

**THE
ECONOMIC & SOCIAL
RESEARCH INSTITUTE**

**Women and Employment in Ireland:
Results of a National Survey**

BRENDAN M. WALSH
assisted by
ANNETTE O'TOOLE

APRIL, 1973

PAPER No. 69

THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL RESEARCH INSTITUTE
COUNCIL 1972 - 73

*T. K. WHITAKER, M.SC. (ECON.), D.ECON.SC., *President of the Institute.*

*G. O'BRIEN, D.LITT., LITT.D., *Chairman of the Council.*

T. J. BARRINGTON, *Director, Institute of Public Administration.*

*J. P. BEDDY, D.ECON.SC., LL.D. (H.C.).

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, C.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.CAP., M.A., PH.D., *Professor, Department of Applied Psychology, University College, Cork.*

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.*

*THE MOST REV. JAMES KAVANAGH, M.A., S.T.L., *Bishop of Zerta.*

*KIERAN A. KENNEDY, M.ECON.SC., B.PHIL., PH.D., *Director of the Institute.*

IVOR KENNY, M.A., *Director, Irish Management Institute.*

T. P. LINEHAN, B.E., B.SC., *Director, Central Statistics Office.*

P. LYNCH, M.A., *Associate Professor of Political Economy, University College, Dublin.*

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.

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 Ó 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 Ó 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., *Confederation of Irish Industry.*

T. WALSH, D.SC., *Director, An Foras Taluntais.*

*Members of Executive Committee.

Women and Employment in Ireland:
Results of a National Survey

*Copies of this paper may be obtained from the Economic and Social Research Institute,
4 Burlington Road, Dublin 4.*

Price £1.00
(Special rate for students £0.50)

Brendan Walsh is a Senior Research Officer and Annette O'Toole is a Research Assistant of the Economic and Social Research Institute. The paper has been accepted for publication by the Institute, which is not responsible for either the content or the views expressed therein.

*Women and Employment in Ireland:
Results of a National Survey*

BRENDAN M. WALSH
assisted by
ANNETTE O'TOOLE

© ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL RESEARCH INSTITUTE
DUBLIN, 1973

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Acknowledgements	7
Preface	9
Section 1: Economic Background	11
Section 2: The Sample	17
Section 3: Participation in the Labour Force. Work history. Reasons for not Working. Plans for Returning to Work	19
Summary and Conclusions	32
Section 4: Attitudes Towards Married Women Working	65
Summary and Conclusions	78
Section 5: The Present Job. Arrangements for Child-Care	97
Summary and Conclusions	104
Section 6: Policies Towards Married Women Working	119
Section 7: Concluding Remarks	143
Appendix The Sample: Methodology and Outcome	145
Bibliography	155

LIST OF TABLES

<i>Table</i>	<i>Page</i>
1.1 Women in the Irish Labour Force Classified by Marital Status, 1961 and 1966	13
1.2 Women in the Labour Force: Some International Comparisons	14
1.3 Changes in Sex Ratio of Labour Supply, 1961-1966	15
3.1 Women's Participation in the Labour Force Classified by Age and Marital Status	36
3.2 Working Women: Hours Worked Classified by Marital Status	37
3.3 Participation Rate Classified by Education and by Marital Status	38
3.4 Non-Farm Married Working Women: Hours Worked Classified by Education	39
3.5 Non-Farm Married Women: Participation Rate Classified by Social Group	40
3.6 Married and Widowed Women: Participation Rate Classified by Presence of Children	41

Table

3.7	Non-Farm Married Working Women: Hours Worked per Week Classified by Presence of Children	42
3.8	Non-Farm Married Women: Participation Rate Classified by Social Group and Presence of Children	43
3.9	Married Women: Participation Rate Classified by Education and Presence of Children	44
3.10	Farm and Non-Farm Women not Working: Work History Classified by Marital Status	45
3.11	Farm Married Women: Non-Farm Work History Classified by Age	45
3.11a	Non-Farm Single Women: Work History Classified by Age	46
3.11b	Non-Farm Married and Widowed Women: Work History Classified by Age	47
3.12	Age Distribution of Those Who Have Never Worked	48
3.13	Non-Farm Married and Widowed Working Women: Work History Classified by Age	49
3.14	Non-Farm Married Women who Returned to Work After Marriage: Age of Youngest Child When Returned to Work	48
3.15	Non-Farm Women Not Working: Main Reason for Not Working Classified by Marital Status	50
3.16	Women Not Working: Likelihood of Return (or Entry) to (Non-Farm) Work Classified by Marital Status	51
3.17	Non-Farm Married Women Not Working: Likelihood of Return (or Entry) to Work Classified by Age	50
3.18	Married Women Not Working: Likelihood of Return (or Entry) to Work Classified by Education	52
3.19	Married Women Not Working: Likelihood of Return (or Entry) to Work Classified by (Non Farm) Work History	53
3.20	Non-Farm Married Women Not Working: Likelihood of Return (or Entry) to Work Classified by Main Reason for Not Working	54
3.21	Non-Farm Women Not Working: When Likely to Return Classified by Likelihood of Return	55
3.22	Non-Farm Working Women: Reasons for Working Short Week (Less Than 25 hours) and Plans for Working Full-time Classified by Marital Status	56
3.23	Attitude of Single Women Aged under 26 years to Working after Marriage and Whether Respondent Would Resume Work "Later in Married Life"	57
3.24	Belief About (Non-Farm) Job Availability in the Neighbourhood Classified by Marital Status and Labour Force Status	58
3.25	Belief About (Non-Farm) Job Availability Within Easy Reach Classified by Marital Status and Labour Force Status	59
3.26	Non-Farm Married Women: Belief About Job Availability (Within Easy Reach) Classified by Work History	60

<i>Table</i>	<i>Page</i>
3.27 Non-Farm Married Women Not Working: Main Reason for Not Working Classified by Belief About Job Availability (Within Easy Reach)	61
3.28 Type of Jobs Believed Available (in the Neighbourhood or Within Easy Reach) Given by Those Answering YES to Question on Job Availability	57
3.29 Total Non-Farm Sample: Belief About Job Availability Within Easy Reach Classified by Residence	62
3.30 Measures of Excess Labour Supply	62
3.31 Non-Farm Married Women: Those Giving "No Jobs Available" as Main Reason for Not Working Expressed as Proportion of (a) the Total (Working and Not Working in Each Group), (b) the Labour Force (Those Working Plus the Excess Labour Supply) in Each Group	63
4.1 Attitude to Married Women Working Classified by Marital and Labour Force Status	82
4.2 Conditions for Married Women Working: Proportion of Total Answering who Mentioned Each Condition	83
4.3 Married Women: Attitude to Married Women Working Classified by Age	84
4.4 Attitude to Married Women Working Classified by Presence of Children	85, 86
4.5 Proportions of Married Women, Classified by Presence of Children and by Labour Force Status, Mentioning "No Children" as Condition for Approval by Married Women Working	87
4.6 Those Disapproving of Married Women Working: Average Rank of the Reasons for Disapproval	88
4.7 Reasons for and Drawbacks of Married Women Working Classified by Marital Status and Labour Force Status	89
4.8 Reasons for and Drawbacks of Married Women Working Classified by Presence of Children under 19	90
4.9 Wife's Belief About Husband's Attitude Classified by Her Own Attitude	91, 92
4.10 Husband's Attitude Classified by Wife's Belief about Husband's Attitude	93
4.11 Wife's Attitude Classified by Husband's Attitude	94
4.12 Belief about Friends' Attitude to Married Women Working Classified by Own Attitude	95
5.1 Occupational Distribution of Working Respondents Classified by Marital Status	107
5.2 Farm and Non-Farm: Hours Worked Classified by Occupations	108
5.3 Farm and Non-Farm Married Working Women: Time of Day Worked Classified by Occupation	109
5.4 Non-Farm Married Women: Occupation Classified by Social Group	110

<i>Table</i>	<i>Page</i>
5.5 Farm and Non-Farm Working Women: Work History Since "This Time Last Year" Classified by Marital Status	111
5.6 Farm and Non-Farm: Work History During Past Year Classified by Occupation	112
5.7 Farm and Non-Farm: Frequency of Change of Employer Over Last Year Classified by Marital Status	113
5.8 Farm and Non-Farm: Reason for Employer Change Classified by Marital Status	113
5.9 Farm and Non-Farm Working Women: Absences from Work During Year, Other Than Holidays and Leave	114
5.10 How Respondents Heard About Their Jobs Classified by Marital Status	115
5.11 Mode of Transport to and from Work Classified by Marital Status	116
5.12 Mode of Transport to and from Work Classified by Area of Residence	117
5.13 Farm and Non-Farm Married and Widowed Working Women with Children: Arrangements for Child-Care	114
5.14 Farm and Non-Farm Married and Widowed Working Women: Occupational Distribution Classified by Presence of Children	118
5.15 Non-Farm Working Women with Children: Mode of Travel to and from Work of Those Making "No Special Arrangements" for Child-Care	114
6.1 Most Helpful Policy Classified by Marital Status and Labour Force Status	133
6.2 Non-Farm Married Women Not Working: Most Helpful Policy Classified by Reasons for Not Working	Tip-in
6.3 Most Helpful Policy Classified by Presence of Children	134, 135
6.4 Non-Farm Married Working Women: Most Helpful Policy Classified by Whether Working at Home	136
6.5 Non-Farm Married Women: Most Helpful Policy Classified by Area of Residence	137
6.6 Illustration of Effects of Income Tax Code (Finance Act 1972) on Male and Female Earnings	138
6.7 Attitude to Day-Care Centres Classified by Attitude to Married Women Working	139
6.8 Attitude to Day-Care Centres Classified by Presence of Children	140
6.9 Attitude to Day-Care Centres Classified by Who Should Run Them	141
6.10 Married Women: Desirability of Change in School Hours	141
 Appendix	
A.1 Approximate Standard Errors of Sample Percentages	154

Acknowledgements

We wish to acknowledge assistance received from several sources during the preparation of this study. In particular, Dr M. E. J. O'Kelly (Department of Labour and University College, Galway), Mr E. O'Neill (Department of Labour) and Mr W. Kirwan (Department of Finance) were involved in formulating and guiding the entire project. Several of our Institute colleagues suggested numerous improvements during the preparation of the questionnaire and of the various preliminary drafts of the report. Particularly detailed comments were received from Professor M. P. Fogarty, Professor B. Hutchinson, Dr K. A. Kennedy, Mr J. O'Brien, Mr J. Raven, and Mr B. Whelan. A number of important points were also raised by the Referee.

The fieldwork was conducted by the Institute's Survey Unit, to whose Head, Mr J. O'Meara, Operations Manager, Mrs E. Colbert-Stanley and interviewing, coding, and punching staff we are consequently deeply indebted. We are grateful to Mrs M. Dempsey, Secretary of the Institute, for her assistance during the project.

We would also like to thank Miss M. R. Doyle for her efficient typing of several drafts of the report.

Finally, responsibility for the views expressed in the text, and for any remaining errors, rest exclusively with the authors.

Preface

THIS Report makes available the results of a national survey on several topics relating to the employment of women in the Republic of Ireland. The survey was conducted between March and May 1971. The costs of the fieldwork and data processing were met by a grant from the Department of Labour. The project was carried out under the general guidance of a committee which included members of the Departments of Labour and Finance. As emphasised, however, in the Acknowledgements, responsibility for the views expressed rests solely with the authors of the Report.

The present Report is largely descriptive, being confined mainly to a presentation of the survey's findings, and a brief commentary on their more obvious implications. It is hoped at a later date to extend the analysis of some of the topics discussed in the present study by utilising an econometric approach to the question of the "determinants" of female labour force participation.

The information collected in the survey was of immediate interest to the Commission on the Status of Women, and has been made available to it. In order to minimise overlap between the coverage of the present Report and the Commission's investigations the emphasis in the following pages is mainly on the economic and demographic aspects of female employment. Wider issues regarding the status of women have been regarded as outside our terms of reference.

THE aim of this Section is to summarise some of the statistical material already available (from Census of Population and other sources) on women in the Irish economy.

In Table 1.1 some general measures are presented which indicate the importance of female employment in the national economy. Women comprised almost exactly one quarter of the labour force in both 1961 and 1966 (the latest date for which Census data are available at the time of writing). Married women comprised less than 3 per cent of the total labour force at each date. There was some growth in the importance of single and married women in the labour force between 1961 and 1966, but the stability of the proportions in Table 1.1 is very striking. A more detailed analysis [25] has shown that over this period there was an important increase in the labour force participation rate among single women aged 25-64. The decline in agricultural occupations has led to a contraction of employment among older women, and in particular among widows aged 65 and over.

Two aspects of the data in Table 1.1 must be stressed. In the first place, unpaid housework is not included in the concept of National Product and hence women who work only in the household are generally excluded from the labour force. In following this convention, the Irish data do not differ from those of other countries. Economists are, however, increasingly conscious of the value judgment implicit in this convention, and of the distortions that it introduces into our measures of economic welfare, especially during a period of rapid social change in regard to the division of labour between "market" and "non-market" activities. There is, however, no readily available technique for adjusting national product or labour force statistics to remove the effects of this treatment of housework.

The second aspect of the labour force data of Table 1.1 that calls for comment is the treatment of part-time women workers. The Irish Census of Population requires the head of the household to state the "principal occupation" of all the members of the household aged 14 and over. It is likely that many women who work part-time are returned as "housewives" or "in home duties", and consequently that the data of Table 1.1 understate the labour force contribution of women in Ireland, even if attention is confined to "market" activities. Some evidence on this topic has been considered in [25].

Since international conventions regarding the definitions of "gainfully occupied" or "economically active" differ, especially in respect of married women, the data of Table 1.2 must be treated with caution. Despite this caveat, it is unlikely that Ireland's very low rank in column (4) (married women's labour force participation) is due to any serious extent to definitional considerations. The married female labour force participation rate is low in Ireland. Table 1.2 shows, however, that the "femininity" of the Irish labour is not unduly low as a consequence of this fact.

In columns (1) and (2) Ireland occupies a middle rank, despite the very low rank in columns (3), (4) and (5). The demand for female labour has, it seems reasonable to conclude, been met by the relative abundance of single women available for employment, and hence the industrial structure has not been distorted towards "male-intensive" sectors nor has the female proportion in each sector's employment become unusually low.¹ In fact, the availability of single women for work in Ireland may be among the factors that have contributed to the low participation rate among married women.

If married women are defined as not being (actually or potentially) part of the labour force, it can be shown that males increasingly predominate in the Irish labour supply. The data of Table 1.3 illustrate this point. It is evident that since 1961, the pool of people (other than married women) from which the non-agricultural labour force is recruited has become increasingly male. A rising marriage rate, falling age at marriage, and increased participation in post-primary education, have contributed to this development, and these factors have probably gained momentum since 1966 [26, pp. 251-275]. It is obvious, therefore, that the adjustment of the labour market will set in train forces that tend to increase the opportunities and the attractiveness for married women of working outside the home.² It is worth stressing that the changes being experienced in Ireland at the moment, and the reduction in the supply of unmarried women workers they imply, were experienced in the United States and Britain (among other countries) after the second world war, and are generally mentioned among the factors that led to the rapid increase in these countries' married female participation rate [16, Ch. 5]. The comparison with Britain, in particular, should not be pushed too far, however, because that country's demographic structure generated a situation during the 1960s in which the female labour force grew by 8 per cent while the male labour force declined by 4 per cent cf. [17, Table 4]. The high level of male unemployment and the high natural growth rate of the Irish labour force must be borne in mind as part of the overall economic background to the present study.³

¹ These points are discussed at greater length in [25].

² This assertion however, says nothing about the division of the adjustment between higher female wages and reduced female employment. The issues raised by these considerations lie outside the scope of the present discussion, but some of them have been considered in [8].

³ The entry or re-entry of married women to the labour force may be materially affected by factors such as the existence of a marriage bar or the absence of equal pay legislation. At the time of the Survey, the public service and some private employers in Ireland operated a marriage bar, and "equal pay for equal work" was the exception rather than the rule. The *Interim Report* of the Commission on the Status of Women (August 1971) documented the situation in these matters, and recommended the removal of the marriage bar and an equal pay policy.

TABLE 1.1: *Women in the Irish labour force classified by marital status, 1961 and 1966 (Census of Population data)*

	1961				1966			
	<i>Single</i>	<i>Married</i>	<i>Widowed</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Single</i>	<i>Married</i>	<i>Widowed</i>	<i>Total</i>
Gainfully occupied women ('000) (aged 15 and over)	224.3	24.3	33.1	281.7	231.6	25.8	27.9	285.3
Labour force participation rate*	59.2	5.2	26.2	28.9	61.0	5.3	22.2	28.7
Gainfully occupied women as percentage of total labour force (aged 15 and over)**	20.5	2.2	3.0	25.7	20.9	2.3	2.5	25.7

*Gainfully occupied females as percentage of total female population in each marital status.

**Gainfully occupied females in each marital status as a percentage of the total (male plus female) labour force.

Data sources: [3, Table 3] [4, Table 3].

TABLE 1.2: *Women in the labour force: some international comparisons**

<i>Country and year</i>	<i>Women as proportion of total labour force</i>	<i>Non-agricultural salaried employees and wage earners: women as propor- tion of total</i>	<i>Married women as proportion of total labour force</i>	<i>Labour force participation rate among married women</i>	<i>Married as a proportion of total economically active women</i>
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Ireland 1966	25.6	35.0	2.3	5.3	8.9
England and Wales 1966	35.6	36.2	20.6	38.0	57.9
Scotland 1966	35.9	37.1	17.7	34.0	49.3
Northern Ireland 1966	32.0	34.7	11.2	22.4	35.1
Belgium 1961	26.6	30.0	13.7	20.4	51.5
Fed. Rep. Germany 1961	37.0	33.7	16.9	34.3	45.7
France 1968	33.4	32.7	17.8	37.8	53.2
Austria 1961	40.4	36.2	19.0	39.8	47.1
Netherlands 1960	22.3	24.4	4.1	6.7	18.6
Switzerland 1960	30.1	33.4	7.6	16.0	25.3
Dem. Rep. Germany 1964	46.3	n.a.	39.1	67.0	84.3
Czechoslovakia 1961	41.0	38.0	27.9	54.0	67.9
Denmark 1960	30.9	37.1	11.7	22.4	38.0
Finland 1960	39.4	42.5	20.2	45.0	51.2
Norway 1960	22.9	28.9	5.6	9.5	24.7
Sweden 1965	33.6	36.1	18.0	33.2	53.4
USA 1960	32.1	34.6	19.5	31.7	60.7
Canada 1961	27.4	30.6	13.6	22.1	49.6

Sources: [23, Tables 7 and 9] [12, Table 2A] [24, Table 24].

*Latest available data.

TABLE 1.3: *Changes in sex ratio of labour "supply," 1961-1966*

	<i>Numbers ('000)</i>				<i>Females per 1,000 Males</i>	
	<i>Females</i>		<i>Males</i>		<i>1961</i>	<i>1966</i>
	<i>1961</i>	<i>1966</i>	<i>1961</i>	<i>1966</i>		
(1) Total population aged 14 and over	1,001.1	1,021.0	997.5	1,017.9	1,004	1,003
(2) Total aged 15-64	807.6	820.9	818.5	839.7	987	978
(3)=(2) excluding married women	385.4	381.2	818.5	839.7	471	454
(4)=(3) excluding those in agricultural occupations	360.2	361.2	524.6	579.4	687	623
(5)=(4) excluding those at school etc.	321.8	312.5	483.3	526.3	666	594

Census of Population data.
Reproduced from [25].

The Sample

A detailed account of the sampling methodology, and the representativeness of the realised sample, is given in the Appendix.

The present Section summarises some of the main points of this Appendix.

The target population was all women aged over 14 but under 65 (excluding full-time-school-girls) living in the Republic at the time of the survey. The sample size was 5,000 completed interviews and the sampling frame was (of necessity) the latest available Electoral Register. A two-stage sampling procedure was used which followed the basic methodology of the Household Budget Inquiry 1965/66 [5]. The total non-response (due to removal, non-contact, refusals etc.) was 28 per cent of the eligible sample, with refusals amounting to 3.2 per cent. This was considered satisfactory. Interviewers generally reported great interest in the questionnaire, especially among married women. Interviews were obtained with women aged under 21 who lived in the same households as the women drawn from the Electoral Register. This was an attempt to overcome the disparity between the lower limit of 21 years for inclusion on the Electoral Register, and of 15 years for the target population. Just over 10 per cent of the interviews were obtained in this manner.

Detailed comparisons of the realised sample with benchmark data from the 1966 Census of Population are generally encouraging and suggest that the sampling procedure ensured a representative sample. The age group 20-24 was somewhat under-represented in the sample, perhaps due to the deficiencies of the Electoral Register for this age group. The sample also included a lower proportion of single women than that revealed by the 1966 Census (28.2 per cent compared with 37.6 per cent), and this under-representation of the single is evident at all ages 25 and over. The problem of non-contact with younger and single respondents is commonly encountered in survey work, and does not seem to have been unduly pronounced in the present survey, cf. [10]. Nonetheless, those tabulations in the present study where age and marital status are not introduced as classifying variables need to be read subject to the reservations that arise from these discrepancies between the target population and the realised results. A few girls who were still full-time students were included in the completed sample.

Reliability of the Statistical Results

The majority of the tables published in this study present the percentage distribution of the answers to questions in the survey. This distribution is subject to error due, above all, to the fact that only one of all the samples that could have been drawn from the same population has been interviewed. This error increases in importance when the results are cross-classified in detail. Table 1 of the Appendix provides a summary measure of the importance of this error for various percentages and sample sizes. Continued reference to this table is advisable when the results

subsequently discussed are considered. To illustrate the importance of the estimated sampling errors the proportion of the married respondents who were "economically active" may be considered. According to the definitions used in the survey, 15.3 per cent of the married sample were found to be economically active. Use of the table of standard errors shows that a 95 per cent confidence interval about this estimate is 15.3 ± 1.86 . Thus the "true" or "population" proportion may reasonably be expected not to exceed 17.2 or to fall below 13.4. Similar confidence intervals can readily be constructed for the other proportions reported, and all the findings should be interpreted in this light. More specific tests of statistical significance are performed on individual tables in the course of the paper.

SECTION 3

Participation in the Labour Force, Work History, Reasons for not Working, and Plans for Returning to Work

THE central theme of the survey questionnaire was the past, present, and future labour force status of the respondents. By collecting detailed information on *all* work (other than unpaid housework) carried out by the respondents it was hoped that participation rates¹ could be calculated for a large number of population groups. For this purpose, "work" was defined as a "yes" answer to the question, in the non-farm schedule,

Do you have a job at present? That is, are you working (full-or part-time) for pay, profit, or in your own business?

In the farm schedule the question asked was:

Are you doing any work at present, other than general helping on the farm, that brings in income?

The interviewers were instructed as follows:

We want a record of any activity that generates income for the respondent. 'Work' therefore refers to 'gainfully occupied' and does not include one's own housework or child-care, for example, but does include housework done for someone else for which one is paid. Women who take in piece-work of some sort are also 'working' as far as we are concerned. And, of course, women who 'go out to work' are 'working'. It is very important to get accurate answers to all questions concerning work: it may be necessary to stress that answers could NOT result in untaxed earnings being disclosed to the Revenue Commissioners.²

In the farm situation, the problems of classification chiefly revolved about single women who helped in a general way on the farm but did not consider this a full-time job. The interviewers were instructed, as a general rule, to treat as "working" only those women who had non-farm employment or who were head of a farm household. Of course, non-farm work includes piece-work or farm-house holidays. Inevitably, there was a borderline area where the classification between in or out of the labour force was rather arbitrary, but in general the interviewers reported that the respondents had a clear notion as to whether they were or were not "working". The fact that the respondents' own housework was not considered "work" in the sense in which the phrase is used in this study is, of course, an arbitrary

¹ That is, the proportion of a specified group that is "working" or "economically active".

² It was intended that those on sick leave or otherwise temporarily absent from work should be included in our measure of the labour force. The unemployed would, however, be excluded, due to difficulties of measuring their numbers precisely.

decision that implies no inferiority for this type of work, but maintains consistency with the international conventions on national income accounting and labour force statistics.

In Table 3.1 participation rates for the female population classified by age, marital and farm/non-farm status are presented, based on the responses to the question on economic activity. The overall rate of 34 per cent reflects a very wide variety of rates in the separate sub-groups. Married women have generally the lowest, and single women living off-farm the highest, rates. For the purposes of comparison, the 1966 Census rates have been included in the Table. The survey data yielded higher rates for almost all groups. Part of this contrast may be due to an upward trend in the proportions "gainfully occupied" since 1966, but the main source of difference is no doubt the very inclusive definition of "working" used in the survey. The largest contrast is evident for married women and widows of all ages, and for single women in the youngest age groups. The Census emphasis on "principal occupation" may be expected to lead to the exclusion of many of those working only part-time, especially in the case of married women whose main role is that of "housewife". On the other hand, the survey's emphasis on "non-farm" work results in a lower participation rate among single women on farm schedules, since those in the Census occupation "farmers' daughters" would tend to be excluded from the labour force under the definitions used in the present study.

In view of the inclusion of part-time workers in the labour force as defined in Table 3.1, it is important to present data on hours worked ("in a normal work week") by the various population groups. This information is summarised in Table 3.2. Single women work the longest on average, married women the shortest, with a difference of 10 hours between their average work weeks. Eighty-eight per cent of the single working women worked full-time (35 or more hours a week),³ compared with only 37.5 per cent of the married working women. The high proportion of the widowed women in the farm sample who were working full-time reflects the importance of "head of the farm household" as an occupation in this group.⁴ If the data in Table 3.1 are adjusted to represent "full-time participation rates" (by multiplying the entries in Table 3.1 by the corresponding percentage full-time from Table 3.2) the contrast between the survey results and the Census data is greatly reduced. For example, this procedure yields a full-time participation rate of 5.6 per cent for married women aged 15-64, compared with the Census figure of 6 per cent. In view of the sampling errors attached to the survey figure, it is possible to conclude that the "full-time participation rate" derived from the survey does not differ significantly from the participation rate calculated from Census data. An important aspect of married women's participation in the labour force that is revealed by the survey data and not evident in Census data is the tendency for the rate to fall to a minimum at age 25-29, and to increase over the 30-54 range.

The fact that more married women are working part-time than full-time high-

* Since in some jobs (e.g. teaching) a full working week may be less than 35 hours, this definition perhaps exaggerates the prevalence of part-time working.

⁴ Details of occupations, and other aspects of the work, will be considered below.

lights the need to collect full details of hours worked in any attempt to measure the labour force. In Britain, the Census of Population data reveal that the proportion of women workers who are working part-time⁵ has risen from 13 per cent in 1951 to 32 per cent in 1966. Just over 17 per cent of the "full-time equivalent" British female labour force is now contributed by women who are working part-time. This, however, only amounts to 6.4 per cent of the total ("full-time male equivalent") labour force, cf. [17, Table 3].

Details of participation by marital status classified by the level of (full-time) education last attended are presented in Table 3.3. In the non-farm sample, the tendency for participation rates to rise with increasing educational attainment is very pronounced among all marital status, and there is a very marked contrast between the low rates of the "primary, incomplete" group and those with business/commercial, university, or other professional training. Table 3.4 complements Table 3.3 by providing data on hours worked by married women classified by education. It is clear that not only are those with higher educational attainment more likely to be in the labour force, they are also more likely to be working full-time. There is a five hours' difference between the average work week of those with primary as compared with those with "other professional" (nurses, school-teachers, etc.) education. The full-time participation rate among married women with "other professional" training is 14 per cent. The bimodal distribution of hours worked by those with primary and vocational education (one peak at 15-24 hours, the other at 35 and over) reflects the importance of part-time service and factory work for these categories (see Section 5 below).

The married population was assigned to social groups on the basis of husbands' occupations. In the non-farm sample, nine groups were used, based on the Hall-Jones system as modified for the Irish occupational structure by Hutchinson [10]. Agricultural occupations appearing on non-farm schedules were rather specialised categories (foresters, gardeners, farm managers). Participation rates for married women (non-farm) by social group are set out in Table 3.5. The pattern revealed in this Table is complex, with the lowest rates found at either end of the social spectrum, and the highest rates in the intermediate range. The rise in participation rates in the lower inspectorial and routine non-manual social groups may reflect a combination of high income aspirations, modest husband's income, and reasonably high (or career-oriented) wife's education that is especially likely to result in re-entry into the labour force. These groups also include shopkeepers and several other occupations in which the wife may find it easy to work in cooperation with her husband. The number of hours worked per week in this group was, however, above the average for married women.

Care of young children is a major topic in connection with married women's entry or re-entry to the labour force. Participation rates have therefore been calculated by presence of children (Table 3.6) for the main population groups.⁶ In the non-

⁵ Part-time is defined as less than the normal working week in the relevant occupation, which is less inclusive than the definition used in the present survey.

⁶ The small number of farm widows in the various categories ruled out the calculation for this group.

farm sample of married women, the association between presence of children and labour force participation is very clear-cut: the highest rate is found among married women with no children under 19 years, and the rate falls as the number of children present increases up to three, after which it fluctuates. The greatest contrast is between those without and with children aged under 2 years: the participation rate among the former is twice that among the latter group. Women with children aged 2–under 4 years were also noticeably less likely to be working than those with older, or no, children. The net effect of the presence of children aged 4– under 19 on mothers' labour force status appears to be slight.⁷ The association between working and presence of young children is much less close in the farm sample.

For non-farm widows the data in Table 3.6 show that there was generally a higher participation rate among those with, than among those without, school-aged children. The participation rate for widows with children aged 4– under 14, in particular, is notably higher than that for married women in the same situation. This may be taken as evidence of greater economic pressure on widows, and the importance of such pressure in the decision to go out to work.

In Table 3.7 the hours worked per week by married women classified by presence of children are presented. The length of the work week was closely related to the participation rate, being longest among those groups with the highest rate. At one extreme, 50 per cent of working women with no children under 19 were working full-time, compared with only 26 per cent of those with children under 2 years. Thus, the full-time participation rate for married women with children aged under 2 was about 2 per cent, compared with a full-time rate of 8 per cent for those without children under 2, or a full-time rate slightly over 10 per cent for those with no children under 19.

When participation rates by presence of children are classified by social group (Table 3.8) the same general pattern as that found in the table of rates by social groups persists. The presence of young children appears to have its greatest influence on the participation rate in the higher professional and in the manual groups: this suggests that if the rate is high in the absence of children, the presence of children has a less noticeable effect on the rate than is otherwise the case. A consistent pattern emerges for participation rates by education by presence of children (Table 3.9). The tendency for participation to increase with rising educational standards noted above (Table 3.3) is now seen to persist when family size is allowed for: the higher the educational attainment, the higher the participation rate for women both with and without young children.

A question was asked about working "seasonally" or "as work becomes available". Just over 5 per cent of the non-farm sample not currently working said they worked on this basis. Among single women this proportion rises to 16 per cent, but it falls to 4 per cent among married women.

⁷ Table 3.6 does not, however, allow us to examine the effect of presence of children in more than one of the age groups at the same time.

Work History

A question was asked of all about their "work history":

I'd like to get some idea of your working life since you finished your full-time education: which of the following is the best description of your experience?

The list of pre-coded statements which was then read to the interviewee has been used as the categories making up the tables of this section. In the farm questionnaire, the stress was placed on "non-farm work experience". In Table 3.10 the results are presented, classified by marital status, for those not currently working. A substantial proportion (14 per cent) of the non-farm sample not currently working had never worked. Forty four per cent of the single, non-working population had never worked. Almost three-quarters (74 per cent) of the non-working married sample had worked until marriage or the arrival of a child, but not since. Well over half the farm sample not currently working had never worked in non-farm jobs. The contrast between single and married women on the farm is striking: a high proportion of married women had worked in non-farm employment before getting married, but not since, whereas almost 80 per cent of the single women had never worked in non-farm jobs.

Table 3.11 presents the answers to this question in detail, classified by age. In contrast with table 3.10, in this table the base that has been used is the total number (working and not working) in the relevant group. This corrects for distortions that arise if attention is confined to the non-working population only, since this population represents a special sub-group of the total, especially among single women and in certain age groups a more accurate picture may be obtained by considering "currently working" as a special category of work history. For non-farm women, the proportions who have "never worked" may be seen to rise steadily with age; 23 per cent of the single women or 18 per cent of married women aged 55-64 were in this category. Categories such as retirement to care for relatives, etc., remain minor at all ages. Among married women, the interruption of work on marriage or the arrival of a baby is, of course, the most common work history, with younger women showing a much stronger tendency to continue working after marriage until the baby is due. It is interesting that widows displayed the lowest proportion who had never worked in each age group (although their overall proportion in this category is high due to their advanced average age). There is a strong rise in the proportion of widows who had returned to work by age 55-64.

In the farm sample it was found that the older population had very limited non-farm work experience, especially among single women. Even when age is allowed for, the single farm population displayed a low level of contact with the non-farm economy by comparison with the married sample. This is partly due to the fact that sizeable proportions of the married sample, especially in the younger age groups, had worked in non-farm jobs before marriage. The unmarried female population living on farms at an advanced age is obviously a selective sub-sample of the cohort from which it originated.

It is possible to derive some important statistics from the responses to this question

on work history. In Table 3.12 the age distribution of those who have never worked is presented. Well over 50 per cent of them are aged 45 or over. There is a significant group of young single women who have never worked, presumably school leavers who have yet to take their first job. But it is clear that life-long non-participation in the labour force is above all a characteristic of the older women in our sample, and a pattern that is becoming increasingly rare. This has important implications for the readiness of married women to re-enter the labour force, as will be discussed below.

The answers to the question on work history emphasise the need to modify the picture suggested by the low current participation rate in the light of the fact that a significant proportion of married women have at some time returned to work after marriage, in addition to those who are currently working. The proportion who are not now working and have never worked since marriage (or arrival of baby) is fairly stable at about 70 per cent in all age groups, so that about 30 per cent of married women have experience of working as married women.⁸

The work history of married women who are currently working is of interest since it sheds some light on the pattern of re-entry to the labour force. Table 3.13 presents the survey findings. "Continuous working" and "continuous working except for babies" are important among younger women, and "never worked before marriage, started later" is more important among the older respondents. The importance of "continuous working" or "started after marriage" is somewhat surprising, since it means that what might have been thought of as the more normal pattern (worked till marriage or baby, returned later) is relevant to only forty per cent of the working married sample. The summary of the widowed sample's experience shows that a higher proportion of this group are women whose first work experience occurs after marriage (8 per cent, as opposed to 5.4 among the married). On the other hand, continuous working is a good deal less common among the widowed. This points to the conclusion that the widowed working population is a good deal less "career-oriented", and more impelled by necessity and circumstance, than its married counterpart (even when account is taken of the differences in age between the two groups). Detailed tabulations of work history by social group and educational attainment have been prepared, but are not presented here. The falling off in the proportions who had never worked in the higher educational levels was noticeable. In general, married women with high educational attainment show a high degree of involvement in the labour force, either by currently working or by having worked at some time since marriage.

