

*Office employees**Industrial Relations Memos*August 22, 1947: Number 93<sup>v</sup>WAGE DIFFERENTIALS BETWEEN FACTORY AND OFFICE EMPLOYEES

White collar workers are often said to be the forgotten employees when wages and working conditions of factory workers are improved under union pressure. Their comparative wage position was regarded as unfavorable at the beginning of the war and, far from being adjusted since that time, is believed to have deteriorated further. Some general confirmation of this contention is found in a study of postwar increases in basic wage rates reported in the "Monthly Labor Review" of September, 1946. From August, 1945, to May, 1946, four-fifths of the workers in manufacturing—typically unionized factory workers—received general wage increases averaging 14.5 cents per hour, but only two-fifths of the workers in selected nonmanufacturing industries—typically nonunion white collar workers—received increases and then only in amounts averaging 8.4 cents.

In order to obtain firsthand information on the amount and trend of differentials in rates of pay for office and factory jobs, Industrial Relations Counselors sent a questionnaire to sixty companies, of which forty-six replied. Together, the companies covered have well over 500,000 employees. Many of them are large, multiplant concerns, but they were asked to report only for a major or typical location, on the assumption that the differentials everywhere would reflect a company policy. However, the returns for the New York, Chicago and San Francisco operations of one company and for several subsidiaries of another cast doubt on this assumption. It seems possible that variations

(Additional copies of this memorandum  
are available to contributor companies on request.)

INSTITUTE OF  
INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS

RECEIVED

AUG 9 1949

in the relative supply of and demand for different types of labor and in union pressure and other local factors have as much or more to do with determining the differentials than any fixed policy of management. On the other hand, so far as the returns were susceptible of analysis on a geographic or industrial basis the size and trend of the differentials was unrelated to location or industry. The local factors determining differentials in rates relate to labor markets much smaller than the states or regions by which these data can be broken down.

The detailed summary of the returns appears as Appendix A, in which the companies are classified according to industry and with their geographic locations shown. For comparison, daily, weekly and monthly rates reported were computed on an hourly basis, and the table gives for each company the percentage differential in common labor rates over or under the lowest junior office rate reported.<sup>1</sup> The differentials were computed as follows: (1) between single or standard rates where given, (2) between minimum rates and also between maximum rates where rate ranges without standard rates were given for both classes of workers, and (3) between the single or standard rate for one class and both the minimum and maximum of the range for the other. The results are two classes of differentials, one with respect to starting rates, the other with respect to maximum rates. They overlap to the extent that the differentials between single or standard rates are included in both.

---

1.

It was assumed that the best measure of the differential would be that between the rates for common labor and for the lowest ranking office job, other than office boy. Companies were asked to report the rates for three office jobs of substantially the same rank, junior file clerk, junior clerk, and junior typist, with the thought that one of them would be selected for the comparisons. Inspection of the returns revealed that some variations in the ranking and rates of pay for these three jobs among companies suggested greater variations in job content than was expected within the limits of the abbreviated job descriptions furnished on the questionnaire. It was decided, therefore, to take as the differential in each case that between common labor and the lowest paid office job—usually though not invariably the junior file clerk.

### SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

The analysis of comparative rates is briefly summarized below. The discussion indicates (1) the general trend of relative changes in the pay status of office personnel as against factory employees, from 1939 to 1947, (2) the size of differentials in the pay of the two groups, and (3) the average increases in rates and differentials over the period.

Although employees tend to stress absolute rather than relative differences in wage rates, percentage differentials are probably a more valid basis of comparison from the point of view of equitable wage and salary administration. In the following discussion, therefore, the position of office workers is considered primarily in terms of percentage differentials.

#### Trends in Comparative Pay Status

Table 1 gives the number of companies in which differentials in rates of pay for common labor over rates for junior office jobs (measured both in cents per hour and as percentages of the respective office rates) changed in various possible ways between 1939 and 1942, 1942 and 1947 and over the entire period from 1939 to 1947. Where differentials decreased the relative pay status of office as compared to factory workers improved; where differentials increased their relative status declined.

Between 1939 and 1947, the relative status of male office workers improved in six out of twenty-six companies, remained practically unchanged in three, but declined in twelve. In the remaining five companies, their rates were so changed as to make them relatively worse off as to starting rates but better off as to maximum rates. Substantially similar changes took place in the status of female workers, which improved in only four but declined in fourteen companies; it remained unchanged in only one company and in five changed in a mixed fashion with respect to starting and maximum rates.

