occupations the most important difference was that only 35 per cent of the respondents gave a higher figure for the car assembly workers than for the ESB clerk, while 29 per cent gave the same figure, and another 29 per cent a lower amount, which means that overall only a minority put the car assembly worker higher.

This lack of consensus may be due to differences of opinion both between and within social grades. To locate its incidence the answers for the twelve comparisons just discussed and for four others were related to social grade and are presented in Table 9.

TABLE 9: Respondents' social grade related to selected paired comparisons* of the amounts named as appropriate pay for the eleven occupations

	Social grade			
	AB N=168	C1 N=168	C2 N=258	DE N=490
	%	%	%	%
Figure given for electrician				
MORE than car assembly worker	63.7	54.8	68.2	54.3
SAME as "	29.2	38.7	27.5	34.7
LESS than "	3.0	4.2	1.2	5.3
Don't know	4.2	2.4	3.1	5.7
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%
Figure given for electrician				
MORE than ESB clerk	50.0	43.4	72.1	65.9
SAME as "	21.4	26.8	15.9	20.4
LESS than "	25.0	25.6	6.2	6.1
Don't know	3.6	4.2	5.8	7.6
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%
Figure given for car assembly worker				
MORE than ESB clerk	22.7	22.6	35.6	43.1
SAME as "	30.4	25.0	34.6	27.9
LESS than "	42.8	47.6	23.6	20.2
Don't know	4.2	4.8	6.2	8.8
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%
Figure given for ESB clerk				
MORE than bus conductor	64.3	66.1	45.0	41.6
SAME as "	19.6	18.4	27.9	25.3
LESS than "	13.1	11.3	21.3	24.9
Don't know	3.0	4.2	5.8	8.2
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%

TABLE 9—Continued

	Social grade			
	AB N=168	C1 N=168	C2 N=258	DE N=490
	%	%	%	%
Figure given for bus conductor				
MORE than building labourer	53.6	42.3	37.2	36.9
SAME as "	29.8	35.7	38.4	32.9
LESS than "	13.1	20.2	22.9	26.5
Don't know	3.6	1.8	1.5	3.7
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%
Figure given for bus conductor				
MORE than shop assistant	35.1	35.1	47.3	54.1
SAME as "	40.5	45.2	39.1	32.2
LESS than "	21.4	17.8	10.5	8.8
Don't know	3.0	1.8	3.1	4.9
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%
Figure given for bus conductor				
MORE than hotel waiter	42.8	44.0	53.1	56.1
SAME as "	31.0	31.5	26.4	23.1
LESS than "	22.6	20.2	15.5	14.7
Don't know	3.6	4.2	5.0	6.1
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%
Figure given for building labourer				
MORE than shop assistant	23.8	29.8	46.1	47.1
SAME as "	26.2	29.2	27.5	30.4
LESS than "	46.4	39.3	23.6	18.8
Don't know	3.6	1.8	2.7	3.7
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%
Figure given for building labourer				
MORE than hotel waiter	23.8	37.5	48.1	52.8
SAME as "	28.6	26.8	25.6	22.7
LESS than "	44.0	31.5	21.7	18.6
Don't know	3.6	4.2	4.6	5.9
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%
Figure given for building labourer				
MORE than railway porter	39.3	40.5	48.4	53.9
SAME as "	43.5	42.8	36.4	30.4
LESS than "	13.7	14.9	12.8	12.4
Don't know	3.6	1.8	2.4	3.3
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%

TABLE 9—Continued

	Social grade			
	AB N=168	C1 N=168	C2 N=258	DE N=490
	%	%	%	%
Figure given for shop assistant				
MORE than hotel waiter	32.1	38.7	35.3	35.3
SAME as "	41.1	36.3	35.3	35.3
LESS than "	23.2	20.8	23.6	23.3
Don't know	3.6	4.2	5.8	6.1
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%
Figure given for shop assistant				
MORE than railway porter	58.3	53.0	34.9	33.7
SAME as "	31.5	34.5	38.7	37.9
LESS than "	6.5	10.7	22.5	24.3
Don't know	3.6	1.8	3.9	4.1
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%
Figure given for shop assistant				
MORE than agricultural labourer	63.7	60.7	46.9	45.1
SAME as "	24.4	23.8	28.7	27.9
LESS than "	8.9	13.7	21.3	23.3
Don't know	3.0	1.8	3.1	3.7
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%
Figure given for hotel waiter				
MORE than railway porter	53.0	38.7	25.6	27.6
SAME as "	36.3	36.9	46.1	39.8
LESS than "	7.1	20.2	23.6	26.5
Don't know	3.6	4.2	4.7	6.1
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%
Figure given for hotel waiter				
MORE than agricultural labourer	64.2	57.1	39.1	39.2
SAME as "	21.4	18.5	29.1	27.8
LESS than "	10.7	20.2	26.4	27.3
Don't know	3.6	4.2	5.4	5.7
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%
Figure given for railway porter				
MORE than agricultural labourer	34.5	45.2	37.6	38.6
SAME as "	47.0	33.3	39.1	37.7
LESS than "	14.9	19.6	20.2	20.4
Don't know	3.6	1.8	3.1	3.3
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%

*The comparisons selected were those where there was least consensus on relative positions.

Table 9 shows up first of all that for the twelve comparisons where less than 50 per cent of the whole sample had agreed on the relative positions of the comparison occupations, there was also lack of agreement in the majority of cases within each social grade. One exception was in the comparison of the ESB clerk with the bus conductor where, as far as social grades AB and C1 were concerned, a two-thirds majority considered higher pay appropriate for the ESB clerk than for the bus conductor. Also a similar majority in grade AB and a smaller one in grade C1 gave a higher figure for the hotel waiter than for the agricultural labourer.

Secondly, it can be seen from Table 9 that some of the men in social grades C1 (intermediate non-manual workers) and C2 (mainly skilled workers) showed a tendency to name higher figures for their own occupation when this was compared with another. Thus a noticeably higher percentage of respondents in social grade C2 (72 per cent) than in the other social grades gave higher figures for the electrician than the ESB clerk. In the case of the men in social grade C1 the corresponding percentage was only 43.4 per cent. Also, a greater percentage of the men in social grade C2 than in grades C1 and DE gave a higher figure for the electrician than the car assembly worker, probably because they were more conscious of the skill differential. Further, a higher percentage of men in grade C1 placed the ESB clerk above the car assembly worker and above the bus conductor than of the men in the other social grades. Further, the evidence suggests that men gave slightly higher figures for kindred work, namely in the case of men in social grades AB and C1 for non-manual work, and in the case of men in social grades C2 and DE for manual work.

The third—more personal—question about fair pay for different occupations explored the respondents' ideas on inequities in the pay-structure of the organization for which they worked by asking: "*Is there any group of people where you work who you feel get less pay than they should?*" On this the replies revealed that nearly half the respondents considered that some of the employees at their place of work were underpaid. Thus 533 men (49 per cent of the sample) felt that there were people at their place of work who received less pay than they should, while the majority of the remainder (45 per cent) said that they did not think there were any and a small minority that they did not know whether there were any. The respondents who felt that some people were underpaid were further asked: "*What job are these people in?*" This follow-up question produced a variety of responses, many different occupations being named, often related to very specific job situations. The most important finding was that about a third of the 533 men mentioned their own job, thus apparently expressing discontent about their own pay and their own position in the pay-structure. However two-thirds of the respondents mentioned different jobs from their own, thus expressing concern for fellow-employees.

To discover the reason for thinking that a group of people at their place of work were underpaid, the 533 men were asked: "*Why do you feel they (i.e. 'these people') are underpaid?*" To this the answers may be summarised as follows:

<i>Answer</i>	<i>Number of respondents</i>	<i>Percentage of 533 respondents</i>
Cost of living	199	37·3
In comparison with other people	98	18·4
They work so hard/do a large amount of work	55	10·3
People in their job are usually underpaid	25	4·7
They work long hours	24	4·5
They do unhealthy/dirty/dangerous work, where pay is usually higher	23	4·3
They are not paid enough for the responsibility of their jobs	23	4·3
They have had a long training/education	18	3·4
They have no chance of promotion; promotion is too slow	18	3·4
Their work is not appreciated	12	2·3
Other reasons	38	7·1
	533	100%

These answers reveal the interesting finding that the most frequent specific statement made for considering that certain people were underpaid was "the cost of living"—a reason concerned more with the level of pay than with differentials or equity. This view was voiced by 37 per cent of the men asked this question and was given considerably more often than the reason "comparison with others", an answer given by 18 per cent of the 533 men. Most of the remaining answers gave specific work factors as reference frames, which were either factors connected with compensation for specific conditions of work, or factors warranting rewards for specialist contributions. Overall, compensation for hard work, long hours, and unpleasant and trying features of the work situation was considered inadequate by 24 per cent of the men asked this question, and rewards for responsibility or education and training by 8 per cent. The comment by 12 men that the work of some of their fellow employees was not sufficiently appreciated suggests concern about the management's attitudes to individuals.

Next, respondents' views on whether anyone at their place of employment received less pay than they should were related to their occupation and age, and this evidence is presented in Tables 10 and 11.

TABLE 10: Respondents' age related to their views as to whether any people at their place of work were underpaid*

Answer to question: "Is there any group of people where you work who you feel get less pay than they should?"	Respondents' age				
	20-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60-69
Yes	51.6	54.9	49.4	45.6	37.1
No	42.1	41.6	45.6	46.6	52.4
Don't know	6.3	3.5	5.0	7.8	10.5
Total	100% N=254	100% N=255	100% N=259	100% N=206	100% N=105

*There were 5 respondents who did not give their age.

TABLE 11: Respondents' occupation related to their views as to whether any people at their place of work were underpaid

Answer to question: "Is there any group of people where you work who you feel get less pay than they should?"	Occupation			
	Non-manual workers*	Skilled	Manual workers Semi-skilled	Unskilled
Yes	45.5	51.8	60.0	39.7
No	46.1	43.0	37.6	53.9
Don't know	8.4	5.2	2.4	6.4
Total	100% N=321	100% N=249	100% N=210	100% N=232

*Non-clerical junior non-manual workers were not included in this category but were classified as "Other" together with personal service workers and members of the Armed Forces. See Appendix B to first report, *op. cit.*

Table 10 indicates that the 30-39 age group were most inclined to answer "yes", while men in the 60-69 age group were most inclined to answer "no" or "don't know". Table 11 shows that of the four occupational groups semi-skilled manual workers were most ready to name a group of workers whom they felt to be underpaid, and that unskilled workers were least likely to name a group.

An additional finding was that a slightly higher percentage of manual workers (19 per cent) than of non-manual workers (13 per cent) named their own job, and that a higher percentage of manual workers (21 per cent) than non-manual workers (13 per cent) gave the cost of living as a reason for

their view. The manual workers were also more inclined to mention compensation for hard or unpleasant features connected with the work situation, these being instanced by 14 per cent of them as compared with 5 per cent of non-manual workers. The latter were slightly more inclined to talk about inadequate rewards for responsibility, education or training (6.5 per cent as compared with 2.7 per cent); they were also the main people to mention promotion. On "comparability" however there was hardly any difference, with 10 per cent of the non-manual workers and 9 per cent of the manual workers giving this reason.

CHAPTER 2. VIEWS ON THE ECONOMIC SITUATION.

To explore the respondents' views on the economic situation they were asked one personal and one general question. The personal one and the distribution of replies are set out below:

"Thinking about yourself, would you say that you can afford a better living today than a few years back, or about the same, or a poorer living?"