Working married women in the non-farm sample were asked about the age of their youngest child at the time they returned to work. The answers are shown in Table 3.14. Almost 9 per cent had no children. Amongst those with children there was a large range of answers indicating that considerable differences exist in regard to this aspect of returning to work. Nonetheless, the most frequent pattern

⁸ Not counting those who worked only in the interval between marriage and the arrival of the first baby.

was to return when the youngest child was aged 1- under 5 years, possibly at school-going age.

Reasons for Not Working

The non-farm sample of women who were not currently working were asked "What is the main reason you are not now working"? The reply to this question was not prompted, but a list of pre-coded possibilities was printed on the questionnaire, and the interviewers were instructed to keep a record of any unforeseen replies. Obviously the attempt to single out one main reason implies that this topic was investigated in a relatively simple manner. Table 3.15 summarises the responses. Not surprisingly, the presence of young children in families was by far the most important single reason given for not working. When young children were mentioned, an effort was made (by a probe question) to distinguish between those who would not work as long as children were present, and those who were influenced primarily by the absence of child-care facilities rather than the presence of children in itself.

When these results were studied by the respondents' age, concern with child-care was, as expected, most urgent among those aged under 55. Almost half as many gave the reason "no suitable facilities" as "should not work if there are young children" in the age group 25-34, but this ratio declined to one-sixth among women aged 45-54. No doubt this contrast reflects differences in the personal situations of the respondents at different ages, and the greater relevance of child-care facilities to those who have young children. Absence of suitable jobs increased sharply as a reason for not working with advancing age, and this reason was also of above average importance to those in the manual social groups, and with lower levels of educational attainment. Other variations between social groups in reasons for not working follow expectations and can be briefly summarised. "Don't need extra income" was mentioned by 17 per cent of those in the professional group, but this proportion fell in the lower social groups, and was only 2 per cent among the routine manual group. Taxes and the marriage bar figured most prominently in the middle range of social groups. Husband's disapproval was mentioned more frequently at the lower end of the social scale. More detail on those answering "no jobs available" is given in connection with the discussion of excess labour supply, below.

Likelihood of Return

A discussion of the reasons for not working is naturally supplemented by considering the response to the question:

Do you think you are likely to go back to work (or start working) anytime in the future?

The farm sample was questioned about non-farm work. Table 3.16 shows the results tabulated by marital status. The single respondents expressed the greatest interest in returning, the widows the least. The non-farm sample expressed more interest than the farm. The farm sample was more definite about not intending to

return. Perhaps the most striking result is that 11 per cent of the non-farm married sample answered "definitely yes" to this question. In all, 34 per cent of the non-farm married sample gave a "yes" answer (definitely or probably) compared with 45 saying "no". In Table 3.17 these results are broken down by age for married respondents. The likelihood of returning (or entering) falls off with increasing age, and is highest for married women in the age group 25-34, where over one-half gave a "yes" answer, and only 26 per cent gave a "no" answer. In contrast, at age 55-64 only 8 per cent said "yes" and 70 per cent "no". If only those who said "definitely yes" in response to this question actually worked at some future date, in addition to those already at work, there would be a substantial rise in participation rates as the women now in their twenties pass through the age groups in which return to work (after marriage) is most common. The possibility exists, however, that the changed personal circumstances of the young women by the time they have children would lead them to act differently than they foresaw themselves doing when they answered the question in the survey.

For married women, likelihood of return is classified by education in Table 3.18. The expressed likelihood of return increased with increasing educational attainment, especially in the non-farm sample.

Previous work history is also relevant to future work plans, as may be seen from Table 3.19. Those whose previous work experience was the most continuous believed they were most likely to return to work: those who had never worked were least likely to join the labour force.⁹ This finding, when considered along with the fact that earlier tables have documented a fall in the proportions of successive cohorts of married women who have never worked, points to the prospect of a continuing rise in married women's participation rate.

For the non-farm married population, likelihood of return was classified by main reason for not working (Table 3.20). The groups least likely to return to work were those who disapproved (or whose husband disapproved) of working, who had retired due to age or ill health, and who answered "don't need extra income". At the other extreme, those who were not working because there were "no jobs available", "hours not flexible", "no suitable facilities for children", and "taxes too high" were the most likely to return to work. It is interesting to confirm that women who gave "unavailability of jobs" as their reason for not working expressed the greatest interest in returning to work: their pessimism about the condition of the job market did not deter the majority of them (64 per cent) from saying that it was likely that they would return to work at some time in the future. On the other hand, 13 per cent of this group said they definitely would not be going back to work.

Further information on the meaning of a positive response to the question on likelihood of return is provided by the answers to the question "When do you think you will go back to work?" which was asked of all those giving a "yes" (definitely or probably) answer to the first question. Table 3.21 sets out these

⁹ Except for those who had retired for reasons of age or health.

answers. Among the single respondents, the most important answer was "now, if jobs were available," but "later, when children are older etc." dominated the married and widowed responses.

In addition to questioning women not currently working about the likelihood of their returning to work, working women who worked less than 25 hours per week were asked why they were not working "full-time". The answers are set out in Table 3.22, from which it is clear that the main factor among married women (who form the majority of those working a short work week) was a desire to be with their children. Next in importance was a lack of interest in working longer hours, presumably because a short work week either brought in enough extra income or provided sufficient outside interest. However, 15 per cent of married women working less than 25 hours per week claimed that they could not get extra work. These part-time workers were asked about their intentions for working longer hours in the future. Over two-thirds of the married women did not intend to work longer hours in the future, but 11 per cent said they would work a full working week if they could get the work. Another 13 per cent hoped to work longer hours when their children were older. The general impression conveyed by these answers is that to work part-time rather than full-time is very important to married women, since it allows them to work without feeling that they are neglecting their other responsibilities.

A special question was put to young single women regarding their plans for working after marriage. Table 3.23 sets out the answers received. In view of the hypothetical nature of the question (some of the respondents may never marry!) the results must be interpreted with caution. The most striking feature of this table is the high proportion (36 per cent) who believed they would either continue working all their married life or return to work sometime after marriage. This figure is higher than the proportion that at present go back to work and if taken at face value it would suggest that a rise in the participation rate among married women may be anticipated in the future. Perhaps even more revealing is the fact that not much more than a quarter (27 per cent) expressed the belief that they would definitely not work as married women. Of course, these same respondents might answer differently when they are wives and mothers and more aware of the issues involved.

Belief about Job Availability

Two general questions were asked about the respondent's perception of the local job market for women:

Do you think there are jobs available *in this neighbourhood* for women who want to work?

and

Do you think there are *easily reached* jobs available outside this neighbourhood for women who want to work?

The answers to these questions are summarised in Tables 3.24 and 3.25. Only

a minority of respondents believed that jobs were (definitely or probably) available "in the neighbourhood": 28 per cent, as opposed to 63 per cent believed they were not. However, just over 50 per cent believed jobs were available "within easy reach", and only 36 per cent believed they were not. The most striking contrast revealed in these tables is the very much lower proportion of positive answers among farm respondents: for example, 62 per cent of non-working married farm respondents answered "no" to the question about availability of jobs within easy reach, compared with only 32 per cent in the non-farm sample. The proportions of women expressing a belief that jobs were available in the neighbourhood were very low indeed in the farm sample. There is also a consistent contrast between those working and those not working—in almost all instances working women expressed a higher degree of optimism about the availability of jobs than their non-working counterparts. It is worth drawing attention to the general consistency between the views of the married, single and widowed women. The proportion of each marital status answering "yes" or "no" to each of the questions is approximately equal, especially between the married and single groups (the widows expressed greater ignorance of the job situation than either of the other groups). This supports the conclusion that women make a consistent assessment of the availability of jobs.

Belief about the job situation may be influenced by interest in, or contact with, the job market. In Table 3.26 the married non-farm sample is analysed in relation to work history. It is clear that recent contact with the job market seems to reduce pessimism: the highest proportion of "no" and "don't know" answers was received from those who had never worked, the lowest proportion from those who had worked occasionally since marriage. This may be because those who have not worked recently become convinced that work is not available, and presumably, eventually cease to look, or alternatively, because where work is unavailable a history of non-participation is likely. In addition, those who "never worked" may by other criteria (e.g. age, education) be less likely to obtain whatever employment is available. A vicious circle of lack of employment opportunities leading to lower eligibility for employment may thus be formed.

Table 3.27 shows the answers to the question on job availability classified by reasons for not working. The most pessimistic about job availability were those who had given "no jobs available" as their reason for not working, of whom 60 per cent replied "no" to the present question. Presumably, those who answered "yes" to the question on job availability, despite giving "no jobs available" as a reason for not working, were not interested in the type of jobs that they believed were available, or they had objections to them on grounds of hours, etc. This finding is useful in connection with the discussion below, where the reason for not working is used as a measure of excess labour supply. The most striking general feature of the table is, however, the relatively uniform distribution of belief about job availability between those with different reasons for not working. Other than the rather high proportion of those who felt they lacked qualifications for work, who expressed ignorance of the job market, there is little contrast between the various groups in their answers to this question.

Those who said they thought there were jobs available, either in the neighbourhood or within easy reach, were asked to list the type of work they felt was available. In Table 3.28 the answers to this question are summarised. "Domestic work" and "factory work" were by far the most frequently mentioned. "Hotel/catering" was much more important in the farm responses than in the non-farm. These responses were classified by the respondent's education. It is very striking how closely the type of work mentioned seems to reflect the respondent's background: for example, only 15 per cent of those with primary education mentioned clerical work, compared with 54 per cent of those with business/commercial training. This suggests that the question on job availability was answered mainly in the light of the type of jobs that the respondent herself was familiar with and interested in. When the responses of the working respondents were classified by their occupations a very similar pattern emerged but the numbers involved in the majority of the cells were too small to allow much significance to be attached to this finding.

In Table 3.29 belief about job availability ("within easy reach") is considered from the viewpoint of the area of the country in which the respondents lived. Dublin stands out as unique because of the very optimistic answers given to this question, with almost 70 per cent of the respondents answering "yes". In the smaller towns and in the countryside there was a fairly pessimistic appraisal of the job market, with, in general, somewhat less than 50 per cent answering "yes". A similar pattern is revealed when the answers are classified by the type of area in which the respondents lived; those in the central city areas or in the suburbs were far more optimistic about job prospects than those living outside the cities or towns or in the open countryside. In fact over 80 per cent of the total non-farm sample living in the "open countryside" answered "no" to the question on jobs available "within easy reach", with just over 70 per cent saying "definitely no". Thus, proximity to an economic centre of some size appears to be very important in determining the availability of jobs to women. This finding is readily understood in the light of how few women have a car at their disposal or can afford to travel long distances to obtain what may be part-time work.¹⁰

Obviously, geographical variations in belief about job availability may arise in part due to the different socio-economic structures of the populations living in communities of different sizes, as well as due to actual differences in the demand for labour between regions and types of communities. More detailed tabulations, which might illuminate this issue, are not presented here. It is worth mentioning, however, that certain types of employment (e.g. hotel work) figured prominently among the work believed available in country areas. In addition, the contrast in the belief about job availability between urban and rural residents (in the non-farm sample) remained very pronounced even where the answers were classified by the respondents' labour force status.

¹⁰ The non-farm sample living in the "open countryside" are those who, although living outside towns, are not dependent on agriculture. The Census of Population (1966) reveals that the total population living outside towns and villages was 1.2 million but there were only 876 thousand in the agricultural socio-economic groups.

Indications of Excess Labour Supply

Unemployment is basically a measure of the excess of labour supply over demand at prevailing wage rates in a given labour market. The question of whether this phenomenon arises only due to the downward rigidity of wage rates or to a more complex inadequacy of the market economy has been central to the theoretical debate provoked by Keynes' *General Theory* and need not detain us here, cf. [9 pp. 26-30]. The general public, and governmental experts, have come to rely very heavily on official series of unemployment statistics as the operational measure of excess labour supply. Major differences exist between countries in the way in which such data are collected, with Irish and British practice relying on the number of workers registering for certain benefits, whereas American unemployment rates are based on sample data on the numbers not at work who are actively seeking work. The American approach obviously leads to a more inclusive measure of unemployment, and hence a much higher proportion of the US labour force is classified as unemployed even where the economy is believed to be close to "full employment". However, in periods of relatively high unemployment it is recognised that even the approach used in the US understates the extent of unemployment:

. . . the unemployment statistic is not an exhaustive count of those with time and incentive to search (for work). An additional 3 per cent of the labour force are involuntarily confined to part-time work, and another $\frac{3}{4}$ of 1 per cent are out of the labour force because they 'could not find job' or 'think no work is available'—discouraged by market conditions rather than by personal incapacities [22, p. 8].

A short-coming of the widely quoted unemployment rates is their tendency to treat all labour as homogeneous, so that an additional labourer out of work raises the unemployment rate by the same amount as an additional skilled worker or manager, despite the fact that the loss of potential output represented by those types of unemployment is not the same [18, pp. 1-7].

This discussion is relevant to the survey findings because, as is evident from the material already presented, information was collected about job availability, reasons for not working, and plans for returning to work. Information of this type is obviously relevant to the measurement of unemployment, even if it is not included in official indicators of unemployment. It is, however, very important to bear in mind at this stage the comment made above about the fallacy of treating all unemployed workers as equal: from either a humanitarian or a strictly economic viewpoint, there is no justification for treating the head of a household who suddenly becomes redundant as equivalent in unemployment statistics to a housewife who is not working due to difficulty in finding a "suitable" job. But it is equally unjustified to ignore the fact that both are elements in the aggregate excess labour supply.

The existence of excess supply of several categories of labour is not, of course, inconsistent with shortages of other types of workers. Divergences between the types of labour demanded and supplied may persist due to rigidities in the labour market, especially in the case of married women whose "job search mobility" is

low and for whom considerations such as flexibility of hours worked are very important. The statement that "suitable" jobs are not available may reflect a high degree of selectivity among housewives as to what is suitable, but this does not entitle us to exclude completely such job-seekers from our measures of excess labour supply.¹¹

The first indicator of excess labour supply provided by the survey data derives from the answers to the questions on main reason for not working. It may be claimed that women who answered this (open-ended) question by saying "no (suitable) jobs available" are part of the excess labour supply. The second measure available from the survey data is the number who replied that they would go to work "now, if (suitable) jobs were available" in response to the question "When do you think you will go (back) to work?" (asked only of those who answered "yes" to question on whether they were likely to go (back) to work). Finally, a third source of information was obtained by asking those not currently working to classify themselves as in "household duties", "student", "retired" or "unemployed". These three measures are listed here in descending order of inclusiveness: the first is very wide and may include many who are not very actively seeking employment, whereas the last measure is very narrow and should correspond closely to the official unemployment data.

All of these measures may be converted to rates either by dividing by the total number (working and not working) in the relevant group, or by the total labour force (those working plus the excess labour supply) in the group. Table 3.30 presents the three measures, converted to a rate in the two alternative ways, for all marital status. It may readily be seen that the first two measures differ dramatically from the third among married women, but relatively little among single women. This is, of course, merely a reflection of the difficulty of measuring "excess labour supply" among a group such as married women. Nonetheless, when all the obvious reservations that attach to these statistics have been made, the evidence suggests that inadequacy of aggregate demand for women workers is a serious aspect of the present labour market situation in Ireland, despite possible shortages of individual categories of female workers.¹²

Further light on the meaning of these measures of excess labour supply is obtained by a brief consideration of their variation between different sample sub-groups (Table 3.31). A regional breakdown reveals that there is an enormous contrast between Dublin and other major cities, on the one hand, and the rest of the country,

¹¹ Just as, when a plumber can find work only as a builder's labourer, is he rightly regarded as unemployed.

¹² Apart from the Live Register statistics on female unemployment, the only available measure of shortages of female labour is contained in the returns of the CII-ESRI quarterly industrial survey (published in the ESRI's *Quarterly Economic Commentary*). A study of these returns reveals that between December 1969 and December 1972 the only industry whose overall expansion appears to have been constrained by the unavailability of female labour was the "Clothing and footwear" group, and this only between fourth quarter 1969 and fourth quarter 1970. In other industries (especially Textiles) several respondents reported shortages of female labour from time to time but this shortage was not widespread throughout the industry and did not constitute an obstacle to expansion. It is reasonable to infer from this evidence that a generalised scarcity of female labour has not existed in recent years in Ireland.

on the other. Progressively higher rates of excess labour supply are found in the smaller or more rural areas. The pattern of the rates by age and education is a coherent one, indicating that older women, and those with less education, experience greater difficulty in obtaining suitable employment than the rest of the sample. It was also found that an above average proportion of those who reported "no jobs available" had either never worked or had interrupted their employment by a long period of absence from the labour force. It is important to bear in mind in connection with these results that attention has been confined to the non-farm sample. However, the general pattern of farm/non-farm differentials established in connection with belief about job availability suggests that the farm respondents and non-farm respondents living in the countryside experience similar problems in obtaining suitable employment if they are interested in going out to work.

The discussion has been confined to evidence concerning women not currently at work who are, to a greater or lesser extent, interested in working. There is, of course, additional evidence of excess supply based on the women who are working a shorter work week than they would like to work. This type of "underemployment" has been mentioned in connection with Table 3.22, above, where it was seen that a relatively small minority of those working part-time expressed a desire to work a longer week.

Summary and Conclusions

The first objective of the survey was to measure participation in the labour force using a very inclusive definition. The results suggest a higher rate than is shown in the Census returns, which concentrates on full-time participation. The contrast is greatest for married and widowed women and for young single women in non-farm households. When the survey results are adjusted to a full-time basis, a very close concordance with the Census data is found. Some of the activity that has been included in the survey data on labour force participation may seem rather slight when viewed in relation to the total work effort of the national economy, but nonetheless it may be very important from the viewpoint of the individual women (and households) concerned. It is also likely that work supplied on a part-time basis will become increasingly important in certain sectors of the economy. Some of these topics are explored further, later in this report.

The overall participation rate for the married population estimated on the basis of the Survey was 15 per cent, with a full-time rate of 6 per cent. Participation was seen to be most common among those whose full-time education had been prolonged beyond the primary level, especially those who had career-oriented (business/commercial or "other professional") training. The pattern by social class (as measured by husband's occupation) was less clear-cut, but there was a tendency for those in the middle range of the social continuum to have higher than average participation rates. Previous work history made a considerable difference to the likelihood that a women would have returned to work since marriage, those who had not worked before marriage being less likely to have a job. Women who had young children to care for were far less likely to be at work than those without

children and, when presence of children was controlled for, younger women were more likely than older women to work. Thus the married women least likely to be working were older women, those with young children, those who had no work experience prior to marriage, and those with low educational attainment. All of these differentials operated within an overall farm/non-farm differential which showed a consistently higher participation by married women living in non-farm households.

The full extent of labour force involvement by married women is not conveyed by considering only the participation rate at the time of the survey (17 per cent for non-farm married women). In addition, account should be taken of those who had worked at some time since their marriage, even if not currently at work. The survey findings show that 30 per cent of married women in the non-farm sample had worked since their marriage (including those working at the time of the survey). Thus although non-participation in the labour force after marriage is the most common pattern for Irish women, almost a third of the married women interviewed had worked at some time after their marriage. Moreover, an important proportion of those not currently working expressed the belief that it was likely that they would work at some future date.¹³ The following summarises the situation among the married respondents: (Percentages)

	<i>Currently working</i>	<i>Not Currently Working</i>		<i>Sub-total</i>	<i>Not working not likely to return</i>	<i>Total</i>
		<i>"Definitely" likely to return</i>	<i>"Probably" likely to return</i>			
<i>Married women:</i>	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4) = (1)+(2)+(3)	(5)	(6) = (4)+(5)
Non-farm	17.4	8.9	19.1	45.4	54.6	100
Farm	9.2	1.6	6.7	17.5	82.5	100
Total	15.3	7.1	15.9	38.3	61.8	100

The survey results provide many grounds for believing that married women's participation rate will grow. In the first place, return to work is more likely among those who worked prior to marriage, than is entry for the first time subsequent to marriage, and the proportion of women who have never worked is contracting sharply in each successive age cohort: secondly, participation is more likely among women with post-primary education, and the proportion of women who finish their education at the primary level is steadily falling and of those with advanced training and education is growing; the presence of young children reduces the likelihood that a married woman will be working, and the trend is towards both earlier marriage and smaller families, which will increase the proportion of the

¹³ We have no evidence relevant to the present context of the reliability of statements about future plans to actual behaviour. This issue is discussed in a different economic context in [15].

married life-span that women spend without young children to care for.¹⁴ Furthermore, the frequency with which married women cited "no suitable jobs available" as the main reason for not working, suggests that if the overall unemployment rate were lower, a higher proportion of married women would be in employment. Since some of the developments just mentioned (especially the rising marriage rate) imply a contraction in the relative availability of unmarried women workers, it is likely that an expansion in the demand for married women workers may be expected in future years. Even if this source of growth in demand is not rapid enough to absorb all married women interested in working into the labour force, it is nonetheless very likely to be sufficient to ensure an increase in the participation rate. It must, however, be borne in mind that a majority of married women who return to work wish only to work part-time, and many of those who return have been outside the labour force during the years when they had to care for young children. Moreover, even allowing for the growth of participation in the labour force, it is likely that for some years to come the most common pattern among married women in Ireland will be not to return to work after marriage.

The prominence of concern about child-care as a reason for not working among married women is a predictable finding, but the proportion of those not working who cited unavailability of jobs as the reason for not working is less expected. The proportion giving this answer was lowest among those with relatively advanced educational qualifications and younger women. By far the greatest contrast, however, was between the urban and rural areas (even when attention is confined to the non-farm sample): the proportion citing unavailability of jobs as the main reason for not working was low in Dublin, and in or near urban centres generally, and very high in small towns and villages and in the open countryside. Whilst it has not been suggested that these calculations be taken in any way as a measure of unemployment in the sense, for example, that Live Register data measure this phenomenon, the view is advanced that they should be taken into account in any consideration of the flexibility of the Irish labour supply.

It has already been seen that there was substantial interest in returning to work among the married women who were not currently in the labour force: almost one third expressed the belief that they would in fact go back to work, usually "When the children are older" or "If suitable jobs were available". Generally, the degree of interest in returning to work varied by education and socio-economic group very much as the actual participation rate varied. Even among those interested in going to work, there was considerable uncertainty as to the availability of employment opportunities, and in all one-third of the non-farm respondents did not believe work was available (within easy reach) for married women. There were very pronounced regional variations in the way this question was answered, however, with increasing pessimism expressed, the further from Dublin or other urban centres,

¹⁴ Between 1949 and 1969, the median age of Irish brides fell from 27 years to 24 [27]. It has been estimated that, at 1963 fertility rates, out of every 1,000 families with one child, 400 would eventually have a sixth, but that at 1970 rates this had fallen to 234 out of every 1,000 [26].

the respondent lived. When jobs were believed available, service and factory work was most frequently mentioned.

The pessimism about job availability expressed by many women, particularly those living outside the main urban centres, does suggest the existence of a pool of potential entrants to the labour market. This finding must, however, be tempered by the consideration that many of the women interested in returning to work live in areas of low population density and are primarily interested in part-time work. Thus, there is not necessarily an abundant supply of female labour within the catchment areas relevant to many employers, even though a high proportion of married women are interested in getting an opportunity to work. These points will have to be borne in mind in evaluating the question of policy towards married women who work.

TABLE 3.1: Women's participation in the labour force classified by age and marital status (percentage of each group working)

Age	Present Sample†										Census 1966 ("Gainfully Occupied")			
	Non-Farm			Farm*			Total			Total	Single	Married	Widowed	Total
	Single	Married	Widowed	Single	Married	Widowed	Single	Married	Widowed					
15-19	86.5	(18.2)	—	(56.5)	—	(100)	83.8	(16.7)	(100)	82.2	81.8**	9.2	(14.3)	80.1**
20-24	93.3	22.9	—	(52.2)	(21.1)	—	85.8	22.5	—	67.7	86.4	8.7	37.9	66.8
25-29	88.5	11.1	—	(47.1)	8.9	(100)	82.3	10.7	(100)	30.4	83.8	6.2	45.8	35.6
30-34	81.2	16.1	(57.1)	(57.1)	7.9	(100)	78.9	14.2	(62.5)	25.3	75.9	4.8	44.0	22.2
35-39	(79.6)	16.5	(55.6)	(12.5)	7.3	—	70.2	14.3	(50.0)	21.0	70.1	4.4	49.5	19.0
40-44	74.5	18.3	(62.5)	(22.2)	7.4	(100)	61.6	15.4	(67.9)	24.1	65.5	4.7	49.2	17.9
45-54	66.9	19.3	49.4	(24.1)	11.1	(100)	59.1	16.8	58.5	25.7	60.2	5.8	43.9	20.2
55-64	52.7	15.9	32.9	(13.2)	7.0	(87.8)	42.6	13.6	45.3	25.1	49.3	5.9	32.6	21.8
No answer	(81.5)	29.2	(41.7)	—	(11.5)	(66.7)	(62.9)	24.5	(46.7)	35.8	—	—	—	—
Total aged 15-64	81.4	17.4	42.0	36.4	9.2	89.9	74.5	15.3	51.8	34.3	75.1	5.5	37.6	33.7

*Working defined as either "head of household" or "doing non-farm work."

**Excluding those at school (primary, secondary, vocational).

Entries in parentheses relate to sample groups in which the total number of respondents was 50 or fewer.

†Note that we have based our "participation rate" only on those who were "working," whereas the economic concept of "economically active" refers both to those working and to the unemployed. For a discussion of the measurement of unemployment in the present context, see text.

TABLE 3.2: Working women: hours worked classified by marital status

<i>Hours worked per week</i>	<i>Non-farm</i>			<i>Farm</i>			<i>Total</i>		
	<i>Single</i>	<i>Married</i>	<i>Widowed</i>	<i>Single</i>	<i>Married</i>	<i>Widowed</i>	<i>Single</i>	<i>Married</i>	<i>Widowed</i>
Average hours worked:*	38.5	28.0	29.3	37.9	28.1	38.7	38.5	28.0	32.7
Percentage working:—									
35+ hours per week	88.3	39.4	48.7	81.0	26.9	93.5	87.7	37.5	64.6
25-34 hours per week	8.4	17.4	15.9	10.1	20.5	3.2	8.5	17.9	11.4
15-24 hours per week	2.0	23.0	14.2	5.1	14.1	0.0	2.3	21.6	9.2
Under 15 hours per week	0.7	17.1	19.5	—	12.8	3.2	0.7	16.5	13.7
No answer	0.6	3.1	1.8	3.8	25.6	—	0.9	6.5	1.1
Total percent	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
<i>N</i>	979	426	113	79	78	62	1058	504	175

*Based on those answering. Assuming an average of 40 hours per week for those working 35 hours and more.

TABLE 3.3: *Participation rate classified by education and by marital status (percentage of each group working)*

<i>Education (viz: last level attended full time)</i>	<i>Non-farm</i>			<i>Farm</i>			<i>Total</i>		
	<i>Single</i>	<i>Married</i>	<i>Widowed</i>	<i>Single</i>	<i>Married</i>	<i>Widowed</i>	<i>Single</i>	<i>Married</i>	<i>Widowed</i>
Primary: incomplete	57.3	11.2	(32.5)	(20.0)	4.7	(100.0)	55.0	9.3	(38.6)
Primary: complete	77.6	14.8	38.5	21.2	7.3	(87.0)	65.2	12.5	50.8
Vocational/technical: complete or incomplete	85.3	16.1	(46.7)	(56.1)	3.7	(100.0)	79.2	12.8	(60.0)
Secondary: no exam or Inter	85.1	17.0	(48.1)	(19.0)	3.9	(100.0)	78.1	13.9	(60.0)
Secondary: leaving or Matric	89.5	15.1	(38.1)	(60.0)	(20.4)	(83.3)	87.0	16.2	(48.1)
Business/commercial	92.0	19.0	(60.0)	(69.2)	(18.9)	—	89.6	19.0	(60.0)
University: complete or incomplete	(91.9)	50.0	(100.0)	(50.0)	(20.0)	—	(86.0)	47.5	(100.0)
Other professional/technical qualification	(88.2)	40.2	(71.4)	(66.7)	(50.0)	—	(86.5)	42.3	(71.4)
No answer, refused, etc.	(100.0)	—	—	—	—	—	(100.0)	—	—
Total	81.4	—17.4	42.0	36.4	9.2	89.9	74.5	15.3	51.8

Entries in parentheses relate to sample groups where the total number of respondents was 50 or fewer.

TABLE 3.4: *Non-farm married working women: hours worked classified by education (percentages)*

<i>Education</i>	<i>Average hours worked</i>	<i>Less than 15</i>	<i>15– under 25</i>	<i>25– under 35</i>	<i>35 and over</i>	<i>No answer</i>	<i>Total %</i>	<i>N</i>
Primary: complete or incomplete	26.5	20.9	27.7	10.7	38.4	2.3	100	177
Vocational/technical:								
complete or incomplete	(25.8)	(25.7)	(25.7)	(5.7)	(37.1)	(5.7)	100	35
Secondary: no exam or Inter	29.2	15.8	21.1	10.5	47.4	5.3	100	57
Secondary: Leaving or Matric	(27.2)	(17.9)	(25.0)	(21.4)	(35.7)	—	100	28
Business/commercial	29.1	13.8	22.4	15.5	41.4	6.9	100	58
University: complete or incomplete	(29.7)	(14.3)	(7.1)	(42.9)	(35.7)	—	100	28
Other professional/technical qualification	31.9	(2.3)	(14.0)	(46.5)	(37.2)	—	100	43
No answer, refused	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Total	28.0	17.1	23.0	17.4	39.4	3.0	100	426

Entries in parentheses relate to sample groups where the total number of respondents was 50 or fewer.

TABLE 3.5: *Non-farm married women: participation rate classified by social group
(percentage of each group working)*

<i>Social group (derived from husband's occupation)</i>	<i>Percentage working</i>	<i>Average hours worked per week</i>
Higher professional	17.0	31.8
Executive/managerial	17.6	27.5
Inspectoral/supervisory I	16.9	30.1
Inspectoral/supervisory II	29.2	30.5
Routine non-manual	20.8	28.7
Skilled manual	15.2	28.2
Semi-skilled manual	12.3	24.6
Routine manual	16.4	24.1
Agricultural occupations	9.7	31.7
Social benefits	(23.1)	—
No answer/not known	(4.3)	—
Total	17.4	28.0

Entries in parentheses relate to sample groups in which the total number of respondents was 50 or fewer.

TABLE 3.6: *Married and widowed women: participation rate classified by presence of children (percentage of each group working)*

<i>Married Women</i>			
<i>Children present in age groups:</i>	<i>Non-farm</i>	<i>Farm</i>	<i>Total</i>
0-under 19			
None	21.3	7.7	17.6
1	20.7	10.4	18.3
2	16.6	8.7	14.9
3	13.0	12.0	12.8
4	17.0	9.1	14.7
5	15.8	5.3	12.7
6	11.0	(14.6)	12.3
7 or more	13.2	7.5	11.5
0-under 2			
None	19.5	9.4	16.9
One or more	8.3	8.2	8.3
2-under 4			
None	19.5	9.6	16.9
One or more	11.2	8.0	10.3
4-under 14			
None	19.9	8.6	17.1
One or more	15.4	9.5	13.9
14-under 19			
None	16.3	8.0	14.2
One or more	19.6	11.5	17.5
All married women	17.4	9.2	15.3
<i>Widowed Women</i>			
	<i>Non-farm</i>		
0-under 19			
None	38.8		
One or more	47.1		
0-under 2			
None	42.1		
One or more	(37.5)		
2-under 4			
None	42.4		
One or more	(33.3)		
4-under 14			
None	39.6		
One or more	50.0		
14-under 19			
None	41.3		
One or more	44.4		
All widows	42.0		

Entries in parentheses relate to groups where the total number of responses was 50 or fewer.

TABLE 3.7: *Non-farm married working women: hours worked per week classified by presence of children (percentages)*

<i>Children present in age groups:</i>	<i>Average hours worked</i>	<i>Less than 15</i>	<i>15– under 25</i>	<i>25– under 35</i>	<i>35 and over</i>	<i>No answer</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>N</i>
0–under 19:									
None	30.6	11.3	17.4	18.3	49.6	3.5	100	115	
One or more	26.9	19.3	25.1	17.0	35.7	2.9	100	311	
0–under 2									
None	28.1	17.0	23.2	15.7	40.7	3.4	100	388	
One or more	(26.8)	(18.4)	(21.1)	(34.2)	(26.3)	—	100	38	
2–under 4									
None	28.2	16.2	23.8	16.0	40.9	3.1	100	357	
One or more	26.6	21.7	18.8	24.6	31.9	2.9	100	69	
4–under 14									
None	29.6	13.6	21.5	15.9	46.3	2.8	100	214	
One or more	26.3	20.8	24.5	18.9	32.5	3.3	100	212	
14–under 19									
None	27.3	18.8	22.1	19.1	36.4	3.7	100	272	
One or more	29.0	14.3	24.7	14.3	44.8	1.9	100	154	
Total	28.0	17.1	23.0	17.4	39.4	3.1	100	426	

Entries in parentheses relate to sample groups where the total number of respondents was 50 or fewer.

TABLE 3.8: *Non-farm married women: participation rate classified by social group and presence of children (percentage of each group working)*

<i>Children present in age groups:</i>	<i>Higher profes- sional</i>	<i>Executive/ managerial</i>	<i>Inspectoral/supervisory</i>		<i>Routine non- manual</i>	<i>Skilled manual</i>	<i>Semi- skilled manual</i>	<i>Routine manual</i>	<i>Agri- cultural occupations</i>	<i>Other, including no answer/ not known</i>
			<i>I</i>	<i>II</i>						
<i>0-under 19:</i>										
None	(29.2)	(23.1)	21.8	(42.9)	21.3	19.8	16.7	16.4	(16.1)	(9.1)
One or more	13.4	17.0	15.8	26.3	20.6	13.8	11.3	16.2	(4.9)	(15.4)
<i>0-under 2:</i>										
None	20.0	18.4	17.9	31.9	21.4	18.5	14.1	18.2	10.8	(16.1)
One or more	(4.8)	(13.6)	12.7	(15.6)	(18.2)	2.7	6.1	6.3	—	—
<i>2-under 4:</i>										
None	22.1	15.3	18.2	31.7	23.8	17.9	13.9	18.4	10.0	(16.1)
One or more	(3.4)	(22.5)	14.1	22.7	(8.9)	7.3	8.2	7.4	(8.3)	—
<i>4-under 14:</i>										
None	(22.0)	20.0	24.4	31.9	23.8	17.4	14.9	17.4	(12.5)	(7.7)
One or more	13.8	15.7	11.6	27.4	18.2	13.5	10.5	15.4	(6.3)	(27.3)
<i>14-under 19:</i>										
None	14.7	20.0	15.1	29.8	19.0	13.5	12.6	14.6	13.5	(12.0)
One or more	(22.6)	(12.5)	22.9	28.4	25.9	18.8	11.6	18.9	—	(16.7)

Entries in parentheses relate to sample groups where the total number of respondents was 50 or fewer.