TABLE 1

NUMBER OF COMPANIES IN WHICH DIFFERENTIALS IN RATES OF PAY FOR COMMON LABOR IN COMPARISON WITH JUNIOR OFFICE JOBS  
CHANGED IN SPECIFIED WAYS, 1939--1947

Type of Change in Differential of Common Labor Rates Relative to Junior Office Rates	Number of Companies in Which Specified Changes Occurred									
	Male Employees					Female Employees				
	Cents-Per-Hour Differential		Percentage Differential			Cents-Per-Hour Differential		Percentage Differential		
	1939-- 1942	1942-- 1947	1939-- 1942	1942-- 1947		1939-- 1942	1942-- 1947	1939-- 1942	1942-- 1947	
Decrease.....	5	8	4	10		6	7	6	7	4
No substantial change <sup>a</sup> .....	5	3	4	1		4	2	5	6	1
Increase.....	14	18	15	12		12	15	11	14	14
Increase as to starting rate but decrease as to maximum.....	2	4	3	3		2	4	2	1	5
Decrease as to starting rate but increase as to maximum.....	..	1	..	..		..	1	..	1	..
Total companies included <sup>b</sup> .....	26	34	26	26		24	29	24	29	24

<sup>a</sup> Not more than 2 cents per hour or more than 3 per cent.

<sup>b</sup> Excludes companies in which all laborers were male and all clerks female, since computing differentials in such cases would confuse occupational with sex differentials.

### Size of Differentials

For male and female employees separately, Table 2 presents the differentials measured as percentages of the applicable office rates, that is, the proportion by which office rates would have had to be increased to bring them into equality with the common labor rates. Differentials in starting rates for male laborers over those for male office workers exceeded 25 per cent in fourteen out of twenty-six companies in 1939 and in twenty out of thirty-four in 1947; for female laborers, in three out of twenty-four companies in 1939 and in ten out of twenty-nine in 1947. Starting rates for male office workers were as good or better than for laborers in only six out of twenty-six companies in 1939 and in six out of thirty-four in 1947. Although Table 2 shows a roughly similar trend to the disadvantage of female office workers, their disadvantage is not quite so marked, since the starting rates were as high or higher than for female laborers in twelve out of twenty-four companies in 1939, and in six out of twenty-nine companies in 1947.

Lower starting rates were not offset by the possibility of absolutely higher maximum rates, since male junior office workers when at their top rates were paid as much or more than laborers in only ten out of twenty-six companies in 1939 and in but eight out of thirty-four in 1947. The differential disadvantage of female office workers was much less pronounced, since their maximum rates were as good or better than laborers' in seventeen out of twenty-four companies in 1939 and in fourteen out of twenty-nine companies in 1947.

### Average Increase in Rates and Differentials

Despite the obvious reservations that must accompany the use of averages from as small a sample as this survey afforded, unweighted averages of company rates were calculated for the group of companies included in the

**TABLE 2**  
**NUMBER OF COMPANIES PAYING COMMON LABOR SPECIFIED PERCENTAGE DIFFERENTIALS**  
**OVER OR UNDER JUNIOR OFFICE RATES, 1939, 1942 AND 1947**

Percentage Differentials in Common Labor Rates--	Number of Companies With Specified Differentials in--					
	Starting Rate			Maximum Rate		
	1939	1942	1947	1939	1942	1947
<b>Male Employees</b>						
Over junior office rates						
76% or more.....	2	3	5	..	..	..
66-75%.....	..	1	1	..	..	..
56-65 .....	2	4	2	1	1	..
46-55 .....	..	3	1	..	3	1
36-45 .....	6	4	6	4	1	3
26-35 .....	4	4	5	2	6	4
16-25 .....	1	5	3	5	6	6
6-15 .....	2	3	3	1	5	6
1-5 .....	3	1	2	3	1	6
No differential.....	2	1	2	3	1	1
Under junior office rates						
1- 5%.....	..	1	4	1	3	5
6-15 .....	3	3	..	5	4	1
16-25 .....	1	..	..	..	2	1
26-35 .....	..	1	..	1	1	..
Total companies included <sup>a</sup>	26	34	34	26	34	34
<b>Female Employees</b>						
Over junior office rates						
76-85%.....	..	..	1	..	..	..
66-75 .....	..	..	..	..	..	..
56-65 .....	1	2	1	..	..	..
46-55 .....	..	1	3	..	..	1
36-45 .....	1	3	3	1	..	1
26-35 .....	1	2	2	..	2	2
16-25 .....	1	5	4	1	5	3
6-15 .....	5	5	5	3	6	6
1-5 .....	3	2	4	2	3	2
No differential.....	2	..	..	3	1	1
Under junior office rates						
1- 5%.....	3	..	1	2	..	4
6-15 .....	2	5	3	7	6	5
16-25 .....	4	2	2	4	3	2
26-35 .....	1	2	..	..	2	2
36% or more.....	..	..	..	1	1	..
Total companies included <sup>a</sup>	24	29	29	24	29	29