<i>Answer</i>	<i>Number of respondents</i>	<i>Percentage of 1084 respondents</i>
Can afford a better living	559	51.6
Can afford about the same	333	30.7
Can afford a poorer living	182	16.8
Don't know	8	0.7
No answer	2	0.2
	<hr/> 1,084	<hr/> 100%

These answers reveal the interesting finding that, while only just over half the respondents felt that their standard of living had improved over the last few years, a third considered that it had remained the same and 17 per cent felt that their standard of living had deteriorated. This view of the way standards of living had developed may be compared with other answers. For instance, as just discussed, the cost of living was the most frequent reason given for considering that certain groups of people at the respondent's place of work received less pay than they should. Another finding was that a third of the respondents gave the cost of living as a reason for expecting their next pay-increase to be larger than the previous one.⁹

This suggests that a considerable proportion of the sample felt that increases in pay were not-keeping up with rising prices. It can be argued that the per-

⁹See first report, op. cit., p. 16.

ception that pay is not keeping pace with the rising cost of living is likely to lead to demands for bigger pay-increases, and some evidence to support this was found when the answers on respondents' present standard of living were related to their expectations regarding the size of their next pay-increase. This showed that a higher percentage (57 per cent) of the men who expected their next pay increase to be larger than of the men who expected their next pay increase to be smaller (49 per cent) thought they had a better standard of living than in the past.

What were the characteristics of the men who considered that they had a better or worse standard of living than in the past? To find out, the answers were related to the respondents' social grade, occupation and income, all of them interrelated variables, and the results are set out in Tables 12, 13 and 14.

TABLE 12: Views given by respondents in different income groups on their standard of living.*

Answer	Respondents' Income Group, £s per week					
	12 and Under	Over 12 up to 16	Over 16 up to 20	Over 20 up to 25	Over 25 up to 30	Over 30
	%	%	%	%	%	%
Can afford a better living	32.6	43.1	53.6	65.4	69.3	61.4
Can afford about the same	41.1	35.4	29.4	20.9	21.3	26.0
Can afford a poorer living	24.0	20.8	15.8	13.1	9.3	11.8
Don't know, no answer	2.3	0.7	1.2	0.7	0.0	0.8
Total	100% N=129	100% N=288	100% N=265	100% N=153	100% N=75	100% N=127

*There were 47 respondents for whom no income data were available.

TABLE 13: Views given by respondents in different social grades on their standard of living.

Answer	Respondents' social grade			
	AB	C1	C2	DE
	%	%	%	%
Can afford a better living	61.3	56.5	55.8	44.3
Can afford about the same	25.6	31.5	27.9	33.7
Can afford a poorer living	11.3	11.3	15.9	21.0
Don't know, no answer	1.8	0.6	0.4	1.0
Total	100% N=168	100% N=168	100% N=258	100% N=490

TABLE 14: *Views of respondents in different occupational groups on their standard of living.*

Answer	Non-manual workers	Manual workers		
		Skilled	Semi-skilled	Unskilled
	%	%	%	%
Can afford a better living	60.1	55.0	48.1	40.5
Can afford about the same	27.4	28.5	32.9	35.3
Can afford a poorer living	11.5	16.1	18.6	22.8
Don't know, no answer	0.9	0.4	0.5	1.3
Total	100% N=321	100% N=249	100% N=210	100% N=232

The tables show clearly that there were considerable differences in the replies of the better-off sections of the community compared with those from the poorer sections. Thus a sizeable majority of respondents in the high income-groups and in non-manual work, particularly social grade AB, considered that they *could* afford a better living than a few years back, while a sizeable majority of the respondents with an income of less than £12 and of the unskilled workers did *not* feel that their standard of living had improved—indeed about a quarter of them felt that it had deteriorated. Of the skilled workers and the sample's middle income-group (£16–20) over half considered they had a better living than before, but of the semi-skilled workers just under half thought so, and of those earning between £12 and £16 a week, 43 per cent.

An additional finding was that the oldest age-group, men of sixty years and over, had a less favourable view of the situation than the other age-groups. Only 44 per cent thought they had a better living in 1969 than in the past. Some of the implications of the above findings will be discussed in the final section of this report.

Meanwhile, we turn to the other question in this area which was formulated to explore respondents' ideas on the general economic situation. For this objective one crucial economic subject area was selected, namely that of problems connected with the Irish dependence on exports. The pilot studies had suggested that this topic was the one most suitable for our purpose, especially as the question finally selected appeared to present no problem of communication as far as vocabulary was concerned; the wording was generally understood although the complexity of the issues raised was not necessarily appreciated.

The choice was a two-part question about the prospects of Irish exports. It was anticipated that the set of answers would show up two things: firstly, whether the outlook was felt to be favourable or not, which would in itself give an indication as to whether the men felt greater and more efficient work effort was needed in Ireland (part 1 of the question), and secondly, whether the respondents were aware of the problems posed for Irish exports by rising costs, or in other words of the importance of competitive prices for the Irish balance of payments (part 2 of the question).

Part 1 of the question read: "Do you think it will become more difficult to sell Irish goods abroad in the next few years?" Part 2 consisted of two open-ended follow-up questions, one put to the people who answered "yes", namely "Why do you think it will become more difficult?" and the other to the people who answered "no", namely "Why do you think it will not become more difficult?" The replies to the first question are set out below:

Question	Answer	Number of respondents	Percentage of 1,084 respondents
Do you think it will become more difficult to sell Irish goods abroad in the next few years?	Yes	521	48.1
	No	456	42.1
	Don't know	107	9.9
		1,084	100%

The replies show that just under half the respondents thought that Irish exports would run into difficulties in the next few years. Forty-two per cent by contrast were optimistic about the future of Irish exports, while 10 per cent did not express an opinion. It would thus appear that just over half the respondents did not see the maintenance of Ireland's position in world markets as a problem which required special effort. What information emerged from the answers to the follow-up questions which are presented in Table 15?

TABLE 15: *Reasons given by respondents for thinking it would or would not become more difficult to sell Irish goods abroad in the next few years.*^(a)

Follow-up question to "yes" response put to 521 respondents: "Why do you think it will become more difficult?"		Follow-up question to "no" response put to 456 respondents: "Why do you think it will not become more difficult?"	
Answer	Percentage of 1,084 respondents	Answer	Percentage of 1,084 respondents
	%		%
Keener competition	13.9	Exports are improving	5.2
Rising costs and prices	10.2	Irish prices should be able to hold their own	1.6
Quality of goods inferior	6.2 ^(b)	Quality of goods improving	16.8
Production methods/skills inadequate	4.5	Production methods improving	4.5
Marketing techniques inadequate	3.8	Marketing techniques improving	6.6
The Common Market	6.4	The Common Market	3.0
Other answers including "Don't know"	3.0	Other answers including "Don't know"	4.4
Total	48%	Total	42%

(a) The 107 men (9.9 per cent) who answered "don't know" to the main question are not included in this table.

(b) A further 2.1 per cent of the sample whose main answer was "keener competition" also said that the quality of Irish goods was inferior.

The two sets of answers in Table 15 provide some interesting comparisons, although none of the answer groups represent large sections of the sample. Thus, the most frequent reason given for considering that Irish exports would run into difficulties was that competition would become keener, a view expressed by 14 per cent of the sample; this contrasts with the view of the 5 per cent who said exports were improving. The most frequent answer of the men who did not think it would become more difficult to sell Irish goods abroad was that the quality of goods was improving, a statement made by 17 per cent of the sample. However, 8 per cent of the respondents expressed the view that the quality of Irish goods was inferior. Ten per cent of the men identified rising costs and prices as a factor which would make for future difficulties while a small minority of less than 2 per cent thought that Irish prices should be able to hold their own. Further, exactly the same number of men said production methods were adequate as inadequate. More men said that marketing techniques were improving than that this was a problem area. Also more of the people who mentioned the Common Market thought of it as a factor which would make exporting more difficult than not.¹⁰ Although the size of some of the answer groups is small, the choice of factors mentioned is interesting; in a way the mention of marketing and production techniques for instance shows sophistication.

However, on the main issue as to how far respondents were aware of the major problems affecting exports and the Irish balance of payments, the findings show that only a quarter of the respondents named keener competition and rising costs as factors which would make it more difficult to sell Irish goods abroad. Another 15 per cent criticised production and selling aspects which are contributory factors but not the crux of the problem. On the other side, as high a proportion as a third of the sample painted an optimistic picture of Irish export performance and these men thus showed little awareness of the dangers for the Irish economy posed by inflationary forces in 1969.

What then were the characteristics of the people who held such opposing views and who gave such contrasting explanations? To find out, the views of manual and non-manual workers are compared in Table 16.

The sub-totals in Table 16 show first of all that a higher percentage of non-manual than manual workers considered it would become more difficult to sell Irish goods abroad. They show secondly that non-manual workers were considerably more inclined to say "yes, it will become more difficult" than "no", while the percentage of manual workers who said "yes" was fractionally smaller than that saying "no".

On this issue examination of additional evidence also revealed important differences within the manual group in that a higher percentage of skilled workers saw difficulties ahead than of semi-skilled or unskilled workers. Skilled workers were also found to be more inclined to say "yes, it will become more difficult" than "no", while semi-skilled and unskilled workers were somewhat

¹⁰Respondents tended just to say "the Common Market"; where they were more specific, getting in or not getting in was given as a reason for either of the views.

more inclined to say "no" than "yes"; moreover about one-fifth of the unskilled men said "I don't know".

As regards the reasons given for expecting difficulties, it appears that the

TABLE 16: *Manual¹¹ and non-manual workers' views on prospects of Irish exports*

	<i>Non-manual workers</i>	<i>Manual workers</i>
(a) Selling abroad will become more difficult		
<i>Reason</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>
Keener competition	17.8	12.2
Rising costs and prices	15.9	7.7
Quality of goods inferior	3.4	7.5
Production methods/skills inadequate	4.7	4.6
Marketing techniques inadequate	5.3	3.0
The Common Market	7.8	5.9
Other answers including "Don't know"	2.5	2.9
	<hr/> 57.4	<hr/> 43.8
(b) Selling abroad will not become more difficult		
<i>Reason</i>		
Exports are improving	3.4	6.1
Irish prices should be able to hold their own	1.6	1.7
Quality of goods improving	14.6	17.7
Production methods improving	3.4	5.1
Marketing techniques improving	9.0	5.4
The Common Market	1.9	3.5
Other answers including "Don't know"	3.7	4.8
	<hr/> 37.6	<hr/> 44.3
(c) Don't know whether it will become more difficult	5.0	12.0
Total	<hr/> 100% N=321	<hr/> 100% N=691

¹¹The percentage breakdown of answers from the manual group was as follows:

	<i>Skilled workers</i>	<i>Semi-skilled workers</i>	<i>Unskilled workers</i>
Yes, it will become more difficult (to sell Irish goods abroad)	49.4	42.9	38.8
No, it will not become more difficult (to sell Irish goods abroad)	42.2	48.6	42.2
Don't know whether it will become more difficult	8.4	8.6	19.0
Total	<hr/> 100% N=249	<hr/> 100% N=210	<hr/> 100% N=232

one really important difference which emerges is that a much higher percentage of the non-manual workers (34 per cent) than of the manual workers (20 per cent) said "keener competition" or "rising costs and prices" would make exporting more difficult. The non-manual workers thus showed considerably greater awareness of some of the major factors which influence the success of Irish exports.

Next, Table 17 examines whether there is a relationship between respondents' age of finishing full-time education and their answers on exports.

TABLE 17: Respondents' age of finishing full-time education related to their views on Irish exports.

	Respondents' age of finishing full-time education			
	14 or under	15-16	17-18	19 or over
	%	%	%	%
(a) Selling abroad will become more difficult				
<i>Reason</i>				
Keener competition	12.2	12.2	16.8	19.5
Rising costs and prices	7.3	9.5	11.5	20.3
Quality of goods inferior	7.3	7.7	2.4	4.9
Production methods/skills inadequate	4.5	4.3	5.3	4.1
Marketing techniques inadequate	3.3	3.7	3.8	5.7
The Common Market	4.9	8.0	6.3	6.5
Other answers including "Don't know"	4.2	1.8	3.8	0.8
	43.7	47.2	49.9	61.8
(b) Selling abroad will not become more difficult				
<i>Reason</i>				
Exports are improving	7.1	4.0	4.3	3.3
Irish prices should be able to hold their own	0.9	1.8	2.4	1.6
Quality of goods improving	16.7	19.0	17.3	10.6
Production methods improving	4.5	4.6	5.3	3.3
Marketing techniques improving	4.9	7.7	7.7	8.1
The Common Market	3.5	3.1	1.4	3.3
Other answers including "Don't know"	4.5	4.0	5.8	3.2
	42.1	44.2	44.2	33.4
(c) Don't know whether it will become more difficult				
	14.1	8.6	5.8	4.9
Total	100% N=425	100% N=326	100% N=208	100% N=123

The sub-totals in this table reveal the important finding that men with a longer full-time education were more inclined to feel it would become more difficult to sell Irish goods abroad than the men with less education. Thus, of the men who were 19 years old or over when they finished their full-time education, a majority of 62 per cent considered that it would become more difficult to sell Irish goods abroad as compared with only 44 per cent of the men who left school at the age of 14 or under.