TABLE 3.9: *Married women: participation rates classified by education and presence of children (percentage of each group working)*

<i>Children present in age groups</i>	<i>Primary: complete or incomplete</i>	<i>Vocational/ technical: complete or incomplete</i>	<i>Secondary: no exam or Inter</i>	<i>Secondary: Leaving or Matric</i>	<i>Business/ commercial</i>	<i>University: complete or incomplete</i>	<i>Other professional/ technical qualification</i>
	<i>Non-farm</i>						
0-under 19							
None	16.9	(24.1)	14.3	(26.5)	31.1	(53.8)	(52.6)
One or more	13.4	14.9	17.6	12.6	15.9	(48.8)	37.5
0-under 2							
None	16.6	19.4	18.5	17.4	20.4	49.0	43.9
One or more	3.3	5.8	10.9	(5.6)	13.1	(57.1)	(28.0)
2-under 4							
None	17.0	17.7	18.0	15.4	21.4	(52.3)	43.2
One or more	4.5	11.9	14.6	14.5	13.2	(41.7)	(33.3)
4-under 14							
None	16.5	18.3	19.6	17.6	23.7	(51.9)	(43.2)
One or more	12.4	14.8	15.1	13.5	15.2	(48.3)	38.1
14-under 19							
None	12.7	13.8	14.5	15.3	19.2	(48.6)	41.5
One or more	17.2	21.5	22.2	14.8	18.1	(52.6)	(36.0)
				<i>Total</i>			
0-under 19							
None	13.3	(17.1)	12.5	(26.8)	29.7	(53.3)	(50.0)
One or more	11.6	12.1	14.2	14.0	16.5	(45.7)	40.5
0-under 2							
None	13.7	15.7	15.3	17.9	20.7	47.2	44.3
One or more	3.8	4.0	8.8	10.9	12.5	(50.0)	(34.4)
2-under 4							
None	14.1	14.6	15.3	15.8	21.9	(52.2)	44.7
One or more	4.7	8.1	10.8	17.1	12.7	(33.3)	(37.2)
4-under 14							
None	13.5	14.0	16.1	18.3	22.5	(50.0)	44.8
One or more	10.9	12.0	12.3	14.9	16.1	(45.2)	40.5
14-under 19							
None	10.4	10.4	11.4	16.5	18.8	(46.3)	43.1
One or more	15.0	18.6	19.1	15.6	19.3	(50.0)	(39.3)

Entries in parentheses relate to sample groups in which the total number of respondents was 50 or fewer.

TABLE 3.10: *Farm and non-farm women not working: work history classified by marital status (percentages)*

<i>Farm (non-farm work history)</i>	<i>Single</i>	<i>Married</i>	<i>Widowed</i>	<i>Total</i>
Never worked off farm	79.0	55.4	(42.9)	59.1
Worked off farm before marriage not since	—	32.3	(28.6)	27.5
Worked off farm before and after marriage	—	8.8	(28.6)	7.7
Occasionally worked off farm	4.3	—	—	0.7
Other	5.1	0.6	—	0.9
No answer	11.6	2.8	—	4.2
Total percent	100	100	100	100
N	138	774	7	919
<i>Non-farm</i>				
Still at school, student	13.8	—	—	1.3
Never worked since leaving school	44.2	10.8	17.3	14.3
Worked till marriage, not since	—	58.2	44.9	51.9
Worked till had child, not since	0.4	15.4	1.9	13.1
Worked before and after marriage	—	5.9	15.4	5.9
Worked till retirement (age, health)	18.3	1.2	2.6	2.9
Occasionally worked	9.4	8.0	13.5	8.5
Worked till retired to care for relative	7.6	—	—	0.7
Other, including no answer	6.2	0.5	4.5	1.2
Total percent	100	100	100	100
N	224	2,025	156	2,405

Entries in parentheses relate to sample groups in which the total number of respondents was 50 or fewer.

TABLE 3.11: *Farm married women: non-farm work history classified by age (percentages)*

<i>Age</i>	<i>Not currently working</i>				<i>Total</i>	
	<i>Currently working</i>	<i>Never worked off farm</i>	<i>Worked off farm before or after marriage</i>	<i>Other, including no answer</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>N</i>
15-24	(20.0)	(10.0)	(65.0)	(5.0)	100	20
25-34	8.3	40.0	50.3	1.4	100	145
35-44	7.4	45.9	42.0	4.8	100	231
45-54	11.1	56.6	28.8	3.5	100	288
55-64	7.0	63.4	27.5	2.1	100	142
No answer	(11.5)	(38.5)	(50.0)	—	100	26
Total	9.2	50.4	37.3	3.2	100	852

Entries in parentheses relate to sample groups in which the total number of respondents was 50 or fewer.

TABLE 3.11 A. *Non-farm single women: work history classified by age (percentages)*

<i>Age</i>	<i>Not currently working</i>							<i>Total</i>	
	<i>Currently working</i>	<i>Still at school, student</i>	<i>Never worked since leaving school</i>	<i>Worked till retirement (age, health)</i>	<i>Occasionally worked</i>	<i>Worked till retired to care for relative</i>	<i>Other including no answer</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>N</i>
15-24	88.6	4.5	3.9	0.3	2.5	0.1	—	100	667
25-34	85.5	—	7.3	3.0	3.0	1.2	—	100	165
35-44	76.9	—	12.5	1.0	3.8	3.8	1.9	100	104
45-54	66.9	—	16.2	8.5	3.8	4.6	—	100	130
55-64	52.7	—	22.7	18.2	3.6	2.7	—	100	110
No answer	81.5	—	(7.4)	(7.4)	—	(3.7)	—	100	27
Total	81.4	2.5	8.2	3.4	2.9	1.4	0.2	100	1,203

Entries in parentheses relate to sample groups in which the total number of respondents was 50 or fewer.

TABLE 3.11 B. *Non-farm married and widowed women: work history classified by age (percentages)*

<i>Age</i>	<i>Currently working</i>	<i>Not currently working</i>					<i>Total</i>	
		<i>Never worked since leaving school</i>	<i>Worked till marriage, not since</i>	<i>Worked till had child, not since</i>	<i>Occasionally worked</i>	<i>Other including no answer</i>	<i>percent</i>	<i>N</i>
		<i>Married</i>						
15-24	22.3	2.1	40.4	24.5	9.6	1.1	100	94
25-34	13.9	3.5	44.9	26.5	10.9	0.4	100	548
35-44	17.4	6.9	50.7	12.9	11.7	0.4	100	684
45-54	19.3	11.2	49.0	5.9	14.3	0.3	100	649
55-64	15.9	17.9	48.9	3.0	13.9	0.5	100	403
No answer	28.8	8.2	43.8	8.2	8.2	2.7	100	73
Total	17.4	8.9	48.1	12.7	12.4	0.5	100	2,451
		<i>Widowed</i>						
24-34	(57.1)	(14.3)	—	—	(28.6)	—	100	7
35-44	(60.6)	(3.0)	(24.2)	(3.0)	(9.1)	—	100	33
45-54	49.4	10.4	22.1	2.6	14.3	1.3	100	77
55-64	32.9	10.0	30.7	—	25.0	1.4	100	140
No answer	(41.7)	(25.0)	(16.7)	—	(16.7)	—	100	12
Total	42.0	10.0	26.0	1.1	19.7	1.1	100	269

Entries in parentheses relate to sample groups in which the total number of respondents was 50 or fewer.

TABLE 3.12: Age distribution of those who have never worked (percentages)

<i>Non-farm</i>				
<i>Age</i>	<i>Single</i>	<i>Married</i>	<i>Widowed</i>	<i>Total</i>
15-24	26.3	0.9	—	8.1
25-34	12.1	8.7	(3.7)	9.3
35-44	13.1	21.5	(3.7)	17.7
45-54	21.2	33.3	(29.6)	29.6
55-64	25.3	32.9	(51.9)	32.2
No answer	2.0	2.7	(11.1)	3.2
Total percent	100	100	100	100
<i>N</i>	99	219	27	345

<i>Farm (never worked in non-farm jobs)</i>				
<i>Age</i>	<i>Single</i>	<i>Married</i>	<i>Widowed</i>	<i>Total</i>
15-24	27.5	0.4	—	5.9
25-34	8.3	13.6	—	12.4
35-44	15.6	24.7	—	22.8
45-54	17.4	38.0	—	33.6
55-64	26.6	21.0	(66.7)	22.4
No answer	4.6	2.3	(33.3)	3.0
Total percent	100	100	100	100
<i>N</i>	109	429	3	541

Entries in parentheses relate to sample groups in which the total number of respondents was 50 or fewer.

TABLE 3.14: Non-farm married women who returned to work after marriage: age of youngest child when returned to work (percentages)

<i>Age of child</i>	<i>%</i>
Under 1 year	7.1
1-under 5	30.6
5-under 10	21.4
10-under 15	12.8
15-under 20	7.1
20 or over	1.5
No children	8.7
No answer	10.7
Total percent	100
<i>N</i>	196

TABLE 3.13: *Non-farm married and widowed working women: work history classified by age (percentages)*

<i>Age</i>	<i>Continuous working</i>	<i>Continuous working except for babies</i>	<i>Worked till marriage returned later</i>	<i>Worked till had baby, returned later</i>	<i>Never worked before marriage, started later</i>	<i>Occasionally worked (since marriage)</i>	<i>No answer etc.</i>	<i>Total</i>	
								<i>Percent</i>	<i>N</i>
<i>Married</i>									
15-24	(47.6)	(4.8)	(14.3)	(14.3)	—	(9.5)	(9.5)	100	21
25-34	23.7	25.0	21.1	9.2	2.6	15.8	2.6	100	76
35-44	25.2	16.0	31.1	6.7	5.0	15.1	0.8	100	119
45-54	20.0	4.0	48.0	7.2	7.2	11.2	2.4	100	125
55-64	43.8	—	29.7	3.1	9.4	9.4	4.7	100	64
No answer	(42.9)	(14.3)	(14.3)	—	—	(28.6)	—	100	21
Total 15-64	28.2	11.0	32.4	6.8	5.4	13.6	2.6	100	426
<i>Widowed</i>									
Total 15-64	21.2	3.5	53.1	2.7	8.0	—	11.5	100	113

Entries in parentheses relate to sample groups in which the total number of respondents was 50 or fewer.

TABLE 3.15: *Non-farm women not working: main reason for not working classified by marital status (percentages)*

<i>Main reason for not working</i>	<i>Single</i>	<i>Married</i>	<i>Widowed</i>	<i>Total</i>
Pay too low	0.4	1.1	1.3	1.1
Jobs unattractive	3.1	0.7	1.3	1.0
Transport problems	1.3	0.5	1.3	0.6
Hours not flexible	0.4	2.7	1.3	2.4
Lack of qualifications	3.6	2.5	4.5	2.7
No jobs available/unemployed	13.9	8.3	6.4	8.7
Disapproves of married women working	0.4	4.5	3.8	4.1
Husband disapproves	—	5.1	—	4.3
Too old/ill health	21.9	7.9	35.9	11.0
Don't need extra income	2.2	4.9	2.6	4.5
Mother should not work if there are young children	—	35.1	14.7	30.5
No suitable facilities for children	0.4	10.4	1.3	8.9
Has to look after old/ill relative	19.2	2.2	3.2	3.9
Marriage bar	—	0.7	1.9	0.7
Taxes too high	—	3.8	1.3	3.3
Enough to do/not interested	0.8	3.0	3.2	2.9
Expecting baby	—	0.7	—	0.6
At school, student	13.8	—	—	1.3
Other	5.8	1.4	4.5	2.0
No answer	12.5	4.4	11.5	5.6
Total percent	100	100	100	100
N	224	2,025	156	2,405

TABLE 3.17: *Non-farm married women not working: likelihood of return (or entry) to work classified by age (percentages)*

<i>Likelihood of return</i>	<i>15-24</i>	<i>25-34</i>	<i>35-44</i>	<i>45-54</i>	<i>55-64</i>	<i>No answer</i>	<i>All ages</i>
Definitely yes	9.6	20.5	11.2	7.8	1.8	9.8	10.8
Probably yes	31.5	32.3	26.9	20.8	6.5	15.7	23.1
Don't know, not sure	23.3	21.1	22.5	20.0	22.1	23.5	21.5
Probably no	16.4	11.6	17.9	16.2	12.4	23.5	15.2
Definitely no	19.2	14.4	21.7	35.1	57.2	27.5	29.4
Total percent	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
N	73	473	565	524	339	51	2,025

TABLE 3.16: *Women not working: likelihood of return (or entry) to (non-farm) work classified by marital status (percentages)*

	<i>Definitely yes</i>	<i>Probably yes</i>	<i>Don't know, not sure</i>	<i>Probably no</i>	<i>Definitely no</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Total N</i>
<i>Non-farm</i>							
Single	16.5	7.6	39.3	13.8	22.8	100	224
Married	10.8	23.1	21.5	15.2	29.4	100	2,025
Widowed	7.7	12.8	24.3	13.5	41.7	100	156
<i>Farm</i>							
Single	14.5	11.6	11.6	18.8	43.5	100	138
Married	3.1	14.5	14.0	20.7	47.8	100	774
Widowed	—	(14.3)	(14.3)	(14.3)	(57.1)	100	7
<i>Farm and non-farm</i>							
Single	15.7	9.1	28.7	15.7	30.7	100	362
Married	8.7	20.7	19.5	16.7	34.5	100	2,799
Widowed	7.4	12.9	24.0	13.5	42.3	100	163
Total	9.4	19.0	20.7	16.4	34.5	100	3,324

Entries in parentheses relate to sample groups in which the total number of respondents was 50 or fewer.

TABLE 3.18: *Married women not working: likelihood of return (or entry) to work classified by education (percentages)*

<i>Education</i>	<i>Definitely yes</i>	<i>Probably yes</i>	<i>Don't know, not sure</i>	<i>Probably no</i>	<i>Definitely no</i>	<i>Total Percent</i>	<i>Total N</i>
	<i>Non-farm</i>						
Primary: complete or incomplete	9.5	19.9	22.9	15.7	32.0	100	1,061
Vocational/technical: complete or incomplete	14.3	28.6	14.8	17.0	25.3	100	182
Secondary: no exam. or Inter	8.3	24.8	20.5	15.5	30.9	100	278
Secondary: Leaving or Matric.	12.1	23.6	19.1	15.3	29.9	100	157
Business/commercial	13.3	27.8	25.0	10.5	23.4	100	248
University: complete or incomplete	(17.9)	(32.1)	(14.3)	(10.7)	(25.0)	100	28
Other, professional/technical qualification	17.2	31.3	14.1	17.2	20.3	100	64
No answer, refused etc.	(14.3)	—	(57.1)	(28.6)	—	100	7
Total	10.8	23.1	21.5	15.2	29.4	100	2,025
	<i>Farm</i>						
Primary: complete or incomplete	2.6	12.8	16.6	19.7	48.3	100	507
Vocational/technical: complete or incomplete	—	19.2	10.3	21.8	48.7	100	78
Secondary: complete or incomplete	4.3	17.4	9.4	18.1	50.7	100	138
Business/commercial	(10.0)	(10.0)	(6.7)	(33.3)	(40.0)	100	30
University: complete or incomplete	—	—	(25.0)	(25.0)	(50.0)	100	4
All others	(11.8)	(29.4)	—	(41.2)	(17.6)	100	17
Total	3.1	14.5	14.0	20.7	47.8	100	774

Entries in parentheses relate to sample groups in which the total number of respondents was 50 or fewer.

TABLE 3.19: *Married women not working: likelihood of return (or entry) to work classified by (non-farm) work history (percentages)*

	<i>Definitely yes</i>	<i>Probably yes</i>	<i>Don't know, not sure</i>	<i>Probably no</i>	<i>Definitely no</i>	<i>Total Percent</i>	<i>N</i>
<i>Non-farm</i>							
<i>Work history</i>							
Never worked since leaving school	5.0	12.7	22.4	12.3	47.5	100	219
Worked till marriage, not since	8.1	21.1	21.5	17.2	32.1	100	1,178
Worked till baby, not since	16.3	35.6	19.6	12.8	15.7	100	312
Worked before and after marriage	19.3	26.9	22.1	13.5	18.3	100	104
Occasionally worked	20.6	25.2	23.9	9.7	20.6	100	155
Worked till retired (age, health)	(12.5)	(20.8)	(12.5)	(8.3)	(45.8)	100	24
Other, including no answer	(18.2)	(24.2)	(36.4)	(12.1)	(9.1)	100	33
Total	10.8	23.1	21.5	15.2	29.4	100	2,025
<i>Farm</i>							
Never worked off farm	1.4	9.8	12.8	21.4	54.5	100	429
Worked off farm before marriage only	2.8	21.2	12.8	24.0	39.2	100	250
Worked off farm before and after marriage	13.2	19.1	20.6	8.8	38.2	100	68
Other	(20.0)	(20.0)	(20.0)	—	(40.0)	100	5
No answer	(4.5)	(13.6)	(27.3)	(9.1)	(45.5)	100	22
Total	3.1	14.5	14.0	20.7	47.8	100	774

Entries in parentheses relate to sample groups in which the total number of respondents was 50 or fewer.

TABLE 3.20: *Non-farm married women not working: likelihood of return (or entry) to work classified by main reason for not working (percentages)*

<i>Main reason for not working</i>	<i>Definitely yes</i>	<i>Probably yes</i>	<i>Don't know, not sure</i>	<i>Probably no</i>	<i>Definitely no</i>	<i>Total Percent</i>	<i>N</i>
Pay, transport, jobs unattractive	(12.8)	(25.5)	(29.8)	(8.5)	(23.4)	100	47
Hours not flexible	22.2	35.2	20.4	13.0	9.3	100	54
Lack of qualifications	(4.0)	(18.0)	(20.0)	(24.0)	(34.0)	100	50
No jobs available/unemployed	27.8	36.1	12.4	10.7	13.0	100	169
Disapproves/not interested	0.8	3.3	13.9	18.9	63.1	100	122
Husband disapproves	3.8	9.6	9.6	21.2	55.8	100	104
Too old/ill health	5.7	11.3	13.2	11.2	58.5	100	159
Don't need extra income	1.0	10.1	17.2	24.2	47.5	100	99
Mother should not work if there are young children	10.4	27.8	17.7	17.6	26.4	100	711
No suitable facilities for children	18.1	37.6	22.9	10.0	11.4	100	210
Has to look after old/ill relative	(8.9)	(15.6)	(17.8)	(20.0)	(37.8)	100	45
Marriage bar	(6.7)	(33.3)	(26.7)	(13.3)	(20.0)	100	15
Taxes too high	16.9	24.7	24.7	11.7	22.1	100	77
Expecting baby	(28.6)	(50.0)	(14.3)	(7.1)	—	100	14
Other	3.1	6.2	70.1	6.2	14.4	100	97
No answer, don't know	—	5.8	76.9	13.5	3.8	100	52
Total	10.8	23.1	21.5	15.2	29.4	100	2025

Entries in parentheses relate to sample groups in which the total number of respondents was 50 or fewer.

TABLE 3.21: *Non-farm women not working: when likely to return classified by likelihood of return (percentages)*

<i>Likelihood of return</i>	<i>Now, if jobs available</i>	<i>Later when children are older</i>	<i>Now, if facilities for child-care</i>	<i>"If I had to"</i>	<i>If health improves</i>	<i>If tax laws were changed</i>	<i>Other, not sure</i>	<i>No answer</i>	<i>Total Percent</i>	<i>N</i>
	<i>Single</i>									
Definitely yes	(64.9)	—	—	—	(10.8)	—	(21.6)	(2.7)	100	37
Probably yes	(41.2)	—	—	—	(29.4)	—	(17.6)	(11.8)	100	17
Total yes	57.4	—	—	—	16.7	—	20.4	5.6	100	54
	<i>Married</i>									
Definitely yes	29.2	44.7	7.8	0.9	4.6	5.9	6.4	0.5	100	219
Probably yes	15.8	63.8	4.3	6.6	3.0	3.0	2.6	0.9	100	467
Total yes	20.1	57.7	5.4	4.8	3.5	3.9	3.8	0.7	100	686
	<i>Widowed</i>									
Definitely yes	(41.7)	(25.0)	—	—	(25.0)	—	(8.3)	—	100	12
Probably yes	(25.0)	(35.0)	(5.0)	—	(30.0)	—	(5.0)	—	100	20
Total yes	(31.3)	(31.3)	(3.1)	—	(28.1)	—	(6.3)	—	100	32

Entries in parentheses relate to sample groups in which the total number of respondents was 50 or fewer.

TABLE 3.22: *Non-farm working women: reasons for working short week (less than 25 hours) and plans for working full-time classified by marital status (percentages)*

<i>Reasons for working short week</i>	<i>Single</i>	<i>Married</i>	<i>Widowed</i>
Extra work not available	(11.8)	14.9	(14.3)
Want to be with children	—	41.0	(34.3)
Health/age	(23.5)	6.2	(17.1)
Not interested	(17.6)	21.1	(20.0)
Other	(29.4)	15.5	(14.3)
No answer	(17.6)	1.2	
Total percent	100	100	100
Number answering	17	161	35
<i>Plans for working full-time:</i>			
None	(66.7)	68.9	(74.3)
Yes: if work available	(5.6)	10.6	(8.6)
Yes: when children older	—	13.0	(8.6)
Yes: if more income needed	—	2.5	(2.9)
Yes: other	(5.6)	2.5	—
Yes: no reason	—	0.6	—
Don't know, not sure	(22.2)	1.9	(5.7)
Total percent	100	100	100
Number answering	18	161	35

Entries in parentheses relate to sample groups in which the total number of respondents was 50 or fewer.

TABLE 3.23: *Attitude of single women aged under 26 years to working after marriage (percentages)*

<i>Plans on working immediately after marriage:</i>			
	<i>Non-farm</i>	<i>Farm</i>	<i>Total</i>
Would stop immediately	19.2	19.2	19.2
Stop when baby is due	58.7	42.3	56.6
Continue uninterrupted	11.9	11.5	11.9
Not sure	10.2	26.9	12.3
Total percent	100	100	100
Number answering	714	104	818
<i>Whether respondent would resume work "later in married life" (percentages)</i>			
	<i>Non-farm</i>	<i>Farm</i>	<i>Total</i>
Yes (incl. continuous working)	36.1	36.5	36.2
No	27.2	25.0	26.9
Not sure, etc.	36.7	38.5	36.9
Total percent	100	100	100
Number answering	714	104	818

TABLE 3.28: *Type of jobs believed available (in the neighbourhood or within easy reach) given by those answering "YES" to questions on job availability (percentage of times mentioned by those answering)*

<i>Type of job</i>	<i>Non-farm</i>	<i>Farm</i>	<i>Total</i>
Domestic/service work	56.1	54.9	56.0
Hotel/catering work	27.2	48.0	29.9
Skilled, semi-skilled factory work	59.0	54.9	58.4
Clerical/office work	32.2	29.6	31.8
Teaching	11.2	12.4	11.4
Professional/technical work	17.2	26.1	18.4
Serving in pubs, shops	33.7	33.6	33.7
Other	6.5	5.5	6.4
Number answering	2,254	348	2,602

TABLE *Belief 3.24: about (non-farm) job availability in the neighbourhood classified by marital status and labour force status (percentages)*

	<i>Definitely yes</i>	<i>Probably yes</i>	<i>Don't know, not sure</i>	<i>Probably no</i>	<i>Definitely no</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Total N</i>
<i>Non-farm</i>							
<i>Single</i>							
Working	18.4	19.4	10.4	19.5	32.2	100	979
Not working	10.3	12.9	13.4	13.8	49.6	100	224
<i>Married</i>							
Working	25.8	16.2	8.5	19.7	29.8	100	426
Not working	15.2	14.9	10.0	17.5	42.4	100	2,025
<i>Widowed</i>							
Working	15.9	12.4	15.9	16.8	38.9	100	113
Not working	11.1	17.4	16.8	14.8	40.0	100	156
<i>Farm</i>							
<i>Single</i>							
Working	7.6	19.0	—	8.9	64.6	100	79
Not working	1.5	8.8	6.6	13.9	69.3	100	138
<i>Married</i>							
Working	—	9.7	8.1	17.7	64.5	100	78
Not working	1.8	7.4	4.4	11.6	74.8	100	774
<i>Widowed</i>							
Working	2.6	11.5	3.8	23.1	59.0	100	62
Not working	—	—	(14.3)	—	(85.7)	100	7
Total	13.4	14.4	9.2	16.8	46.2	100	5,051

Entries in parentheses relate to sample groups in which the total number of respondents was 50 or fewer.

TABLE 3.25: *Belief about (non-farm) job availability within easy reach classified by marital status and labour force status (percentages)*

	<i>Definitely yes</i>	<i>Probably yes</i>	<i>Don't know, not sure</i>	<i>Probably no</i>	<i>Definitely no</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Total N</i>
<i>Non-farm</i>							
<i>Single</i>							
Working	32.9	29.4	13.2	9.9	14.6	100	979
Not working	20.5	23.7	18.3	9.8	27.7	100	224
<i>Married</i>							
Working	29.3	30.1	14.1	11.3	15.3	100	426
Not working	22.8	31.5	14.1	12.0	19.7	100	2,025
<i>Widowed</i>							
Working	40.7	21.2	11.5	11.5	15.0	100	113
Not working	19.9	30.1	24.4	7.7	17.9	100	156
<i>Farm</i>							
<i>Single</i>							
Working	17.7	30.4	7.6	12.7	31.6	100	79
Not working	7.2	23.9	20.3	10.9	37.7	100	138
<i>Married</i>							
Working	7.7	24.4	12.8	12.8	42.3	100	78
Not working	7.5	20.2	10.6	10.9	50.9	100	774
<i>Widowed</i>							
Working	3.2	24.2	16.1	12.9	43.5	100	62
Not working	—	(14.3)	(28.6)	(42.9)	(14.3)	100	7
Total	22.1	28.2	13.9	11.1	24.6	100	5,061

Entries in parentheses relate to sample groups in which the total number of respondents was 50 or fewer.

TABLE 3.26: *Non-farm married women: belief about job availability (within easy reach) classified by work history (percentages)*

<i>Work history</i>	<i>Definitely yes</i>	<i>Probably yes</i>	<i>Don't know, not sure</i>	<i>Probably no</i>	<i>Definitely no</i>	<i>Total Percent</i>	<i>Total N</i>
Never worked since leaving school	14.6	28.3	16.9	12.8	27.4	100	219
Worked till marriage, not since	21.4	31.5	13.5	12.5	21.1	100	1,178
Worked till baby, not since	24.7	35.3	15.4	12.2	12.5	100	312
Worked occasionally after marriage	32.2	29.9	13.2	8.2	16.4	100	304*
Other, including no answer	(16.7)	(25.0)	(41.7)	(8.3)	(8.3)	100	12*
Total not working	22.8	31.5	14.3	11.8	19.7	100	2,025
Total working	25.8	16.2	8.5	19.7	29.8	100	426

Entries in parentheses relate to sample groups in which the total number of respondents was 50 or fewer.

*These categories are not strictly comparable with Table 3.19.

TABLE 3.27: *Non-farm married women not working: main reason for not working classified by belief about job availability (within easy reach) (percentages)*

<i>Main reason for not working</i>	<i>Definitely yes</i>	<i>Probably yes</i>	<i>Don't know, not sure</i>	<i>Probably no</i>	<i>Definitely no</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Total N</i>
Pay, transport, jobs unattractive	(19.1)	(21.3)	(12.8)	(8.5)	(38.3)	100	47
Hours not flexible	18.5	37.0	5.6	14.8	24.1	100	54
Lack of qualifications	(10.0)	(20.0)	(34.0)	(18.0)	(18.0)	100	50
No jobs available/unemployed	7.1	26.0	7.1	15.4	44.4	100	169
Disapproves/not interested	22.1	32.8	18.0	10.7	16.4	100	122
Husband disapproves	26.0	31.7	11.5	16.3	14.4	100	104
Too old/ill health	25.8	32.7	18.9	5.0	17.6	100	159
Don't need extra income	31.3	29.3	16.2	9.1	14.1	100	99
Mother should not work if there are young children	25.7	32.5	13.5	11.5	16.7	100	711
No suitable facilities for children	25.2	34.3	15.2	12.4	12.9	100	210
Has to look after old/ill relative	(20.0)	(37.8)	(11.1)	(15.6)	(15.6)	100	45
Marriage bar	(13.3)	(33.3)	(26.7)	(13.3)	(13.3)	100	15
Taxes too high	29.9	29.9	16.9	13.0	10.4	100	77
Expecting baby	(50.0)	(28.6)	—	—	(21.4)	100	14
Other	15.5	37.1	13.4	14.4	19.6	100	97
No answer, don't know	13.5	21.2	9.6	13.5	42.3	100	52
Total	22.8	31.5	14.1	12.0	19.7	100	2,025

Entries in parentheses relate to sample groups in which the total number of respondents was 50 or fewer.

TABLE 3.29: *Total non-farm sample:
belief about job availability within easy reach classified by residence*

<i>Residence</i>	<i>Def- initely yes</i>	<i>Prob- ably yes</i>	<i>Don't know, not sure</i>	<i>Def- initely no</i>	<i>Prob- ably no</i>	<i>Total</i>	
						<i>%</i>	<i>N</i>
Dublin, city and county	40.3	28.6	14.9	8.7	7.4	100	1,544
Other county boroughs	23.4	41.9	13.3	10.1	11.2	100	465
Cities of 5,000+ population	18.1	22.9	20.3	16.3	22.4	100	459
Towns of 1,500-5,000 population	9.7	27.2	18.8	16.7	27.8	100	320
DEDS with towns 500-1,500 population	13.5	31.3	11.4	13.2	30.6	100	281
DEDS with towns under 500 population	10.4	29.1	15.2	11.1	34.2	100	316
DEDS with no towns	16.2	29.4	8.7	10.8	34.9	100	538
Total	25.5	29.8	14.6	11.2	18.9	100	3,923

TABLE 3.30: *Measures of excess labour supply*

<i>Percentage of non-farm labour force (viz. at work + "unemployed") giving—</i>	<i>Single</i>	<i>Married</i>	<i>Widowed</i>	<i>Total</i>
	"no jobs available" as answer to "main reason for not working"	3.1	28.4	8.1
"now, if jobs available" in reply to "when do you think you might go (back) to work?"	3.1	23.2	8.1	10.4
"unemployed" in response to question on present status	2.2	0.2	—	1.5
<i>Percentage of total non-farm sample giving—</i>	<i>Single</i>	<i>Married</i>	<i>Widowed</i>	<i>Total</i>
"no jobs available" as answer to "main reason for not working"	2.6	6.9	3.7	5.4
"now, if jobs available" in reply to "when do you think you might go (back) to work?"	2.6	5.6	3.7	4.6
"unemployed" in response to question on present status	1.8	—	—	0.6

TABLE 3.31: *Non-farm married women: those giving "no jobs available" as main reason for not working expressed as proportion of (a) the total (working and not working) in each group, (b) the labour force (those working plus the excess labour supply) in each group*

<i>Age</i>	<i>a.</i>	<i>b.</i>	<i>Social group</i>	<i>a.</i>	<i>b.</i>
15-24	2.1	(8.7)	Higher professional	2.8	(14.3)
25-34	4.9	26.2	Executive/managerial	4.8	(21.4)
35-44	6.0	25.6	Inspectoral/supervisory I	5.1	23.1
45-54	9.4	32.8	Inspectoral/supervisory II	3.6	11.0
55-64	8.2	34.0	Routine non-manual	5.3	20.3
No answer	6.9	(19.2)	Skilled manual	5.0	24.8
Total	6.9	28.4	Semi-skilled manual	9.6	43.8
			Routine manual	9.4	36.3
			Agricultural occupations	26.4	(73.1)
			Social benefits	7.7	(25.0)
			No answer/not known	13.0	(75.0)
<i>Education</i>			Total	6.9	28.4
Primary:			<i>Residence</i>		
complete or incomplete	8.9	38.3	Dublin, city and county	2.7	13.8
Vocational/technical:			Other county boroughs	3.3	21.4
complete or incomplete	6.5	(28.6)	Cities of 5,000+ population	5.0	19.4
Secondary:			Towns with 1,500-5,000 population	5.4	17.6
complete or incomplete	4.4	21.3	DEDS with towns of 500-1,500 population	14.8	47.4
Business/commercial	5.2	21.6	DEDS with towns under 500 population	16.7	57.6
University:			DEDS with no towns	13.8	42.0
complete or incomplete	1.8	(3.4)	Total	6.9	28.4
Other professional/technical qualification	3.7	(8.5)			
No answer, refused, etc.	14.3	(100.0)			
Total	6.9	28.4			

Entries in parentheses relate to sample groups in which the total number of respondents was 50 or fewer.

SECTION 4 *Attitudes Towards Married Women Working*

THE survey questionnaire contained a number of questions designed to establish the respondents' attitudes towards married women working. All respondents were asked to rank the advantages and disadvantages associated with married women working. A general approve/disapprove question was also asked, and those who approved subject to conditions were asked to give their conditions, while those who disapproved were asked to rank four reasons for disapproving. Finally, two brief questions were asked about the attitudes of the respondents' husbands and friends, as perceived by the respondents. For married women whose husbands could be contacted without an extra visit, husbands were asked separately about their own attitudes.

The exact questions asked were:

- (a) Married women go back to work or continue working for various reasons. Which of the following do *you* think is the most important, the least important, the second most important etc.?
 - A. When the mother has a job, the children are more independent
 - B. A job gives the wife money to help meet family and household expenses
 - C. A job gives the wife her own source of income for her own needs
 - D. A job gives the wife a chance to put her education and training to use.....
 - E. A job gives the wife an interest outside the home, and helps her meet people.....
 - No opinions on subject, etc.

- (b) Here are some drawbacks and problems that may arise when married women go out to work. Could you say which of these you think is the most important, then the least important etc.?
 - A. It is hard to run the house (cooking, shopping, cleaning) and go out to work.....
 - B. The husband may not want the wife to work, and this causes problems.....
 - C. There is generally a bad effect on the children if the mother works.....
 - D. Good jobs are not open to married women.....
 - E. It is hard to make satisfactory arrangements for care of the children.....
 - No opinions etc.

- (c) (i) How do you feel about whether married women should or should not go out to work?

DO NOT PROMPT:

- Approve (unconditionally).....
- Approve conditionally.....
- No strong feelings on topic.....
- In general, disapprove.....
- Strongly disapprove.....
- No answer, etc.....