<sup>a</sup> Excludes companies in which all laborers were male and all clerks female, since computing differentials in such cases would confuse occupational with sex differentials.

preceding table.<sup>2</sup> Between 1939 and 1947 male common labor rates increased 63 per cent, while male junior office rates increased 54 per cent. The differential between them increased from 7 cents to 15 cents, or from 12 per cent to 17 per cent. Female common labor rates increased 98 per cent, while female junior office rates increased 63 per cent. The differential between them increased from minus 2 cents to 6 cents, or from minus 2 per cent to 7 per cent.

---

No qualification of the broad statements made in the above summary developed from the analysis of differentials measured in terms of absolute rates. For comparison with the data on percentage differentials, however, Table 3 gives similar information with respect to the amount of differentials, in cents per hour.

### CONCLUSIONS

The data, despite any limitations and despite the variations in the changes among companies, generally confirm the contention that, as to compensation, office workers since 1939 have not fared as well as factory workers. By the wide extension to factory workers recently of privileges previously reserved to office workers—such as, vacations, paid holidays and sick leave with pay—the disadvantageous status of the white collar worker was further intensified.

---

#### 2

Lack of information about the distribution of employees throughout ranges of rates made it inadvisable to use the mid points of ranges to measure the differentials in rates for purposes of the preceding discussion. The mid points were nevertheless used in the calculation of these averages which are intended only to give a rough measure of overall changes.

The questionnaires were drafted to produce data about changes in factory-office differentials which differences in job content among jobs of the same class or title in different companies would not affect. Such differences would, however, make misleading the calculated average rates which are, therefore, not given.

**TABLE 3**  
**NUMBER OF COMPANIES PAYING COMMON LABOR SPECIFIED CENTS-PER-HOUR DIFFERENTIALS**  
**OVER OR UNDER JUNIOR OFFICE RATES, CLASSIFIED BY SEX, 1939, 1942 AND 1947**

Amount of Differentials in Common Labor Rates--	Number of Companies With Specified Differentials in--					
	Starting Rate			Maximum Rate		
	1939	1942	1947	1939	1942	1947
<b>Male Employees</b>						
Over junior office rates						
\$.51-.55.....	..	1	3	..	..	..
.46-.50.....	..	..	2	..	..	..
.41-.45.....	..	2	2	..	..	..
.36-.40.....	..	1	1	..	..	1
.31-.35.....	2	3	2	..	1	1
.26-.30.....	2	3	6	1	3	3
.21-.25.....	..	5	3	..	3	4
.16-.20.....	7	4	3	5	3	4
.11-.15.....	4	4	2	4	8	2
.06-.10.....	1	3	2	2	2	4
.01-.05.....	4	2	2	4	3	7
No differential.....	2	1	2	3	1	1
Under junior office rates						
\$.06-.10.....	3	2	1	4	3	1
.11-.15.....	1	1	..	1	2	1
.16-.20.....	..	..	..	..	1	..
.21-.25.....	..	1	..	..	1	..
.26-.30.....	..	..	..	1	..	1
Total companies included <sup>a</sup>	26	34	34	26	34	34
<b>Female Employees</b>						
Over junior office rates						
\$.46-.50.....	..	..	1	..	..	..
.41-.45.....	..	..	1	..	..	..
.36-.40.....	..	..	..	..	..	2
.31-.35.....	..	1	..	..	..	..
.26-.30.....	..	1	6	..	..	1
.21-.25.....	1	4	2	..	2	1
.16-.20.....	..	2	2	1	1	1
.11-.15.....	1	3	3	1	2	3
.06-.10.....	4	5	4	2	4	3
.01-.05.....	6	4	4	3	7	4
No differential.....	2	..	..	3	1	1
Under junior office rates						
\$.01-.05.....	5	2	1	9	5	4
.06-.10.....	2	4	1	3	2	3
.11-.15.....	1	..	2	..	1	2
.16-.20.....	2	3	1	1	2	..
.21-.25.....	..	..	1	..	..	1
.26-.30.....	..	..	..	..	1	1
.31-.35.....	..	..	..	1	..	1
.36-.40.....	..	..	..	..	1	1
Total companies included <sup>a</sup>	24	29	29	24	29	29