As regards the reasons given for expecting difficulties, an even greater difference is revealed in the percentages mentioning keener competition and rising costs and prices than in the previous table. Thus 40 per cent of the people who had received the longest education gave one of these reasons, compared with 28 per cent of the men who finished their education at the age of 17 or 18, 22 per cent of those leaving school aged 15 or 16, and 20 per cent of those with the shortest education. The men who had received most education thus appear to have been considerably more aware of the dangers which inflationary forces present for the Irish balance of payments than the men who had not received so much education.

CHAPTER 3. INTERPRETATION OF THE TERM "INCOMES POLICY".

Turning now to the topic of incomes policy and the meaning given to the term by the survey respondents, it is important to stress that incomes policy in the Republic of Ireland at the time of our survey in April 1969 was still in a comparatively early stage of development; however the case for an incomes policy had been publicly acknowledged and principles for it laid down by the NIEC.¹² Since the date of our survey events have taken place which have led once again to detailed discussions of the need for an incomes policy and of possible institutional arrangements for supporting it; NIEC in its 1970 *Report on Incomes and Prices Policy*¹³ reaffirmed the objectives of its earlier report and the need for action, the Employer-Labour Conference has been discussing a national framework pay agreement for the next wage round, and the Government has stated its intention to give statutory support, if necessary, to an incomes and prices policy.

¹²National Industrial Economic Council, *Report on Economic Situation 1965*, Report No. 11, Stationery Office, Dublin, Nov. 1965, pp. 7-10 and 37-49.

¹³NIEC Report No. 27, op. cit.

It is however clear that at the date of this survey Irish income-earners had not been exposed to an incomes policy to the same extent, as, for instance, income-earners in Britain where various types of official Government policies of income restraint have been in operation since 1948. It can of course be argued that there has been a tacitly accepted incomes policy in Ireland insofar as biennial wage-rounds have become institutionalised—a point which is borne out by the finding in this research that the phrase “general all-round pay-increase” was understood by all but a handful of respondents in the survey. Furthermore, in four of the eleven wage-rounds which had taken place by September 1968, national agreements had laid down formulae which set a maximum for pay-increases; at times therefore Irish income earners seem to have had the experience of a ceiling on increases.

However, on the role and objectives of an incomes policy in Ireland the individual's major sources of information in April 1969 would appear to have been the then available literature and ongoing discussions. In their 1965 Report the NIEC argued that at least three things were necessary if the continuity of Irish economic development was to be assured and that one of these was a policy for the planned development of incomes. They reported:

“Incomes policy has both an economic and a social purpose. It is a fundamental requirement for achieving the output, employment and export targets of the second programme; it has also a most important role to play in securing a more acceptable relationship between different categories of income.”

“... The minimum objective of an incomes policy is to ensure that aggregate money incomes rise at a maximum rate which is consistent with maintaining competitiveness and avoiding excessive pressure of demand. An incomes policy is not an instrument designed to prevent incomes from rising. Our concern, which is shared by all income receivers, is to ensure that in future increases in the total of money incomes will not have inflationary consequences involving (*inter alia*) an erosion of the real value of the increased money income.”

“... The first principle on which an incomes policy must be based is that increases in total money incomes must be related to increases in national production.”

How far has this NIEC statement and subsequent discussion of incomes policy and the issues involved been noted and understood by the country's income-earners? To assess this, respondents were asked the following set of questions: firstly, “Have you ever come across the term ‘incomes policy’?” and secondly, if the reply was “yes”, “What does the term ‘incomes policy’ mean to you?” The first

question served the purpose of identifying the men who felt they had never heard the phrase and revealed that over half the sample said they had never heard it—in itself an important finding. The open-ended follow-up question tried to ascertain how far those men who *had* heard the phrase were able to give it a meaningful interpretation, and gave rise to a wide variety of answers. Scrutiny of these showed that some respondents gave a reasonable description of the objectives of an incomes policy (in line with the NIEC statement); others gave less precise but relevant answers; still other men were decidedly vague though not wholly irrelevant in their responses, and finally there were people who were unable to give the term any meaning at all. This finding suggested that a four-fold classification of the answers, based on their meaningfulness, would be appropriate. The distribution of answers within the four categories to the question: “*What does the term ‘incomes policy’ mean to you?*” is presented opposite.

The answers show very clearly that at the time of the Irish sample survey, that is in the spring of 1969, the great majority of the respondents, namely 73 per cent, had either never heard the term “incomes policy” or were unable to give it a valid meaning; an additional 7 per cent had only extremely vague notions as to what the term involved. This means that only 20 per cent of the men gave the term some meaning, and only a small minority of 7 per cent can be considered as having been well informed on the subject. This finding is particularly important in the context of the current discussions on incomes policy in Ireland; it suggests that in 1969 male employees had little idea as to what incomes policy meant and it highlights the communications problem which exists on this matter.

The fact that there are serious communication problems in this area was shown up in a British study¹⁴ in February 1966 when the vast majority of a representative sample of the British male and female population was found to have little idea of the content of the Labour Government’s long-term incomes policy which had been in force for over a year at the time of the survey. This was all the more striking as the Labour Government’s incomes policy was not the first policy of its kind in Britain; there had been official policies of wage-restraint in 1948 and 1961 and the Conservative Government’s “guiding light” policy of 1962, putting forward a norm of 2½% per year for income-increases, which was raised to 3¼% in 1962. This was succeeded by the Labour Government’s norm of 3–3½% for income-increases which was in force at the time of the survey. Furthermore, successive governments had repeatedly stressed the need to keep income-increases in line with productivity increases so as to halt inflation and price-increases.

In the British study, the respondents in the sample were asked to describe (in their own words) the Government’s incomes policy, and the answers were

¹⁴See Hilde Behrend, Harriet Lynch and Jean Davies, *A National Survey of Attitudes to Inflation and Incomes Policy*, Occasional Papers in Social and Economic Administration No. 7, Edutext Publications (1966), Section VII, p. 25. The British research is sponsored by the Social Science Research Council.

<i>Categorization of answers to question:</i> "What does the term 'incomes policy' mean to you?"	<i>Number of respondents</i>	<i>Percentage of 1,084 respondents</i>
<i>Group A—Well informed</i>		
Clear answers showing that respondent understood the objectives of an incomes policy e.g.:		
"Policy to relate incomes to productivity"		
"Keep rises in incomes within scope of gross national productivity"		
"Country tries to steady its inflation by keeping increases to 2% or 3% per annum"	76	7.0
<i>Group B—Less specific but relevant</i>		
(a) Answers mentioning control of income or income increases, e.g.:		
"Policy laid down by Government to control increases"		
"Controlled pay rises"		
"A set pay scale for a given job for a given period"	90 (8.3%)	
(b) Answers mentioning objectives in the field of social justice, related to need, e.g.:		
"A policy to determine a living wage for all types of workers"	35 (3.2%)	
(c) Answers mentioning objectives in the field of social justice, related to what is fair for particular work contributions, e.g.:		
"The Government works out a policy that the worker according to his ability gets paid a set rate"	<u>12 (1.1%)</u>	137
		12.6
<i>Group C—Vague but not wholly irrelevant</i>		
Answers such as:		
"Rationalization of incomes"		
"It relates to employment productivity"		
"Relating incomes to jobs"	78	7.2
<i>Group D—Irrelevant, meaningless or "No answer"</i>		
Answers where respondents had never come across the phrase or were unable to give it any valid meaning, e.g.:		
"I have heard it but don't know what it means"	793	73.2
Total	<u>1,084</u>	<u>100%</u>

categorized with the help of a four-fold classification which was similar to the Irish one. The evidence for the sub-group which comprised men working full-time is of greatest interest here and for them the comparison with the Irish survey is set out below:

<i>Type of answer</i>	<i>Irish Survey 1969</i>	<i>British Survey 1966¹⁵</i>
	%	%
Group A—Well informed	7.0	15.2
Group B—Less specific but relevant	12.6	16.6
Group C—Vague but not wholly irrelevant	7.2	15.0
Group D—Irrelevant, meaningless or “no answer”	73.2	53.2
	100% N=1,084	100% N=513

Two main findings emerge from these figures. Firstly, the majority of the British male respondents (as many as 68 per cent) were very ill informed as regards incomes policy. Over half were unable to describe the policy or to give it a valid meaning and 15 per cent had only extremely vague notions as to what it involved. However, 15 per cent of the men gave clear and well informed descriptions of the British incomes policy and another 17 per cent gave clear but incomplete descriptions.

Secondly, the comparison with the Irish survey shows that a higher percentage of the British respondents than of the Irish ones was well informed even although in both samples only minorities were found to be well informed.

In terms of the content of the answers in categories A, B and C some interesting differences emerged between the Irish and the British samples. For instance, the Irish respondents were more inclined to mention productivity in relation to incomes policy with few mentions of prices, whereas the British tended to speak about prices rather than productivity. Only a minority in both surveys mentioned the three variables—incomes, prices and productivity, and their inter-relation. A sizeable proportion of the British respondents showed a tendency to associate incomes policy with wage-freezes rather than with the

¹⁵For the more detailed British evidence see Appendix C. The British survey was conducted three years before the Irish one, in 1966. Even allowing for that time interval, the British sample may be considered to have had more experience of incomes policy than the Irish one.

long-term goal of a planned growth of incomes based on a norm for income-increases. By contrast, some Irish respondents gave answers describing features of phased agreements suggesting that these could be interpreted as an incomes policy, but a pay-freeze was hardly ever mentioned.

Who then were the people who were well or little informed? To explore this question, the answers were related to social grade and education (for which figures were available for both surveys), and to the Irish respondents' occupation and the location of their homes. The findings, which revealed a number of striking differences, are presented in Tables 18 to 21.

TABLE 18: *Interpretation of the term "incomes policy" by respondents of different social grades in the Irish and British surveys.*

Type of answer	Irish (1969) male employees				British (1966) men working full-time			
	AB	C1	C2	DE	AB	C1	C2	DE
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Group A Well informed	25.6	10.7	5.0	0.4	34.6	20.0	9.2	9.5
Group B Less specific but relevant	28.0	20.8	9.7	6.1	19.8	20.0	16.3	13.3
Group C Vague but not wholly irrelevant	19.0	8.9	4.7	3.9	16.0	15.6	17.4	11.4
Group D Irrelevant, meaningless or "no answer"	27.4	59.5	80.6	89.6	29.6	44.4	57.1	65.8
Total	100% N=168	100% N=168	100% N=258	100% N=490	100% N=81	100% N=90	100% N=184	100% N=158

TABLE 19: *Manual and non-manual workers' interpretation of the term "incomes-policy".*

Type of answer	Non-manual workers	Manual workers
	%	%
Group A—Well informed	19.0	1.9
„ B—Less specific but relevant	24.9	6.8
„ C—Vague but not wholly irrelevant	14.0	4.1
„ D—Irrelevant, meaningless or "no answer"	42.1	87.3
Total	100% N=321	100% N=691

TABLE 20: Respondents' age of finishing full-time education related to their interpretation of the term "incomes policy"¹⁸

Type of answer	Respondents' age of finishing full-time education			
	14 or under	15-16	17-18	19 or over
Group A—Well informed	1.6	3.7	10.6	28.5
„ B—Less specific but relevant	5.6	11.7	19.7	27.6
„ C—Vague but not wholly irrelevant	2.8	5.5	13.0	17.1
„ D—Irrelevant, meaningless or "no answer"	89.9	79.1	56.7	26.8
Total	100% N=425	100% N=326	100% N=208	100% N=123

TABLE 21: Location of respondents' home related to their interpretation of the term "income policy".