- (c) (ii) What conditions must be met for you to approve? (if "approve conditionally")

DO NOT PROMPT:

- Provided she has no (young) children (living at home).....
- Provided she (really) needs the (extra) income.....
- Provided she can arrange flexible work hours (be home when children are home, etc.).....
- Provided she can get (suitable) help with children/house.....
- Provided she is not depriving someone else (man) of a job.....
- Provided she gets a good job—uses her education etc.....
- Other.....

(if "disapprove"):

- (c) (iii) Here are some reasons why people sometimes disapprove of married women working. Which do you think is the most important, the least important etc.?

- A. A wife's place is in the home.
- B. A husband should be able to support the whole family.....
- C. When the mother is working there is generally a bad effect on the children.....
- D. Married women take jobs that would otherwise be available to men with families to support.....

- (d) Do you think your friends and neighbours approve or disapprove of married women working?

- They approve.....
- They disapprove.....
- Some do, some don't/don't know/no opinion.

(IF MARRIED)

- (e) Does this influence you about whether you should work or not?
- Yes.....
 - No.....

- (f) IF WORKING: How does your husband feel about you working?
 IF NOT WORKING: How would your husband feel about your working?
 Approves.....
 Disapproves
 Don't know, No opinion.....
- (g) Does his opinion have any influence on you in deciding whether or not to work?
 No influence.....
 Some influence.....
 Strong influence.....
 Don't know, No opinion, No answer.....

The main emphasis of the present study is on the economic and demographic aspects of labour force participation. The sociological dimensions of the subject have not been explored in depth or with any great sophistication of technique. The foregoing attitudinal questions were included in the questionnaire in the hope that some useful material on the more subjective aspects of the topic could be obtained without excessively raising the cost of the study. It is realised that important reservations must be entered about the accuracy with which these questions measure attitudes and the extent to which they may merely reflect the respondents' ideas of "socially acceptable" or "correct" answers. If they measured only this, they would nevertheless provide a useful point of departure for a more thorough investigation of this aspect of the subject.¹

General Attitudes

Table 4.1 presents the answers to the very general question on married women working, classified by marital and labour force status. As might have been anticipated, conditional approval was by far the most common answer, but over one-third of the sample expressed more definite views (roughly equally divided between strong approval and strong disapproval). Nine per cent of the entire sample expressed strong disapproval of married women working, compared with 15 per cent who expressed strong approval. For the majority of the respondents return to work by married women was a matter of secondary urgency, to be approved only if some important conditions were met.

The general similarity of views between farm and non-farm respondents is very striking. Apart from a larger proportion of "no strong feelings" among the farm sample, views were virtually identical to the two sub-groups. There was, however, a fairly marked contrast between the views of those who were working and those who were not, with in general much higher proportions of the working women expressing approval. Single women on balance were more likely to disapprove than

¹ Many of the topics raised in this Section have also been discussed in connection with a survey of housewives in the Galway area in [13]. Although the results of the Galway survey are not directly comparable with those of the present survey, the general conclusions that can be based on each are very similar.

their married counterparts, and fairly large proportions of them gave "no strong feelings" as their reply. Thus, approval was most common among non-farm married women who were working (21.5 per cent "approve unconditionally", 4.5 per cent "strongly disapprove"), and least common among farm single women who were not working (11.7 per cent "approve unconditionally", 16.7 per cent "strongly disapprove").

In order to understand the "approve conditionally" answer to this question, the answers to the probe question asked of those giving this response must be analysed (Table 4.2). The overwhelming importance of child-care among the conditions is evident, and does not vary too greatly between the sub-categories. Of those citing conditions relating to child-care as a condition, about two-thirds felt that a married woman should only work if she did not have young children, the other third specified only that "suitable child care facilities" should be provided. (Interest in suitable facilities for child-care was greatest among married, working women.) In as much as the "flexible hours" condition is also related to child-care, it is even more striking that the majority of those "approving conditionally" were concerned about the care of children when a married woman works, and seemed to be expressing the view that combining work outside the home with marriage was acceptable provided the children were not adversely affected.

Combining the data from Tables 4.1 and 4.2 it is possible to show the proportions who either disapprove ("in general" or "strongly") of married women working or who approve subject to the condition that there are no (young) children present. This percentage is an index of the proportion who would not approve of married women with children working:

Single		Married		Widowed		Total
Working	Not-Working	Working	Not-Working	Working	Not-Working	
		<i>Non-Farm</i>				
49.3	50.0	42.3	51.1	46.0	50.6	49.5
		<i>Farm</i>				
43.0	53.6	41.0	50.0	54.8	(42.9)	50.2
		<i>Total</i>				
48.9	51.4	42.1	51.1	49.1	50.3	49.6

This percentage is fairly stable at about one-half of the respondents, varying from 41 per cent of farm, married working women to 55 per cent of the farm working widows. Thus, while about 20 per cent of the sample disapproved of married women working ("in general" or "strongly"), another 30 per cent made approval conditional on the absence of young children.

The data of Table 4.1 may also be used to calculate participation rates for married women according to attitude, or the proportion of those expressing each attitude that was in the labour force. The results are:

	Approve unconditionally	Approve conditionally	No strong feelings, etc.	In general disapprove	Strongly disapprove
Non-Farm	26.3	17.7	5.1	14.3	5.1
Farm	10.4	9.7	4.2	11.7	5.4

In the case of the non-farm responses, the stronger the approval expressed, the more likely the respondent was to be working (with those who had "no strong feelings" being similar to those who "disapproved strongly"). Results from a tabulation of attitudes of non-working women against likelihood of return to work show that approval of married women working was also more frequently expressed by those who were interested in returning to work than by those not interested. These patterns were not evident in the farm sample.

In Table 4.3 married women's attitudes are tabulated by age. There is a falling-off in approval with advancing age. This pattern is more pronounced in the non-farm sample. There is a rise in the proportions expressing strong views (at the expense of the proportion answering "approve conditionally") with increasing age. Nonetheless, conditional approval was the answer given by at least half the respondents at all ages, and there was also a fairly wide diversity of more pronounced views among the remainder of the respondents at every age.

These answers have been considered from the viewpoint of the respondents' education and social group.² Among non-farm respondents not currently working, unconditional approval was most common among those with the least and with the most education, and least common among those with secondary or business/commercial education. Strong disapproval was also most frequent among those with primary education, and respondents in this category were the most likely to give strong opinions on the subject. Among non-working women there was a steady rise in the proportion approving unconditionally as one moves from the higher professional to the routine manual social group. The decrease in the proportions "approving conditionally" in the routine manual and agricultural groups was very striking, but may reflect a cultural factor (less caution in verbal expression) rather than a genuine polarisation of opinion. The tabulation of working women's attitudes by social group and education brings out more clearly than ever the contrast in attitudes between those working and not working, since within a given social or educational group approval was far more likely to be expressed by the working than by the non-working respondents. When the answers to the attitudinal question were tabulated by work history, it was apparent that, among the non-working respondents, disapproval was most common among women who had never worked, and approval most likely among those who had worked after their

² These tabulations are not presented in the interests of reducing the number of tables in the report. They are, however, available on request. This applies to several of the results summarised in this section.

marriage. This confirms the idea that the greater her involvement in the labour market, the more likely a respondent was to approve of married women working.

A final cross-tabulation on the answers to the general attitudes question is provided in Table 4.4, where the association with presence of children is considered. The pattern that emerges is quite complex. Among women not currently working, those with children (especially children under 14) were more likely to "approve conditionally", than those without children. On the other hand, strong disapproval was generally more common among those without children, who thus displayed more polarised attitudes than their counterparts with children. This contrast in the proportions "approving conditionally" between non-working women with and without children was greater in the farm than in the non-farm sample. Among women who were currently working, the picture was almost exactly reversed: those with children were more likely to express approval. Although the numbers involved were small, it is striking that over a third of working women with children aged under 2 "approved unconditionally" of married women working. This is perhaps a natural reflection of the fact that only women who are very strongly in favour of married women working, or who have strong economic inducements, are willing to assume the responsibilities of a job in addition to those of caring for an infant.

Conditional Approval

The respondents who "approved conditionally" were further questioned as to the condition(s) they felt should be met before a married woman goes out to work. The overall results of this probe have been presented in Table 4.2. When these answers were cross-tabulated by education the similarities in the replies were found to be more striking than the contrasts. "Has help with children" gained in importance with increasing educational attainment, at the expense of "provided there are no children", indicating a greater willingness to approve of work even if children are present. The condition "provided she gets a good job" assumed greater importance among those with higher educational attainment, but nowhere reached any prominence among the answers. For all educational levels, it was obvious that the main concern was child-care, with relatively small contrasts between groups as to whether this could be delegated or constituted an absolute barrier to labour force participation. The combined proportion of those who disapproved, "in general or strongly" and approved, "provided there are no children" varied little among the non-farm, non-working respondents—ranging from 49 per cent of those with secondary (Leaving) to 54 per cent of those with business/commercial and other professional education.

When the "conditional approval" answers were analysed by social group, concern about "needs income" was found to be least frequent in the two highest groups, and "provided she gets a good job" was scarcely mentioned in the manual social groups. "Provided she can get help with children" tended to be more frequently mentioned in the higher social groups. But, once again, these contrasts were minor compared with the overall similarities between social groups. The combined pro-

portion of "disapproval" and "approve, provided there are no children" varied from 59 per cent in the executive, managerial group to 43 per cent in the agricultural group, and the variations between social groups were somewhat wider than was the case with educational categories. Further light on this attitude is provided by the finding that those who had never worked, or who had worked only before marriage, tended to stipulate that a mother should not work if she had young children more frequently than did those with more extensive work experience (who placed greater emphasis on the need for suitable arrangements for the care of young children). Among non-farm married women who had worked without interruption, the attitudes question was answered "approve, provided she can get suitable help with children" by 22 per cent of respondents, compared with only 7 per cent of those who had never worked. This is part of the consistent pattern that has emerged from the analysis of the "approve conditionally" responses, which shows that those who are disposed by education and work history to enter the labour force are also not inclined to regard the presence of young children as an absolute barrier to labour force entry.

It is natural to analyse the response "approve, provided there are no children" by whether or not the respondent had any children. The findings are presented in Table 4.5. Among women not currently working, the presence of children tended to raise the proportion stipulating "provided there are no children" in all cases, although by surprisingly small percentages, especially in the non-farm sample (the difference between the proportions is not statistically significant for women with and without children under 2 years). Among the working respondents this condition was given much less frequently by those with, than by those without, children. This may reflect, the fact that many working women who have children may have made satisfactory arrangements for their care and hence no longer regard this as an issue. Nonetheless, 18 per cent of working women who had children aged under two years indicated that they did not approve of mothers working when they had young children. There is a contrast between the answers of working and non-working respondents. Non-working women with children gave "provided there are no children" as a condition far more frequently than their working counterparts. Once again a consistent picture emerges, with women who were working when they had young children more flexible in their expression of concern about child-care than women who were not working.

Reasons for Disapproving

The respondents who disapproved ("in general" or "strongly") of married women working were asked to rank four possible reasons for disapproval in order of importance. In Table 4.6 the average rank of these reasons is tabulated. (Average rank has been employed in all cases where ranking was used, as a method of summarising the responses. The results showed that this measure was generally very consistent with the results obtained from measuring the proportion giving each

item first rank). The lower the average rank, the more important the item.³ The most important group among those disapproving was the non-farm women not currently working, and they gave "wife's place is in the home" and "generally bad effect on children" equal importance on average, placing them at the top of the list. In the farm sample, and among single women, "wife's place is in the home" came clearly at the top of the list. "Takes jobs away from men" was in all categories ranked on average as least important, with "husband should be able to support family" generally the second last. It is clear, then, that those who disapproved of married women working did so above all because of their views of the wife's role in a marriage and especially of the possible consequences of a mother's working for her children. The idea that working women take jobs away from men or that a husband should be able to support the entire family figured much less prominently among the reasons for disapproval.

The numbers disapproving were relatively small, and hence detailed cross-classification of the results in Table 4.6 was not feasible. However, "a wife's place is in the home" seemed to decline rapidly in average rank with rising educational levels, whereas "generally bad effect on children" increased in importance. The pattern by social group was less pronounced, although the lower average rank of "generally bad effect on children" in the manual worker groups was noticeable, and conversely "husband should support entire family" had more prominence among these respondents. Thus the respondents who disapproved of married women working appeared more likely to be influenced by a particular view of women's role in marriage, if they were in the lower educational groups, and by concern for the effects on the children, if they were in the higher groups.

Reasons for Working and Drawbacks as a Result of Working

All respondents were asked two very broad questions on the reasons why married women work, and the drawbacks attached to married women working. Once again, items were presented to the respondents and they were asked to rank them in order of importance. The tabulations present the average rank of each item. The general findings are presented in Table 4.7. There was a striking consensus of opinion regarding the relative importance of the various reasons for working: "gives a wife money to meet family and household expenses" was ranked most important (on average) by all categories of respondents except the numerically very small group of farm widows not currently working. The least important item was clearly "children are more independent". There was also a high degree of uniformity in awarding "gives a wife an interest outside the home" the second highest average rank. Thus it seems that married women's entry to the labour force is seen above all as a source of extra household income, than as a means for the

³ The average rank has been calculated by taking the sum of the products of the number giving each rank times the rank, divided by the total number ranking the item in question. Thus the denominator varied slightly from item to item, since some items were not ranked by some respondents. If 100 respondents ranked an item as follows: 40 gave it first rank, 30 second, 20 third and 10 fourth, the average rank would be $200 \div 100 = 2.0$.

wife to get out of her daily routine, and only to a limited extent as a source of her own income, as a chance to use her education or, least of all, as a positive factor in the rearing of children. Whether the respondent was single or married, working or not, in farm or non-farm residence, made comparatively little difference to ranking of the items proposed as reasons for married women working.

Drawbacks associated with married women working were ranked by the respondents, and the general results are also summarised in Table 4.7. It may be seen that there is less contrast between the highest and lowest average rank for the drawbacks than there was for the reasons for working, but there is also far less uniformity in answering this question between the several categories of the sample. Overall, the idea that "it is hard to run a house" came out the most important drawback, closely followed by "generally a bad effect on the children" or "hard to make satisfactory arrangements for the children". Among the largest single category of respondents (non-farm married women not currently working) these three drawbacks were on average rated equally important. Thus, each of them was considered very important by numerous respondents. Among other categories of respondents, "hard to run house" was more prominent, especially for married working women, who are also noticeable for the reduced emphasis they placed on "generally bad effect on children". The contrast between those working and not working may be seen as a greater awareness of the problems of running a household when the wife has a job, among the former, and a correspondingly increased prominence for concern about the effect of a mother's working on the children, among the latter. Compared with these drawbacks, the notion that a married woman could not get a good job or that her husband might disapprove of her working appeared relatively unimportant among all respondents. Thus the answers reveal a very practical attitude towards the subject: concern about income, child-care, household management, rather than with personal development, ideological considerations, or the opportunities available to women, predominate among the reasons given for married women working and the drawbacks attendant on the decision to work. Even if these findings merely reflected the respondents' beliefs about a socially acceptable answer to the questions posed, they would still reflect some important aspects of the social climate in Ireland as it impinges on whether married women should work. The contrast that emerges in the answers to these questions between married women who were working and those who are not, especially in regard to beliefs about possible adverse effects on children, must reflect important factors in the individual decision on whether or not to enter the labour force.

More detail on these responses was obtained by tabulating the average rank of the reasons and drawbacks by education. Among the working respondents "helps meet family and household expenses" had the highest average rank in all groups, but among those not working it was displaced from this position in the five highest educational groups by "provides interest outside the house". The "chance to put education and training to use" increased in importance with higher educational attainment, and moved from the lowest to the highest average rank when working

women with primary education are compared with university-educated respondents in the non-farm sample.

Educational attainment also appeared to exert an important influence on the respondents ranking of the various possible drawbacks to married women working. Difficulties in running a household and keeping a job were stressed most by those with primary and vocational education, whereas other groups placed somewhat less emphasis on this problem and more on the effects on children or on the difficulties in making suitable arrangements for children. This shift in emphasis was especially clear among the working respondents. In general, "good jobs not open to married women" was rated least important by the respondents not currently working, but among the working women it was placed slightly higher, with "husband may not want wife to work" generally in last place. It is interesting that for working women with business/commercial education, "good jobs not open to married women" was actually given the highest average rank.

Among non-working women, a sharp contrast was found between the most important reason as expressed by the first three social groups (who gave "gives wife interest outside home") and all others (who gave "helps meet family and household expenses"). However, in most cases where one of these motives was given the highest average rank, the other was given the next highest. In all groups "makes the children more independent" was awarded the lowest average rank. In the working sample, it is interesting to note that the first two social groups awarded "chance to put education and training to use" the highest average rank (although the numbers involved were very small). All other social groups agreed with the non-working sample in giving "helps meet family and household expenses" first average rank.

Concern about the possible effects on children predominated among non-working women, especially in the upper and middle social groups. In the lower social groups this concern was expressed in the form of fears about difficulties in running the household, or in making arrangements for child-care. In the case of working women, the inter-group differences were slight and a general consensus on the problems of running a household and making suitable arrangements for the children was evident, and all groups placed least stress on the possible disapproval of the husband. There was some variation in the average importance of "good jobs not open to married women", but this item was in either last or second last average rank for all social groups.

Finally, in Table 4.8 the reasons and drawbacks are tabulated by presence of children under 19. Most surprisingly, there are in general no important differences between those with and those without children in each sub-sample. In all cases the presence or absence of children under 19 did not affect the position of the items in terms of average rank. In fact no significant difference emerges across the rows of this table.⁴ Thus, whether or not the respondent had children did not of itself

⁴ The difference between the average rank of "difficult to run household" for non-farm married women not currently working, with and without children, comes closest to being significant, but the *t*-value (for a test of the difference between two means) is 1.57, not significant at the 10 per cent level.

appear to influence the motives ascribed to married working women or the drawbacks feared if a wife enters the labour force. The differences between respondents on these variables seemed to arise mainly from educational attainment or social background, but the general similarity of the answers between all the categories of the sample is the most striking finding of this section of the survey.

Beliefs about Husbands' and Friends' Attitudes

Married respondents were asked what they believed their husbands' and friends' attitudes towards married women working were. The responses about husbands' attitudes have been tabulated by the respondents' own attitudes in Table 4.9. It is immediately striking that non-working women believed that their husbands disapproved in 49 per cent of cases, whereas they themselves disapproved in only 19 per cent of cases (the corresponding farm percentages are 52 per cent and 20 per cent).

The answers of the working respondents on the other hand, reveal that the percentage of husbands believed to disapprove (13 per cent in the non-farm, 19 per cent in the farm sample) coincides almost exactly with the proportions of wives disapproving. Thus, non-working women believed their husbands were much more likely to disapprove than they themselves were, but this was not the case among women who were currently working. If these answers are considered from the viewpoint of the respondent's own attitude, it is clear that wives in general tended to believe that their husbands' attitudes coincided with their own, especially when they themselves were working. At one extreme, 73 per cent of the non-working wives who "strongly disapproved" of married women working believed that their husbands also disapproved, whilst at the other extreme only 9 per cent of working women who "unconditionally approved" believed that their husband disapproved (non-farm sample). The picture therefore seems to be that working women believe they and their husbands generally agree on whether or not married women should work. Non-working women however tended to believe that they and their husbands had differing views, with as many as 31 per cent of those who "approved unconditionally" believing that their husbands disapproved. This outcome is consistent with the increased importance that we saw was given to the possibility of the husband disapproving (as a drawback to working) by non-working women.

It is necessary to ask, in the case of non-working women, whether this revealed difference in beliefs about husbands' attitudes reflects an actual divergence of opinion or whether the working women were simply more successful at persuading themselves that their husbands agreed with them. This topic can only be tested superficially in the present study, since it would have been a major undertaking to study husband-wife interaction on these variables. However, a question was posed to those husbands that could be contacted without a special visit. The findings are presented in Table 4.10. The first point to be noted is that the husbands contacted did not in general differ greatly from those not contacted: the wife's attitude towards working seems the most relevant variable by which to compare the minority of husbands who were contacted with the majority who were not, and as far as this evidence goes,

the contacted group did not differ greatly from the full sample of husbands. The only important contrast between contacted and non-contacted husbands appears in the higher proportion of wives of non-contacted husbands who "didn't know" their husbands' attitudes. This contrast between the two groups of husbands is important only in the non-farm non-working sample and in the farm sample, but it does indicate that the data on husbands' attitudes must be used with some caution.

Table 4.10 shows an overall tendency for the wife's belief about her husband's attitude to be in line with the husband's attitude as he himself expressed it. This is not surprising, and may have been influenced by the interview situation. What is more significant is that working women appeared to have a much more accurate picture of their husbands' attitudes than is the case among non-working women (the number of husbands with working wives who disapproved was, however, so small that this cross-tabulation is subject to large sampling errors). The large percentage of cases where the husband of a non-working wife actually approved of married women working, but the wife believed he disapproved, is striking. Among the husbands with non-working wives (non-farm sample) contacted, it may be seen that in 219 out of 432 cases the wives believed that their husbands "disapproved" of married women working, but the husbands' own responses showed that 80 of these 219 (or 37 per cent) actually "approved". On the other hand, in 169 cases the wives believed that their husbands "approved" but in only 27 of those cases (or 16 per cent) did the husband actually express disapproval. In the case of married women who were working, the proportion of wives whose views of their husbands' beliefs differed from those actually expressed by their husbands, was much smaller. It seems reasonable to conclude that there was a noticeable tendency for some non-working wives to believe that their husbands were less likely to approve of married women working than was the case. A reverse tendency existed, but only to a much smaller extent, for some wives to believe their husbands approved, whereas, in fact, the husbands expressed disapproval.

Further light may be shed on these points by the data in Table 4.11, where wife's attitude is cross-tabulated by husband's attitude. There is a tendency for husbands and wives to express broadly similar attitudes, but for all categories of the sample there is a minority of cases where the husband and wife expressed opposite views. In the non-farm sample of non-working women, 60 per cent of the wives of husbands who "strongly disapproved" of married women working said they "approved" (of whom 14 per cent said they "approved unconditionally"). This type of disagreement was more likely when the husband disapproved of married women working and it may be seen that there are relatively few cases where the husband approved and the wife disapproved. These tables illustrate a complex pattern of attitudes, and beliefs about attitudes. In the non-farm sample, when the wife was not working, there was a marked tendency for wives to believe that their husbands were less likely to approve than the husbands revealed to be the case to the interviewers; but on the other hand when the husband's attitude was cross-classified by the wife's, husbands were shown to be less likely to approve than wives. It is always possible that husbands were unwilling to reveal the full extent of their disapproval of married

women working to the interviewers, so that the wives' beliefs about the husbands' views may be accurate, and the husbands' responses to the interviewers may have understated the extent of their disapproval. But this hypothesis would not account for the fact that the husbands of working women were both believed (by their wives) to be, and actually revealed themselves to be, more approving of married women working than was the case for the husbands of non-working women. The discrepancy between the wife's beliefs about the husband and his revealed attitude was not very marked when the wife was working. Thus, it is possible that some non-working wives ascribed their own feelings of disapproval to their husbands, rather than expressing them in their own names.

Wives were asked whether their husbands' views had much influence on their own decisions about working. The four possible answers and the distribution of responses were:

	per cent
No influence	16.7
Some influence	34.1
Strong influence	42.1
Other including no answer	7.0

As expected, "strong influence" is the most popular answer, but a sizeable proportion of the respondents seemed to believe that they acted independently of their husbands' views. These answers were classified by the wife's belief about the husband's attitude. Regardless of husband's attitude, non-farm working women expressed themselves more independent than either farm women or non-farm women who were not working. There was also a very interesting contrast between working and non-working non-farm women when they believed their husbands disapproved of married women working: the working women expressed much greater independence from their husbands' views in this situation—perhaps a logical reflection of the fact they had decided to work despite his disapproval, but perhaps even more significant as a possible indication that among the working women is a group who are very independent in their decision-making. Within each category in the non-farm sample it was noticeable that women who believed that their husbands' views were consistent with their present course of action were more likely to claim that their husbands' views had a "strong influence" on their decisions than was the case when they believed there was a conflict between their views. It was striking that 53 per cent of the women who were not working and who believed their husbands disapproved claimed their husbands' views carried "strong influence", whereas only 35 per cent of working women who believed their husbands approved claimed this "strong influence" for their husbands' views. Eighteen per cent of the working women were acting against their husbands' presumed disapproval, despite the claim that their husbands' views had a "strong influence" on them; at the other end of the distribution, 34 per cent of the non-working women who believed that their husbands approved of married women working also claimed their husbands' views had a "strong influence" on them. It is relevant, of course, that a husband's

"approval" is merely permissive and may not imply any attempt to encourage his own spouse to look for work or indeed the existence of employment opportunities for her.

Respondents' beliefs about their friends' attitudes are presumably less important (and less precisely defined) than are beliefs about husbands' attitudes. From Table 4.12 it may be seen that almost half the sample said they "didn't know" how their friends felt on the subject of married women working (in contrast with less than 10 per cent giving this answer for beliefs about their husbands' attitudes). Of those who believed they knew how their friends felt on the subject, about twice as many believed they approved as believed they disapproved. There is a clear tendency for women who approve to believe that their friends also approve, and a less pronounced tendency for women who disapprove to believe that their friends disapprove (although those who disapprove were by far the most agnostic concerning their friends' attitudes). It is interesting to note that there is less of a contrast in Table 4.12 between working and non-working women than was the case in connection with husbands' attitudes. Working women appear less concerned about their friends' attitudes (and less likely to believe that they coincide with their own views) than they are about their husbands'. In fact, 92 per cent answered a question on the influence of friends' opinions with "does not influence". The most important feature of the responses to this question was the fact that women who claimed that their friends' attitudes did influence their behaviour also claimed to have more knowledge of their friends' views (and to believe that they were likely to approve) than women who claimed not to be influenced by their friends' views. These findings suggest a relatively independent-minded stance, and a willingness to decide about going out to work without too much concern for their friends' attitudes. No doubt this apparent independent-mindedness is facilitated by the fact that a majority of those respondents who claimed a knowledge of their friends' views believed them to be favourable to married women working.

When husbands' reasons for approving and disapproving of married women working were analysed, a similar pattern to that found among wives emerged. Of husbands who disapproved, the most important reason for disapproval was "wife's place is in the home", the least important was "taking a man's job", which is the same ordering as was found among the women respondents. The average rank of the reasons for working and the drawbacks when a woman works also reflect the same attitudes as those of the women respondents, with income for household the most important reason and difficulty in running a household the most serious drawback. Those approving conditionally were most likely to mention "provided there are no children" as a condition, and the proportion of responding husbands who either disapproved or approved only if there are no children amounted to 56 per cent (somewhat higher than among women).

Summary and Conclusions

This Section has been concerned with examining the respondents' attitudes to whether married women should work. The questions included in the survey

on this topic were relatively simple and designed to permit broad generalisations to be drawn, rather than to form the basis for an in-depth investigation of the motivations underlying the responses.

At the most general level, the responses indicate that most women are in principle neither strongly in favour nor strongly opposed to married women working. The most common attitude is one of conditional approval, the view being that it is acceptable for married women to work if certain conditions are met. The condition most frequently stipulated was that there should be no (young) children in the household. However, about half the respondents indicated that they disapproved of married women working either in all circumstances or when they had children. It was striking how little these attitudes varied when the sample was analysed in detail: the broad picture was the same in the farm and non-farm sample and for married, single or widowed women. However, some contrasts were evident. Perhaps the most important was that those who were working, or thought they would go back to work, were more likely to approve than were other respondents. It was also true that younger respondents were more likely to approve than were older women. Previous work history also influenced attitudes so that the more extensive or continuous the respondent's work experience, the greater the likelihood of her approval. Conditional approval tended to be more frequent among respondents with high levels of formal education, in contrast with those who had less formal education, who tended to express less qualified views (both approval and disapproval). It should, however, be stressed that no matter how detailed the tabulations, the findings always revealed a diversity of opinion in each sub-group, with generally about 10 per cent of each group expressing unconditional approval and another 10 per cent strong disapproval. The presence of children tended to raise the proportion expressing conditional approval at the expense of unconditional approval, although working women with young children gave the highest proportion of strong approval answers of any group examined.

In connection with those answering "approve conditionally" it was noticeable that in the higher social groups, and among those with post-primary education, there appeared to be a greater willingness to delegate responsibility for child-care, in comparison with the view, more prevalent in other groups, that the presence of children was an absolute barrier to working. This, of course, may merely reflect greater ability to afford, or more experience of, hired help. This difference was also apparent between those who had never worked compared with those who had, and in general between groups with high labour force participation rates as compared with those with low. It was striking, too, how frequently women who were not working and who had young children cited the presence of young children as an absolute barrier to working.

Among respondents who disapproved of married women working, the most important reason appeared to be a particular view of the wife's role ("wife's place is in the home"), followed closely by concern about the effect on children. Other possibilities, such as taking jobs away from men or not being able to get good jobs, seemed to have far less importance for the respondents.

The reasons given for married women going out to work were above all financial ("gives a wife money to help meet family expenses"), and then relief from household routine ("gives a wife interest outside home, helps her meet people"). Factors such as using one's education or making the children more independent were far less important. Only in the highest educational groups did the use of one's education become an important factor (and the need to earn extra income declined correspondingly). The various categories studied differed very little in their expressed beliefs about the reasons for married women going to work.

Among the possible drawbacks to working, several items were considered important by most respondents, especially the possibility that "it is hard to run the household and a job" and that "there is generally a bad effect on the children". The working women seemed to be more aware of the problems of running a household and a job, and less worried about the possibility of an adverse effect on the children. This, no doubt, reflects their own experiences, and their relative success in solving the problem of child-care while working.⁵ Compared with these two drawbacks, the notions that married women could not get good jobs or that husbands might disapprove were not considered major problems. Concern about the effects on children seemed to be more important among non-working women, especially in the middle and upper social groups, but once again the similarities between the groups were more striking than the contrasts.

Married women were questioned about their beliefs about their husbands' attitudes. Not surprisingly, there was a strong tendency for women to express the belief that their husbands' views were fairly similar to their own, and in fact the results from the sample of husbands contacted confirms that this did tend to be the case. Nonetheless, there were some important variations. Some non-working women said their husbands opposed married women's employment, whereas the husbands themselves expressed approval. There was in general greater concordance of views between husband and wife when the wife was working than when she was not, perhaps a reflection of the fact that the issue was more likely to have been discussed by couples when the wife was working. It was also striking that there were relatively few cases where the husband approved, and the wife disapproved, but the reverse (wife approve, husband disapprove) was not uncommon. In general husbands were less likely to approve than wives, but wives believed that husbands were even less likely to approve than was the case.

Most women claimed their husbands' views carried weight with them, but working women expressed greater independence than those not working, especially in the case where their husbands disapproved. When the wife believed her husband's attitude coincided with hers she was most likely to believe that his views had a strong influence on her.

The respondents' views about their friends' attitudes were much vaguer than they were about their husbands', and they also claimed that friends' views carried less weight with them. Nonetheless, it is clear that the general impression among the

⁵ See Section 5, however, for a discussion of the arrangements actually made.

respondents was that the public is not strongly opposed to married women working, so that if a wife works she is not seen as running a serious risk of incurring censure from her friends.

What conclusions may be drawn from this, admittedly rather simplified, summary of attitudes towards married women working? In the first place, it seems possible to state that Irish women are not rigidly opposed to the idea that married women may combine some paid employment with their duties as mother and housewife. The prevailing climate seems to be a pragmatic one in which responsibilities to the children and the household come first, but the benefits, especially the financial benefits, from working are both appreciated and estimated in general to compensate for the effort and trouble entailed in going out to work. Secondly, paid employment is generally regarded as a *potential* threat to the correct discharge of the duties of mother and wife, and concern about this issue was very evident in the answers to the questionnaire. Apart from a small minority, with high educational attainment and extensive previous work experience, the urgency of working (even to supplement family income) was not considered great enough to risk any serious curtailment of existing roles in marriage. Among those who had a strong attachment to the labour force, the belief was evident that many household duties, including child-care, could be delegated, whereas those who were not so committed to working tended to regard the presence of young children as an absolute barrier to taking up a job outside the home. However, this apparent contrast in willingness to delegate child-care may in part stem from the differences in social and educational group adherence between those women with strong attachment to the labour force and those without: the high participation groups were those in which ability to afford hired help, and hence presumably experience of delegation of child-care and household work, was greatest.

The balance of priorities revealed by these responses must be borne in mind in connection with any attempt to evaluate policy towards married women in the labour force.

TABLE 4.1: Attitude to married women working classified by marital and labour force status (percentages)

Attitude	Single		Married		Widowed		Total		Total
	Working	Not working	Working	Not working	Working	Not working	Working	Not working	
	<i>Non-farm</i>								
Approve unconditionally	18.3	14.7	21.5	12.7	21.2	12.2	19.4	12.9	15.4
Approve conditionally	50.2	53.1	64.6	63.4	58.4	59.6	54.8	62.2	59.3
No strong feelings, no answer	6.2	7.6	1.2	4.6	4.4	5.8	4.7	4.9	4.8
In general disapprove	13.6	9.8	8.2	10.3	8.0	13.5	11.7	10.5	10.9
Strongly disapprove	11.7	14.7	4.5	9.0	8.0	9.0	9.4	9.5	9.5
Total percent	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
N	979	224	426	2,025	113	156	1,518	2,405	3,923
	<i>Farm</i>								
Approve unconditionally	17.7	11.7	16.7	14.5	11.3	(28.6)	15.5	14.1	14.4
Approve conditionally	60.8	48.6	60.3	56.8	58.1	(42.9)	59.8	55.5	56.3
No strong feelings, no answer	3.8	13.0	3.8	8.9	6.5	—	6.4	9.5	8.9
In general disapprove	11.4	10.1	14.1	10.7	12.9	—	12.3	10.6	10.9
Strongly disapprove	6.3	16.7	5.1	9.0	11.3	(28.6)	5.9	10.3	9.5
Total percent	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
N	79	138	78	774	62	7	219	919	1,138
	<i>Total</i>								
Approve unconditionally	18.2	13.5	20.8	13.2	17.7	12.9	18.9	13.2	15.2
Approve conditionally	50.9	51.4	63.9	61.6	58.3	58.9	55.4	60.3	58.6
No strong feelings, no answer	6.0	9.7	1.6	5.8	7.4	5.5	4.9	6.2	5.7
In general disapprove	13.4	9.9	9.1	10.4	9.1	12.9	11.7	10.5	10.9
Strongly disapprove	11.3	15.5	4.6	9.0	7.4	9.8	9.0	9.7	9.5
Total percent	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
N	1,058	362	504	2,799	175	163	1,737	3,324	5,061

Entries in parentheses relate to sample groups in which the total number of respondents was 50 or fewer.