<sup>a</sup> Excludes companies in which all laborers were male and all clerks female, since computing differentials in such cases would confuse occupational with sex differentials.



The findings do not provide any basis for the determination of what differentials would be "proper" in all cases. Decisions must be reached by the individual company on the basis of a variety of considerations, including prestige elements, promotional opportunities, and other factors usually considered in job evaluation. And there is no reason to assume that such differentials once equitably fixed should remain unchanged in the face of a changed labor market and social conditions, or that a differential equitable in one company is, therefore, equitable in another. Presumably, management pays the relative rates it finds necessary to attract and retain the requisite supply of labor of different classes and skills and to maintain the morale of the work force. Differentials in each company, nevertheless, should have an explicable basis and should seem reasonable to the employees concerned. The recent growth of union organization among office workers is evidence of considerable doubt among them of the equity of their treatment.

The spread of education has tended over a long period to reduce the value of the basic clerical skills and there is said to be some tendency for a disproportionate number of school graduates now to seek white collar jobs. Even these factors, however, do not seem sufficient to explain why a worker starting at the bottom of the ladder in the factory should so frequently be paid substantially more than one starting in the office or why, apart from union pressure, his advantage should have increased during the last few years.

The trends indicated above suggest that managements should review relative factory and office wage and salary schedules. If they are found to be as far out of line with one another as would appear from these data at face value, managements are challenged to effect the requisite adjustment before it is forced upon them.

It is generally anticipated, now that "second round" wage increases have run their course, that the pressure for further general wage increases

for factory workers will be somewhat reduced over the next twelve to eighteen months. Managements may therefore have a better opportunity to concentrate attention on the development of policy for elimination of excessive differentials or for their reduction to a level that is clearly defensible on the strength of comparative job content or peculiar factors. Provision must be made, moreover, for maintaining under all possible future circumstances the differentials between wage and salary rates that are determined to be necessary.