Type of answer	Dublin	County Borough	Urban	Rural
		or other area (population over 10,000)	(3,000-10,000)	(500-3,000)
Group A—Well informed	11.4	2.2	4.5	4.2
„ B—Less specific but relevant	14.5	13.2	12.3	6.6
„ C—Vague but not wholly irrelevant	9.6	6.6	5.8	2.4
„ D—Irrelevant, meaningless or "no answer"	64.5	78.0	77.4	86.7
Total	100% N=490	100% N=273	100% N=155	100% N=166

¹⁸The corresponding figures for the 1966 British sample of 513 men working full-time were as follows:

Type of answer	Respondents' age of finishing full-time education*	
	15 or under	16 and over
Group A—Well informed	10.9	27.1
„ B—Less specific but relevant	17.7	13.6
„ C—Vague but not wholly irrelevant	15.2	15.0
„ D—Irrelevant, meaningless or "no answer"	56.3	44.3
	100% N=368	100% N=140

*5 men did not give the age at which they finished their education.

Table 18, which relates to social grade, shows a clear relationship between respondents' social grade and the quality of their answer on the meaning of the term "incomes policy"—a finding which holds for both surveys. Thus the highest percentages of well informed respondents were found in Grade AB, representing professional workers, senior and middle management, and higher civil servants; and the highest percentages of uninformed men were in social grade DE, mainly unskilled workers. A higher percentage of the men in social grade AB in the British than in the Irish sample were well informed. However, in the British sample the majority of the men in grades C2 and DE, and in the Irish sample the vast majority, were unable to give the term "incomes policy" any valid meaning. The occupational breakdown for the Irish sample in Table 19, like the breakdown into social grades, brings out the difference between the answers from non-manual and manual workers, and the combined evidence suggests that non-manual workers have a far better understanding of the term "incomes policy" than manual workers. Particularly striking is the interrelated finding of a very close relationship between education and answers to the incomes policy question. Thus it can be seen in Table 20 that the longer the education the respondents had received, the higher the percentage which was well informed and *vice versa*. (A similar finding held for the British sample.) The size of the community in which the respondent lived was also found to be related to the quality of the respondent's answers as is shown in Table 21.

An additional and related finding was that 63 per cent of the respondents who were well informed on incomes policy considered that it would become more difficult to sell Irish goods abroad as compared with only 45 per cent of the respondents who could not give a meaning to the term incomes policy. This suggests that a better understanding of the export problem is likely to be found among people who also know something about incomes policy than among those who know nothing about it.

CHAPTER 4. RESPONDENTS' PERCEPTION OF WHETHER AND HOW THEY COULD HELP THE ECONOMIC SITUATION

For an incomes policy to be effective it is not only necessary that people should understand its objectives but also that they accept that the objectives are important and require their support. Thus one can argue that an individual's co-operation can only be won if he considers the measures necessary and feels he has a contribution to make. But does the individual feel

he can contribute to the solution of economic problems such as difficulties in the export sphere or the problem of rising costs and prices, or does he feel caught up in an inexorable process of rising living costs—a victim of circumstances over which he has no control?

To explore people's perception of what contribution they felt they could make towards Irish prosperity, two sets of more personal questions were included in the survey, one fairly general and one related to their work.

In the general question people were first asked: "Do you think you can do anything to help our economic situation yourself?" The people who answered "yes" were then asked "What can you do?" and those who answered "no", "Why do you think you cannot do anything to help?" The distribution of replies to the first question is set out below:

Question	Answer	Number of respondents	Percentage of 1,084 respondents
Do you think you can do anything to help our economic situation yourself?	Yes	445	41.1
	No	547	50.5
	Don't know	92	8.5
		<u>1,084</u>	<u>100%</u>

These answers reveal that half the respondents said that they could not do anything to help the economic situation and a further 8.5 per cent were not sure whether they could help or not, which means that in all a majority of 59 per cent did not see any way in which they could contribute to the improvement of the country's economic situation; however, 41 per cent of the respondents said that they could make a positive contribution. It is difficult to judge whether this represents a very unfavourable picture or not, and it is therefore interesting to compare the distribution with that for answers to the same questions given by respondents in a British sample survey¹⁷ conducted at the same point of time as the Irish one. The relevant findings are set out below:

Question	Answer	Number of respondents	Percentage of 685 respondents
Do you think you can do anything to help the economic situation yourself?	Yes	216	31.5
	No	404	59.0
	Don't know	65	9.5
		<u>685</u>	<u>100%</u>

¹⁷This evidence has not as yet been published but for a description of the survey and for particulars of the results so far see "Have you heard the phrase 'Productivity Agreements'?", by Hilde Behrend, Ann Knowles and Jean Davies, *Scottish Journal of Political Economy*, Vol. XVI, No. 3, Nov. 1969, pp. 256-270.

Of the 685 British men who were working full-time, a majority of 59 per cent felt that they could not do anything to help the country's economic situation, with an additional 9.5 per cent uncertain as to whether they could do anything, suggesting that a sizeable majority of just under 69 per cent did not see a way in which they could help. Only a minority of 31.5 per cent replied that they thought they could make a contribution. The picture which emerges from the British survey is thus noticeably less favourable than the Irish one.

What sort of contribution did the respondents in the two surveys who gave a positive answer think they could make? The replies to the open-ended follow-up question envisaged three types of action: some people said they could contribute through their work, others felt they could do something as consumers by buying home-produced goods or by saving money, and still others mentioned the possibility of political action such as using their vote. The answers in the different categories are summarized below:

<i>Question: "What can you do to help the economic situation?"</i>	<i>Irish Survey. Percentage of 445 respondents who said "yes" to the main question</i>	<i>British Survey. Percentage of 216 respondents who said "yes" to the main question</i>
<i>Answers from respondents who felt they could make a contribution through their work:</i>		
Can promote efficiency, increase production, keep down costs, promote exports	9.0	5.1
Can do a better, more efficient job	18.2	12.0
Can continue to do a good job	6.7	8.8
Can work harder, work longer hours	18.9	25.5
	52.8	51.4
<i>Answers from respondents who felt they could help as consumers:</i>		
Can buy Irish/Buy British	23.4	9.7
Can save or not squander	10.1	11.6
	33.5	21.3
<i>Answers from respondents who mentioned political action:</i>		
Can use my vote, get rid of the Government	2.5	6.0
Other infrequent answers:	11.2*	21.3
	100%	100%

*About half of these respondents gave fairly reasonable suggestions such as "refuse a pay increase", "avoid strikes", "pay more taxes", "help on committees", etc; the remainder gave vague or evasive answers.

It can be seen that the most frequent ideas for helping which occurred to the respondents were connected with their job. Thus about half of the men in the two surveys who thought they could help mentioned contributions affecting the quality or quantity of their work. As regards consumer action 34 per cent of the 445 Irish men who had given a positive answer felt they could do something by buying Irish goods or by saving money compared with only 21 per cent of the 216 men in the British sample who amplified their "yes" answer by saying they could buy British or save money. Only a very small minority in both surveys mentioned their power as voters.

As regards specific actions within the three categories it is interesting to note that the most frequent reply from the Irish respondents was "buy Irish", given by almost a quarter of the men who thought they could help, while the most frequent answer from the British respondents was "work harder" or "work longer hours", given by just over a quarter of the men who felt they could make a contribution. One can speculate on whether the latter response is a reflection of the prevalence of systematic overtime in Britain and whether the Irish response reflects a successful "buy Irish" campaign.

It will be remembered that in both surveys less than half the respondents considered that they could make a contribution. What of the other men who felt they could not do anything to help and who represented more than half the sample in both cases? What reasons did they give for their belief that they could not do anything to help the economic situation? When their responses to the open-ended follow-up question as to why they thought they could not do anything were categorized it was found that specific phrases recurred again and again, for instance "I don't know what I could do" and most frequent of all "I am not in a position to help"—a point made as a simple statement on its own, or amplified by reasons such as having no scope in their type of work or having personal or family problems. The answers suggest the existence of widespread feelings of helplessness *vis-a-vis* economic problems; the economic situation appears as something remote, something in the functioning of which the individual as an individual, as an ordinary citizen, can exercise little influence or control. This feeling of being caught up in events without power to influence them was perhaps most clearly expressed by those of the respondents who said that as individuals they could not do anything to influence the economy but that they might be able to do something if they formed groups together with others.¹⁸ It may also account for answers shifting the responsibility for action on to someone else, such as the Government, employers or trade unions. The self-satisfied statement that they "were doing enough already" was made

¹⁸In the British survey for instance some of the housewives thought that as groups they might influence prices.

twice as often by British than Irish respondents. The distribution of the various statements is presented below and requires no further comment:

<i>Question: "Why do you think you cannot do anything (to help the economic situation)?"</i>	<u><i>Irish Survey.</i></u> <i>Percentage of 547 respondents who said "no" to the main question</i>	<u><i>British Survey.</i></u> <i>Percentage of 404 respondents who said "no" to the main question</i>
Answers from respondents who say they are not in a position to help:		
Not in a position to help	26.0	10.6
Not in a position to help because of my job	19.2	15.3
Not in a position to help because of family, money, other personal reasons	17.6	6.4
Not able to help as an individual	3.3	9.7
Don't know what I could do	<u>13.3</u>	<u>18.1</u>
	79.4	60.1
Answers from respondents who say it is the responsibility of Government, management, trade unions	6.6	3.5
Answers from respondents who say they are doing enough already	8.6	20.5
Other infrequent answers	<u>5.5*</u>	<u>15.8</u>
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>

*5 of these respondents said they could not do anything except "work harder"; this method of helping had not occurred to them in the first instance.

For comparing the views of sub-groups the answers to the question whether respondents themselves could do anything to help the economic situation were related to length of respondents' education (Table 22), social grade (Table 23) and occupation (Table 24), all inter-related variables and all equally relevant here insofar as education is a gateway to jobs falling into the higher social grades and offering the individual more scope and responsibility.

TABLE 22: *Views of respondents as to whether they could do anything to help the economic situation, related to their age of finishing full-time education*

<i>"Can you do anything to help the economic situation yourself?"</i>	<i>Age of finishing full-time education</i>			
	<i>14 or under</i>	<i>15-16</i>	<i>17-18</i>	<i>19 or over</i>
	%	%	%	%
Yes	28.7	40.5	51.9	67.5
No	58.6	52.5	43.3	29.3
Don't know	12.7	7.1	4.8	3.3
Total	100% N=425	100% N=326	100% N=208	100% N=123

TABLE 23: *Views of Irish and British respondents in different social grades as to whether they could do anything to help the economic situation.*

"Can you do anything to help the economic situation yourself?"	Irish respondents				British respondents (1969)			
	AB	C1	C2	DE	AB	C1	C2	DE
Yes	61.9	48.8	43.8	29.8	47.5	30.3	30.1	23.1
No	35.7	46.4	47.3	58.6	44.9	62.1	61.3	62.8
Don't know	2.4	4.8	8.9	11.6	7.6	7.6	8.6	14.1
Total	100% N=168	100% N=168	100% N=258	100% N=490	100% N=118	100% N=145	100% N=266	100% N=156

TABLE 24: *Manual and non-manual workers' views on whether they could do anything to help the economic situation.*

"Can you do anything to help the economic situation yourself?"	Non-manual workers		Manual workers		
			Skilled	Semi-skilled	Unskilled
Yes		56.7	43.4	36.7	23.3
No		39.6	47.8	53.3	62.5
Don't know		3.7	8.8	10.0	14.2
Total		100% N=321	100% N=249	100% N=210	100% N=232

It can be seen that Table 22 reveals a strong association between length of education and the answers. The longer the education received, the higher was the percentage of respondents who felt able to do something to help and *vice versa*. Table 23, which presents the evidence for both the Irish and the British surveys, similarly reveals a close relationship between the answers and respondents' social grade, with the respondents in social grade AB most inclined to say that they could do something and the men in social grade DE least inclined to say so.¹⁹

As regards the replies of manual and non-manual workers, the picture emerging from Table 24 is similar to the one obtained from the social grade analysis, but it provides additional information on the difference in the perception of skilled, semi-skilled and unskilled workers in that a much higher percentage of skilled than unskilled workers felt they could make a contribution to the economic situation. Also more semi-skilled than unskilled workers felt they could do something. What kind of help the manual and non-manual workers envisaged giving can be seen in Table 25.