TABLE 4.2: *Conditions for married women working: proportions of total answering who mentioned each condition (base equals totals (N) in Table 4.1)*

<i>Conditions</i>	<i>Single</i>		<i>Married</i>		<i>Widowed</i>		<i>Total</i>		<i>Total</i>
	<i>Working</i>	<i>Not working</i>	<i>Working</i>	<i>Not working</i>	<i>Working</i>	<i>Not working</i>	<i>Working</i>	<i>Not working</i>	
<i>Non-farm</i>									
No children	24.0	25.4	29.6	31.8	30.1	28.2	26.0	30.9	29.0
Need income	14.6	18.3	12.0	12.8	23.0	18.6	14.5	13.7	14.0
Flexible hours	7.8	8.0	16.4	13.5	8.0	14.7	10.2	13.1	12.0
Has help with children	8.5	14.3	19.0	13.8	7.1	8.3	11.3	13.5	12.6
Not taking man's job	2.7	1.3	0.9	1.6	0.9	0.6	2.0	1.5	1.7
Gets a good job	1.8	2.2	2.1	1.5	1.8	1.3	1.9	1.6	1.7
Other	1.6	0.4	2.6	1.3	1.8	2.6	1.9	1.3	1.5
Proportion "approving conditionally"*	50.2	53.1	64.6	63.4	58.4	59.6	54.8	62.2	59.3
<i>Farm</i>									
No children	(25.3)	26.8	(21.8)	31.1	(30.6)	(14.3)	25.6	30.4	29.4
Need income	(22.8)	6.5	(16.7)	11.9	(12.9)	(14.3)	17.8	11.1	12.4
Flexible hours	(8.9)	4.3	(12.8)	8.9	(8.1)	—	10.0	8.2	8.5
Has help with children	(13.9)	17.4	(24.4)	12.7	(9.7)	(14.3)	16.4	13.4	14.0
Not taking man's job	—	—	(1.3)	1.4	(1.6)	(14.3)	0.9	1.3	1.2
Gets a good job	(5.0)	2.2	(3.8)	2.7	(3.2)	—	4.1	2.6	2.9
Other	—	—	—	0.6	(1.6)	—	0.5	0.5	0.5
Proportion "approving conditionally"*	60.8	48.6	60.3	56.8	58.1	(42.9)	(59.8)	55.5	56.3
<i>Total</i>									
No children	24.1	26.0	28.4	31.6	30.3	27.6	26.0	30.8	29.1
Need income	15.2	13.8	12.7	12.6	19.4	18.4	14.9	13.0	13.7
Flexible hours	7.8	6.6	15.9	12.3	8.0	14.1	10.2	11.7	11.2
Has help with children	8.9	15.5	19.8	13.5	8.0	8.6	12.0	13.4	12.9
Not taking man's job	2.5	0.8	1.0	1.5	1.1	1.2	1.9	1.4	1.6
Gets a good job	2.1	2.2	2.4	1.9	2.3	1.2	2.2	1.9	2.0
Other	1.5	0.3	2.2	1.1	1.7	2.5	1.7	1.1	1.3
Proportion "approving conditionally"*	50.9	51.4	63.9	61.6	58.3	58.9	55.4	60.3	58.6

Entries in parentheses relate to sample groups in which the total number of respondents was 50 or fewer.

*Totals of percentages referring to specific "conditions" may exceed the general totals of those "approving conditionally" because informants mentioned more than one "condition"

TABLE 4.3: *Married women: attitude to married women working classified by age (percentages)*

	15-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	No answer	Total
<i>Attitude</i>	<i>Non-farm</i>						
Approve unconditionally	23.4	14.0	15.0	13.7	11.7	16.9	14.3
Approve conditionally	55.3	66.8	63.2	64.9	60.0	60.6	63.6
No strong feelings, no answer	6.4	4.6	3.6	3.2	4.2	4.2	4.0
In general disapprove	9.6	9.1	9.5	10.5	10.9	11.3	10.0
Strongly disapprove	5.3	5.5	8.6	7.7	13.2	7.0	8.2
Total percent	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
N	94	549	685	649	403	71	2,451
	<i>Farm</i>						
Approve unconditionally	(15.0)	10.3	13.9	16.7	17.6	(7.7)	14.7
Approve conditionally	(70.0)	66.2	52.4	58.3	52.1	(53.8)	57.2
No strong feelings, no answer	—	8.2	11.3	7.3	9.2	—	8.5
In general disapprove	(5.0)	9.7	14.3	9.7	9.2	(19.2)	11.0
Strongly disapprove	(10.0)	5.5	8.2	8.0	12.0	(19.2)	8.7
Total percent	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
N	20	145	231	288	142	26	852

Entries in parentheses relate to sample groups in which the total number of respondents was 50 or fewer.

TABLE 4.4: Attitude to married women working classified by presence of children (percentages)

Children present in age groups:	0-under 19		0-under 2		2-under 4		4-under 14		14-under 19	
	None	One or more	None	One or more	None	One or more	None	One or more	None	One or more
<i>Non-farm married not working</i>										
Attitude										
Approve unconditionally	14.6	12.3	13.2	11.2	13.3	11.1	13.4	12.2	12.8	12.6
Approve conditionally	56.8	65.1	62.7	66.0	62.4	65.9	60.7	65.3	63.6	62.9
No strong feelings, no answer	5.6	4.3	4.6	4.5	4.6	4.4	5.1	4.1	4.3	5.0
In general disapprove	10.1	10.4	10.4	10.0	10.4	10.0	10.6	10.1	10.4	10.3
Strongly disapprove	12.9	8.0	9.2	8.3	9.2	8.6	10.2	8.2	9.0	9.1
Total percent	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
N	426	1599	1604	421	1477	548	857	1168	1391	634
<i>Non-farm married working</i>										
Approve unconditionally	17.4	23.2	20.4	(34.2)	21.8	20.3	18.8	24.4	22.4	20.1
Approve conditionally	68.7	63.0	65.7	(52.6)	63.6	69.6	66.7	62.4	65.1	63.6
No strong feelings, no answer	2.6	0.6	1.0	(2.6)	1.1	1.4	1.9	0.5	1.5	0.6
In general disapprove	7.0	8.7	8.5	(5.3)	9.0	4.3	8.5	8.0	7.0	10.4
Strongly disapprove	4.3	4.5	4.4	(5.3)	4.5	4.3	4.2	4.7	4.0	5.2
Total percent	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
N	115	311	388	38	357	69	213	213	272	154

TABLE 4.4: *Attitude to married women working classified by presence of children (percentages)—continued*

<i>Children present in age groups:</i>	<i>0-under 19</i>		<i>0-under 2</i>		<i>2-under 4</i>		<i>4-under 14</i>		<i>14-under 19</i>	
	<i>None</i>	<i>One or more</i>	<i>None</i>	<i>One or more</i>	<i>None</i>	<i>One or more</i>	<i>None</i>	<i>One or more</i>	<i>None</i>	<i>One or more</i>
<i>Farm married not working</i>										
Approve unconditionally	18.8	13.2	16.7	5.8	15.7	11.1	16.1	13.2	13.3	17.2
Approve conditionally	47.5	59.7	54.5	66.0	54.9	62.0	52.4	60.2	56.8	56.9
No strong feelings, no answer	14.9	7.1	9.4	7.1	9.5	7.2	11.0	7.3	10.5	5.4
In general disapprove	9.9	11.0	10.2	12.8	9.9	13.0	11.3	10.3	11.8	8.4
Strongly disapprove	8.8	9.1	9.2	8.3	9.9	6.7	9.2	8.9	7.7	12.1
Total percent	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
N	181	593	618	156	566	208	336	438	535	239
<i>Farm married working</i>										
Approve unconditionally	(20.0)	15.9	18.8	(7.1)	16.7	(16.7)	(15.6)	(17.4)	(19.1)	(12.9)
Approve conditionally	(73.3)	57.1	59.4	(64.3)	63.3	(50.0)	(56.3)	(63.0)	(63.8)	(54.8)
No strong feelings, no answer	—	4.8	1.6	(14.3)	3.3	(5.6)	—	(6.5)	(2.1)	(6.5)
In general disapprove	—	17.5	14.1	(14.3)	11.7	(22.2)	(25.0)	(6.5)	(8.5)	(22.6)
Strongly disapprove	(6.7)	4.8	6.3	—	5.0	(5.6)	(3.1)	(6.5)	(6.4)	(3.2)
Total percent	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
N	15	63	64	14	60	18	32	46	47	31

Entries in parentheses relate to sample groups in which the total number of respondents was 50 or fewer.

TABLE 4.5: Proportions of married women, classified by presence of children and by labour force status, mentioning "no children" as condition for approval of married women working

Children present in age groups:	0-under 19		0-under 2		2-under 4		4-under 14		14-under 19	
	None	One or more	None	One or more	None	One or more	None	One or more	None	One or more
Non-farm, not working	28.2	32.7	31.7	31.9	31.2	33.3	29.2	33.6	30.7	34.0
Non-farm, working	34.8	27.7	30.7	(18.4)	30.3	26.1	33.6	25.5	28.3	31.8
Farm, not working	28.2	32.0	30.9	32.1	29.5	35.6	28.9	32.9	30.7	32.2
Farm, working	(33.3)	19.0	21.9	(21.4)	23.3	(16.7)	(21.9)	(21.7)	(25.5)	(16.1)

Entries in parentheses relate to sample groups in which the total number of respondents was 50 or fewer.

TABLE 4.6: *Those disapproving of married women working: average rank of the reasons for disapproval*

<i>Reasons</i>	<i>Single</i>		<i>Married</i>		<i>Widowed</i>	
	<i>Working</i>	<i>Not working</i>	<i>Working</i>	<i>Not working</i>	<i>Working</i>	<i>Not working</i>
	<i>Non-farm</i>					
Wife's place is in the home	2.1	1.9	2.0	2.0	2.0	(2.2)
Husband should be able to support family	2.4	2.1	2.7	2.7	2.5	(2.4)
Generally bad effect on children	2.4	2.5	2.0	2.0	2.1	(2.1)
Takes jobs from men	3.0	3.2	3.1	3.2	3.4	(3.1)
Number answering	253	57	62	133	20	35
	<i>Farm</i>					
Wife's place is in the home	(2.0)	(1.7)	(1.8)	1.8	(1.9)	
Husband should be able to support family	(2.3)	(2.4)	(2.8)	2.5	(2.2)	
Generally bad effect on children	(2.7)	(2.2)	(2.1)	2.2	(2.4)	
Takes jobs from men	(2.7)	(3.6)	(3.0)	3.2	(3.3)	
Number answering	17	43	26	190	19	(1)

(1) Numbers too small to have any significance.

TABLE 4.7: *Reasons for, and drawbacks of, married women working classified by marital status and labour force status (average rank)*

	<i>Single</i>		<i>Married</i>		<i>Widowed</i>	
	<i>Working</i>	<i>Not working</i>	<i>Working</i>	<i>Not working</i>	<i>Working</i>	<i>Not working</i>
<i>Non-farm</i>						
<i>Reasons</i>						
When a mother has a job children are more independent	3.9	3.9	4.0	3.9	3.9	3.9
Gives wife money to meet family and household expenses	2.0	1.9	2.0	2.0	1.7	2.0
Gives wife own source of income	3.2	3.0	3.1	3.1	2.9	3.0
Gives wife a chance to put education and training to use	3.1	3.1	3.2	3.2	3.5	3.4
Gives wife interest outside the home and helps her to meet people	2.5	2.6	2.4	2.4	2.7	2.6
Number answering	874	195	395	1882	105	141
<i>Farm</i>						
When a mother has a job children are more independent	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.2	(3.3)
Gives wife money to meet family and household expenses	2.3	1.9	1.8	1.8	1.7	(2.6)
Gives wife own source of income	2.5	2.6	2.8	2.8	2.7	(2.2)
Gives wife a chance to put education and training to use	3.2	3.1	3.1	3.0	2.9	(3.5)
Gives wife interest outside the home and helps her to meet people	2.8	2.8	2.9	2.7	3.0	(2.8)
Number answering	69	114	72	657	53	6
<i>Non-farm</i>						
<i>Drawbacks</i>						
Hard to run a house	2.5	2.4	2.4	2.6	2.4	2.5
Husband may not want wife to work	3.0	3.3	3.5	3.3	3.8	3.5
Generally bad effect on children	2.6	2.7	3.0	2.6	2.5	2.5
Good jobs not open to married women	3.8	3.6	3.2	3.7	3.5	3.6
Hard to make satisfactory arrangements for children	2.9	2.7	2.6	2.6	2.5	2.5
Number answering	854	192	364	1831	101	139
<i>Farm</i>						
Hard to run a house	2.2	2.6	2.4	2.3	2.6	(3.6)
Husband may not want wife to work	3.1	3.4	3.4	3.3	3.5	(3.5)
Generally bad effect on children	2.7	2.7	3.3	2.8	2.5	(3.0)
Good jobs not open to married women	3.7	3.3	2.9	3.5	3.4	(2.2)
Hard to make satisfactory arrangements for children	2.8	2.4	2.5	2.5	2.6	(2.2)
Number answering	63	109	71	634	52	6

Entries in parentheses relate to sample groups in which the total number of respondents was 50 or fewer.

TABLE 4.8: *Reasons for, and drawbacks of, married women working classified by presence of children under 19 (average rank)*

	<i>Non-farm married</i>				<i>Farm married</i>	
	<i>Not working</i>		<i>Working</i>		<i>Not working</i>	
	<i>None</i>	<i>One or more</i>	<i>None</i>	<i>One or more</i>	<i>None</i>	<i>One or more</i>
<i>Children present in age group 0-under 19:</i>						
<i>Reasons</i>						
When a mother has a job children are more independent	4.0	4.0	4.1	3.8	4.0	4.0
Gives wife money to meet family and household expenses	1.9	2.1	2.1	2.0	1.8	1.9
Gives wife own source of income	3.1	3.2	3.0	3.2	2.7	2.8
Gives wife chance to put education and training to use	3.3	3.2	3.2	3.2	3.2	3.0
Gives wife interest outside the house and helps her to meet people	2.5	2.3	2.3	2.5	2.8	2.7
Number answering	390	1492	108	287	153	506
<i>Drawbacks</i>						
Hard to run a house	2.4	2.7	2.3	2.5	2.2	2.3
Husband may not want wife to work	3.4	3.3	3.5	3.5	3.2	3.3
Generally bad effect on children	2.6	2.6	3.0	2.9	2.9	2.7
Good jobs not open to married women	3.7	3.7	3.2	3.2	3.5	3.5
Hard to make satisfactory arrangements for children	2.7	2.6	2.7	2.5	2.6	2.4
Number answering	381	1450	102	262	147	487

TABLE 4.9: *Wife's belief about husband's attitude classified by her own attitude (percentages)*

	<i>Approve unconditionally</i>	<i>Approve conditionally</i>	<i>No strong feelings, no answer</i>	<i>In general disapprove</i>	<i>Strongly disapprove</i>	<i>Total</i>
<i>Belief about husband's attitude</i>						
<i>Non-farm married not working</i>						
Approves	58.5	43.4	27.1	16.3	13.1	39.1
Disapproves	30.6	45.5	43.5	72.3	72.7	48.7
Don't know etc.	10.9	11.1	29.3	11.5	14.2	12.2
Total percent	100	100	100	100	100	100
N	258	1283	92	209	183	2,025
Row percent	12.7	63.4	4.5	10.3	9.0	100
<i>Non-farm married working</i>						
Approves	90.2	85.5	(80.0)	(54.3)	(47.4)	82.2
Disapproves	8.7	10.2	(20.0)	(37.1)	(26.3)	12.9
Don't know etc.	1.1	4.4	—	(8.6)	(26.3)	4.9
Total percent	100	100	100	100	100	100
N	92	275	5	35	19	426
Row percent	21.5	64.6	1.2	8.2	4.5	100

TABLE 4.9: *Wife's belief about husband's attitude classified by her own attitude (percentages)—continued*

	<i>Approve unconditionally</i>	<i>Approve conditionally</i>	<i>No strong feelings, no answer</i>	<i>In general disapprove</i>	<i>Strongly disapprove</i>	<i>Total</i>
<i>Farm married not working</i>						
Approves	53.6	38.4	27.5	8.4	5.7	33.5
Disapproves	38.4	48.0	43.5	75.9	77.1	51.8
Don't know etc.	8.0	13.6	29.0	15.7	17.1	14.7
Total percent	100	100	100	100	100	100
N	112	440	69	83	70	774
Row percent	14.5	56.8	8.9	10.7	9.0	100
<i>Farm married working</i>						
Approves	(84.6)	(80.9)	(66.7)	(45.5)	—	71.8
Disapproves	(7.7)	(12.8)	—	(45.5)	(75.0)	19.2
Don't know etc.	(7.7)	(6.4)	(33.3)	(9.1)	(25.0)	9.0
Total percent	100	100	100	100	100	100
N	13	47	3	11	4	78
Row percent	16.7	60.3	3.8	14.1	5.1	100

Entries in parentheses relate to sample groups in which the total number of respondents was 50 or fewer.

TABLE 4.10: *Husband's attitude classified by wife's belief about husband's attitude (percentages)*

<i>Husband's attitude</i>	<i>Approves</i>	<i>Dis- approves</i>	<i>Don't know, etc.</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Total Percent</i>
	<i>Non-farm married not working</i>				
Approve unconditionally	(65.5)	(31.0)	(3.4)	29	100
Approve conditionally	54.4	36.8	8.8	193	100
No strong feelings, no answer	(40.9)	(18.2)	(40.9)	44	100
In general disapprove	20.9	73.1	6.0	67	100
Strongly disapprove	13.1	82.8	4.0	99	100
Husbands contacted	39.1	50.7	10.2	432	100
Husbands not contacted	39.0	48.2	12.7	1,593	100
Total	39.1	48.7	12.2	2,025	100
<i>Non-farm married working</i>					
Approve unconditionally	(85.0)	(10.0)	(5.0)	20	100
Approve conditionally	96.4	3.6	—	55	100
No strong feelings, no answer	(60.0)	(40.0)	—	5	100
In general disapprove	(37.5)	(62.5)	—	8	100
Strongly disapprove	(33.3)	(55.6)	(11.1)	9	100
Husbands contacted	81.4	16.5	2.1	97	100
Husbands not contacted	82.4	11.9	5.8	329	100
Total	82.2	12.9	4.9	426	100
<i>Farm married working and not working</i>					
Approve unconditionally	(75.8)	(15.2)	(9.1)	33	100
Approve conditionally	62.8	28.3	8.8	113	100
No strong feelings, no answer	(31.4)	(45.7)	(22.9)	35	100
In general disapprove	(12.8)	(79.5)	(7.7)	39	100
Strongly disapprove	15.1	79.2	5.7	53	100
Husbands contacted	44.0	46.2	9.9	273	100
Husbands not contacted	33.7	50.1	16.2	579	100
Total	37.0	48.8	14.2	852	100

Entries in parentheses relate to sample groups in which the total number of respondents was 50 or fewer.

TABLE 4.11: *Wife's attitude classified by husband's attitude (percentages)*

	<i>Approve un- conditionally</i>	<i>Approve conditionally</i>	<i>No strong feelings, no answer</i>	<i>In general disapprove</i>	<i>Strongly disapprove</i>	<i>Total husbands contacted</i>	<i>Total husbands not contacted</i>	<i>Total</i>
<i>Wife's attitude</i>								
<i>Non-farm married not working</i>								
Approve unconditionally	(31.0)	8.8	(2.3)	9.0	14.1	10.9	13.3	12.7
Approve conditionally	(69.0)	73.6	(70.5)	61.2	45.5	64.6	63.0	63.4
No strong feelings, no answer	—	3.6	(20.5)	3.0	3.0	4.9	4.5	4.5
In general disapprove	—	6.7	—	17.9	22.2	10.9	10.2	10.3
Strongly disapprove	—	7.3	(6.8)	9.0	15.2	8.8	9.1	9.0
Total percent	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
N	29	193	44	67	99	432	1593	2025
Row percent	6.7	44.7	10.2	15.5	22.9	100		
<i>Non-farm married working</i>								
Approve unconditionally	(25.0)	21.8	(20.0)	(12.5)	—	19.6	22.2	21.6
Approve conditionally	(70.0)	72.7	(60.0)	(62.5)	(55.6)	69.1	63.2	64.6
No strong feelings, no answer	—	—	—	—	—	—	1.5	1.2
In general disapprove	(5.0)	3.6	(20.0)	(25.0)	(33.3)	9.3	7.9	8.2
Strongly disapprove	—	1.8	—	—	(11.1)	2.1	5.2	4.5
Total percent	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
N	20	55	5	8	9	97	329	426
Row percent	20.6	56.7	5.2	8.2	9.3	100		
<i>Farm married working and not working</i>								
Approve unconditionally	(48.5)	16.8	(5.7)	(17.9)	15.1	19.0	12.6	14.7
Approve conditionally	(39.4)	66.4	(45.7)	(48.7)	45.3	53.8	58.7	57.2
No strong feelings, no answer	(9.1)	10.6	(14.3)	(2.6)	9.4	9.5	7.9	8.5
In general disapprove	(3.0)	5.3	(20.0)	(12.8)	13.2	9.5	11.7	11.0
Strongly disapprove	—	0.9	(14.3)	(17.9)	17.0	8.1	9.0	8.7
Total percent	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
N	33	113	35	39	53	273	579	852
Row percent	12.1	41.4	12.8	14.3	19.4	100		

Entries in parentheses relate to sample groups in which the total number of respondents was 50 or fewer.

TABLE 4.12: *Belief about friends' attitude to married women working classified by own attitude (percentages)*

	<i>Approve unconditionally</i>	<i>Approve conditionally</i>	<i>No strong feelings, no answer</i>	<i>In general disapprove</i>	<i>Strongly disapprove</i>	<i>Total</i>
<i>Belief about friends' attitude</i>						
<i>Non-farm married not working</i>						
Approves	56.6	42.2	19.6	15.8	11.5	37.5
Disapproves	8.9	9.4	10.9	22.5	27.9	12.4
Don't know, etc.	34.5	48.3	69.6	61.7	60.7	50.0
Total percent	100	100	100	100	100	100
N	258	1283	92	209	183	2,025
<i>Non-farm married working</i>						
Approves	50.0	46.6	—	(22.9)	(21.1)	43.7
Disapproves	6.5	7.6	—	(17.1)	(26.3)	8.9
Don't know, etc.	43.5	45.8	(100)	(60.0)	(52.6)	47.4
Total percent	100	100	100	100	100	100
N	92	275	5	35	19	426
<i>Farm married not working</i>						
Approves	31.3	24.3	13.0	7.2	2.9	20.5
Disapproves	16.1	17.3	18.8	33.7	41.4	21.2
Don't know, etc.	52.7	58.4	68.1	59.0	55.7	58.3
Total percent	100	100	100	100	100	100
N	112	440	69	83	70	774
<i>Farm married working</i>						
Approves	(30.8)	(31.9)	(66.7)	(18.2)	(25.0)	30.8
Disapproves	(23.1)	(19.2)	—	(36.4)	—	20.5
Don't know, etc.	(46.2)	(48.9)	(33.3)	(45.5)	(75.0)	48.7
Total percent	100	100	100	100	100	100
N	13	47	3	11	4	78

Entries in parentheses relate to sample groups in which the total number of respondents was 50 or fewer.

SECTION 5: *The Present Job: Arrangements for Child-Care*

RESPONDENTS who were currently in employment were questioned about several aspects of their present job. Details were collected concerning occupation, number of hours worked per week, transport arrangements used, and arrangements (if any) made for the care of children. This Section presents the main findings of this part of the questionnaire.

Occupational Distribution

In Table 5.1 the occupational distribution of the working women is presented, using the most detailed level of coding of the job descriptions. The categories were based on the groupings in the 1966 Census of Population (Vol. IV). However, as seen in Section 3, the emphasis on part-time as well as full-time occupations in the present study implies certain differences between the occupational distribution shown in Table 5.1 and a comparable table derived from Census data. In addition to the inclusiveness of the definitions of "economic activity" used in the survey, certain occupations have been treated differently from the Census convention.¹

The material in Table 5.1 is self-explanatory. It may be noted that single women are relatively heavily concentrated in production and clerical work, whereas married women are relatively heavily concentrated in "shop-owners, assistants, etc.", service work, professional/technical work and piece work etc. Eighty-seven per cent of the widowed women living on farms who were classified as economically active were "head of farm households". The fact that over 30 per cent of married working women were assigned to "service work" suggests that a more detailed classification of these occupations might have been useful, although the occupations² included in this group appear to have enough in common to serve as a well-defined unit without further sub-categories. The concentration of working women in "female" occupations has often been noted; it is also worth stressing the existence of a group of "married female" occupations.

Table 5.2 tabulates the number of hours worked ("in a normal work week") by occupation and marital status. The greater importance of part-time work among the married sample has already been discussed. The present table makes it clear that in all occupations married respondents were far more likely to work less than 35 hours per week than their single counterparts. It is, however, also noticeable

¹ The most important points of contrast are: the category of "piece, craft workers" does not exist as a separate category in the Census; "head of farm household" has been applied in the present study to women who could probably be classified as "farmers" in the Census; farmers' wives doing specific jobs on or off the farm have been assigned to the relevant occupation in the present study, whereas the Census convention in general is not to classify farmers' wives as "gainfully occupied".

² Namely, waitresses, cooks, kitchen hands, maids, charwomen, hairdressers, laundry workers, dry cleaners and pressers, caretakers, hospital and ward orderlies. Thus, hotel workers were assigned to this category, but hotel owners or guesthouse keepers were in a separate category. The relatively small number of working women in the sample limited the extent to which occupational classifications could be refined.

that married women were more highly concentrated in occupations (such as service or professional/technical work) where even single women were likely to work part-time.³

The time of day normally worked by married women is tabulated by occupation in Table 5.3. The great variety of arrangements found in some occupations among married women is striking: in service work, for example, working mornings only, or a full day, or some of the morning and some of the afternoon, were about equally prevalent. Nonetheless, "full working day" was the most common arrangement for all occupations and marital status. The flexibility of women working as shop owners, assistants, etc. was reflected in the importance of "irregular" hours for married women in this category. It is interesting to see that "afternoons only" or "evening shift" do not figure at all prominently in the table: apart from the relatively small proportion of married women doing production work on an evening shift, this type of working schedule seemed rare, and even among married service workers accounted for less than one fifth of the total.

For married women, occupations are classified by social group in Table 5.4. Much of the clustering by social group evident in this table would be expected on the basis of the educational background of the women in the various social groups. But the association between wife's occupation and her social group (as determined by her husband's occupation) is by no means very close. For example, clerks and typists are drawn from a wide range of social groups, as are to a lesser extent shop-owners, assistants, etc., and hotel, guesthouse keepers. But technical/professional workers are drawn predominantly from the upper and upper-middle social groups, and production and service workers from the lower middle and manual social groups. If a broad dichotomy between manual and non-manual workers is made, it is evident that in the overwhelming majority of cases women performing manual work⁴ are themselves married to manual workers. The most important exception to this generalisation is the fact that significant proportions of women doing clerical work and of shop-owners, assistants, etc. were married to skilled manual workers. An important aspect of Table 5.4 is the high concentration of shop-owners, assistants etc. in the inspectoral/supervisory II social group: this social group includes many shop-owners etc. whose wives presumably work in the family business, thus helping to explain the high participation rate found among married women in this group.

In order to shed further light on the factors influencing occupational choice among married women, the type of work believed available by the respondents was tabulated by (present) occupation. It was seen that those who were employed in a particular occupation believed this type of work to be more likely to be available ("to married women who want to work") than any other type of work. This might be expected, in view of the fact that they themselves had succeeded in obtaining a job of this type. Nonetheless, it was evident that when certain broadly similar

³ The importance of a work week of 25-34 hours among technical/professional workers no doubt reflects the inclusion of teachers in this category.

⁴ The manual/non-manual dichotomy is arbitrary and not readily defined in the case of women workers, but for present purposes production and service workers could be defined as "manual".

categories are considered, belief about job availability was not the only factor determining job choice: in the case of married women doing service work, for example, a substantial proportion believed that factory work was available, and in the case of those doing factory work, a substantial proportion believed service work available. Obviously factors other than employment opportunities influence the choice between these types of employment (which may require fairly similar educational qualifications). As mentioned earlier, the higher proportion of non-production jobs that are part-time may be a factor in job choice among married women.

Another factor that may be relevant is the respondent's previous work history. The main dichotomy in work history among married women is between those who have worked more or less continuously and those who interrupted their careers on marriage (or first started to work after marriage). It was confirmed that occupations such as shop-owners, assistants, etc., technical/professional workers, and hotel, guesthouse keepers, were characterised by high proportions (about one-half) who had worked more or less continuously, whereas among production and service workers this proportion fell to about one-fourth. There may be two forces at work here: on the one hand, certain occupations (especially those in which hours and conditions of work are flexible) lend themselves to the sort of arrangements which permit women to remain in the labour force almost without interruption, even when they have young children:⁵ on the other hand, other occupations, especially unskilled and routine jobs which require little training and where the penalties for discontinuity in one's working career are slight, may tend to attract women who are returning to work after interruptions for family formation.

The geographical distribution of the occupations was studied. A greater dispersion of such categories as service work, shop-owners, assistants, etc., and hotel, guesthouse keepers was found, reflecting the narrower range of industrial and commercial employment available to women outside Dublin, especially those in the open country. It is interesting that among married women there was a higher concentration of workers in service and technical/professional occupations in Dublin than was the case among single women. The possibility exists that the variety and relative abundance of service-type employment opportunities in the Dublin area attracts married women into the labour force. This conclusion is consistent with the inferences drawn from econometric work on this topic [25].

Stability of Employment

A question was asked concerning the working respondents' situation "this time last year" in order to collect information on the recent labour force history of those who were working at the time of the survey. This type of question might be expected to yield answers of a lower degree of reliability than the remainder of the survey. However, there is no reason to suspect that the present responses were less accurate

⁵ The importance of this factor is illustrated by the data in Table 5.15 below. Over 50 per cent of those with children under 4, who had made "no special arrangement" for their care, were working at home. This is a higher proportion than in the working sample as a whole.

than is normal in questions of this type and the contrary may even be true in view of the fairly important nature of the decision to change jobs. Those who answered that they were working for the same employer this time last year were coded "no change of employer", those who said they were working this time last year, but for a different employer, were coded "one or more changes of employer", and those who were not working this time last year were coded "entered employment during the year". Further details were obtained from those who had changed employer during the year (number of changes, reasons for change) and those who entered employment (situation at this time last year). The results are presented in Table 5.5.⁶ The most striking feature of the table is the contrast between married and single respondents with respect to employment change: almost three times as high a proportion of the single respondents said they had changed employer in the previous twelve months as was the case among the married respondents, and the widowed reported the lowest rate of change of all. There was not much difference between the single and married in regard to the proportion which had entered employment during the year. If attention is confined to the respondents who were employed this time last year, 12.4 per cent of the single, compared with 4.0 per cent of the married had changed employer during the year.⁷ Thus there can be little doubt about the greater mobility of single women between employers, and it is very unlikely that the retirement of married women (due to maternity etc.) would be sufficiently greater than the retirement of single women (due to marriage etc.) to offset this differential. This table also illustrates the importance of the inflow of single women from school and of married women from "home duties" to the labour force. It is also interesting to note that 1.8 per cent of currently employed married women stated they were "unemployed" or "looking for work" this time last year.

It is evident from Table 5.5 that the farm sample exhibited lower rates of employment change than the non-farm sample in each marital status. Table 5.6 presents a detailed picture of employment change by occupation (at the time of the survey). The highest rates of change among single women were in production, clerical and service work, the lowest among shop-owners, assistants, etc., and those in technical/professional work.

Within each occupation, the single respondents had a higher rate of change than their married counterparts. The rates of employment change were also studied by respondents' age. The inflow of married women from "home duties" and "unemployment" was concentrated in the ages 25-44. Among both married and single respondents the rate of change was highest among the youngest age groups, with a very high rate evident for single women aged under 25.

The findings on frequency of employment change are presented in Table 5.7.

⁶ In one aspect this tabulation is incomplete: no information was collected about those who had been in the labour force this time last year but had since left. Whilst it would have been desirable to try to estimate the rate at which single women retire on marriage, and married women retire on maternity, etc., the sample would not have contacted those who emigrated, retired on reaching age 65, or died.

⁷ The χ^2 test for these differences is significant at the .001 level.

Over one-half of all those who had changed employer had changed more than once, over ten per cent had changed more than twice. There is little contrast between the marital status in regard to frequency of change. The responses to the question on reason for changing employer are presented in Table 5.8 (the questionnaire stressed the main reason, and only this was coded). "Higher wages" was the most frequently cited factor, with "firm closed or redundancy" the next most important. Taken together, these two economic factors account for almost one-half the total number of employer changes. This result is very interesting in view of the scepticism that is sometimes expressed about the relevance of 'net advantage' as an hypothesis explaining inter-job mobility, cf. [20].

All working respondents were asked whether, in addition to normal holidays and leave, there were days "when you do not go to work". The usual caveats associated with accuracy of response to the questions relying on memory obviously apply in connection with this question. A further difficulty arises with respect to the "not applicable" answer, since this may have been used in varying degrees by the self-employed etc. Nonetheless, there is a striking consistency between the marital status in Table 5.9 as far as the frequency with which "when I don't feel like working" or for "other reasons" were cited. The higher overall rate of absenteeism among the married is due to the 6 per cent of married respondents who mentioned remaining away from work "when husband/children are sick", and in fact this is the most important reason for absenteeism given by any marital status. Those who mentioned any reason for absenteeism were further asked whether this had tended to create a problem for them ("has it made it hard for you to hold down your job?"). Of those to whom this question was relevant, 11 per cent of the single women replied "yes" compared with only 4 per cent of the married (and none of the widowed). Thus, although absenteeism was relatively more frequent among the married respondents, it seemed more likely to create problems for the single. No doubt this reflects both the concentration of married women in occupations that are chosen at least partly for their flexibility on issues such as this, and the high proportion of absenteeism among the single that was attributable to personal, as opposed to family considerations.

How They Heard About Their Jobs

In Table 5.10 the answers to the question on how respondents "first heard there was a job available" where they were working at the time of the survey are presented. This question is not relevant to the self-employed, who form an important proportion of the married and farm sample. For the entire sample, the single most important response was "heard from friends", with "ads. in the paper" and "contacted employer" also very important. Methods such as employment agencies (State or private), direct employer recruitment, or job counsellor, were of minor importance. It is interesting to note that single respondents seemed somewhat less likely to be recruited, and more likely to contact the employer or to go to an agency, than was the case for married women. When tabulated by the respondent's occupation, the answers to this question pinpointed the occupations where self-employment is

the rule (notably shop-owners, assistants, etc., service work, agricultural occupations, "other"). It is interesting to note that "ads. in the paper" accounted for a high proportion of the clerical and professional jobs, but learning from friends or contacting employers predominated in production and service occupations.