## APPENDIX

Company Code and Location <sup>b</sup>	Differential in Hourly Rates of Common Labor Jobs Over or Under (-) Junior Office Jobs <sup>a</sup> for—																	
	Male Employees									Female Employees								
	January, 1939			October, 1942			January, 1947			January, 1939			October, 1942			January, 1947		
	Common Labor Rate	Junior Office Rate	Per-centage Differ-ential	Common Labor Rate	Junior Office Rate	Per-centage Differ-ential	Common Labor Rate	Junior Office Rate	Per-centage Differ-ential	Common Labor Rate	Junior Office Rate	Per-centage Differ-ential	Common Labor Rate	Junior Office Rate	Per-centage Differ-ential	Common Labor Rate	Junior Office Rate	Per-centage Differ-ential
Chemicals, Drugs and Soap																		
Company 1 New York	\$.55 .66	\$.66 .78	-17 -15	\$.63 .74	\$.66 .78	-5 -5	\$.80 1.00	\$.80 .90	0 11	\$.44 .54	\$.46 .58	-5 -6	\$.54 .60	\$.49 .64	10 -6	\$.80 1.00	\$.74 .80	8 25
Company 2 New York	.. .62	.46 .62	35 0	.. .83	.58 .72	44 15	.. 1.11	.58 .92	92 20	.. ..	.46 .62	.. ..	.. ..	.58 .72	.. ..	.. .92	.58 ..	.. ..
Company 3 New Jersey	.54 .56	.40 .43	34 30	.70 .73	.55 .61	27 19	.. 1.04	.75 .87	38 19	.. ..	.40 .43	.. ..	.55 .59	.50 .54	10 9	.. .92	.75 .87	23 7
Company 4 New Jersey	.55 .67	.40 .48	38 41	.. .75	.50 .60	50 25	.. .83	.55 .78	51 7	.55 .67	.40 .48	38 41	.. .75	.50 .60	50 25	.. .83	.55 .78	51 7
Company 5 Pennsylvania	.. .62	.. .62	.. 0	.72 .85	.72 .85	.. 0	1.07 1.17	1.07 1.17	.. 0	.. ..	.. ..	.. ..	.. ..	.. ..	.. ..	.. ..	.. ..	.. ..
Company 6 Ohio	.50 .65	.. .48	5 37	.62 .78	.. .60	4 29	.80 1.10	.82 1.09	-3 1	.40 .49	.. .52	-24 -7	.48 .60	.. .65	-26 -8	.68 .88	.65 .88	4 0
Company 7 Ohio	.62 .78	.45 .60	40 31	.. .85	.54 .72	59 19	.. 1.12	.68 .92	64 21	.50 .64	.45 .60	12 7	.. .66	.54 .72	23 -8	.. .97	.68 .92	42 5
Company 8 Indiana	.. .60	.. ..	.. ..	.. .70	.. ..	.. ..	.. 1.08	.. ..	.. ..	.. .45	.. .45	.. 0	.. .60	.50 .60	20 0	.. .88	.78 .92	13 -5
Company 9 West Virginia	.62 .68	.46 .69	35 -2	.75 .85	.52 .88	44 -3	1.01 1.13	.72 1.15	41 -2	.. ..	.46 .69	.. ..	.. ..	.52 .88	.. ..	.. ..	.72 1.15	.. ..
Company 10 South Atlantic	.58	.55	5	.81	.61	34	1.10	.83	32	.44	.47	-7	.62	.67	-7	.77	.83	-7
Electrical Machinery and Equipment																		
Company 11 Middle Atlantic	\$.59	..	..	\$.78	..	..	\$.98	..	..	\$.49	\$.50	-2	\$.66	\$.65	1	\$.86	\$.84	4
Company 12 Middle Atlantic	.58 .75	.. ..	.. ..	.82	\$.72	14	1.02	\$.92	11	.58 .75	.. ..	.. ..	.. ..	.72	.. ..	1.02	.92	11
Company 13 Middle Atlantic	.40 .63	.. ..	.. ..	.. .80	.64 .81	25 -1	.. 1.04	.. .73	.. 44	.40 .46	.38 .49	7 -6	.. .66	.49 .64	36 5	.. .96	.. .73	.. 33

Where one rate appears it is the single or "standard" rate paid; where two rates are shown they are the maximum and minimum of a range without a "standard." Percentage differentials are given (1) between single or standard rates, (2) between minimum rates and between maximum rates where there is a range for both classes, and (3) between the single or standard rate and both the minimum and the maximum where there is a single rate for one class and a range for the other.

<sup>b</sup> Location is by state, except in a few cases where it seemed desirable to use census regions to avoid possible identification of the company.