¹⁹It needs to be remembered that fewer British respondents had given the answer "yes" and this is reflected by the different levels in the percentages in the breakdown in Table 23.

TABLE 25: *Manual and non-manual workers' perception of whether and how they could help the economic situation.*

	<i>Non-manual workers</i>	<i>Manual workers</i>
	%	%
(a) Ways in which respondents thought they could help the economic situation:		
Can promote efficiency, increase production, keep down costs, promote exports	8.1	1.9
Can do a better job, can continue to do a good job*	13.4	9.6
Can work harder, work longer hours	7.5	8.5
Can buy Irish/save or not squander*	21.2	10.2
Can use my vote, get rid of the Government	1.2	0.9
Other infrequent answers	5.3	4.1
	56.7	35.2
(b) Reasons why respondents thought they could not do anything to help:		
Am not in a position to help/ because of job/because of family, etc.*	27.4	34.7
Don't know what I could do	1.6	9.0
It is the responsibility of the Government, management, trade unions	4.4	2.7
Am doing enough already	3.4	5.1
Other infrequent answers	2.8	2.3
	39.6	53.8
(c) Respondents who did not know whether they could do anything to help:	3.7	11.0
Total	100% N=321	100% N=691

*Combined categories.

The percentages in Table 25 reflect the differences already noted in the percentage of positive and negative replies received from non-manual and manual workers. Perhaps the most interesting point is that the evidence suggests

that people in occupations which require more education, training and skill and which involve more responsibility—that is in occupations which offer more scope for individual endeavour—are aware of some of these opportunities, such as that they can promote efficiency. This means there are forces here that could be harnessed to the advantage of the Irish economy.

Next, it appeared important to explore how people would respond to opportunities which are clearly spelt out, such as are offered, for instance, by productivity agreements. The pilot studies had revealed that the word “productivity” presented considerable problems of comprehension, and the term “productivity agreements” still greater ones. Even in Great Britain, where productivity agreements had been part of the official prices and incomes policy since 1965, it was found²⁰ in May 1969 that 38 per cent of the men working full-time either said they had never heard the phrase, or could not give it any meaning, and only 6 per cent showed a really good grasp of what is involved.

A simply worded question was therefore used to explore respondents’ willingness to co-operate in some kind of productivity deal. This was presented to respondents on a card and read as follows:

“In return for extra money would you be willing or not willing to do any of the following?”

Would work longer hours

Would do more difficult work

Would agree to a different way of doing my work

Would not be willing to do any of these for extra money

Don’t know”

The answers revealed that the vast majority of respondents (79 per cent) said they were willing to do something for extra money and only 19 per cent were not willing to take any of the suggested courses of action; a very small group of 2 per cent were undecided. A number of men (8 per cent) said they were willing to do several of the things suggested. Taking this into account, it was found that 35 per cent of the respondents were willing to work longer hours, 28 per cent were willing to do more difficult work and 29 per cent were willing to agree to a different way of doing their work.

The three types of changes in this question may be described as “wage-work” bargains. Of these, working longer hours represents a traditional type of change affecting the *quantity* of work done while the other two changes involve the *quality* of work and are therefore more in the nature of a productivity deal. These results showed that 29 per cent of the men interviewed said they were only prepared to adopt a change in the quantity of work in return for extra money while 51 per cent were willing to adopt a change in the quality of their work, thus opting for features which belong to productivity agreements.

²⁰See H. Behrend *et al.*, “Have you heard the phrase ‘Productivity Agreements?’”, *op. cit.*

Were any groups among the respondents particularly willing or unwilling to enter into a wage-work bargain, and if willing what kind of bargain did they choose? These questions are examined in Tables 26 to 31. In these tables the 88 people who were willing to adopt several changes are included in the counts for each of the changes to which they agreed. This means that the percentages add up to more than 100.

TABLE 26*: *Attitude of respondents in different age-groups to suggested wage-work bargains.*

<i>Attitude to taking part in wage-work bargains</i>	<i>Respondents' age-group</i>				
	20-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60-69
	%	%	%	%	%
Would work longer hours	31.1	34.6	40.6	35.0	29.6
Would do more difficult work	39.0	29.4	26.2	20.4	14.3
Would work in a different way	26.8	40.4	30.5	23.3	16.2
Not willing to do any of these things	14.6	11.4	17.4	24.8	38.1
Don't know	0.4	1.2	1.9	3.4	4.8
Base for percentages	N=254	N=255	N=259	N=206	N=105

*The percentages in this and the following tables total more than 100%. For explanation see text.

TABLE 27: *Attitude of respondents with and without dependent children to suggested wage-work bargains.*

<i>Attitude to taking part in wage-work bargains</i>	<i>Respondents without dependent children</i>	<i>Respondents with dependent children</i>
	%	%
Would work longer hours	33.7	35.4
Would do more difficult work	28.1	27.6
Would work in a different way	21.8	33.5
Not willing to do any of these things	23.2	15.9
Don't know	2.0	2.7
Base for percentages	N=409	N=675

TABLE 28: *Respondents' age of finishing full-time education related to their attitude to suggested wage-work bargains.*

<i>Attitude to taking part in wage-work bargains</i>	<i>Respondents' age of finishing full-time education.</i>			
	14 or under	15-16	17-18	19 or over
	%	%	%	%
Would work longer hours	40.0	34.6	31.7	22.0
Would do more difficult work	19.7	26.4	37.0	43.9
Would work in a different way	28.5	28.5	29.8	31.8
Not willing to do any of these things	20.0	20.9	15.4	13.8
Don't know	1.2	1.5	3.8	2.4
Base for percentages	N=425	N=326	N=208	N=123

TABLE 29: *Attitude of respondents in different income-groups to suggested wage-work bargains.*

Attitude in taking part in wage-work bargains	Respondents' income— \$s per week					
	12 and under	Over 12 up to 16	Over 16 up to 20	Over 20 up to 25	Over 25 up to 30	Over 30
	%	%	%	%	%	%
Would work longer hours	38.8	37.6	38.9	26.9	25.3	28.4
Would do more difficult work	21.8	23.3	23.8	30.1	42.6	40.9
Would work in a different way	16.3	25.0	31.4	43.2	30.6	32.3
Not willing to do any of these things	22.5	23.6	18.1	13.7	10.7	15.0
Don't know	2.3	1.0	1.1	2.0	5.3	3.1
Base for percentages	N=129	N=288	N=265	N=153	N=75	N=127

TABLE 30: *Attitude of respondents in different social groups to suggested wage-work bargains.*

Attitude to taking part in wage-work bargains	Respondents' social grade			
	AB	C1	C2	DE
	%	%	%	%
Would work longer hours	27.4	26.2	36.2	39.6
Would do more difficult work	40.6	42.9	23.4	20.6
Would work in a different way	29.8	26.9	33.5	27.3
Not willing to do any of these things	13.7	14.9	18.2	21.8
Don't know	3.0	4.2	1.2	1.4
Base for percentages	N=168	N=168	N=258	N=490

TABLE 31: *Manual and non-manual workers' attitude to suggested wage-work bargains.*

Attitude to taking part in wage-work bargains	Non-manual workers	Manual workers
	%	%
Would work longer hours	26.2	38.4
Would do more difficult work	41.7	21.1
Would work in a different way	28.7	30.0
Not willing to do any of these things	15.0	20.3
Don't know	3.7	1.4
Base for percentages	N=321	N=691

Tables 26 to 31 suggest that the factors which influence the expressed willingness to participate in a wage-work bargain do not all work in the same direction. One set of factors appears to be financial need and family responsibility which affects the urgency with which extra money is required; the other set appears to be connected with quicker appreciation of the opportunities offered, particularly perhaps as regards the qualitative wage-work deals.

Table 26, which relates the answers to age, thus reveals important differences in the refusal rates, with 38 per cent of the men in the 60-69 age group saying they would not be willing to do anything for extra money as compared with only 11 per cent in the 30-39 age group; which probably has the greatest financial commitments and is at the same time physically more able to take on extra work. Similarly, it was found that the refusal rates for households with no dependent children was 23 per cent as compared to 16 per cent for those with dependent children; among the latter group it was also found that a higher percentage was willing to make more than one change. One additional point about age was that the 20-29 age group was the one which expressed the greatest willingness to take on more difficult work.

As regards the other influences, it can be seen that compared with other groups the refusal rates for taking part in a wage-work bargain were somewhat higher for the men who had received less education, who belonged to the lower income groups, in particular to social grade DE, with manual workers somewhat more inclined to refuse than non-manual workers. Allied to this finding were differences in the choice of wage-work bargains by those men who *did* express a willingness to co-operate. Here a higher percentage of the men who had received little education, who had low incomes, and who were in manual work, particularly in social grade DE, were willing to work longer hours than of those in the other groups.

Conversely, compared with other groups a higher percentage of the men who had received the longest education, whose incomes were above £25 per week, and who were in non-manual employment (in social grade AB or C1) said they were willing to do more difficult work.

As regards offers to do their work in a different way, the relationship seems less clear-cut, with men in the £20-£25 income group, in social grade C2 and in the 30-39 age group more inclined to choose this change than the other groups.

When the wage-work bargain question was related to the more general question in this chapter, it was found that a third of the people who had felt that they could do nothing to help the economic situation and 46 per cent of those who did not know what they could do declared themselves willing to work longer hours. A quarter of the "no's" were willing to do more difficult work or do their work in a different way. This suggests that spelling out more specifically how help can be given, at the same time bringing benefits to the individual, would produce a better response than general admonitions and appeals to patriotism. Some of the problems of communication and motivation which are involved are taken up in the following section.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The research results which have been presented in this paper are based on a national sample survey which was carried out in the Republic of Ireland during

the period 25th April to 6th May 1969 and which explored the views of 1,084 adult male employees on a number of important issues connected with problems of pay and economic welfare. The major objective of the enquiry was to throw light on issues which are important for the development of an incomes policy in Ireland, a subject very much to the forefront at the present time.

A first report published in August 1970 presented the results with regard to views on pay-increases, fringe benefits and low pay. The present report describes the evidence which relates to the respondents' perceptions of the income-structure and of the economic situation, and to the contributions respondents thought they could make to the Irish economy. The findings on each of the topics are summarized briefly below.

Views on what would be fair pay for different occupations.

In the context of discussions on the need to contain inflation by an incomes policy, the NIEC has drawn attention to the need for consensus on reasonable differentials in its 1965 and 1970 reports. In the latter it states:²¹

"As we made clear in Report No. 11, it will be more difficult to prevent total money incomes from rising at an excessive rate if there does not exist general consensus on what constitutes reasonable differences between wages and earnings in different occupations, between wages and salaries, and between wages and salaries and other kinds of income. The absence of such consensus leads to competitive attempts by some groups to improve their relative position, and by other groups to maintain their relative position, and may merely create a new situation in which all are as dissatisfied as they were initially with their relative positions but in which the general level of prices is higher and the level of employment lower. From the economic point of view, inflexible differentials would be undesirable. In the course of economic or social change, it may become necessary for good reasons to alter a previously agreed system of differentials. We also pointed out in Report No. 11 that the difficulties must not be underestimated and cannot be met merely by urging at national level that attitudes should change. Events in recent years leave no doubt about the difficulties involved in reaching consensus on differentials."