Travel to Work

The aim of the questions relating to transport arrangements was to collect data on the normal journey to and from work, its cost, and the time spent travelling. In Table 5.11 the mode of transport used is tabulated by marital status. As was expected from previous findings, the married working sample was relatively highly concentrated (over 25 per cent) in work that did not involve any travel outside the home. Of those working away from home, the dominance of walking and public transport as a means of reaching the job is clear, but it is of interest that a higher proportion of married women used their own cars to get to work than was the case with single women. Very few of the respondents relied on firms' transport. A tabulation of the married women who were working at home by occupation revealed that 34 per cent of them were shop-owners, assistants etc., a further 21 per cent were in agricultural occupations, and the only other important categories were "other (including piece workers)", service workers, and hotel, guest house keepers. Details of the cost of travel and time spent on the journey were collected and have been tabulated, but these results are not presented here.

The effect of area of residence on mode of transport is considered in Table 5.12. It may be seen that those living in an urban area ("business district") were most likely to walk to work or to work at home, whereas the suburban residents relied heavily on walking, public transport, and cars. Those living in the open country were the least likely to use public transport (even after allowance is made for the high proportion that worked at home), and depended on a wide variety of arrangements for getting to work (the 13 per cent that mentioned "get a lift" was almost three times the corresponding proportion in any other area). It seems fair to conclude that those living in the central city areas had the least problem, and those in the country areas the greatest, in getting to work. The highest average cost of travel, however, was found to be among those who lived "near towns", followed closely by those in "open country" —the latter's average costs being kept down by the high proportions working at home or getting a lift to work.

Arrangements for Child-Care

This important topic was explored by the question whether "as a result of going to work, any special arrangements were made for looking after the children"? Table 5.13 presents some of the responses to this question. The question was concerned with "special arrangements" and did not collect data on how the children were actually cared for when the mother was at work. (In retrospect, it would have been preferable to have collected both types of information.) The strong impression is conveyed that the majority of working women make no special arrangement for the care of their children while they are working. When the answers were classified

by presence of children it was found that the proportion making no special arrangement as a result of going to work was lowest among those with children under 4 years old (just over 50 per cent) and rose to almost all of those with children aged 14- under 19. The data also show that the proportions making no special arrangement were higher in the farm than in the non-farm sample. Of those that made some special arrangements, "paid help" was the most common, followed closely by relatives living with the family, and then by taking children to relatives or neighbours. Taking the children to the place of employment or to day-care centres was mentioned very infrequently.

It may seem puzzling that so small a proportion of the working respondents with young children made special arrangements for the care of their children as a result of going to work. It is possible that the wording of the question may have resulted in some information being lost on women who for example, already had paid help before they decided to go to work, but on the whole the picture conveyed is probably accurate: in the first place, older children and the respondent's husband may look after younger children when the mother works part-time (the most common work arrangement among women with young children). Secondly, many of those with young children are working at home. This point is illustrated by the data of Table 5.14, which shows that the presence of children is significantly associated with the occupational distribution of the respondents: those with children, especially young children, are far more likely to be in the professional/technical, shop-owners, assistants, etc., and hotel, guesthouse keepers categories, than those without children.⁸ No doubt this association in part reflects the greater eagerness of those with certain qualifications and opportunities to return to work after marriage, but it is also reasonable to assume that the greater flexibility of hours and conditions of work typical of the occupations in which women with young children are over-represented attract wives who wish to work into these occupations.

The findings on the proportions who worked at home are revealing: whereas 29 per cent of all married working women worked at home, among those with children under 4 this proportion rises to 42 per cent, and as Table 5.15 shows, it reaches almost 60 per cent among working women with, children under 4 who said they had made no special arrangements for child-care. It is clear that the ability to work in her own home, thereby largely obviating the need for special child-care arrangements, greatly facilitates the return to work of a married woman with young children. Furthermore, the fairly small proportion of women with young children who work outside home are presumably heavily dependent on other members of their family, and on flexible hours etc. in their employment, in making arrangements for child-care. It is important to stress that these findings are very similar to those reported in Britain [11, Section E. part iv], and in general found to be the case in the European Economic Community. In the case of the British survey, it was found that:

⁸ The differences in occupational structures between each of the three relevant pairs of columns in Table 5.14 are highly significant statistically (X^2 test, amalgamating the first two rows).

. . . the majority of mothers of pre-school children were able to have their children cared for at little or no direct cost to themselves. The ability to obtain free care for children depends for the most part on the existence of relatives able and willing to undertake the care . . . [11, p. 94].

Mme. Sullerot summarised the situation in the EEC as follows:

. . . the majority of mothers who work find themselves unable to choose a satisfactory solution to the problem of child-care due to the dearth of social facilities. They therefore have to fall back on an *ad hoc* solution: they have their children boarded-out (thus heavily burdening their budget and depriving themselves of the child's presence in the evening) or they have a relative look after them, or a neighbour, according to the opportunities available, always in agony that something could occur to upset the fragile solution they have found [21, p. 97].

An attempt was made to collect information on the cost of child-care arrangements to the woman who had made special arrangements. This question posed difficulties, since in many cases (e.g. with live-in help) the cost of caring for children could not be disentangled from that of doing housework, etc. Eighty (out of 115 eligible) answered in a manner that allowed separate data for the care of children to be tabulated, as follows:

<i>Cost per week;</i>	<i>Nothing</i>	<i>Less than £1</i>	<i>£1-under £2</i>	<i>£2-under £3</i>	<i>£3-under £4</i>	<i>£4-under £5</i>	<i>Total</i>
<i>per cent</i>	20.0	31.3	27.5	1.3	13.8	6.3	100.0

Even allowing for the limited reliability of answers to a question of this nature, it seems that the average expense incurred explicitly for childcare was low, with only 21 per cent of those who made special arrangements paying more than £2 per week. Of course, this low average figure does not detract from the very real possibility that for many of those concerned these expenses are a serious incursion into the after-tax income derived from working. Moreover, as is evident from the earlier evidence on how the majority of working women try to manage their child-care arrangements, these figures on monetary costs represent only one aspect of the problem: the heaviest costs are most probably the strain of the overburdening and the anxiety about the adequacy of the *ad hoc* arrangements that are made, and the difficulties faced by those women who find it impossible to make any satisfactory arrangements.

Summary and Conclusions

Much of the material in this Section is of a straightforward descriptive nature, and requires little commentary. The data on the occupational distribution of working

women, especially married women, are important both in their own right and in conjunction with the material on labour force participation. The tendency for married women to work shorter hours than their single counterparts in each occupation has been documented, as has been the greater variety of arrangements they use in relation to the timing of their work. All of these findings clarify the results presented in Section 3, where the definition of "economically active" adopted in the survey was seen to give a relatively high participation rate among married women (compared with the Census of Population figure).

Our findings allow some evaluation of the continuity and stability of married, as compared with single, women's contribution to the labour force. It was seen, for example, that married women were far more likely to work continuously (or with only minor interruptions) throughout their marriage if they were employed in technical/professional occupations or as "shop-owners, assistants, etc.". The answers to the question on work history "since this time last year" showed greater stability of employment among married than single women: if a married woman had been economically active throughout the year, she was far more likely to have remained in the same employment than was a single woman. To some extent this may have been merely a reflection of the greater youth of the single respondents, and their greater concentration in certain production jobs (and possibly also in first jobs). It must also be kept in mind that the results do not allow an assessment of the rate of retirement from the labour force of the married and single respondents. But despite these reservations, it is very likely that the separation rates from a given employment are higher among single than among married women. It is impressive that economic considerations (and especially "higher wages" and "redundancy") dominate among the factors leading to changing employer, although to a somewhat smaller degree among the married respondents. In contrast with the apparently greater continuity of employment among married women was their higher rate of absenteeism: some six per cent mentioned that they stayed away from work when their husband and/or children were ill. Very few of those who mentioned this type of absenteeism claimed it gave rise to a problem for them in keeping their jobs, and no doubt this is partly a reflection of the concentration of married women in jobs where flexible hours and working conditions are most readily found.

The question about "hearing about the present job" revealed the importance of informal networks in the labour market. "Heard from friends" was the most important single way of learning about the present job, followed by "ads. in the newspapers". Use of formal employment agencies etc. or direct recruitment by employers seemed to be very uncommon methods of obtaining jobs.

The series of questions on travel to and from work revealed that over a quarter of married working women worked at home. Married women who worked away from home, however, were dependent on a wide variety of travel arrangements, with the private car assuming a much greater importance for them than was the case among single respondents. In rural areas, also, both married and single respond-

ents relied on a larger variety of transport arrangements, and the car was of greater importance, than was the case in the urban sample.

The responses to the question on child-care revealed that only of a minority of those who had young children made any special arrangements for child-care as a consequence of the decision to go to work. Those who had made no special arrangements were concentrated in jobs that allowed them to work at home, or they worked flexible hours and relied on informal arrangements. It is readily concluded from the data that arrangements for child-care are difficult to make, and from the answers to earlier questions it was clear that many married women not now working (about 10 per cent of the total) were unable to do so due to the unavailability of child-care facilities. It is thus very evident from this Section that whether a married woman who is responsible for young children works or not is strongly influenced by the type of employment opportunities open to her: those who can work at home or in employment where hours are flexible are in a relatively privileged situation. It seems likely that the favourable position of these occupations may influence the present occupational distribution of the married female labour force.

TABLE 5.1: Occupational distribution of working respondents, classified by marital status (percentages)

	Single	Non-farm Married	Widowed	Single	Farm Married	Widowed	Total
<i>Occupation/Industrial sector</i>							
Production workers: skilled, semi-skilled, textile, clothing	13.2	3.1	4.4	6.3	—	—	8.8
Production workers: skilled, semi-skilled, other	4.0	2.3	1.8	1.3	1.3	—	3.1
Production workers: unskilled	9.9	4.2	4.4	3.8	1.3	—	7.1
Transport, communications workers	2.6	0.7	1.8	2.5	1.3	1.6	2.0
Clerks/typists: industrial enterprises	6.7	1.2	1.8	2.5	—	—	4.3
Clerks/typists: commercial enterprises	16.0	7.3	4.4	16.5	5.1	—	12.1
Clerks/typists: government enterprises	5.7	0.2	5.3	8.9	—	—	4.0
Salaried employees/shop-keepers/shop assistants	16.6	23.5	15.0	16.5	16.7	3.2	17.7
Service workers/maids/cleaners	10.9	30.8	47.8	8.9	5.1	4.8	17.6
Professional workers	8.6	16.0	6.2	7.6	21.8	—	10.5
Technical workers	2.2	0.5	—	3.8	—	—	1.6
Hotel/guesthouse keepers	2.3	3.8	3.5	—	7.7	—	2.8
Head of farm household	—	—	—	13.9	1.3	87.1	3.8
Piece workers, craft workers, etc.	0.6	5.4	1.8	5.1	35.9	1.6	3.7
Other occupations, including not stated	0.5	0.9	1.8	2.5	2.6	1.6	0.9
Total percent	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
N	979	426	113	79	78	62	1,737

TABLE 5.2: Farm and non-farm: hours worked classified by occupation (percentages)

Hours worked	Production workers: skilled, and semi-skilled	Production workers: unskilled	Clerks/ typists	Salaried employees/ shop-keepers/ assistants	Service workers/ maids/ cleaners	Professional/ technical	Hotel/ guesthouse keepers	Agricultural occupations	Other, including no answer	Total
	<i>Single</i>									
Under 5 hours	—	—	—	—	0.9	—	—	—	—	0.1
5–under 15	1.1	—	0.7	—	1.8	—	—	—	—	0.6
15–under 25	—	—	—	1.7	7.0	8.7	—	(9.1)	(4.5)	2.3
25–under 35	0.6	—	7.0	6.3	14.9	28.7	(8.7)	(9.1)	(9.1)	8.5
35+	98.3	99.0	92.0	90.3	75.4	62.6	(91.3)	(81.8)	(77.3)	87.7
No answer	—	1.0	0.3	1.7	—	—	—	—	(9.1)	0.9
Total percent	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
N	174	100	301	176	114	115	23	11	44	1058
<i>Married</i>										
Under 5 hours	—	—	(2.4)	0.9	4.4	—	(4.5)	—	4.9	2.4
5–under 15	—	(5.3)	(19.5)	9.7	21.5	5.7	(9.1)	—	24.6	14.1
15–under 25	(25.0)	(26.3)	(19.5)	20.4	29.6	15.9	(9.1)	—	18.0	21.6
25–under 35	(12.5)	(10.5)	(7.3)	11.5	11.9	48.9	(18.2)	—	9.8	17.9
35+	(62.5)	(57.9)	(48.8)	54.0	31.1	27.3	(54.5)	(100.0)	4.9	37.5
No answer	—	—	(2.4)	3.5	1.5	2.3	(4.5)	—	37.7	6.5
Total percent	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
N	24	19	41	113	135	88	22	1	61	504
<i>Widowed</i>										
Under 5 hours	—	—	—	—	5.3	—	—	—	(11.1)	2.3
5–under 15	(14.3)	—	(7.7)	—	26.3	—	(25.0)	—	(22.2)	11.4
15–under 25	—	(20.0)	(7.7)	—	19.3	(14.3)	—	—	(22.2)	9.1
25–under 35	—	—	(15.4)	(10.5)	14.0	(28.6)	(75.0)	3.7	(11.1)	11.4
35+	(85.7)	(80.0)	(69.2)	(89.5)	31.6	(57.1)	—	96.3	(33.3)	64.6
No answer	—	—	—	—	3.5	—	—	—	—	1.1
Total percent	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
N	7	5	13	19	57	7	4	54	9	175

Entries in parentheses refer to sample groups in which the total number of respondents was 50 or fewer.

TABLE 5.3: *Farm and non-farm married working women: time of day worked classified by occupation (percentages)*

	<i>Production workers: skilled, and semi-skilled</i>	<i>Production workers: unskilled</i>	<i>Clerks/ typists</i>	<i>Salaried employees/ shop-keepers</i>	<i>Service workers/ maids/ cleaners</i>	<i>Pro-fessional/ technical</i>	<i>Hotel/ guesthouse keepers</i>	<i>Agricul-tural occupations</i>	<i>Other, including no answer</i>	<i>Total</i>
<i>Time of day worked</i>										
Mornings only	(4.2)	(21.1)	(19.5)	2.7	23.0	11.4	(9.1)	—	3.3	12.1
Afternoons only	(4.2)	(10.5)	(7.3)	5.3	5.9	2.3	—	—	8.2	5.4
Some of both	(8.3)	(10.5)	(9.8)	11.5	21.5	14.8	(9.1)	—	6.6	13.7
Full day	(45.8)	(47.4)	(48.8)	54.9	28.1	55.7	(59.1)	(100.0)	9.8	41.5
Evening shift	(33.3)	(5.3)	(2.4)	2.7	10.4	5.7	—	—	6.6	7.1
Irregular	(4.2)	(5.3)	(9.8)	18.6	8.1	8.0	(13.6)	—	26.2	12.7
No answer	—	—	(2.4)	4.4	3.0	2.3	(9.1)	—	39.3	7.5
Total percent	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
N	24	19	41	113	135	88	22	1	61	504

Entries in parentheses relate to sample groups in which the total number of respondents was 50 or fewer.

TABLE 5.4: *Non-farm married women: occupation classified by social group (percentages)*

<i>Social group</i>	<i>Production workers: skilled and semi-skilled</i>	<i>Production workers: unskilled</i>	<i>Clerks/typists</i>	<i>Salaried employees/shop-keepers/shop assistants</i>	<i>Service workers/maids/cleaners</i>	<i>Professional/technical</i>	<i>Hotel/guesthouse keepers</i>	<i>Other, including not stated</i>	<i>Total</i>
Higher professional	—	—	(8.1)	2.0	—	16.9	—	(3.3)	4.2
Executive/managerial	—	—	(8.1)	5.0	—	14.1	(18.8)	(3.3)	5.2
Inspectoral/supervisory I	(8.7)	—	(13.5)	16.0	0.8	25.4	(31.1)	(10.0)	11.7
Inspectoral/supervisory II	—	(11.1)	(18.9)	42.0	6.9	15.5	(18.8)	(23.3)	19.0
Routine non-manual	(17.4)	(5.6)	(18.9)	12.0	6.1	16.9	(6.3)	(6.7)	11.0
Skilled manual	(17.4)	(38.9)	(16.2)	16.0	26.7	9.9	—	(23.3)	19.2
Semi-skilled manual	(13.0)	(16.7)	(5.4)	4.0	15.3	—	(6.3)	(10.0)	8.5
Routine manual	(39.1)	(27.8)	(5.4)	2.0	39.7	1.4	(12.5)	(16.7)	18.3
Agricultural occupations	(4.3)	—	(2.7)	1.0	1.5	—	(6.3)	(3.3)	1.6
Other, including no answer/not known	—	—	(2.7)	—	3.1	—	—	—	1.2
Total percent	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
N	23	18	37	100	131	71	16	30	426

Entries in parentheses relate to sample groups in which the total number of respondents was 50 or fewer.

TABLE 5.5: *Farm and non-farm working women: work history since "this time last year" classified by marital status (percentages)*

	<i>Working this time last year</i>		<i>Entered employment during the year</i>					<i>Total percent</i>	<i>Total N</i>
	<i>No change of employer</i>	<i>One or more changes of employer</i>	<i>Situation last year</i>						
			<i>At school</i>	<i>Home responsibilities</i>	<i>Ill</i>	<i>No jobs, unemployed</i>	<i>No answer</i>		
<i>Non-farm</i>									
Single	76.9	12.8	7.3	0.4	0.4	0.3	1.9	100	979
Married	84.5	4.5	—	5.2	0.9	1.6	3.3	100	426
Widowed	85.0	4.4	—	5.3	—	2.7	2.7	100	113
<i>Farm</i>									
Single	84.8	7.6	5.1	—	1.3	—	1.3	100	79
Married	92.3	1.3	—	2.6	—	2.6	1.3	100	78
Widowed	98.4	—	—	—	—	—	1.6	100	62
<i>Total</i>									
Single	77.5	12.4	7.1	0.4	0.5	0.3	1.9	100	1,058
Married	85.7	4.0	—	4.8	0.8	1.8	3.0	100	504
Widowed	89.7	2.9	—	3.4	—	1.7	2.3	100	175

TABLE 5.6: Farm and non-farm: work history during past year classified by occupation (percentages)

Work history during last year	Production workers: skilled and semi-skilled	Production workers: unskilled	Clerks/typists	Salaried employees/shop-keepers/shop assistants	Service workers/maids/cleaners	Professional/technical	Hotel/guesthouse keepers	Agricultural occupations	Other, including not stated	Total
	<i>Single</i>									
No job change	75.3	71.0	75.4	81.8	75.4	80.0	(82.6)	(100.0)	(88.6)	77.5
1 or more change	15.5	15.0	13.3	9.7	12.3	9.6	(8.7)	—	(11.4)	12.4
Entered labour force	6.9	14.0	9.6	6.3	7.0	10.4	(4.3)	—	—	8.3
No answer	2.3	—	1.7	2.3	5.3	—	(4.3)	—	—	1.9
Total percent	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
N	174	100	301	176	114	115	23	11	44	1,058
<i>Married</i>										
No job change	(83.3)	(84.2)	(70.7)	87.6	80.7	88.6	(100.0)	(100.0)	95.1	85.7
1 or more change	(4.2)	(5.3)	(7.3)	8.0	3.0	2.3	—	—	—	4.0
Entered labour force	(12.5)	(10.5)	(17.1)	2.7	11.1	8.0	—	—	—	7.3
No answer	—	—	(4.9)	1.8	5.2	1.1	—	—	4.9	3.0
Total percent	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
N	24	19	41	113	135	88	22	1	61	504
<i>Widowed</i>										
No job change	(85.7)	(80.0)	(100.0)	(94.7)	84.2	(28.6)	(75.0)	100.0	(100.0)	89.7
1 or more change	(14.3)	—	—	—	1.8	(42.9)	—	—	—	2.9
Entered labour force	—	(20.0)	—	—	8.8	(28.6)	(25.0)	—	—	5.1
No answer	—	—	—	(5.3)	5.8	—	—	—	—	2.3
Total percent	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
N	7	5	13	19	57	7	4	54	9	175

Entries in parentheses relate to sample groups in which the total number of respondents was 50 or fewer.

TABLE 5.7: *Farm and non-farm:
frequency of change of employer over past year classified by marital status (percentages)*

<i>Number of different employers</i>	<i>Single</i>	<i>Married</i>	<i>Widowed</i>	<i>Total</i>
One	32.8	(30.0)	(20.0)	32.1
Two	45.8	(40.0)	(20.0)	44.2
Three or more	13.7	(15.0)	(20.0)	14.1
No answer	7.6	(15.0)	(40.0)	9.6
Total percent who had changed employer	100	100	100	100
<i>N</i>	131	20	5	156

Entries in parentheses relate to sample groups in which the total number of respondents was 50 or fewer.

TABLE 5.8: *Farm and non-farm:
Reason for employer change classified by marital status (percentages)*

<i>Reason</i>	<i>Single</i>	<i>Married</i>	<i>Widowed</i>	<i>Total</i>
Higher wages	29.0	(10.0)	(33.3)	26.8
Better or more interesting job	17.6	(10.0)	—	15.9
Less distance to travel	3.8	(5.0)	—	3.8
"Bored" with present job	9.2	—	—	7.6
Firm closed, redundancy	17.6	(20.0)	(16.7)	17.8
Convenience or social factors	11.5	(10.0)	(33.3)	12.1
Other, including no answer	11.5	(45.0)	(16.7)	15.9
Total percent	100	100	100	100
Number answering	131	20	6	157

Entries in parentheses relate to sample groups in which the total number of respondents was 50 or fewer.

TABLE 5.9: *Farm and non-farm working women: absences from work during year, other than holidays and leave (percentages)*

	Single	Married	Widowed	Total
<i>Absences</i>				
None	90.5	75.2	85.1	85.5
"When husband/children are sick"	—	6.3	2.9	2.1
"When I don't feel like working"	3.4	3.4	1.7	3.2
For other reasons	2.7	2.4	1.1	2.5
Not applicable	2.1	8.5	6.3	4.4
No answer	1.3	4.2	2.9	2.3
Total percent	100	100	100	100
N	1058	504	175	1737

TABLE 5.13: *Farm and non-farm married and widowed working women with children: arrangements for child care (percentages)*

<i>Children present in age groups:</i>	0-under 2	2-under 4	4-under 14
No special arrangement	56.1	55.8	73.7
Paid help (live-in)	7.0	8.4	5.3
Paid help (not living in)	5.3	10.5	5.3
Unpaid help (relative living in)	14.0	10.5	6.0
Take children to neighbours, etc.	12.3	4.2	4.7
Paid day-care centre	3.5	4.2	1.0
Take children to work	—	2.1	1.0
No answer	1.8	4.2	3.0
Total percent	100	100	100
N	57	95	300

TABLE 5.15: *Non-farm working women with children: mode of travel to and from work of those making "no special arrangements" for child-care (percentages)*

<i>Children present in age groups:</i>	0-under 2	2-under 4	4-under 14
<i>Mode of travel</i>			
Works at home	(53.1)	60.4	33.9
All others	(46.9)	39.6	66.1
Total percent	100.0	100	100
N	32	53	221

Entries in parentheses relate to sample groups in which the total number of respondents was 50 or fewer.

TABLE 5.10: *How respondents heard about their jobs, classified by marital status (percentages)*

	<i>Self- employed/ family business</i>	<i>Ads in the paper</i>	<i>Employ- ment exchanges</i>	<i>Employ- ment agency</i>	<i>Contacted employer</i>	<i>Recruited</i>	<i>Counsellor/ priest</i>	<i>Heard from friend</i>	<i>Other, including no answer</i>	<i>Total percent</i>	<i>N</i>
<i>Non-farm</i>											
Single	5.0	26.5	1.4	2.8	15.4	8.2	7.0	29.7	4.1	100	979
Married	28.9	12.2	0.2	0.5	12.2	11.0	3.8	23.2	8.0	100	426
Widowed	12.4	5.3	3.5	0.9	12.4	11.5	—	40.7	13.3	100	113
<i>Farm</i>											
Single	19.0	22.8	2.5	—	19.0	7.6	2.5	19.0	7.6	100	79
Married	34.6	15.4	—	—	1.3	9.0	1.3	10.3	28.2	100	78
Widowed	95.2	—	—	—	—	1.6	1.6	1.6	—	100	62
<i>Total</i>											
Single	6.0	26.2	1.5	2.6	15.6	8.1	6.7	28.9	4.3	100	1,058
Married	30.0	12.7	0.2	0.4	10.5	10.7	3.4	21.2	11.1	100	504
Widowed	41.7	3.4	2.3	0.6	8.0	8.0	0.6	26.9	8.6	100	175
Total	16.5	20.0	1.2	1.7	13.4	8.9	5.1	26.5	6.7	100	1,737

TABLE 5.11: *Mode of transport to and from work, classified by marital status (percentages)*

	<i>Works at home</i>	<i>Walks</i>	<i>Public transport</i>	<i>Bicycle</i>	<i>Private car</i>	<i>Motor cycle/scooter</i>	<i>Gets a lift</i>	<i>Firm's transport</i>	<i>Other, including no answer</i>	<i>Total percent</i>	<i>N</i>
<i>Non-farm</i>											
Single	7.0	32.1	33.1	5.9	7.7	1.1	8.1	1.5	3.5	100	979
Married	27.0	28.4	14.3	6.3	15.0	0.2	3.1	0.2	5.4	100	426
Widowed	16.8	29.2	28.3	9.7	5.3	—	4.4	—	6.2	100	113
<i>Farm</i>											
Single	19.0	3.8	11.4	11.4	11.4	2.5	24.1	2.5	13.9	100	79
Married	37.2	5.1	2.6	1.3	21.8	—	3.8	2.6	25.7	100	78
Widowed	96.8	1.6	—	1.6	—	—	—	—	—	100	62
<i>Total</i>											
Single	7.9	30.0	31.5	6.3	7.9	1.2	9.3	1.6	4.3	100	1,058
Married	28.6	24.8	12.5	5.6	16.1	0.2	3.2	0.6	8.5	100	504
Widowed	45.1	19.4	18.3	6.9	3.4	—	2.9	—	4.0	100	175
Total	17.7	27.4	24.6	6.2	9.8	0.8	6.9	1.2	5.5	100	1,737

TABLE 5.12: *Mode of travel to and from work, classified by area of residence (percentages)*

<i>Area</i>	<i>Works at home</i>	<i>Walks</i>	<i>Public transport</i>	<i>Bicycle</i>	<i>Private car</i>	<i>Motor cycle/ scooter</i>	<i>Gets a lift</i>	<i>Firm's transport</i>	<i>Other including no answer</i>	<i>Total percent</i>	<i>N</i>
Open country	29.1	9.4	11.1	9.8	13.9	1.5	13.0	1.7	10.5	100	468
Near town, outside speed limit	17.1	18.6	22.9	11.4	20.0	—	2.9	—	7.1	100	70
Residential, suburban, inside speed limit	10.7	35.2	32.1	4.4	8.1	0.7	4.5	1.2	3.1	100	1,014
Business district, city centre	27.9	33.9	18.0	4.4	5.5	—	4.9	—	5.5	100	183
No answer	—	—	(50.0)	—	—	—	(50.0)	—	—	100	2
Total	17.7	27.4	24.6	6.2	9.8	0.8	6.9	1.2	5.5	100	1,737

TABLE 5.14: *Farm and non-farm married and widowed working women: occupational distribution classified by presence of children (percentages)*

<i>Children present in age groups:</i>	<i>0-under 2</i>		<i>2-under 4</i>		<i>4-under 14</i>	
	<i>None</i>	<i>One or more</i>	<i>None</i>	<i>One or more</i>	<i>None</i>	<i>One or more</i>
<i>Occupation</i>						
Production workers: skilled and semi-skilled	4.8	1.2	5.0	2.1	4.7	4.3
Production workers: unskilled	3.9	—	3.8	2.1	3.4	3.7
Clerks/typists	8.2	5.3	7.9	8.4	8.4	7.3
Salaried employees/shop-keepers/shop assistants	19.1	22.8	19.3	20.0	17.7	21.3
Service workers/maids/cleaners	29.4	15.8	30.3	15.8	30.0	25.3
Professional/technical	12.5	29.8	12.5	23.2	11.6	16.7
Hotel/guesthouse keepers	3.5	7.0	3.7	4.2	3.7	4.0
Agricultural occupations	8.5	3.5	8.7	4.2	11.9	3.3
Other, including not stated	10.0	14.0	8.7	20.0	8.4	14.0
Total percent	100	100	100	100	100	100
N	622	57	584	95	379	300

SECTION 6 *Policies Towards Married Women Working*

THE questionnaire included a number of questions designed to find out how the respondents viewed the State's and employers' policies towards married women who are working or interested in working. All respondents were asked:

What do you think is *the most* helpful thing that could be done (by employers or the Government, for example) to help married women who are interested in working?

The respondents were not prompted in any way. It proved relatively easy to code the answers obtained using a short list of policy options. Table 6.1 presents the general findings.¹

It may be seen that a number of policies figured prominently among the replies received. "Flexible hours", "change tax laws" and "provide day-care centres" (either State or privately run) were all important, each being mentioned by at least 14 per cent of the respondents. "Better transport" and "equal pay" were somewhat less important, and "remove marriage bar", "raise social security benefits", "other" were not mentioned very frequently. A considerable proportion (over 25 per cent) had no opinion on this matter: they either disapproved of married women working or felt they could not suggest a helpful policy. It may be seen from the table that this "no opinion" response was most common among single women, especially those who were not working and least common among married women, especially those who were working.

"Change tax laws" was far more frequently mentioned among non-farm respondents, and "better transport" among farm respondents. Dissatisfaction with the tax treatment of married women's earnings was more common among working than non-working respondents, and among the married than the single in the non-farm sample. The lowest proportion mentioning this policy was 4.3 per cent among farm single, non-working women, and the highest was 34 per cent among non-farm married working women. This outcome shows that those who would be most affected are also most anxious to have the tax laws changed. Provision of day-care centres was more in demand in the non-farm, than in the farm, sample and among non-working than among working respondents. There was some tendency for this policy to increase in importance as "change tax laws" declined. Thus, those not now working were more interested in a policy that would facilitate entry to the labour force but those already at work placed more emphasis on a policy that would raise their take-home pay. This presumably reflects the fact (already commented on) that working women were likely to have solved the child-care problem to their

¹ The material discussed in Section 4 showed that the items receiving the highest average rank were also those that were most frequently given first rank. The tables in the present Section giving percentage of times mentioned as the most important item may therefore be taken as an indication of average rank.

own satisfaction, and hence it had lost urgency for them. The demand for "flexible hours" was fairly uniform among the non-farm groups, but reached a high figure (29 per cent) among farm working respondents. "Equal pay" was mentioned as the most helpful policy by 8 per cent of the total sample and was actually the most important item (along with "flexible hours") among single farm women not currently working.

These responses were classified by the respondent's attitude towards married women working. Within each sub-category the contrasts between respondents with different attitudes to married women working in what was considered the most helpful policy were not very great. As might have been expected, "no opinion, disapprove etc." was most important among those who disapproved (reaching 49 per cent of non-working married women who disapproved strongly, compared with only 9 per cent of working married women who approved unconditionally). "Change tax laws" gained somewhat in importance among those who approved of married women working: over 40 per cent of working married women (non-farm) who approved unconditionally thought "change tax laws" would be the most helpful policy. When allowance is made for differences in attitudes, "flexible hours" remained more important among non-working, than among working women. Those who disapproved of married women working were less likely to recommend any policy, but if they did suggest one it was likely to be "flexible hours" or "provide day-care centres", presumably reflecting their over-riding concern that when a mother works this should not adversely affect the care of her children. On the other hand, those who strongly approved of married women working were more likely (especially if they were working) to recommend some policy, and this policy was more likely to be "change tax laws". This contrast is consistent with earlier findings on the greater concern about child-care expressed by those who were not working, especially when they disapproved of married women working.

In Table 6.2 the most helpful policy is classified by reasons for not working. It is striking that a variety of policies was mentioned by women giving each reason: although certain pairs of policies and reasons were frequently matched, there was no unanimity as to the most helpful policy according to the reason for not working. For example, 41 per cent of those who said they were not working because "hours were not flexible" gave "flexible hours" as the most helpful policy, but 24 per cent of these gave "provide day-care centres" and 11 per cent "change tax laws". Of course, "the most helpful" policy may be only one of many policies that are almost equally urgent to an individual respondent (just as "the main reason" for not working may also be only one among many important reasons) and hence an exact fit of policies and reasons for not working would not be expected. Furthermore the reason for not working may have been given strictly from the viewpoint of the respondent's personal situation, whereas the policy question may have been interpreted as having a more generalised frame of reference ("married women in general"). This table illustrates the point, already evident from earlier results, that no one policy change would of itself solve the problems of even the majority of the respondents, nor is there necessarily even a unique policy capable of alleviating

the problems faced by women giving the same reason for not working. The difficulties posed by inflexibility in working hours, for example, could be overcome by a change in the work schedule, but there are situations in which this might not be feasible and women could go to work only by being able to arrange child-care (either in day-care centres or through paid help in the home, which would be facilitated by lower taxes). It is notable that each of these policies (flexible hours, day-care centres, lower taxes) was considered desirable by a substantial proportion of the respondents who said they were not working because of responsibilities for child-care. Even among those who gave "taxes too high" as the main reason for not working, 14 per cent advocated day-care centres as the most helpful policy (although of course "change tax laws" was the policy most frequently mentioned by this group).

Table 6.3 shows the policies mentioned classified by presence of children. A striking feature is the relatively constant frequency with which "change tax laws" is mentioned, whereas "provide day-care centres" was much more frequently mentioned by those with young children (about one-fourth of those in the non-farm sample with children under 4 years advocated day-care centres, and this proportion was almost equal as between the working and non-working respondents). It is also noticeable that those with children had more definite views on the policy question and were less likely to give "no opinion" as an answer.

The policies advocated were considered from the viewpoint of the respondent's education. The higher the level of education, the lower the proportions giving "no opinion". It was also broadly the case that the higher the level of education the greater the stress placed on "change tax laws". Advocacy of day-care centres was least common among those whose education had ended at the primary level. Once again, though, the relatively high frequency of the three main policies in all the educational groups is striking. In fact, none of the more detailed classifications considered exercises as much influence on the relative importance of the policies mentioned as does the simple farm/non-farm dichotomy on the rank of "better transport" and "change tax laws". This point was illustrated once again when policies were classified by social group. Many different policies remain important in all groups, and the overall similarities are more striking than the differences.