## APPENDIX A (Continued)

Company Code and Location <sup>b</sup>	Differential in Hourly Rates of Common Labor Jobs Over or Under (-) Junior Office Jobs <sup>a</sup> for—																	
	Male Employees									Female Employees								
	January, 1939			October, 1942			January, 1947			January, 1939			October, 1942			January, 1947		
	Common Labor Rate	Junior Office Rate	Percentage Differential	Common Labor Rate	Junior Office Rate	Percentage Differential	Common Labor Rate	Junior Office Rate	Percentage Differential	Common Labor Rate	Junior Office Rate	Percentage Differential	Common Labor Rate	Junior Office Rate	Percentage Differential	Common Labor Rate	Junior Office Rate	Percentage Differential
Food Products																		
Company 14 New York	\$.70	\$.43	62	\$.81	\$.55	46	\$1.06	\$.83	28	\$.49	..	..	\$.60	..	..	\$.90	..	..
Company 15 New York	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	.80	31	..	..	..	..	..	..	\$.80	..	4
	.58	.40	45	.73	.45	62	1.05	.90	17	.40	\$.40	0	.51	\$.45	13	.83	.90	-8
Company 16 New York	..	.59	18	..	.66	22	..	.76	39	..	.59	-28	..	.66	-10	..	.73	23
	.70	.79	-12	.81	.96	-16	1.06	1.01	5	.43	.77	-44	.60	.86	-30	.90	.98	-8
Company 17 New York	.55	.40	39	.60	.50	21	..	.82	15	.41	.40	3	.43	.50	-13	.71	.82	14
	.65	.56	16	.70	.89	-21	.95	1.06	-10	.46	.56	-18	.50	.89	-44	.80	1.06	-24
Company 18 Iowa	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	.38	28	..	.52	14	..	.66	42
	.62	..	..	.76	..	..	1.06	..	..	.48	.49	-2	.59	.72	-18	.94	.86	9
Company 19 California	.72	.68	6	.92	.80	16	1.24	1.19	4	.72	.62	15	.92	.74	25	1.24	.98	26
Company 20 California	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	.43	-2	..	..	..	..	.86	2
	.52	..	..	.73	..	..	1.04	..	..	.42	.46	-8	.60	.64	-6	.88	.89	-1
Machinery (Including Automobiles)																		
Company 21 New York	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
	\$.62	\$.45	39	\$.66	\$.50	32	\$.92	\$.65	41	..	..	..	..	\$.52	..	..	\$.70	..
	..	..	..	..	..	..	1.02	.82	24	..	\$.45	..	..	..	..	..	.98	..
Company 22 Michigan	.75	..	..	.89	..	..	1.08	.86	24	\$.75	..	..	\$.89	..	..	\$1.08	.86	24
Company 23 Illinois	..	.35	82	..	.55	36	..	.70	29	..	.35	..	..	.55	..	..	.70	29
	.63	.52	21	.75	.64	17	.90	.80	12	..	.52	..	..	.64	..	.90	.80	12
Company 24 Illinois	.62	..	..	.77	.50	54	.95	.75	27	..	..	..	..	.50	..	..	.75	..
	.67	..	..	.82	.75	9	1.00	.98	2	..	..	..	..	.75	..	..	.98	..
Company 25 Wisconsin	..	..	..	..	.38	97	..	.49	88	..	..	..	..	.38	63	..	.49	60
	.60	..	..	.74	.52	43	.92	.81	14	..	..	..	.61	.52	18	.79	.81	-2
Metal Products																		
Company 26A New York	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
	\$.50	..	..	\$.68	..	..	\$.92	..	..	\$.38	\$.47	-19	\$.55	\$.65	-16	\$.78	1.12	-16
	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Company 27 New Jersey	.40	\$.44	-9	.60	..	..	.97	..	..	..	.34	..	..	.47	..	..	.71	..
	.60	.84	-29	.85	..	..	1.21	..	..	..	.46	..	..	.69	..	..	.92	..
Company 28 New Jersey	..	..	..	.70	..	..	.92	\$.72	24	..	..	..	.70	..	..	.90	.72	24
	.50	..	..	.75	..	..	.92	.88	9	.50	..	..	.75	..	..	.95	.88	9

<sup>a</sup> See first page of table.<sup>b</sup> See first page of table.