The major question raised by the NIEC is thus not concerned with the actual level of pay (which after all changes with inflation) but with the question of consensus on differentials, that is the question of how much agreement or disagreement there is on relative positions in the pay-structure. Evidence on this issue was obtained by open-ended questions asking how much men in eleven selected occupations and in four occupational groups should be paid per week. The replies named a wide range of figures but the middle 50 per cent of each set of answers was represented by a comparatively narrow range. Statistical

²¹See NIEC, *op. cit.*, 1970, p. 22.

analysis of the amounts showed that on average the occupations and occupational groups were allotted the following positions in the pay hierarchy:

- (a) Factory manager
- School teacher
- Electrician
- Car assembly worker
- ESB clerk
- Bus conductor
- Building labourer
- Shop assistant
- Hotel waiter
- Railway porter
- Agricultural labourer

- (b) Skilled manual workers
- Clerical workers (lower grades)
- Semi-skilled manual workers.
- Unskilled manual workers.

Next, the degree of consensus on these relative positions in the pay-structure was investigated by a method of paired comparisons which examined for each respondent whether he had given a higher, the same or a lower amount as appropriate pay for occupation one, as compared with occupation two. This revealed that there was an extremely high degree of consensus in all social grades that skilled workers should get more pay than semi-skilled or unskilled workers, and that lower grade clerical workers should get more than unskilled workers. However there was considerable dissension over the position of the clerical workers *vis-a-vis* the skilled workers, with a majority of 61 per cent of the men in social grade C2²² (mainly skilled workers) naming higher amounts for skilled workers than for clerical workers, whilst only 41 per cent of the men in social grade C1 (intermediate non-manual workers) gave higher amounts for skilled workers and 41 per cent gave the same amounts. As regards the eleven occupations there was a very high level of consensus among the respondents, whatever their social grade, on giving the highest place in the pay hierarchy to the factory manager, the second highest to the school teacher and the third highest to the electrician. However, there was also dissension, and this was most apparent in comparisons involving shop assistants, hotel waiters, building labourers and railway porters. The majority of the cases of dissension were found to exist *within* each of the four social grades. However, there were also some cases of disagreements *between* the grades; for instance, once again there was lack of agreement on the position of clerical workers, as represented by the

²²For a description of the composition of the social grades see Appendix A.

ESB clerk. A majority of 72 per cent of the men in social grade C2 placed the electrician above the ESB clerk, compared with only 43 per cent of the men in social grade C1.

Another finding showing up differences among sub-groups related to the level of pay which was considered appropriate for each occupation. On this it was found that proportionately more men in the higher social grades (and thus also in the higher income brackets) tended to give *above* average amounts (i.e. amounts above the sample median) for most, but not all, of the occupations. Getting down to further details, comparison of the *median* amounts for the answers of *each social grade* also revealed interesting features relating to the level of pay considered appropriate for the different occupations. Looking first at the medians for the lowest rank in the pay hierarchy, that is the unskilled workers (and among them agricultural labourers), it was found that the average views of the four social grades all fell within a few decimal points of £15. The average views for fair pay can thus be seen to have envisaged a shortening of the pay-structure based on bringing the lower income-groups up to £15 per week. However, it should be noted that to bring the agricultural workers' rates which were current at the time of the survey up to this figure would have involved an increase of £3 to £3 10s. The 12th wage-round may have reduced this margin meantime but there would appear to have been a gap here between what workers at the bottom of the pay-structure received and what the general public felt would be fair. This point may be linked with the survey findings reported in the previous paper²³ that the average amount considered fair for a minimum wage for a single man was £15 per week, £3 higher than the median of £12 for the sample's views as to what constituted lower pay.

While, on average, the men in the four social grades were thus agreed on an amount for the bottom end of the pay-structure there was little agreement between them on the amount appropriate for the occupation which came out in first position, there being a £10 a week difference between the average views of the men in social grades AB and DE as to what would be fair pay for a factory manager. For teachers the corresponding difference was £8. The evidence suggests that on average the higher a person's income, the greater were the differentials considered fair at the upper end of the income-structure. It would thus appear that the image of the pay-structure of the men in social grades AB and C1 (and in the higher income brackets) embraced a wider range of incomes than that of the men in social grades C2 and DE, whose image appeared to involve a marked shortening at the top as well as at the bottom of the pay-structure.

Overall the evidence further suggests that a certain proportion of the respondents tended to give in their answers somewhat higher figures for their own or kindred groups than for non-kindred groups.

A more personal question on views about fair pay for different occupations explored respondents' ideas on inequities in the pay-structure of the organisation

²³See first report, *op. cit.*, p. 47.

for which they worked. This revealed that nearly half the men in the sample felt that there were some groups of people at their place of work who were receiving less pay than they should. When asked what job these people were in, nearly two-thirds of the men named other people's jobs and about one-third mentioned their own job, with semi-skilled men most inclined to do this. The most frequent reason given for stating that people were underpaid was the cost of living, given by 37 per cent of the men asked this question, while 18 per cent mentioned comparison with others. Compensation for hard work, or long hours, or unpleasant features of the work situation were considered inadequate by 24 per cent of the men, and rewards for responsibility, education or training by 8 per cent.

Views on the economic situation

To explore respondents' views on the economic situation they were asked whether they thought they could afford a better living at the time of the survey than a few years back or not. The responses revealed the important finding that, while just over half the sample thought that their standard of living had improved over the last few years, 31 per cent considered it had remained the same and 17 per cent felt it had deteriorated. The picture of the standard of living was found to be related to respondents' circumstances in the sense that the higher the income, the higher was the percentage of respondents who felt they had a better standard of living than in the past. It is interesting to note that in the *middle* income group (earning at that time £16-£20 per week) there was still a slight majority of 54 per cent who felt they *were* better off, compared with majorities who felt they were *not* better off, of 55 per cent in the £12-£16 group and 65 per cent in the group earning £12 or less; a quarter of the latter felt that their standard of living had deteriorated. Examination of respondents' social grade and occupation, factors which are closely inter-related with income, provided a similar picture. For instance, 60 per cent of non-manual workers (and 61 per cent of the men in social grade AB) thought they had a better living now, while 58 per cent of the unskilled workers (and 55 per cent of the men in social grade DE) felt they did not have a better living.

Although our evidence shows that answers were related to respondents' income level, we are not in a position to judge whether the responses reflect factual or only perceived differences between their past and present standards of living. It has been shown elsewhere²⁴ that it is often only a perceived difference because many people judge the reasonableness of present prices (and therefore of the cost of living) by comparison with past prices—a necessarily unfavourable comparison in times of inflation; they often do not take account of the fact that their incomes have also risen, in many cases faster than prices.

Also, the lower paid worker who is constantly struggling against odds to make ends meet may find that a relative improvement in income enabling him to

²⁴See Hilde Behrend, "Price Images, Inflation and National Incomes Policy", *Scottish Journal of Political Economy*, Vol. XIII, pp. 273-296, November 1966.

buy a few things more makes no noticeable difference to his standard of living. Moreover, he is least likely to receive service pay or promotion. One could argue that there are certain income thresholds which need to be reached to provide visible improvements in standards of living. Whatever the factual position therefore (and it would be interesting to know whether the standards of living of only a limited section of Irish employees have improved in past years) it is the *perception* of the situation which affects people's outlook and their pay-demands, and for this reason the finding that such large sections of Irish employees, and in particular the lower paid, felt that they had no share in rising standards of living is one which warrants attention. On the other hand, the finding that the majority of the better paid admitted to having better standards of living is also of importance. It is worth relating it to two other findings in this study.²⁵ The first of these was that there were marked differences in expectations between different income and occupational groups in the sample as regards the size of their next pay-increase compared with their last one. The middle and lower income groups were more inclined to say that they would receive larger increases in coming negotiations while the higher income groups were more inclined to say that they would receive smaller ones. A higher percentage of manual than non-manual workers expected to receive a larger pay-increase; conversely a higher percentage of men in social grade AB than in social grades C2 and DE expected less than in the past. The second finding was that proportionately more men in managerial and professional occupations and higher income groups said that they were willing to hold back on their own pay-increases to let the lower paid workers get ahead. For instance, 55 per cent of the men earning more than £30 per week declared that they were willing to help in this way.

The picture which thus emerges is one where the majority of the higher income-groups, represented mainly by the higher non-manual occupations, consider that they have a better standard of living than they had some years back, do not expect that their income-increases will necessarily grow and seem willing to concede that some income restraint and tapering of increases to help the lower paid is acceptable.

How did the respondents' views of their own economic situation (as reflected by their perception of their standard of living) compare with their view of the general economic situation? To gain an insight into their opinions on the prospects of the economy, respondents were asked whether they thought it would become more difficult to sell Irish goods abroad in the next few years. On this issue it was found that just under half the sample (48 per cent) thought that Irish exports would run into difficulties in the next few years; 42 per cent were optimistic about the future of Irish exports, while 10 per cent did not express an opinion. Yet the position of the Irish balance of payments had

²⁵See Hilde Behrend, Ann Knowles and Jean Davies, *Views on Pay Increases, Fringe Benefits and Lower Pay: Findings from a National Sample Survey*, Paper No. 56, Chapter 3, Economic and Social Research Institute, Dublin 1970.

deteriorated from a surplus of £15 million in 1967 to a deficit of £22 million in 1968 (the year preceding the survey), a deterioration of £37 million, and was in the process of further deterioration.²⁶

Nonetheless our evidence suggests that about 50 per cent of all male employees did not think in April 1969 that there was an Irish export problem and that the maintenance of Ireland's position in world markets required special effort. There are a number of possible explanations. People may have been naturally optimistic or they may not have understood the issues involved, or have had insufficient information to make a correct judgment. For instance, the balance of payments had been in surplus in 1967 and there may have been a time lag in the information reaching people. The problem of communication would appear to be particularly difficult in this area because the situation changes with time. It would be easier to explain the problems of dependence on exports to the average citizen if the situation were static; but there are considerable fluctuations—at times the facts of the situation may not be unfavourable and at others, as in 1965 and 1970, there are grounds for serious concern.

Examination of personal particulars revealed that there was a strong association between education and the views on Irish exports; the longer the men's full-time education, the higher was the percentage who considered it would become more difficult to export Irish goods. A similar association with education was found on the follow-up question which asked why the respondents thought it would become more difficult to sell Irish goods. The longer the men's full-time education, the higher was the percentage giving as a reason "keener competition", or "rising costs and prices", the most important variables named in this context. 40 per cent of the men who had received the longest education gave one of these two reasons compared with only 20 per cent of the men who left school at the age of 14. The men who had received most education thus appear to have been considerably more aware of the dangers which inflationary forces presented for the Irish balance of payments than the men who had not received much education.

An inter-related finding was that a higher percentage of non-manual workers (57 per cent) than of manual workers (44 per cent) considered it would become more difficult to sell Irish goods abroad; within the manual groups a higher percentage of skilled workers than of unskilled saw difficulties ahead. Also a higher percentage of non-manual workers (34 per cent) than of manual workers (20 per cent) gave as a reason "keener competition" or "rising costs and prices".

Overall, the evidence suggests that the view of the general economic situation which was held by non-manual workers was less favourable than that held by manual workers, and that of skilled workers less favourable than that of the unskilled. This points to the paradox that the groups which were found to be most inclined to express a favourable view with regard to their own personal economic position (that is, their present standard of living) were also most inclined to hold an unfavourable view of the general economic situation (that

²⁶See NIEC, *op. cit.*, 1970, p. 6.

is, of future export performance) while the men who were most inclined to feel that their own standard of living was deteriorating were also most inclined to state that exports would be all right.

Interpretation of the term "Incomes Policy"

The respondents' interpretation of the term "incomes policy" was obtained by asking them whether they had ever come across the phrase and, if they had, by an open-ended follow-up question enquiring what the term "incomes policy" meant to them. Probably the most important finding on this was that over half the sample (54 per cent) said they had never heard the phrase, and that 19 per cent were unable to give the term a valid meaning although they had heard it. This shows that in the spring of 1969 the vast majority of the sample (73 per cent) did not appear to know what is meant by an incomes policy; furthermore, an additional 7 per cent had only extremely vague notions as to what the term involved. Overall then it may be said that the vast majority of the sample (80 per cent) did not really know what an incomes policy was about. Of the remaining 20 per cent a small minority of 7 per cent seemed to be well informed on the subject. This suggests that in 1969 the vast majority of male employees in Ireland had little idea as to what an incomes policy meant and highlights the communications problem which exists on this matter.