The point was made earlier that women with opportunities to work at home were more likely to enter the labour force (even when they had young children) than were all others. In Table 6.4 the policies advocated by women working at home are compared with those advocated by women who go out to work. Although the difference between these two categories is not very dramatic, it is significant statistically.² Two contrasts are noticeable: those who work at home were far more likely to answer "no opinion" or to mention establishment of day-care centres, whereas those working away from home were more interested in seeing the tax laws changed. This further illustrates the points made in Section 5 in the context of the attraction of working at home for women with young children.

² $P(X^2) < 0.01$

Table 6.5 illustrates the importance of geographical factors in the emphasis placed on various policies. Naturally, "better transport" received most emphasis from those living in the "open country". This group was also least likely to mention "change tax laws", but most likely to answer "no opinion". This pattern of responses suggests that the non-working women living in the open country (but not on farms) were below average in interest in the problems of married women working, and, to the extent they were interested, they placed more stress on getting to jobs than on other policy alternatives. This is consistent with the findings reported in Section 3, where it was seen that women in the open country were by far the most pessimistic about the availability of employment opportunities.

Those who gave high taxation as the main reason why they were not working were asked what changes they thought should be made in the tax treatment of married women. The (106) answers received were generally of a qualitative nature, and can be summarised as follows:

	per cent
Tax as single woman	26
Tax as man	3
Do not tax at all	8
Raise tax free allowance	62
	—
N=106	100

Only two policies were mentioned with any frequency: "tax as single woman" and "raise tax free allowance". Those who advocated a higher tax free allowance in some cases specified the allowance they would like to see: the average figure was £6.67 (the most common range was £4-£6) per week.

At this point it is helpful to summarise some of the relevant features of the Irish income tax code (Budget 1972). Three cases are used in Table 6.6 to illustrate the incidence of taxation on the working wife. In Case I, the husband's and wife's combined income is less than £2,000 a year. In Case II, their combined income exceeds, but the husband's income is less than, £2,000. In Case III, the husband's income is £2,000. The tax code allows the working wife a maximum tax free allowance of £74. In addition her income may benefit from the 25 per cent earned income relief that applies up to a maximum of £500 in respect of a combined income of £2,000.

The following points are clear from Table 6.6:

- (1) The tax payable by the married couple in all cases exceeds the sum of the tax payable by two unmarried people. This excess increases (both absolutely and as a proportion of income) as the combined income of the couple rises. The married couple would also become liable to sur-tax much sooner than would be the case if their incomes were taxed separately.

- (2) The marginal tax rate (that is, the proportion of each extra pound payable in income tax) on the wife's earnings is 35 per cent, except in the case where combined income is less than £2,000.
- (3) The average tax rate (that is, the proportion of total income payable in income tax) on the wife's earnings rises, and rapidly approaches 35 per cent, as combined income increases.

There is an element of discretion in the calculation of the wife's tax rates, since earned income relief is based on combined income, and if a "separate assessment" is obtained this relief can be distributed between husband and wife in any way they desire: up to a maximum of 25 per cent of her earned income, or £500, may be deducted from her liability (but added to his), without altering their combined tax liability. The suggestion "tax as single woman" mentioned by some respondents presumably implies going beyond the existing provision for "separate assessment" and allowing husband and wife to file separate returns so that their combined liabilities never exceeds the sum of those of a single man and woman. Provision for this type of return exists under the income tax codes in the United Kingdom, W. Germany, and the USA, but not in France or Italy, for example. The reduction in revenue that would be caused by introducing such a provision in Ireland would be less than that associated with the hypothetical changes discussed in detail below.

The policy most frequently advocated by those who gave high taxes as a reason for not working was "raise tax free allowance". About two-thirds of this group (64 people) advocated this policy explicitly. This goal might be achieved by making provision for separate returns, as discussed above, but it is likely that most of the respondents who suggested this policy envisaged a more generous treatment of the wife's earned income within the framework of a joint return. A number of points must be kept in mind in considering this proposal. The present tax-free allowance to married women of £74 yearly is the only direct tax concession made to the married woman who works, although if her husband's income is below £2,000, the couple's combined take home pay will benefit from an increased earned income relief (as in Cases I and II in Table 6.6). Expenses (on child-care, travel to work etc.) are not normally deductible for tax purposes, and this obviously leans more heavily on the wife's income than on the husband's. In some other EEC member countries, the tax treatment of working wives is far more favourable than in Ireland. In the United Kingdom, for example, a wife receives an allowance of up to £460 a year, in addition to 22 per cent earned income relief (on combined income of up to £4,500), allowing her to earn £592 a year tax-free. However, the economic and demographic background of the British situation is very different from the Irish, since (as mentioned in Section 1 above) the increased number of married women working was the only source of labour force growth in Britain in the 1960s.

The subjective feelings of taxpayers regarding the fairness of the tax regime are possibly more important in connection with the Irish' tax treatment of working wives than are the other economic benefits and costs associated with a change in the tax code. The most important benefit to be derived from a different tax regime

might be the increased sense of equity among women who advocate this as the most desirable policy (they amounted to 16 per cent of our total sample, and 34 per cent of non-farm married working women). Other benefits and costs exist, however. A reduction in tax liability would, in the first instance, represent a transfer of part of the value of the worker's total product from the government to the worker. In as much as the existing labour force was willing to work at the pre-tax-reduction net wage, it experiences an increase in its rent or producers' surplus³ as a result of the tax cut. However, a lower level of taxation may induce more married women to enter the labour force, and the value of the additional workers' producers' surplus⁴ must be added to the increase in surplus received by those already in the labour force in evaluating the benefits of a tax cut. It would be necessary to have a numerical estimate of the response (in term of new entrants to the labour force) to a tax cut in order to quantify these benefits. Our survey does not provide such an estimate, although the frequency with which this policy was recommended suggests that there would be a positive response.⁵ Furthermore if a reduction in the tax rate resulted in a more efficient allocation of the female labour force (by reducing the incentive to work at home or in self-employment generally), the increased output thereby facilitated would have to be counted among the policy's benefits.

Thus, the factors that make it likely that a favourable benefit/cost ratio would result from a policy of reduced taxation on working wives may be listed as:

- (1) The increased sense of equity among married women that would follow from this policy.
- (2) The probability that the elasticity of supply of married women to the labour force is relatively high.
- (3) The reduction in the social costs associated with the effects on the structure of the female labour force of the desire to avoid income tax.

Although the results of our survey do not lend themselves to use in quantifying these factors, it is clear from our discussion in this and previous Sections that ample evidence exists to show that all three effects are likely to be important in Ireland today. However, these factors favourable to a tax reduction must be considered in conjunction with the evidence, discussed at length in Section 3, that an excess supply of married women available for work exists at current net wage rates. To the extent that deficient aggregate demand for labour constitutes the effective constraint on the employment of married women, the second factor listed above becomes less relevant to an analysis of the tax cut policy.

³ That is, the excess of the wage bill over the sum of the payments necessary to entice the existing number of workers into the labour force.

⁴ The rest of their earnings are not a benefit of the policy, since this amount is required to compensate the entrants to the labour force for the sacrifice of leisure and non-market work involved in entering the labour force.

⁵ Against this evidence of elasticity in the supply of married women to the labour force must be set the evidence of excess supply at existing net wages examined in Section 3. If demand factors are the constraint that prevent a growth in the married female labour force, policies designed to increase supply are of far less benefit.

Although it is not feasible to quantify the economic benefits that would follow from a tax cut, it is a relatively simple matter to estimate the financial cost to the Exchequer of such a policy. It must be stressed, however, that this financial cost is in no way a measure of the economic costs entailed by the policy.⁶

The effects of a tax cut on the Exchequer can be illustrated by considering in detail the implications of raising a married woman's tax free allowance from its present level of £74 a year to (a) £250 and (b) £500. The following assumptions are pre made. They are designed to overestimate the financial costs of the policies.

- (1) Average income earned by working wives is £750 a year.
- (2) Average tax liability at present rates is £237 a year (which would be the case only if all husbands were earning at least £2,000: if a husband were earning less than £1,250, wife's liability at present rates would be £176).
- (3) There are 30,000 wives working in non-agricultural employment before any change in taxes. (The 1966 Census of Population yields a figure of twenty-three thousand, which has been raised to allow for under-reporting and the growth of the non-agricultural female labour force.)

On these assumptions, the following is the initial outcome of the two hypothetical tax cuts:

	(a)	(b)
<i>Hypothetical tax free allowance for married women;</i>	£250	£500
a. Tax liability on income of £750:	£175	£87.50
b. Initial loss in tax revenue (present liability of £237 less a):	£62	£149.50
c. Total initial loss to Exchequer (b x 30,000):	£1.9	£4.5 m.
d. Loss as % of total receipts from income tax, 1972/3:	1.1 per cent	2.5 per cent
e. Loss as % of growth in receipts from income tax, 1971/2 - 1972/3:	6.2 per cent	14.75 per cent

This initial loss of revenues could be offset, in part at least, by increased indirect tax receipts when the extra income injected into the economy is spent. An analysis of such repercussions of the tax cut is, however, dependent on the assumptions made about the impact of the shortfall in government receipts on government expenditure. In order not to underestimate the financial cost of the hypothetical tax cut, let us assume that government maintains its existing levels of expenditure and finances the loss of revenue due to the tax cut by raising direct taxes by the small

⁶ It is possible, for example, that the increase in producers' surplus resulting from a tax cut could exceed the initial amount of the reduction in tax receipts, making it feasible for the Exchequer to recoup its lost revenue while still leaving some people better off than they were before the tax cut. Whether or not the Exchequer actually recoups its losses is not relevant to this criterion for an improvement. It is also evident that this criterion is not a necessary condition for the policy to represent a potential improvement in the Pareto sense.

amount required to recoup the lost revenue.⁷ Thus the maximum loss of revenue entailed by the tax cuts we have considered is in the range of £1.9 million to £4.5 million. The introduction of the right to separate taxation for husband and wife would, of course, cost much less than the £1.9 million associated with a £250 a year tax-free allowance for working wives.

It may be calculated that each additional married woman attracted into the labour force (at our assumed average income of £750 a year) would contribute £175 a year in extra income tax if the tax-free allowance were £250, and £87.50 a year if the allowance were £500. Moreover, each additional woman receiving this income would contribute £92 or £106 yearly in indirect taxes (depending on the tax-free allowance)⁸

Hence, their total extra tax contribution would be £267 or £193.50 a year. Thus, in the case of the introduction of a tax-free allowance of £250 a year, if this elicited an increase of about 7,100 in the number of married women working, the Exchequer as a whole would suffer no net tax loss; if the allowance were raised to £500 a year, the increase in the labour force required to restore the lost revenue would be just over 23,000.⁹

It is one thing to demonstrate that a hypothetical tax cut would cost relatively little, another to conclude that such a cut should be the first priority among all possible policies. It should, for example, be borne in mind that the existing tax regime is progressive, and bears most heavily on working wives where family income is in excess of £2,000 a year. Thus raising the wife's tax-free allowance to £500 a year would improve the after-tax pay of a family where the husband earned £2,000 and the wife £500 by about £150 a year, but it would improve the position of the couple where the husband earned £1,400 and the wife £500 by only about £105 a year. The family with the smaller joint income would experience a smaller proportional rise in its after-tax income. In fact, almost any reform of the tax treatment of married women would benefit the wealthier sections of the population proportionately more than the poorer.¹⁰

Furthermore, reform in the tax treatment of working wives is here considered in isolation from the rest of the income tax system. The hypothetical changes discussed above would undoubtedly create anomalies, since, for example, the tax liability of a married couple, both of whom work, might become less than that of two single people with the same combined income as the married couple (ignoring the allowances given married couples in respect of children). It would be undesirable

⁷ We thereby remove any "multiplier" effects from the policy. For a discussion of these effects in an Irish context, cf. Bristow and Fell [1, p. 23].

⁸ Assuming the ratio of taxes on expenditure (excluding rates) to expenditure on GNP is 16 per cent, cf. [6].

⁹ The fact that substantial reductions in the income taxation of married women could be implemented at a very small financial cost relative to total income tax receipts is perhaps so obvious that these exercises are unnecessary. It was seen in Table 1.1 that only 2 per cent of the labour force consists of married women, and this figure alone would allow one to conclude that they contribute less than 2 per cent of the total income tax bill.

¹⁰ This does not preclude the possibility that the progressiveness of the tax structure would increase as a result of the change—which, in fact, would generally be the case when tax-free allowances are increased.

that an unmarried woman head of household should pay more in taxes than a married woman with the same income. However, the exact changes in married women's taxes that are desirable, and the alterations in other rates of taxation that such changes would render inevitable, would have to be decided by tax experts if a decision were taken in principle concerning the need for change. It must also be borne in mind that the analysis presented above considers a change in the tax treatment of married women only in relation to policies towards married women in the labour force. It is recognised that other changes in the income tax code may be more urgent than the one considered here, but obviously a complete evaluation of the tax system lies outside the scope of the present study.

Changes in the tax laws would not satisfy all the proposals made in reply to the question on the "most helpful policy". In particular, they would not directly meet the needs of those who proposed the provision of day-care centres. In order to assess more fully the importance of this proposal, and hence its urgency compared with a reduction in the taxation of married women, the following question was asked of all married women:

What do you think about leaving young children in day-care centres (nurseries, playgroups) while their mothers are working? Do you approve or disapprove?

The answers were coded into the following results:

	per cent
Strong disapproval	25.2
Disapproval ("only if necessary" etc.)	23.7
No opinion etc.	4.8
Approval ("no objection")	31.2
Strong approval ("it's good for them etc.")	14.9
	<hr style="width: 10%; margin-left: auto; margin-right: 0;"/>
N=3303	100.0

As was the case with the question on married women working, attitudes were quite polarised, although definitely more inclined towards strong disapproval than strong approval. Table 6.7 presents a breakdown of these replies by the respondents' attitudes to married women working and by labour force status. In the first place, it is clear that respondents in the farm sample were far less likely to approve than those in the non-farm sample. It is also striking that within each sub-sample, the working women in general differed little from the non-working in their attitudes to day-care centres. When farm/non-farm residence and labour force status are controlled, there is a very clear association between attitudes to day-care centres and to married women working, with those that approve of one being much more likely to approve of the other. Strong approval was expressed by 37 per cent of the non-farm working women who approved unconditionally of married women working, compared with, at the other extreme, only 7 per cent of the non-working women who strongly disapproved of married women working. Thus the two sets of attitudes are interrelated although they do not entirely coincide, as may be seen from the proportions that approve on one question and disapprove on the other.

When the answers to this question were classified by respondents' education, strong disapproval was found to be most common among those who ended their education at primary level, but the tendency was also apparent (as was noticed in other situations earlier) for them to express more definite views (either strong approval or disapproval). The most striking feature, though, of this analysis was the relative uniformity of views between women with very different educational backgrounds: approval or disapproval of the notion of day-care centres was not the monopoly of any one group. A similar conclusion could be drawn from the analysis by social group. The importance of unqualified approval or disapproval among the manual social groups was striking, but it was also clear that a variety of opinions existed within each group.

Finally, the answers to the question on day-care centres have been analysed by presence of children in Table 6.8. The rather surprising findings are, first, that there is relatively little difference between the opinions of those with and those without children. Secondly, those without young children tend to be somewhat less likely to approve of day-care centres than those with.¹¹ These patterns are consistent between the farm and non-farm samples. It is important to note, therefore, that approval of day-care centres is, if anything, more common among those with children. The idea of putting children into day-care centres seems at least as attractive to women who are responsible for looking after children as to those who do not have this responsibility.

Respondents who approved of day-care centres were asked "who should run these centres?" The answers are set out in Table 6.9. A state-run system was by far the most popular alternative, as was already revealed in the answers to the question on "most helpful policy". It may be seen that neither labour force status nor attitude to centres has a significant influence on the answers to who should run the centres (the differences between the two rows of each panel of Table 6.8 are not significant, $P(X)^2 = .20$). In the farm sample there was a tendency for respondents to favour "private" centres at the expense of "employer" run centres, but the general pattern of preferences were very similar in farm and non-farm answers.

It might be suspected that the preference for state-run day-care centres was merely a reflection of the belief that this would be the cheapest way of obtaining the service. An extra question had been asked of those women who said that the absence of day-care facilities was the main reason why they were not working concerning the amount they would be willing to pay for such facilities. The non-response rate to this question was high, 25 per cent of those asked replying that they "didn't know". A further 11 per cent thought it should depend on the income of the person using them. Of those giving a quantified estimate of the amount that they thought would be fair, the average was £1.76 per week, with a standard deviation of £1.03. The averages given by those mentioning the different types

¹¹ The differences between those with and without children under 19 are statistically significant for both working and non-working women in the non-farm sample although not at a very high level of significance. In both cases $P(X)^2 = .10$.

of arrangements possible ranged from £1.74 for those saying State to £1.83 for those saying "private". These differences are not significant statistically (*t*-test), and hence it seems that the preference for state-run centres was not merely a reflection of a desire to pay as little as possible for these facilities.

Those who said that the establishment of day-care centres would be the most helpful policy were also questioned about the extent to which they would use these facilities, if they were available. Seventy per cent of those answering said they were interested in these facilities "all year round", 11 per cent "during school holidays only", and 19 per cent said during some other fraction of the year. In terms of hours per week the answers were:

	per cent
under 10	11.3
10 - under 20	17.0
20 - under 25	35.3
25 - under 30	9.8
30 - under 35	6.3
35 and over	13.6
Don't know, not sure	6.6
	<hr/>
N=317	100.0

When it is borne in mind that this policy ("establish day-care centres") was advocated as the most helpful policy by fewer respondents than advocated "change tax laws" or "flexible hours", and that married women were on average less than enthusiastic about leaving children in centres of this type, it seems reasonable to assign this policy a lower priority than should be given to a tax change. This conclusion is reinforced by considering that a radical revision of the tax treatment of married women would have the effect of giving all working women now subject to taxation greater purchasing power which could be allocated, if parents so wished, to paying for suitable child-care arrangements. Allowing the working mother to arrive at her own solution to the problem of child-care has the obvious advantage of avoiding mis-allocation of resources, such as might be entailed in setting up a national network of centres in advance of demand. Although our results show that such facilities would be less in demand in rural areas than elsewhere, a policy of setting up such centres in urban areas only would, nonetheless, entail a discrimination against those women who live in country areas and are interested in using them. A change in the tax law avoids this type of discrimination, since it would benefit all those presently subject to tax. Removing a very substantial proportion of working married women from the reach of income tax would have the additional advantage of tending to equalise the burden of taxation between the self-employed and the rest of the labour force.

However, the strong preference expressed by our respondents in favour of state control of day-care facilities should be acknowledged at least to the extent that a national system of registration and inspection of private facilities be established.

As the number of married women entering the labour market increases, there is likely to be an increase in the number of privately operated child-care facilities. In the long-run, the availability of members of the family (especially grandparents) for child-care duties is likely to be reduced as average household size declines and as more older women are themselves at work. It is likely that the objectives behind the expressed preference for state-run facilities could be satisfied if measures were taken to ensure that privately operated facilities (be they play groups, nursery schools, or day-care centres) do not violate certain minimum standards.

It should be kept in mind at this point that the relatively early age at which children start school in Ireland somewhat mitigates the problem of child-care for working mothers here compared with many other European countries. A full evaluation of the desirability of allocating state funds to the establishment of day-care centres for the benefit of working mothers could not avoid considering whether the same money might not result in a high rate of social return if devoted, for example, to improving existing school facilities for young children. No information or attitudes towards broader issues of this type was collected in the survey on which the present report is based.

A final question was, however, asked of the interviewees, concerning their views on the desirability of changing school hours with a view to helping mothers who want to work. Table 6.10 sets out the answers, classified by labour force status. An overall feeling against change is evident. The only change that is viewed with favour is the provision of school lunches. This policy was more frequently advocated in the farm sample (the differences between the farm and combined non-farm samples are statistically significant, $P(X^2) < .01$). When these results were further analysed by classifying them by attitudes towards day-care centres the one important difference that emerged was that those who strongly disapproved of day-care centres were very likely to answer "no change" in reply to the question on school hours.

Obviously the question of changing school hours, and in particular of providing school lunches, cannot be decided simply by reference to its effect on married women who wish to work. But the survey does reveal a demand for change in this direction among a significant minority of the respondents, especially those living on farms. This finding should be considered in connection with any evaluation of the feasibility of providing school lunches.

Policies such as "better transport" (which was strongly advocated in the rural areas) and "flexible hours" (which was the most popular of all policies advocated by the respondents) fall mainly within the scope of employers. Such policies may be regarded as extra costs necessary to ensure an adequate supply of female labour.¹² No doubt Irish employers, in view of the low proportion of the labour force accounted for by married women, have not been accustomed to the need to incur these costs. It is evident, for example, from the answers obtained to the questions on recruitment and transport to work, that employers only rarely explicitly recruit married workers or provide special transport facilities. However, the prospect is for continued

¹² The greater employment stability and lower turn-over of married (as opposed to single) women offset some of these extra costs.

change on this front, as was argued in Section 1, where it was seen that in future the supply of women workers will increasingly consist of married women. The proportions of married women interested in working but unable to get "suitable" work, especially outside the towns, indicates a considerable labour reserve. But this reserve is not available on the same terms as, for example, a male labour force. Many of the women indicated that child-care considerations restrict their ability to work, and a pattern of part-time work ("flexible hours") is obviously preferred by a majority of married women with children. Ability to travel long distances or to incur heavy costs in getting to work is also limited, in view of the substantial inroads on take-home pay already made by taxation, social insurance and perhaps child-care arrangements. Hence, employers experiencing a shortage of labour in the traditionally female occupations can obtain extra women workers, but only if an effort is made to accommodate the special problems faced by married women who work.¹³

The task of employers in attracting married women to the labour force would, of course, be made substantially easier by a radical reduction in the taxation of working wives. From this viewpoint, a tax cut could be regarded as equivalent to a subsidy to employers who hire married women, since the effect would be the same as a grant designed to finance an increase in the pre-tax wages and salaries of married women. A tax cut achieves its effect in a manner that is vastly simpler and more attractive from an administrative point of view than such a grant system. Employers could avail of the opportunity to develop day-care centres located at the place of work for married workers wishing to use them. Working wives would be in a better position to contribute to the maintenance of such facilities after a tax cut. Thus the development of these facilities would begin at the locations where they are in greatest demand.

All of the foregoing discussion, it may be pointed out, assumed the existing division of labour within the family: responsibilities for child-care and household management were assumed to rest primarily with the wife. The analysis started from the viewpoint that the wife's entry to the labour force was a secondary consideration compared with her obligations to children and household. The husband, on the other hand, was assumed normally to go out to work, implicitly leaving his wife to care for the children as her first responsibility. No radical rearrangement of these traditional roles and priorities has been explicitly considered in the present report, but it is acknowledged that the foregoing analysis would be very different if the institutional assumptions underlying it were altered.

A final issue needs to be stressed. In an economy characterised by substantial unemployment (both in official Live Register statistics and in the "hidden" sense discussed in Section 3), policies designed to increase the supply of any category of labour cannot be considered very urgent. It is true that shortages of certain types of labour can occur in the face of an overall surplus and this may from time to

¹³ This statement should perhaps be qualified to exclude certain lower paid occupations in the past heavily dependent on younger female workers. Such occupations will in any event be affected by the implementation of an equal pay policy.

time be true in Ireland of skilled workers or of certain types of women workers. When a shortage of female workers develops in an economy characterised by substantial male unemployment there is naturally a question as to whether it is desirable to perpetuate the segregation of occupations implied by this imbalanced growth in the demand for male and female workers. Any policy designed to increase the supply of women workers could in this context be interpreted as reducing the likelihood that employers would substitute male for female workers or hire additional male workers. The urgency of all the policies discussed in the present section will increase if the economy moves closer to the goal of general full employment. The high proportions of non-working women (especially outside the main urban areas) who indicated that they were not working due to the absence of suitable employment opportunities serves to emphasise the magnitude of the task implied in reaching this full employment target. From the viewpoint of assisting married women who are interested in working, as well as in view of the obvious need to relieve unemployment among heads of households, an acceleration of the growth of employment opportunities is the most urgent goal of all.

TABLE 6.1: *Most helpful policy classified by marital status and labour force status (percentages)*

<i>Most helpful policy</i>	<i>Non-farm</i>						<i>Farm</i>						<i>Total</i>
	<i>Working</i>			<i>Not working</i>			<i>Working</i>			<i>Not working</i>			
	<i>Single</i>	<i>Mar- ried</i>	<i>Wid- owed</i>	<i>Single</i>	<i>Mar- ried</i>	<i>Wid- owed</i>	<i>Single</i>	<i>Mar- ried</i>	<i>Wid- owed</i>	<i>Single</i>	<i>Mar- ried</i>	<i>Wid- owed</i>	
Flexible hours	19.2	14.6	15.9	15.6	19.2	19.2	21.5	29.5	14.5	17.4	19.5	(14.3)	18.7
Better transport	1.7	2.8	5.3	4.0	3.5	4.5	8.9	14.1	11.3	13.8	14.7	(28.5)	5.6
Change tax laws	15.5	34.3	22.1	8.5	18.5	11.5	13.9	6.4	6.5	4.3	5.3	—	15.8
Remove marriage bar	5.5	1.9	2.7	3.6	2.9	0.6	6.3	5.1	4.8	4.3	4.7	—	3.7
Equal pay	8.0	8.7	8.0	7.1	6.3	13.5	16.5	9.0	11.3	17.4	10.6	—	8.3
State should provide day-care centres	10.2	10.8	9.7	12.5	13.8	12.2	1.3	3.8	4.8	2.9	4.3	—	10.4
Firms should provide day-care centres	3.4	4.5	1.8	2.7	5.3	2.6	1.3	1.3	3.2	2.2	1.7	—	3.8
Raise social insurance benefits	1.5	1.9	8.0	4.9	2.9	4.5	1.3	6.4	4.8	3.6	2.1	—	2.7
Other	3.0	4.0	6.2	6.3	3.0	3.8	3.8	7.7	4.8	2.2	3.6	—	3.5
No opinion, disapprove, no answer	32.0	16.7	20.4	34.8	24.7	27.6	25.3	16.7	33.9	31.9	33.6	(57.1)	27.5
Total percent	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
N	979	426	113	224	2,025	156	79	78	62	138	774	7	5,061

Entries in parentheses relate to sample groups where the total number of respondents was 50 or fewer.

TABLE 6.3: *Most helpful policy classified by presence of children (percentages)*

<i>Children present in age groups:</i>	<i>0-under 19</i>		<i>0-under 2</i>		<i>2-under 4</i>		<i>4-under 14</i>		<i>14-under 19</i>	
	<i>None</i>	<i>One or more</i>	<i>None</i>	<i>One or more</i>	<i>None</i>	<i>One or more</i>	<i>None</i>	<i>One or more</i>	<i>None</i>	<i>One or more</i>
<i>Most helpful policy</i>	<i>Non-farm married working</i>									
Flexible hours	13.0	15.1	14.7	(13.2)	15.7	8.7	12.6	16.5	12.9	17.5
Better transport	1.7	3.2	3.1	—	3.1	1.4	3.7	1.9	1.5	5.2
Change tax laws	37.4	33.1	33.8	(39.5)	34.5	33.3	34.6	34.0	37.5	28.6
Remove marriage bar	2.6	1.6	2.1	—	1.7	2.9	1.9	1.9	2.2	1.3
Equal pay	7.8	9.0	8.5	(10.5)	9.0	7.2	8.9	8.5	7.7	10.4
State should provide day-care centres	9.6	11.3	10.3	(15.8)	9.2	18.8	8.9	12.7	12.1	8.4
Firms should provide day-care centres	1.7	5.5	4.6	(2.6)	3.9	7.2	5.6	3.3	2.9	7.1
Raise social insurance benefits	2.6	1.6	2.1	—	2.2	—	1.9	1.9	2.6	0.6
Other	4.3	3.9	3.9	(5.3)	4.2	2.9	4.2	3.8	3.7	4.5
No opinion, disapprove, no answer	19.1	15.8	17.0	(13.2)	16.5	17.4	17.8	15.6	16.9	16.2
Total percent	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
N	115	311	388	38	357	69	214	212	272	154
	<i>Non-farm married not working</i>									
Flexible hours	18.1	19.5	20.4	4.8	19.0	19.9	17.7	20.3	18.1	21.6
Better transport	4.0	3.3	3.6	3.1	4.1	1.6	4.3	2.8	2.9	4.6
Change tax laws	16.4	19.0	17.4	22.4	18.0	19.7	18.9	18.2	20.6	13.9
Remove marriage bar	2.1	3.1	2.9	2.9	2.4	4.2	2.6	3.1	2.9	2.8
Equal pay	6.6	6.3	6.2	6.7	6.6	5.5	6.5	6.2	6.3	6.5
State should provide day-care centres	8.0	15.4	12.7	18.1	12.1	18.4	10.1	16.6	14.2	12.9
Firms should provide day-care centres	3.1	5.9	5.0	6.4	4.1	8.6	3.8	6.3	5.6	4.6
Raise social insurance benefits	2.6	2.9	3.4	0.7	3.2	1.8	2.4	3.2	2.5	3.6
Other	3.1	3.0	3.0	3.1	3.3	2.2	2.9	3.1	2.7	3.8
No opinion, disapprove, no answer	36.2	21.6	25.4	21.9	27.1	18.1	30.7	20.2	24.2	25.7
Total percent	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
N	426	1,599	1,605	420	1,477	548	859	1,166	1,391	634

TABLE 6.2: Non-farm married women not working: most helpful policy classified by reasons for not working (percentages)

Most helpful policy	Pay too low, jobs unattractive	Transport problems	Hours not flexible	Lack of qualifications	No jobs available/unemployed	Disapproves/not interested	Husband disapproves	Too old/ill health	Don't need extra income	Mother should not work if there are young children	No suitable facilities for children	Has to look after old/ill relative	Marriage bar	Taxes too high	Other including no answer	Total
Flexible hours	(13.9)	(10.0)	40.7	(22.0)	20.1	10.7	17.3	25.1	14.1	20.4	19.9	(24.4)	(33.3)	10.4	12.3	19.2
Better transport	(2.8)	(10.0)	5.6	(6.0)	10.1	2.5	—	5.7	—	3.0	1.4	—	—	1.3	4.9	3.5
Change tax laws	(30.6)	—	11.1	(20.0)	13.6	6.6	19.2	15.1	21.2	17.9	24.6	(13.3)	(13.3)	53.2	14.1	18.5
Remove marriage bar	(5.6)	(10.0)	1.9	(4.0)	1.8	1.6	1.9	1.9	2.0	2.8	3.3	(2.2)	(20.0)	1.3	4.9	2.9
Equal pay	(11.1)	(20.0)	5.6	(2.0)	8.9	4.1	7.7	5.7	7.1	6.6	2.4	(2.2)	(13.3)	7.8	8.0	6.3
State should provide day-care centres	(11.1)	(20.0)	20.4	(4.0)	10.7	8.2	14.4	8.8	14.1	13.2	28.9	(8.9)	(13.3)	11.7	12.3	13.8
Firms should provide day-care centres	(8.3)	—	3.7	—	2.4	4.1	5.8	5.7	7.1	5.6	9.5	(2.2)	—	2.6	4.9	5.3
Raise social insurance benefits	(5.6)	(10.0)	—	(8.0)	5.3	1.6	1.0	5.7	2.0	3.2	0.5	(6.7)	—	1.3	—	2.9
Other	(8.3)	—	3.7	(6.0)	4.7	2.5	—	—	3.0	3.1	2.4	(4.4)	(6.7)	—	5.5	3.0
No opinion, disapprove, no answer	(2.8)	(20.0)	7.4	(28.0)	22.5	58.2	32.7	26.4	29.3	24.2	7.1	(35.6)	—	10.4	33.1	24.7
Total percent	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
N	37	10	54	50	169	122	104	159	99	711	210	45	15	77	163	2025

Entries in parentheses relate to sample groups in which the total number of respondents was 50 or fewer.

TABLE 6.3: *Most helpful policy classified by presence of children (percentages)—continued*

<i>Children present in age groups:</i>	<i>0-under 19</i>		<i>0-under 2</i>		<i>2-under 4</i>		<i>4-under 14</i>		<i>14-under 19</i>	
	<i>None</i>	<i>One or more</i>	<i>None</i>	<i>One or more</i>	<i>None</i>	<i>One or more</i>	<i>None</i>	<i>One or more</i>	<i>None</i>	<i>One or more</i>
<i>Farm married working</i>										
Flexible hours	(46.7)	25.4	28.1	(35.7)	30.0	(27.8)	(37.5)	(23.9)	(27.7)	(32.3)
Better transport	—	17.5	17.2	—	16.7	(5.6)	(6.3)	(19.6)	(8.5)	(22.6)
Change tax laws	(13.3)	4.8	7.8	—	6.7	(5.6)	(6.3)	(6.5)	(10.6)	—
Remove marriage bar	—	6.3	3.1	(14.3)	3.3	(11.1)	—	(8.7)	(6.4)	(3.2)
Equal pay	(6.7)	9.5	7.8	(14.3)	6.7	(16.7)	(15.6)	(4.3)	(10.6)	(6.5)
State should provide day-care centres	—	4.8	3.1	(7.2)	3.3	(5.6)	(3.1)	(4.3)	(4.3)	(3.2)
Firms should provide day-care centres	—	1.6	1.6	—	1.7	—	—	(2.2)	(2.1)	—
Raise social insurance benefits	(6.7)	6.3	4.7	(14.3)	6.7	(5.6)	(3.1)	(8.7)	(6.4)	(6.5)
Other	—	9.5	9.4	—	5.0	(16.7)	—	(13.0)	(8.5)	(6.5)
No opinion, disapprove, no answer	(26.7)	14.3	17.2	(14.3)	20.0	(5.6)	(28.1)	(8.7)	(14.9)	(19.4)
Total percent	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
N	15	63	64	14	60	18	32	46	47	31
<i>Farm married not working</i>										
Flexible hours	19.9	19.4	20.9	14.1	21.9	13.0	20.2	18.9	18.9	20.9
Better transport	11.6	15.7	15.9	10.3	15.9	11.5	12.8	16.2	12.5	19.7
Change tax laws	4.4	5.6	5.0	6.4	4.2	8.2	4.2	6.2	6.2	3.3
Remove marriage bar	6.6	4.0	4.2	6.4	4.6	4.8	5.4	4.1	5.6	2.5
Equal pay	14.4	9.4	10.0	12.8	10.6	10.6	13.7	8.2	12.5	6.3
State should provide day-care centres	2.2	4.9	3.7	6.4	2.8	8.2	3.3	5.0	4.3	4.2
Firms should provide day-care centres	—	2.2	1.3	3.2	1.2	2.9	1.8	1.6	1.7	1.7
Raise social insurance benefits	3.3	1.7	1.9	2.6	1.9	2.4	3.0	1.4	1.9	2.5
Other	2.8	3.9	3.9	2.6	4.1	2.4	2.7	4.3	3.0	5.0
No opinion, disapprove, no answer	34.8	33.2	33.2	35.3	32.7	36.1	33.0	34.0	33.5	33.9
Total percent	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
N	181	593	618	156	566	208	336	438	535	239

Entries in parentheses refer to sample groups where the total number of respondents was 50 or fewer.