While the Irish public has only been exposed to discussions on an incomes policy for a comparatively short period (and never to an official incomes policy), it is interesting to note that a serious communications problem on this topic was also found in Britain which introduced its first official incomes policy of wage-restraint as long ago as 1948. Yet in a national sample survey conducted in February 1966 (when norms for income-increases of $2\frac{1}{2}\%$ and later 3 to $3\frac{1}{2}\%$ had been a part of official incomes policies since 1962) it was found that over half (53 per cent) of the men who were working full-time were unable to describe the Government's incomes policy or give a valid meaning to it; and a further 15 per cent of them were ill informed about it, indicating that a majority of 68 per cent knew nothing or very little about incomes policy. However, 15 per cent of the men gave clear and well-informed descriptions and another 17 per cent clear but incomplete descriptions. The fact that the percentage of well-informed men in the British survey was 8 per cent higher than that in the Irish survey suggests on the one hand that greater contact with, and exposure to, an incomes policy makes some impact on certain sections of the public, but the evidence for the rest of this British sample as well as evidence from a later survey indicates how difficult it is to make people understand an incomes policy other than a pay-freeze.²⁷

Who were the people who were well or ill informed? On this question a very close association was found in both the Irish and the British surveys between

²⁷A survey of responses to the British prices and incomes standstill introduced later in 1966 showed that this latter policy was well understood and commanded support as an emergency measure. See Hilde Behrend, Harriet Lynch, Howard Thomas and Jean Davies, *Incomes Policy and the Individual*, Oliver & Boyd, 1967.

the length of respondents' education and the quality of their answers on the meaning of the term "incomes policy"—the longer the education received, the higher was the percentage among the respondents who were well informed and *vice versa*. An inter-related finding which again applied to both surveys was that the highest percentage of well informed respondents belonged to social grade AB representing professional workers, senior and middle management and higher civil servants, and the highest percentage of uninformed men were in social grade DE, mainly semi- and unskilled workers. This evidence, as well as that from an occupational breakdown, suggests that non-manual workers have a better understanding of the term "incomes policy" than manual workers. Finally it was found that respondents living in Dublin were better informed on incomes policy than respondents living elsewhere in Ireland.

These findings (and there is little reason for believing that the situation has changed significantly since 1969) are particularly important because of the discussions about incomes policy which are taking place at present in Ireland. They show up that attention needs to be focussed on providing comprehensible information about the nature and aims of any incomes policy which is agreed upon. This is especially important because the implementation and effectiveness of an incomes policy depends very much on its acceptance and support by everyone. Not only is every individual in some way affected by the policy but he in turn can influence its success and the economic issues which it tries to deal with through his behaviour at work as well as through his behaviour as a consumer and investor. In particular the success of an incomes policy depends on the co-operation of wage and salary earners. One can argue that the individual's co-operation can only be won if he considers the measures necessary and feels that he has a contribution to make.

Respondents' perception of whether and how they could help the economic situation

In this context it appeared pertinent to find out whether respondents felt they could make a positive contribution to the prosperity of the economy. They were therefore asked whether they thought that they themselves could do anything to help the economic situation; those who answered "yes" were then asked what they could do, and those who had answered "no" were asked why they thought they could not do anything to help. This revealed that a majority of 59 per cent of the sample did not see any way in which they could contribute to the improvement of the country's economic situation, while the other 41 per cent said they they could do something. Although it is difficult to evaluate whether one should consider this a reasonable response, the finding compares favourably with responses given by a British sample at the same point of time in which a majority of 69 per cent of the men working full-time saw no way in which they could help, and less than a third of the men thought they could do something.

Once again on this question a very important finding was a close relationship between the length of the respondent's education and his answer. The longer the

education the respondents had received, the higher was the percentage who said they could make a contribution to help the economic situation. An inter-related finding was that non-manual workers, and especially those in social grade AB, were more inclined to say "yes" than manual workers; among the latter, skilled workers were considerably more inclined to say they could do something than unskilled workers.

Comparison with the men's views on their standard of living revealed another interesting finding which was that of the people who thought that they could help the economic situation, proportionately more (60 per cent) said their standard of living had improved than of the men who felt they could do nothing, of whom only 47 per cent thought their standard of living had risen. Further, only 39 per cent of the men who were uncertain whether they could do anything to help thought their standard of living had improved. This raises the question: Does increased prosperity increase an individual's readiness to make a contribution? Or are the people who are prepared to make a contribution the ones who are most actively engaged in working to improve their standard of living?

As regards ways of helping the economy, about half the answers from the men who had given a positive reply mentioned contributions affecting the quality or quantity of their work, an area in which the opportunities to make a contribution vary considerably with the type of work. A third of the respondents mentioned consumer action, such as buying Irish goods (mentioned by 23 per cent) or saving, and a very small minority their power as voters.

As regards reasons for *not* being able to help, the main responses were "I am not in a position to help" and "I don't know what I could do". The answers suggest that there existed a widespread feeling of helplessness *vis-a-vis* economic problems; the economic situation appeared to be something remote, in the functioning of which the individual as an individual could exercise little influence or control.

Another survey question spelt out ways in which an individual could help by asking whether respondents would be willing or not to make certain changes at work in return for extra money. The choices offered in this wage-work bargain question were to work longer hours, to do more difficult work or to do work in a different way. In reply, the vast majority of the respondents (79 per cent) said that they were willing to do something for extra money while 19 per cent were not prepared to take any of the suggested courses of action, and 2 per cent were undecided. A number of men expressed a willingness to do several of the things suggested. Taking this into account, it was found that 35 per cent of the respondents were willing to work longer hours, that is to adopt a change affecting the *quantity* of work done. As regarded the suggested changes in the *quality* of work (which represent features of productivity agreements) 28 per cent of the men were willing to do more difficult work, and 29 per cent to do their work in a different way.

Among sub-groups it was found that the 30-39 age-group showed the highest willingness to adopt one or more of the changes for extra money, probably

because financial commitments are often greatest at that period of a man's life. Similarly there were indications that married men with children were more prepared than other men to take up the chance of earning extra money. As age increased, proportionately more refusals to do anything for extra money were recorded. Another rather different factor operative in producing positive or negative responses seemed to be connected with an ability for speedy appreciation of the opportunities offered, particularly by the non-traditional productivity deal types of change. An absence of this ability may account for the finding that men who had received less education, who belonged to the lower income groups, to social grade DE, and who lived in rural areas were somewhat more inclined than others to refuse to take part in a wage-work bargain, and those of them who *did* express a willingness to co-operate were more inclined to opt for working longer hours than men in the other sub-groups. As regards opting for the productivity type deals, the men who had received the longest education, whose incomes were above £25 per week, and who were in non-manual employment were the ones who expressed themselves most prepared to do more difficult work, while the men in the £20-25 income group, in social grade C2 (that is, mainly skilled workers) and in the 30-39 age-group were the men most inclined to opt for doing their work in a different way in exchange for extra money.

The very favourable responses to the wage-work bargain question must be seen in the correct perspective. There is a gap between an expression of *readiness* to respond to an economic incentive and translating the readiness into action. The problem is not just that some respondents may have felt that they ought not to say "no", but rather that we do not necessarily know how to translate genuine willingness into action. It may require inspiration, leadership and specific managerial qualities to harness it, and success would very much depend on the amount of extra money offered.

Concluding Comments

The findings in this report show up that large sections, particularly of the lower paid, of Irish employees considered that their standards of living had not improved in recent years or had even deteriorated—a feeling likely to give rise to pay-demands. To offset inflationary pressures from such demands, as the NIEC has pointed out, other groups need to be content with smaller pay-increases; and the findings that many respondents with incomes above £25 felt that their standards of living had improved over recent years and said they were willing to hold back on their own pay-increases raises the hope that the better-off might be willing to support an anti-inflationary incomes policy which does at the same time try to improve the lot of the lowest paid. Since in addition there was a fair degree of consensus on what constitutes low pay and on what would have been (in April 1969) fair pay for the unskilled workers it appears feasible that agreement on such a policy could be reached.

More generally, however, we believe that the success of an incomes policy

depends on recognition by the general public that such a policy is not only desirable but necessary. On this dimension the survey results show up serious communication gaps: not only did half the respondents not appreciate the vulnerability of the Irish export position in world markets, but the vast majority of them also had no clue as to the meaning and objects of an incomes policy. Nor did the majority of them see any way in which they personally could do anything to help the country's economic position, although, when specific wage-work bargains (as ways of improving output) were put before them, the vast majority expressed a readiness to participate in such bargains.

The results show up clearly the problems of communication in the dispersal of information about economic problems and economic policies. They indicate the role education can play in bridging the gap, since the people who had received the longest education tended to be better informed than the men who had received the minimum compulsory education. However, education is not the only important requisite for effective communication. Motivating people to listen is even more important, since exposure to information by itself is often not enough. Once a person's attention has been caught it is important that the information is presented in a form which is easily understood, and which relates the economic problems meaningfully to everyday life, so that it can be seen that incomes policy is not something abstract and remote but something closely connected with the consumers' problem of rising prices, and that the resources necessary to increase not merely monetary incomes but real incomes can only be created by raising productivity.

APPENDIX A

Note on Social Grading and Income Classification.

(1) *Social Grading*

Classification of respondents by social grade provides a useful method of taking account of both economic and social factors when analysing survey results. The grading method adopted in this survey uses four grades, based mainly on occupation and income, and was done on completed questionnaires in Edinburgh in conjunction with a member of the Economic and Social Research Institute. The four social grades used may be described as follows:

Social Grade

- | | |
|----|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| AB | Professional workers, senior and middle management, civil servants in administrative, executive and similar grades. |
| C1 | Mainly non-manual workers carrying out less important administrative, supervisory and clerical jobs. |
| C2 | Mainly skilled manual workers. |
| DE | Mainly semi-skilled and unskilled manual workers. |

(2) *Income Classification*

While the social grading was carried out by the research team, the income classification is that of the respondents, and was obtained by asking: "Could you give me an idea of your own weekly earnings or your salary *before* deductions?" The respondent was then shown the following card and asked to indicate which group he fell into.

Weekly Earnings or Salary Before Deductions.

£8 and under	Under £416	1
Over £8 up to £12	£417— £624	2
„ £12 „ „ £16	£625— £832	3
„ £16 „ „ £20	£833—£1,040	4
„ £20 „ „ £25	£1,041—£1,300	5
„ £25 „ „ £30	£1,301—£1,560	6
„ £30	£1,561+	7

(3) *Relation of Income to Social Grade*

The distribution of the evidence obtained in this survey is presented below:

Respondents' Social Grade (4)	Respondents' Income £s per week						
	12 and under	Over 12 up to 16	Over 16 up to 20	Over 20 up to 25	Over 25 up to 30	Over 30	Don't know Refused
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
AB	0.0	1.4	2.3	11.8	38.7	80.3	19.1
C1	4.7	6.9	17.0	28.8	32.0	11.0	31.9
C2	9.3	18.1	38.9	37.9	17.3	8.7	19.1
DE	86.0	73.6	41.9	21.6	12.0	0.0	29.8
Total	100% N=129	100% N=288	100% N=265	100% N=153	100% N=75	100% N=127	100% N=47

APPENDIX B.

Details of statistical measures for Tables 1 and 4 relating to respondents' views as to the amount per week which should be paid to people in different occupations.

Statistical measures for Table 1.

<i>Occupational groups</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Median</i>	<i>Lower quartile</i>	<i>Upper quartile</i>	<i>Quartile difference</i>	<i>Standard deviation</i>	<i>Skewness</i>	<i>Lowest amount named</i>	<i>Highest amount named</i>
	£	£	£	£	£			£	£
Skilled workers	20.2	19.9	18.2	22.0	3.8	4.02	1.66	10	60
Clerical workers (lower grades)	18.3	17.9	15.9	20.5	4.6	4.04	0.80	8	35
Semi-skilled workers	16.6	16.1	15.1	18.5	3.4	3.00	0.98	8	32
Unskilled workers	14.9	14.8	13.7	16.6	2.9	2.76	0.76	6	30

Statistical measures for Table 4.

<i>Occupation</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Median</i>	<i>Lower quartile</i>	<i>Upper quartile</i>	<i>Quartile difference</i>	<i>Standard deviation</i>	<i>Skewness</i>	<i>Lowest amount named</i>	<i>Highest amount named</i>
	£	£	£	£	£			£	£
Factory manager	35.1	34.5	30.0	40.5	10.5	10.66	1.60	10	98
School teacher	25.6	24.8	20.4	30.3	9.9	7.62	1.24	10	77
Electrician	21.8	20.4	20.0	25.1	5.7	4.10	1.00	10	50
Car assembly worker	19.7	19.6	17.5	20.9	3.4	3.79	1.16	8	40
E.S.B. clerk	19.6	18.5	16.6	22.1	5.5	4.65	1.02	10	40
Bus conductor	17.8	17.6	16.1	20.2	4.1	3.05	1.24	9	40
Building labourer	17.2	16.7	15.5	20.0	4.5	2.90	0.86	10	31
Shop assistant	16.6	16.2	15.0	18.8	3.8	3.46	0.73	6	35
Hotel waiter	16.5	15.9	14.5	18.8	4.3	3.95	1.02	6	40
Railway porter	16.0	15.5	14.7	18.2	3.5	2.99	1.26	6	40
Agricultural labourer	15.4	15.1	14.1	17.5	3.4	3.02	0.74	6	31

APPENDIX C.

Descriptions of Incomes Policy given by men working full-time in a British sample survey conducted in February 1966.

	<i>Number of respondents</i>	<i>Percentage of 513 respondents %</i>
<i>Group A—Well informed</i>		
Answers showing a clear idea of the essence of the British Government's incomes policy and of the relationships between some of its key features, e.g.		
"Is a measure to ensure that any rise in income is matched by a similar rise in productivity"		
"Control incomes in order to keep prices stable"	78	15.2
<i>Group B—Less specific but relevant</i>		
Answers displaying some idea of the objectives of the policy but no knowledge of inter-relationships between its key features, e.g.		
"A policy to stabilise cost of living"		
"Control incomes"	85	16.6
<i>Group C—Vague and somewhat incorrect but not wholly irrelevant</i>		
Answers showing an awareness of one or more of the economic factors involved but often misinterpreting the policy, e.g.		
"Freeze wages"		
"Keep the income parallel with the prices"	77	15.0
<i>Group D—Wholly incorrect, meaningless or no answers</i>		
Answers where respondents had never come across the phrase or were unable to give any valid meaning, e.g.		
"Cannot describe it"		
"A form you get that tells you what you should have or what you shouldn't"	273	53.2
	513	100%

THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL RESEARCH INSTITUTE

Reprint Series:

- | | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------|
| 1. <i>Commentary on "Europe's Future in Figures"</i> | R. C. Geary |
| 2. <i>Forms of Engel Functions</i> | C. E. V. Leser |
| 3. <i>The Cost Structure of British Manufacturing, 1948-61</i> | E. T. Nevin |
| 4. <i>The Life of Capital Assets: An Empirical Approach</i> | E. T. Nevin |
| 5. <i>Estimation of Quasi-linear Trend and Seasonal Variation</i> | C. E. V. Leser |
| 6. <i>The Pattern of Personal Expenditure in Ireland</i> | C. E. V. Leser |
| 7. <i>Some Remarks about Relations between Stochastic Variables: A Discussion Document</i> | R. C. Geary |
| 8. <i>Towards an Input-Output Decision Model for Ireland</i> | R. C. Geary |
| 9. <i>Do-It-Yourself Economics of the Firm; First Draft of a Statistical Scheme</i> | R. C. Geary |
| 10. <i>Recent Demographic Developments in Ireland</i> | C. E. V. Leser |
| 11. <i>The Average Critical Value Method for Adjudging Relative Efficiency of Statistical Tests in Time Series Regression Analysis</i> | R. C. Geary |
| 12. <i>A Note on Residual Heterovariance and Estimation Efficiency in Regression</i> | R. C. Geary |
| 13. <i>Direct Estimation of Seasonal Variation</i> | C. E. V. Leser |
| 14. <i>Ex post Determination of Significance in Multivariate Regression when the Independent Variables are Orthogonal</i> | R. C. Geary |
| 15. <i>The Economics Of An Off-Shore Island</i> | G. G. Firth |
| 16. <i>The Role of Macroeconomic Models in Short-Term Forecasting</i> | C. E. V. Leser |
| 17. <i>A Dublin Schools Smoking Survey</i> | Angus O'Rourke, Noellie O'Sullivan, Keith Wilson-Davis |
| 18. <i>Significance Tests in Multiple Regression</i> | R. C. Geary, C. E. V. Leser |
| 19. <i>Two-stage Planning in the Irish Context</i> | M. Ross |
| 20. <i>Hospital Beds in Ireland</i> | P. R. Kaim-Caudle |
| 21. <i>Evaluations of Occupations by Irish Rural Adolescents on the basis of Prestige and Difficulty of Achievement</i> | Damian F. Hannan |
| 22. <i>Comparative Efficiency of Maximum Likelihood and ex ante Reduced Form for Forecasting: Study of a Simple Model</i> | R. C. Geary |
| 23. <i>Relative Efficiency of Count of Sign Changes for Assessing Residual Autoregression in Least Squares Regression</i> | R. C. Geary |
| 24. <i>Marriage Rates and Population Pressure: Ireland, 1871 and 1911</i> | B. M. Walsh |
| 25. <i>A Study of Irish County Marriage Rates, 1961-1966</i> | B. M. Walsh |

Broadsheet Series:

- | | |
|----------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1. <i>Dental Services in Ireland</i> | P. R. Kaim-Caudle |
| 2. <i>We Can Stop Rising Prices</i> | M. P. Fogarty |
| 3. <i>Pharmaceutical Services in Ireland</i> | P. R. Kaim-Caudle,
assisted by Annette O'Toole and Kathleen O'Donoghue |

Geary Lecture:

- | | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------|
| 1. <i>A Simple Approach to Macro-economic Dynamics</i> | R. G. D. Allen |
| 2. <i>Computers, Statistics and Planning—Systems or Chaos?</i> | F. G. Foster |
| 3. <i>The Dual Career Family</i> | Rhona and Robert Rapoport |

Publication Series:

- | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|
| 1. <i>The Ownership of Personal Property in Ireland</i> | Edward Nevin |
| 2. <i>Short Term Economic Forecasting and its Application in Ireland</i> | Alfred Kuehn |
| 3. <i>The Irish Tariff and The E.E.C.: A Factual Survey</i> | Edward Nevin |
| 4. <i>Demand Relationships for Ireland</i> | C. E. V. Leser |
| 5. <i>Local Government Finance in Ireland: A Preliminary Survey</i> | David Walker |
| 6. <i>Prospects of the Irish Economy in 1962</i> | Alfred Kuehn |
| 7. <i>The Irish Woollen and Worsted Industry, 1946-59: A Study in Statistical Method</i> | R. C. Geary |
| 8. <i>The Allocation of Public Funds for Social Development</i> | David Walker |
| 9. <i>The Irish Price Level: A Comparative Study</i> | Edward Nevin |
| 10. <i>Inland Transport in Ireland: A Factual Survey</i> | D. J. Reynolds |
| 11. <i>Public Debt and Economic Development</i> | Edward Nevin |

THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL RESEARCH INSTITUTE

Publication Series:—continued.

- | | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------|
| 12. <i>Wages in Ireland, 1946-62</i> | Edward Nevin |
| 13. <i>Road Transport: The Problems and Prospects in Ireland</i> | D. J. Reynolds |
| 14. <i>Imports and Economic Growth in Ireland, 1947-61</i> | C. E. V. Leser |
| 15. <i>The Irish Economy in 1962 and 1963</i> | C. E. V. Leser |
| 16. <i>Irish County Incomes in 1960</i> | E. A. Attwood and R. C. Geary |
| 17. <i>The Capital Stock of Irish Industry</i> | Edward Nevin |
| 18. <i>Local Government Finance and County Incomes</i> | David Walker |
| 19. <i>Industrial Relations in Ireland: The Background</i> | David O'Mahony |
| 20. <i>Social Security in Ireland and Western Europe</i> | P. R. Kaim-Caudle |
| 21. <i>The Irish Economy in 1963 and 1964</i> | C. E. V. Leser |
| 22. <i>The Cost of Irish Industry, 1950-60</i> | Edward Nevin |
| 23. <i>A Further Analysis of Irish Household Budget Data, 1951-1952</i> | C. E. V. Leser |
| 24. <i>Economic Aspects of Industrial Relations</i> | David O'Mahony |
| 25. <i>Psychological Barriers to Economic Achievement</i> | P. Pentony |
| 26. <i>Seasonality in Irish Economic Statistics</i> | C. E. V. Leser |
| 27. <i>The Irish Economy in 1964 and 1965</i> | C. E. V. Leser |
| 28. <i>Housing in Ireland; Some Economic Aspects</i> | P. R. Kaim-Caudle |
| 29. <i>A Statistical Study of Wages, Prices and Employment in the Irish Manufacturing Sector</i> | C. St. J. O'Herlihy |
| 30. <i>Fuel and Power in Ireland: Part I. Energy Consumption in 1970</i> | J. L. Booth |
| 31. <i>Determinants of Wage Inflation in Ireland</i> | Keith Cowling |
| 32. <i>Regional Employment Patterns in the Republic of Ireland</i> | T. J. Baker |
| 33. <i>The Irish Economy in 1966</i> | The Staff of The Economic and Social Research Institute |
| 34. <i>Fuel and Power in Ireland: Part II. Electricity and Turf</i> | J. L. Booth |
| 35. <i>Fuel and Power in Ireland: Part III, International and Temporal Aspects of Energy Consumption</i> | J. L. Booth |
| 36. <i>Institutional Aspects of Commercial and Central Banking in Ireland</i> | John Hein |
| 37. <i>Fuel and Power in Ireland; Part IV, Sources and Uses of Energy</i> | J. L. Booth |
| 38. <i>A Study of Imports</i> | C. E. V. Leser |
| 39. <i>The Irish Economy in 1967</i> | The Staff of The Economic and Social Research Institute |
| 40. <i>Some Aspects of Price Inflation in Ireland</i> | R. C. Geary and J. L. Pratschke |
| 41. <i>A Medium Term Planning Model for Ireland</i> | David Simpson |
| 42. <i>Some Irish Population Problems Reconsidered</i> | Brendan M. Walsh |
| 43. <i>The Irish Brain Drain</i> | Richard Lynn |
| 44. <i>A Method of Estimating the Stock of Capital in Northern Ireland Industry; Limitations and Applications</i> | C. W. Jefferson |
| 45. <i>An Input-Output Analysis of the Agricultural Sector of the Irish Economy in 1964</i> | R. O'Connor with M. Breslin |
| 46. <i>The Implications for Cattle Producers of Seasonal Price Fluctuations</i> | R. O'Connor |
| 47. <i>Transport in the Developing Economy of Ireland</i> | John Blackwell |
| 48. <i>Social Status and Inter-Generational Social Mobility in Dublin</i> | Bertram Hutchinson |
| 49. <i>Personal Incomes by County, 1965</i> | Miceal Ross |
| 50. <i>Income Expenditure Relations in Ireland, 1965-1966</i> | John L. Pratschke |
| 51. <i>Costs and Prices in Transportable Goods Industries</i> | W. Black, J. V. Simpson, D. G. Slattery |
| 52. <i>Certain Aspects of Non-Agricultural Unemployment in Ireland</i> | R. C. Geary and J. G. Hughes |
| 53. <i>A Study of Demand Elasticities for Irish Imports</i> | Dermot McAleese |
| 54. <i>Internal Migration in Ireland with Appendix</i> | R. C. Geary and J. G. Hughes
C. J. Gillman |
| 55. <i>Religion and Demographic Behaviour in Ireland</i> | B. M. Walsh |
| 56. <i>Views on Pay Increases, Fringe Benefits and Low Pay,</i> | H. Behrend, A. Knowles and J. Davies |