TABLE 6.4: *Non-farm married working women:
most helpful policy classified by whether working at home (percentages)*

<i>Most helpful policy</i>	<i>Works at home</i>	<i>All others</i>
Flexible hours	15.7	14.1
Better transport	2.6	2.9
Change tax laws	22.6	38.6
Remove marriage bar	1.7	1.9
Equal pay	7.0	9.3
State should provide day-care centres	13.9	9.6
Firms should provide day-care centres	3.5	4.8
Raise social insurance benefits	2.6	1.6
Other	2.6	4.5
No opinion, disapprove, no answer	27.8	12.5
Total percent	100	100
<i>N</i>	115	311

TABLE 6.5: *Non-farm married women: most helpful policy classified by area of residence (percentages)*

<i>Most helpful policy</i>	<i>Working</i>				<i>Not working</i>				
	<i>Open country</i>	<i>Near town, outside speed limit</i>	<i>Residential, suburban, inside speed limit</i>	<i>Business district, city centre</i>	<i>Open country</i>	<i>Near town, outside speed limit</i>	<i>Residential, suburban, inside speed limit</i>	<i>Business district, city centre</i>	<i>No answer</i>
Flexible hours	15.3	(8.7)	14.8	14.5	13.0	23.1	20.7	21.9	—
Better transport	3.5	(4.3)	2.3	3.6	9.5	2.6	1.7	2.5	—
Change tax laws	27.1	(26.1)	37.3	34.5	9.7	23.1	20.5	21.9	(100.0)
Remove marriage bar	1.2	(8.7)	1.5	1.8	3.2	5.1	2.6	3.1	—
Equal pay	11.8	(8.7)	8.0	7.3	8.1	7.7	5.8	5.0	—
State should provide day-care centres	11.8	(17.4)	9.9	10.9	9.7	15.4	15.0	14.4	—
Firms should provide day-care centres	3.5	—	5.3	3.6	2.1	1.3	6.3	7.5	—
Raise social insurance benefits	2.4	(4.3)	1.5	1.8	7.0	—	2.0	0.6	—
Other	4.7	—	4.2	3.6	3.0	—	3.2	2.5	—
No opinion, disapprove, no answer	18.8	(21.7)	15.2	18.2	34.6	21.8	22.2	20.6	—
Total percent	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
N	85	23	263	55	431	78	1,355	160	1

Entries in parentheses refer to sample groups where the total number of respondents was 50 or fewer.

TABLE 6.6: Illustration of effects of income tax code (Finance Act 1972) on male and female earnings (£'s)

Assumed pre-tax earnings (annual)	Tax payable ^a									After-tax income		Tax rates on	
	As single persons			As married couple			As married couple		married woman's		income		
	Man	Woman	Com- bined	Man	Woman	Com- bined	Man	Woman	Com- bined	Wife not working	Wife working	Aver- age ^b	Mar- ginal ^c
Col.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)
Case													
I	1,500	400	1,900	289	0	289	186	114	300	1,281	1,600	20%	26%
II	1,500	700	2,200	289	79	368	177	219	396	1,281	1,804	25%	35%
III	2,000	700	2,700	420	79	499	352	219	571	1,650	2,129	32%	35%

- (a) All income assumed earned, no account taken of national insurance, children, interest paid etc. Separate assessment not availed of.
 (b) Proportion of wife's pre-tax earnings not retained in *couple's* after-tax income: Col. 12 = Col. 2 - (Col. 11 - Col. 10) ÷ Col. 2.
 (c) Proportion of each extra £1.00 of wife's earnings not retained in *couple's* after-tax income.
 (d) National insurance contributions would lower the wife's take-home pay by about £50 a year.

TABLE 6.7: *Attitude to day-care centres classified by attitude to married women working (percentages)*

	<i>Approve unconditionally</i>	<i>Approve conditionally</i>	<i>No strong feelings, no answer</i>	<i>In general disapprove</i>	<i>Strongly disapprove</i>	<i>Total</i>
<i>Attitude to day-care centres</i>						
<i>Farm-married working and not working</i>						
Strong disapproval	30.4	29.0	27.8	42.6	52.7	32.6
"Only if necessary"	24.0	23.6	29.2	28.7	23.0	24.6
No opinion, not asked etc.	4.0	3.1	13.9	1.1	—	3.6
No objection, mild approval	20.8	31.8	20.8	23.4	23.0	27.6
Strong approval	20.8	12.5	8.3	4.3	1.4	11.5
Total percent	100	100	100	100	100	100
N	125	487	72	94	74	852
<i>Non-farm married working</i>						
Strong disapproval	15.2	22.9	—	(28.6)	(52.6)	22.8
"Only if necessary"	17.4	28.0	(60.0)	(31.4)	(21.1)	26.1
No opinion, not asked etc.	5.4	2.9	(20.0)	(5.7)	—	3.8
No objection, mild approval	25.0	32.7	(20.0)	(20.0)	(10.5)	28.9
Strong approval	37.0	13.5	—	(14.3)	(15.8)	18.5
Total percent	100	100	100	100	100	100
N	92	275	5	35	19	426
<i>Non-farm married not working</i>						
Strong disapproval	14.3	19.7	18.5	22.5	56.0	22.6
"Only if necessary"	15.5	23.3	23.9	33.5	16.8	22.8
No opinion, not asked etc.	7.0	4.8	9.8	6.2	6.0	5.6
No objection, mild approval	36.4	36.0	33.7	31.1	14.1	33.5
Strong approval	26.7	16.1	14.1	6.7	7.1	15.6
Total percent	100	100	100	100	100	100
N	258	1,282	92	209	184	2,025

Entries in parentheses relate to sample groups in which the total number of respondents was 50 or fewer.

TABLE 6.8: *Attitude to day-care centres classified by presence of children (percentages)*

<i>Children present in age groups:</i>	<i>0-under 19</i>		<i>0-under 2</i>		<i>2-under 4</i>		<i>4-under 14</i>		<i>14-under 19</i>	
	<i>None</i>	<i>One or more</i>	<i>None</i>	<i>One or more</i>	<i>None</i>	<i>One or more</i>	<i>None</i>	<i>One or more</i>	<i>None</i>	<i>One or more</i>
<i>Attitude to day-care centres</i>										
<i>Non-farm married working</i>										
Strong disapproval	28.7	20.6	23.5	(15.8)	22.1	26.1	24.3	21.2	22.8	22.7
"Only if necessary"	26.1	26.0	25.3	(34.2)	27.2	20.3	22.9	29.2	26.1	26.0
No opinion, not asked etc.	6.1	2.9	3.9	(2.6)	4.2	1.4	5.6	1.9	3.3	4.5
No objection, mild approval	27.8	29.3	29.1	(26.3)	28.0	33.3	30.4	27.4	29.4	27.9
Strong approval	11.3	21.2	18.3	(21.1)	18.5	18.8	16.8	20.3	18.4	18.8
Total percent	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
N	115	311	388	38	357	69	214	212	272	154
<i>Non-farm married not working</i>										
Strong disapproval	26.1	21.6	22.9	21.4	23.4	20.3	24.0	21.5	22.6	22.4
"Only if necessary"	22.3	23.0	22.8	22.9	22.3	24.1	22.0	23.4	23.0	22.4
No opinion, not asked etc.	8.0	4.9	5.7	5.0	6.1	4.2	6.5	4.9	5.8	5.0
No objection, mild approval	28.9	34.8	33.5	33.3	32.6	35.8	31.1	35.2	33.4	33.6
Strong approval	14.8	15.8	15.1	17.4	15.5	15.7	16.4	14.9	15.1	16.6
Total percent	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
N	426	1,599	1,605	420	1,477	548	859	1,166	1,391	634
<i>Farm married working and not working</i>										
Strong disapproval	35.2	31.9	32.3	34.1	32.1	34.1	34.9	30.9	33.0	31.9
"Only if necessary"	23.5	25.0	24.6	24.7	24.6	24.8	24.1	25.1	24.6	24.8
No opinion, not asked etc.	6.6	2.7	4.1	1.8	4.3	1.8	5.9	1.9	4.0	3.0
No objection, mild approval	25.5	28.2	28.0	25.9	28.9	23.9	25.4	29.3	26.3	30.4
Strong approval	9.2	12.2	11.0	13.5	10.1	15.5	9.7	12.9	12.2	10.0
Total percent	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
N	196	656	682	170	626	226	370	482	582	270

Entries in parentheses relate to sample groups in which the total number of respondents was 50 or fewer.

TABLE 6.9: *Attitude to day-care centres classified by who should run them (percentage)*

<i>Attitude to day-care centres</i>	State	Private	Em- ployers	No opinion	State/ private	Other in- cluding no answer	Total %	N
<i>Non-farm married not working</i>								
No objection, mild approval	47.5	18.9	17.7	6.9	4.6	4.4	100	678
Strong approval	54.3	18.7	12.4	4.1	7.0	3.5	100	315
<i>Non-farm married working</i>								
No objection, mild approval	52.0	20.3	13.0	6.5	5.7	2.4	100	123
Strong approval	49.4	17.7	11.4	8.9	6.3	6.4	100	79
<i>Farm working and not working</i>								
No objection, mild approval	45.1	27.7	11.5	11.9	3.0	0.9	100	235
Strong approval	50.0	25.5	9.2	9.2	2.0	4.1	100	98
Total								
No objection, mild approval	47.5	21.0	15.7	8.0	4.3	3.4	100	1,036
Strong approval	52.6	19.9	11.6	5.9	5.9	4.1	100	492
Total (approving)	49.1	20.7	14.4	7.3	4.8	3.6	100	1,528

TABLE 6.10: *Married women: desirability of change in school hours*

	<i>Non-farm</i>			<i>Total</i>
	<i>Not working</i>	<i>Working</i>	<i>Farm</i>	
No change	51.2	56.6	48.4	51.2
Longer hours	4.9	3.3	5.0	4.8
School lunch	12.6	14.1	17.6	14.1
Other	3.1	2.3	0.8	2.4
No opinion, disapprove etc.	28.1	23.7	28.2	27.6
Total percent	100	100	100	100
N	2025	426	852	3,303

IT is unnecessary at this stage to present a detailed summary of the findings of the survey. The three longest Sections of the report conclude with a discussion of the main findings. At this stage it may, however, be worth trying to draw the main themes together by looking at the chief implications of the study as a whole.

The macro-economic background indicates the likelihood that Ireland's traditionally low married female participation rate will rise in coming years. The survey established that about 15 per cent of married women are already in the labour force when part-time work is included in the definition of the labour force. A significant additional proportion indicated interest in returning to work "later on", usually when their children were older, or "if suitable jobs were available". Only a minority of those interviewed expressed strong opposition to the idea of married women taking up paid employment, although a large proportion laid down important conditions regarding child-care as a condition of their approving. The overall impression conveyed by these findings is thus that the proportion of married women entering the labour force would rise if full employment conditions created an overall labour shortage.

It is argued in the final section of this report that a substantial reduction in the tax liability of working wives would be the most appropriate policy for the government to pursue in this area at present. This policy would extend the effective freedom of choice of married women regarding entry to the labour force, by allowing them to retain a larger proportion of their gross pay. It is likely that some who are now deterred from working by the burden of taxation at a high marginal rate, in addition to child-care etc. expenses, would find it worthwhile to work if their tax liability were substantially reduced. A policy of reduced taxation would operate uniformly on a national level. It would tend to reduce any bias in favour of self-employment that may exist in the present situation, and its cost in relation to existing fiscal flows would be slight. It would also indirectly help to meet several other proposals for policies to aid working wives (such as providing day-care centres or improved transport facilities) by allowing them to spend more of their gross earnings in meeting work-related expenses. The analysis in the report has, it should, however, be stressed, been confined to attempting to rank various policies affecting working women. The place of such policies in the overall national set of priorities cannot be evaluated within the scope of a study of this type. In particular, the existence of a high general unemployment rate must be recognised as reducing the urgency of any policy which would tend to increase the supply of one category of workers.

Throughout the report, emphasis has been laid on the economic aspects of the entry of married women to the labour force. It was not intended to convey the impression that these are the only, or even the main, factors to be taken into account in policy formulation on this issue. The ramifications of whether or not

a wife works are obviously far-reaching. Whilst the economist may abstract from such considerations in order to isolate some of the economic issues at stake, it would obviously be undesirable to ignore any serious non-economic side-effects associated with increased participation by married women in the labour force. The most obvious possibility is, of course, adverse repercussions on children in families where mothers go out to work. The respondents in the survey were clearly concerned about this possibility, and it was mentioned frequently among the list of possible drawbacks to married women working. If we believed that serious adverse repercussions on child-care would follow from any policy that encouraged mothers to work outside the home then obviously the evaluation of such a policy would have to include this adverse side-effect as a major cost.

It is beyond our brief to evaluate all the available evidence on the effects on her children of a mother working. We shall restrict ourselves to mentioning the conclusions of a recent study of social factors in child development, a study that appears to be one of the most authoritative in its field.

The net effect of a mother working (having controlled for social class, family size and similar factors) was found (in a national sample of 16,000 British children) to be:

- (1) Some loss of reading attainment if the mother worked before the child started school, a smaller loss if she worked only after the child started school. Both these effects were very small compared with the effect of family size, social class or sex.
- (2) Some loss of arithmetic attainment, if mother worked before the child started school, no significant effect if she worked only after the child started school. This effect was smaller than (1) above, and very small compared with the social class or family size effect.
- (3) Some loss of "social adjustment" if mother started work after the child started school; no effect if mother worked before the child started school. This effect was very small when compared with effect of social class, family size, or sex.

The authors summarise their findings as follows: ". . . it is clear that, in general, the children of working mothers do not show any marked ill effects at the age of seven in terms of attainment and adjustment in school. It may be that any important ill effects will manifest themselves at later ages, but this seems unlikely . . ." [7, pp. 42-47].

These generally optimistic conclusions are reassuring from the viewpoint of the present study. However, it is clear that research is needed in the Irish context, and presumably if it becomes more usual for Irish mothers to take up paid employment, this subject will attract the attention of investigators working in the appropriate disciplines.

Appendix

APPENDIX I *The Sample: Methodology and Outcome*

THE target population was all women aged over 14 but under 65 (excluding full-time school girls) living in Ireland at the time of the survey. The target sample size was 5,000 completed interviews, and the sampling frame was (of necessity) the latest available Electoral Register. A two-stage sampling procedure was used, which followed the same basic procedures as the Household Budget Inquiry [5].

Initially the country was divided into areas classified by population size, as follows:

	<i>Area</i>	<i>Description</i>
"Urban"	A	Towns and cities with population 10,000 and over
	B	Towns with population 5,000 up to 10,000.
	C	Towns with population 3,000 up to 5,000.
	D	Towns with population 1,500 up to 3,000.
	E	DEDs with towns of 500 up to 1,500 population.
"Rural"	F	DEDs with towns of up to 500 population.
	G	DEDs with no towns.

The Census of Population 1966, provides data for the aggregate "urban" and "rural" areas. On the basis of these 1966 figures, extrapolated forward to 1971 on the basis of the 1961-66 growth rates by region, 45 per cent of the target population lives in areas A-D, 55 per cent in areas E-G. On the basis of the Census data, a sample of one name in 90 from the "urban" population would yield the names of 3,500 women aged 15-64, and this would allow an adequate margin for removal, non-response etc. to ensure 2,700 completed interviews. In the rural areas, one name in 120 would yield 2,530 names of women aged 15-64 and this would allow an adequate margin for non-response etc. to yield 2,300 completed interviews. The need for economy in travel time, etc., dictated that only a sample of the units in each class of areas B through G should be included in the survey, with the sampling fraction within the area adjusted accordingly. Further economy in the urban areas was gained by sampling in clusters of 4 adjacent names (the first, third, sixth and ninth in a run of names forming the cluster). The final scheme that was followed may be summarised:

Area	Sampling fraction for units of area	Sampling fraction for names within area
A	all	1 in 90*
B	1 in 3	3 in 90*
C	1 in 4	4 in 90*
D	1 in 6	6 in 90
E	1 in 15	15 in 120
F	1 in 30**	30 in 120
G	1 in 60**	60 in 120

In the outcome these procedures yielded a close approximation to the number of completed questionnaires required for the urban areas, but due to higher than anticipated removal etc. rates in the rural areas, resampling was necessary in some cases to reach the goal.

There is a discrepancy between the target population (women aged 15-64, not currently full-time school-girls) and the population used as the sampling frame, which excludes all women aged under 21 (as well as those who fail to register to vote). In order to compensate for this exclusion, the interviewers were instructed to contact any women aged under 21 (other than school-girls) normally resident in the households of the women whose names had been selected from the Electoral Register. This procedure still excluded those women aged under 21 who are living in households in which there is no woman on the Electoral Register (mainly young women living in urban areas on their own, or those living with a widowed father), and it should result in an over-representation of young women living in households with above average numbers of such women. In view of the difficulty of overcoming this sampling problem, it was necessary to use this procedure.

The outcome of the sampling procedure was as follows:

Names issued and used	7,420
Contacted, but over 64	<u>1,181</u>
Eligible sample	6,239
Distribution of eligible sample:	
<i>Non-response:</i>	
Moved	848
Non-contact (three visits)	270
Refusals	198
Dead	185
In hospital, etc.	123
Address unknown, etc.	36
On holiday, etc.	<u>78</u>
Total non-response	1,738

* Since clusters of four adjacent names were picked in these areas, only 1 in 360, 3 in 360, 4 in 360, respectively, were picked at random.

** Since two adjacent DEDs were picked together in these areas, only 1 in 60 and 1 in 120 respectively were picked at random. Also in these areas, some DEDs were eliminated due to remoteness from interviewers' residences.

Non-response as per cent of eligible sample= $1,738/6,239=27.9$ per cent.

Refusals as per cent of eligible sample= $198/6,239=3.2$ per cent.

Completed Interviews:

Obtained from names issued to interviewers= $7,420-1,181-1,738=4,501$

Obtained from persons not named (i.e. from second women in
households, aged under 21) 560

Total 5,061

The refusal rate of 3.2 per cent (which excludes from the denominator those over 64 who were successfully contacted) is satisfactorily low, and reflects the general impression of interest and cooperation reported by the interviewers. The only group that showed little interest in the survey was, according to the interviewers, elderly single women.

The total non-response rate of almost 28 per cent is in keeping with experience in previous surveys undertaken in Ireland [10] or even below the expected proportion, if account is taken of the over 64 population successfully contacted. On the other hand, the wastage involved in this rate of non-contact, especially the high number who had moved, points to the inadequacy of the Electoral Register as a sampling frame in Ireland.

Checks on the Representativeness of the Achieved Sample

The only data available at the time of writing against which the main features of the completed returns could be checked were the 1966 Census of Population returns. Because the survey was undertaken almost exactly five years after this Census, the concordance between the two sets of data would not be expected to be exact even if there were no deficiencies in the sampling procedure. The comparison of the age structure in the sample with that of the Census is given below:

<i>Age</i>	<i>Census 1966 per cent</i>	<i>Sample per cent</i>
15-19	10.4	10.3
20-24	11.7	7.0
25-29	9.6	8.2
30-34	9.4	9.4
35-39	10.0	10.4
40-44	10.6	11.0
45-54	21.1	23.5
55-64	17.2	17.3
No answer	0.0	2.9
<i>Total</i>	100.0	100.0

The under-representation of the 20-24 age group in the sample is the most important difference between the two distributions. This may be due to two factors, the failure of women aged exactly 21 to be included on the Electoral Registers, and the deficiency in the sampling frame mentioned above whereby young women aged 20 and under living in independent households would not have been contacted. Taken in relation to the overall sample, this defect is unlikely to bias the results too seriously, but care must be taken in interpreting the responses of those in the 20-24 age group, since the sample of these women may differ from the underlying population in some (undetermined) manner.

The marital status distribution was as follows:

	<i>Census</i>		<i>Sample</i>
	1961	1966	
Single	39.4	37.6	28.2
Married	54.6	56.7	65.2
Widowed	6.1	5.8	6.1
Other	0	0	0.5

The low proportion of single women in the sample is disturbing, even when allowance is made for the upward trend in the proportion of the population married. More detail on the sample outcome by age and marital status shows that this problem is present at all ages over 20 years:

<i>Marital status with in age groups</i>	<i>percentage single</i>							
	15-19	20-24	25-29	30-34	35-39	40-44	45-54	55-64
Sample ('71)	97.5	71.3	27.2	16.1	10.9	13.2	13.4	17.0
Census '66	97.5	74.8	37.8	24.1	21.2	19.5	20.8	24.4
Census '61	98.4	78.2	45.1	29.6	23.5	22.0	23.1	25.0

Hutchinson found a similar distortion in his Dublin sample [10], where the sample proportion single was 66 per cent of the Census proportion, compared with 75 per cent in the present survey. It is not difficult to list reasons why the single population is not easily contacted regardless of the sampling frame used: high mobility, low probability of being at home, etc. Nonetheless, the problem remains that the overall sample returns do not adequately reflect the views of the single population, and the single people included in the returns may be somewhat unrepresentative of the total single population. However, virtually all the tabulations in the present study are classified by marital status, so that the effect of this problem has been isolated and confined to the single population.

Further comparisons of the achieved sample with the Census show that 22.3 per cent of the sample returns were completed on farm schedules (to be used where

the household lived on a farm), as compared with 24.9 per cent of females aged 20-64 in the agricultural socio-economic group in the 1966 Census. More detailed comparison of the socio-economic groupings of the married respondents other than those on farm schedules is possible when the results of the Hutchinson social mobility study are used as a basis:

<i>Social Group</i>	<i>Present sample (based on married women's husbands' occupations) non- farm</i>	<i>Hutchinson's adult male sample, Dublin</i>
	<i>per cent</i>	<i>per cent</i>
Professional, etc.	4.6	4.9
Managerial, executive	5.1	5.2
Inspectional, higher non-manual	11.8	8.6
Inspectional, lower non-manual	12.0	18.6
Skilled manual, routine non-manual	33.0	33.1
Semi-skilled manual	12.7	13.0
Routine manual	20.9	16.6
Total	100	100

The Dublin sample displays a higher proportion of "lower grade non-manual" and a lower proportion of "routine manual", but otherwise the distributions are similar. It is to be expected that a Dublin sample would be somewhat more weighted towards non-manual, clerical occupations than a national sample.

A comparison with the Census data on education is possible. The Census asked respondents to indicate each level of education they had attended full-time, and the tabulations refer to the "highest" level (except for the combined "vocational and secondary" category). Under "vocational" the Census includes commercial courses. The following is a comparison of the Census and sample returns, using as far as possible comparable groupings:

	<i>Women aged 15-64</i>	
	<i>Census, 1966, per cent</i>	<i>Sample per cent</i>
Primary	55.4	50.9
Secondary	20.9	20.8
Vocational/technical/business	9.5	22.5
Vocational and Secondary	7.0	
University and other Professional	3.4	5.7
No answer	3.8	0.2
Total	100	100

The lower proportion with primary education in the sample returns may be partly due to the rising level of post-primary participation but also to the possibility that the interviewers were instructed to give a liberal interpretation to the "full-time" aspect of the question, and especially to include all those who had "business/commercial" training of a more or less complete nature under this code. A total of 12.2 per cent of the sample was assigned to this category and whilst a comparable figure cannot be calculated from the Census tables (since business was coded in with vocational and technical education), this probably accounts for the lower proportion with "vocational education" in the Census, and the higher proportion with "primary" and "no answer".

Data on the occupations of the employed respondents have been compared with the Census returns in the text of this report (cf. Section 2).

The married respondents were asked to state their husbands' present labour force status (that is, whether he was employed, retired, or out of work). Almost six per cent (5.9) stated "out of work, unemployed", and this compares with the 4.5 per cent of married males classified as out of work in the 1966 Census. In view, however, of the rise in the general unemployment rate from 6.1 per cent in 1966 to 7.2 per cent in 1971, the sample figure seems consistent with the official data.

These checks on the representativeness of the achieved sample are on the whole reassuring, bearing in mind that comparisons with the Census are five years out of date and that socio-economic change has been rapid over this period. It is also important to bear in mind that the discrepancies evident between the Census and sample returns for questions of occupations, education etc. may reflect differences in definitions and coding between the two sources as well as discrepancies due to sampling variability. The two (interconnected) areas where the sample appears to be deficient are the under-representation of women aged 20-24 and of single women. Although it is not at all likely that these problems seriously undermine any of the main conclusions that are drawn from an analysis of the sample returns a general caveat attaches to any commentary referring to these population groups.

Reliability of the Statistical Results

The majority of the tables in the report present the percentage distribution on the respondents' answers to the questions in the survey. This percentage distribution is always subject to a degree of error reflecting the fact that not the whole population, but only one from the very large number of all possible samples, was interviewed. The magnitude of this error rises as the degree of cross-classification of the results is increased, and can very quickly reach the level where it is doubtful whether the tabulation is reliable enough to be published. This is especially true for the present study in the case of some of the minor population groups (e.g. widowed women, single women who are not working, etc.). Table A1 displays the standard error of a range of percentages for a number of sample sizes. These standard errors have been calculated as $1.5 \sqrt{p(1-p)/N}$ where p is the sample proportion and N the sample size. This formula is an approximation to the exact error for a multi-stage random sample [11]. A 95 per cent confidence interval

for a sample proportion is given approximately by *twice* the relevant entry in Table A.1. For example, the results presented in Section 3 show that 15.3 per cent of all married women interviewed were "economically active". From Table A.1 it may be seen that the standard error for 15 per cent, with a sample size the same as that for the number of married women in the sample, is 0.93 per cent. Hence, the width of the 95 per cent confidence interval is approximately 1.86 per cent, or in 95 samples out of 100 the proportion of married women classified as "economically active" would fall in the interval 17.16-13.44, (that is, 15.3 ± 1.86). This range is tolerably small due both to the large number in the relevant sample category and to the relatively low proportion of these with the characteristic in question. However, as the cross-tabulation becomes more elaborate, the importance of the standard error rises and consequently the confidence interval tends to become meaninglessly wide. The rule of thumb that has been adhered to is to draw attention to tabulations based on sub-groups with 50 or fewer entries.¹ All the tables are of course, to be interpreted in the light of the type of errors summarised in Table A.1. and it is hoped that undue reliance is not placed on relatively minor differences arising between some of the smaller sample groups. In important cases where the issue is in doubt, more elaborate statistical tests are referred to in the text.

¹ In tables where percentage distribution were based on totals of 50 or fewer observations, the relevant percentages have been entered in parentheses.

APPENDIX TABLE A 1
Approximate Standard Errors of Sample Percentages

Group	Sample Size, N	Standard Error to be Applied to Sample Proportion, P						
		P=50	60 or 40	70 or 30	80 or 20	85 or 15	90 or 10	95 or 5
All interviewees	5,054	1.05	1.04	.98	.86	.75	.63	.45
Economically inactive women	3,315	1.29	1.28	1.19	1.04	.93	.78	.56
Married women	3,294	1.31	1.28	1.20	1.05	.93	.78	.56
Non-farm economically inactive women	2,408	1.53	1.50	1.40	1.22	1.10	.92	.68
Economically active women	1,739	1.80	1.76	1.65	1.44	1.28	1.08	.78
Single women	1,423	2.00	1.95	1.83	1.59	1.43	1.19	.57
Widowed women	337	4.08	4.01	3.75	3.27	2.91	2.45	1.79
Non-farm married women not working, social group I	88	7.99	7.84	7.33	6.39	5.70	4.79	3.48

Based on formula for standard error of percentage in stratified sample = (1.5) $\left(\frac{\sqrt{P(100-P)}}{N} \right)$

Bibliography

- [1] Bristow, J. A. and Fell, C. F. *Bord Na Mona: A Cost Benefit Study*. Dublin: Institute of Public Administration, 1971.
- [2] Cain, Glen G., *Married Women in the Labour Force: An Economic Analysis*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1966.
- [3] Central Statistics Office, *Census of Population* 1961, Vol. V Dublin: The Stationery Office, 1969.
- [4] Central Statistics Office, *Census of Population* 1966, Vol. V. Dublin: The Stationery Office, 1969.
- [5] Central Statistics Office, *Household Budget Inquiry* 1965-66. Dublin: The Stationery Office, 1969.
- [6] Central Statistics Office, *National Income and Expenditure* 1971, Dublin: The Stationery Office, 1972.
- [7] Davie, Ronald, Butler, Neville and Goldstein, Harvey, *From Birth to Seven: A Report of the National Child Development Study*. London: Longman, 1972.
- [8] Geary, P. T. and Walsh, B. M., "The Economics of Equal Pay" Paper Read to the Statistical and Social Inquiry Society of Ireland, Dublin, 3 March, 1972.
- [9] Grossman, Herschal I., "Was Keynes a 'Keynesian'? A Review Article", *Journal of Economic Literature*, Vol. X, No. 1 (March 1972).
- [10] Hutchinson, Bertram, *Social Status and Inter-Generational Social Mobility in Dublin*. Dublin: ESRI paper No. 48, 1969.
- [11] Hunt, Audrey, *Survey on Women's Employment*. London: Government Social Survey, 1968.
- [12] International Labour Office, *Yearbook of Labour Statistics* 1969. Geneva: International Labour Office.
- [13] Kelly, Mary, *Manpower in Galway: Summary Report*. Dublin: Roinn Saothair (Department of Labour) and the Stationery Office, 1970.
- [14] Lennon, L. K., "The Flexibility of Irish Taxes on Incomes", in Ireland: *Some Problems of a Developing Economy*. Edited by A. A. Tait and J. A. Bristow. Dublin. Gill & Macmillan, 1972.
- [15] Mueller, Eva, and Katona, George, *Consumer Expectations* 1953-1956. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Institute of Social Research, University of Michigan, 1957.
- [16] Oppenheimer, Y. D., *The Female Labour Force in the United States*. Berkley: University of California Press, 1970.
- [17] Paish, F. W., "The Prospects for Increasing Output", *Lloyds Bank Review*. January 1973.
- [18] Preston, Maurice, "Unemployment: Why we Need a new Measure", *Lloyds Bank Review*, April 1972.

- [19] Revenue Commissioners, *48th Annual Report* (1967-68). Dublin: The Stationery Office, 1969.
- [20] Robinson, Derek, *Local Labour Markets and Wage Structures*. London: Gower Press, 1970.
- [21] Sullerot, E., *L'Emploi des Femmes et Ses problèmes dans les Etats membres de la Communauté Européenne*. Paris: Commission de Communautés Européennes.
- [22] Tobin, James, "Inflation and Employment", *American Economic Review*, March, 1972.
- [23] United Nations, *Demographic Yearbooks 1965-69*. New York: United Nations Publications, 1966-1970.
- [24] United Nations, *Statistical Yearbook*, 1967. New York: United Nations Publications, 1968.
- [25] Walsh, B. M., "Aspects of Labour Supply and Demand with Special Reference to the Employment of Women in Ireland", *Journal of Statistical and Social Inquiry Society of Ireland*, Vol. XXII, Part III, 1970-71.
- [26] Walsh, B. M., "Ireland's Demographic Transformation", *Economic and Social Review* Vol. 3, No. 2. (1972).
- [27] Walsh, B. M., "Trends in Age at Marriage in Post-War Ireland", *Demography*, Vol. 9, No. 2. (March, 1972).

THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL RESEARCH INSTITUTE

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 | |
| 4. <i>Ophthalmic Services in Ireland</i> | P. R. Kaim-Caudle |
| assisted by Kathleen O'Donoghue and Annette O'Toole | |
| 5. <i>Irish Pensions Schemes, 1969</i> | P. R. Kaim-Caudle and J. G. Byrne |
| assisted by Annette O'Toole | |
| 6. <i>The Social Science Percentage Nuisance</i> | R. C. Geary |
| 7. <i>Poverty in Ireland: Research Priorities</i> | Brendan M. Walsh |

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: 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 |
| 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 |

THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL RESEARCH INSTITUTE

Publication Series:—continued.

42. *Some Irish Population Problems Reconsidered* Brendan M. Walsh
 43. *The Irish Brain Drain* Richard Lynn
 44. *A Method of Estimating the Stock of Capital in Northern Ireland Industry: Limitations and Applications* C. W. Jefferson
 45. *An Input-Output Analysis of the Agricultural Sector of the Irish Economy in 1964* R. O'Connor with M. Breslin
 46. *The Implications for Cattle Producers of Seasonal Price Fluctuations* R. O'Connor
 47. *Transport in the Developing Economy of Ireland* John Blackwell
 48. *Social Status and Inter-Generational Social Mobility in Dublin* Bertram Hutchinson
 49. *Personal Incomes by County, 1965* Miceal Ross
 50. *Income Expenditure Relations in Ireland, 1965-1966* John L. Pratschke
 51. *Costs and Prices in Transportable Goods Industries* W. Black, J. V. Simpson, D. G. Slattery
 52. *Certain Aspects of Non-Agricultural Unemployment in Ireland* R. C. Geary and J. G. Hughes
 53. *A Study of Demand Elasticities for Irish Imports* Dermot McAleese
 54. *Internal Migration in Ireland with Appendix* R. C. Geary and J. G. Hughes
 55. *Religion and Demographic Behaviour in Ireland* C. J. Gillman
 56. *Views on Pay Increases, Fringe Benefits and Low Pay* B. M. Walsh
 57. *Views on Income Differentials and the Economic Situation* H. Behrend, A. Knowles and J. Davies
 58. *Computers in Ireland* H. Behrend, A. Knowles and J. Davis
 59. *National Differences in Anxiety* F. G. Foster
 60. *Capital Statistics for Irish Manufacturing Industry* Richard Lynn
 61. *Rural Household Budget—Feasibility Study* C. W. Jefferson
 62. *Effective Tariffs and the Structure of Industrial Protection in Ireland* Sile Sheehy and R. O'Connor
 63. *Methodology of Personal Income Estimation by County* Dermot McAleese
 64. *Further Data on County Incomes in the Sixties* Miceal Ross
 65. *The Functional Distribution of Income in Ireland, 1938-70* Miceal Ross
 66. *Irish Input-Output Structures, 1964 and 1968* J. G. Hughes
 67. *Social Status in Dublin: Marriage, Mobility and First Employment* E. W. Henry
 68. *An Economic Evaluation of Irish Salmon Fishing; 1: The Visiting Anglers* Bertram Hutchinson
 69. *Women and Employment in Ireland: Results of a National Survey* R. O'Connor and B. J. Whelan
 assisted by Annette O'Toole