## APPENDIX A (Continued)

Company Code and Location <sup>b</sup>	Differential in Hourly Rates of Common Labor Jobs Over or Under (-) Junior Office Jobs <sup>a</sup> for—																	
	Male Employees									Female Employees								
	January, 1939			October, 1942			January, 1947			January, 1939			October, 1942			January, 1947		
	Common Labor Rate	Junior Office Rate	Per- centage Differ- ential	Common Labor Rate	Junior Office Rate	Per- centage Differ- ential	Common Labor Rate	Junior Office Rate	Per- centage Differ- ential	Common Labor Rate	Junior Office Rate	Per- centage Differ- ential	Common Labor Rate	Junior Office Rate	Per- centage Differ- ential	Common Labor Rate	Junior Office Rate	Per- centage Differ- ential
Metal Products (Continued)																		
Company 29 Michigan	.. \$.77	..	..	.. \$.97	\$.46 .72	110 34	.. \$1.23	\$.75 .94	64 31	..	..	..	..	\$.46 .72	..	..	\$.75 .94	..
Company 30 Indiana	.50	..	..	.68	.46	46	.90	..	..	..	\$.35	..	\$.54	.46	17	\$.80	.69	16
Company 268 Illinois	.. .55	..	..	.. .80	..	..	.. .98	..	..	\$.40	.49	-19	.. .66	.. .55	19	.. .88	.93 1.01	-5 -13
Company 31 Illinois	.50 .70	..	..	.65 .89	.57 .60	13 48	.94 1.10	.. .80	18 38	.46 .61	.43 .53	8 14	.54 .66	.48 .57	12 15	.86 .98	.75 .87	15 13
Company 32 Illinois	.. .70	..	..	.68 .85	..	..	.84 1.01	..	..	..	.35 .48	..	..	.50 .58	..	..	.68 .84	..
Company 260 California	.. .62	..	..	.80 .82	..	..	1.01 1.04	..	..	.. .52	.. .68	.. -22	.70 .72	.. .77	-9 -6	.94 .96	.. 1.10	-15 -12
Paper Products																		
Company 33 New Jersey	.. \$.54	\$.38 .45	44 20	.. \$.64	\$.40 .50	60 28	.. \$.85	\$.50 .62	70 36	.. \$.45	\$.38 .45	20 0	.. \$.53	\$.40 .50	32 6	.. \$.73	\$.50 .62	46 17
Company 34 Ontario	.56	.62	-9	.56	.80	-30	.76	.80	-5	..	.37	..	..	.44	..	..	.62	..
Company 35 Ontario	.54	.54	0	.56	.66	-15	.76	.74	3	..	.46	..	..	.55	..	..	.62	..
Petroleum Refining																		
Company 36 Middle Atlantic	.. \$.81	\$.63 .89	29 -9	.. \$1.00	\$.69 .98	45 2	.. \$1.18	\$.81 1.16	45 2	..	\$.63 .89	..	..	\$.69 .98	..	..	\$.81 1.16	..
Company 37 Middle Atlantic	.. .80	.49 .66	64 21	.. 1.00	.58 .76	74 32	.. 1.19	.64 .98	87 21	..	.49 .66	..	..	.58 .76	..	..	.64 .98	..
Company 38 East North Central	.. .76	..	..	.. .96	.54 .64	78 51	.. 1.14	.64 .75	79 51	.. \$.76	..	..	.. \$.85	.54 .64	58 34	.. \$1.14	.64 .75	79 51
Company 39 East North Central	.. .70	.38 .58	87 21	.. .90	.55 .75	64 20	.. 1.13	.61 .89	86 27	..	.38 .58	..	..	.55 .75	..	..	.61 .89	..
Company 40 Pacific	.. .70	.63 .69	12 3	.. .90	.69 .85	31 6	.. 1.08	.. 1.01	.. 6	.. .70	.63 .69	12 2	.. .90	.69 .85	31 6	.. 1.08	.. 1.01	.. 6

<sup>a</sup> See first page of table.<sup>b</sup> See first page of table.

## APPENDIX A (Continued)

Company Code and Location <sup>b</sup>	Differential in Hourly Rates of Common Labor Jobs Over or Under (-) Junior Office Jobs <sup>a</sup> for—																	
	Male Employees									Female Employees								
	January, 1939			October, 1942			January, 1947			January, 1939			October, 1942			January, 1947		
	Common Labor Rate	Junior Office Rate	Per- centage Differ- ential	Common Labor Rate	Junior Office Rate	Per- centage Differ- ential	Common Labor Rate	Junior Office Rate	Per- centage Differ- ential	Common Labor Rate	Junior Office Rate	Per- centage Differ- ential	Common Labor Rate	Junior Office Rate	Per- centage Differ- ential	Common Labor Rate	Junior Office Rate	Per- centage Differ- ential
Rubber Products																		
Company 41 Ohio	\$.81	..	..	\$.86	\$1.00	-14	\$1.14	\$1.20	-5	\$.69	..	..	\$.74	\$.90	-18	\$.96	\$1.20	-20
Company 42 Ohio	.. .78	..	..	.. .86	..	..	.. 1.12	..	..	.. .65	\$.40 .52	61 25	.. .73	.52 .69	41 6	.. .98	.70 .88	40 12
Miscellaneous																		
Company 43 Massachusetts	.. \$.52	..	..	.. \$.63	..	..	.. \$.77	..	..	.. \$.42	.. \$.40	.. 4	.. \$.50	.. \$.48	.. 5	.. \$.70	.56 \$.71	24 -2
Company 44 Pennsylvania	.56	\$.62	-9	.66	\$.62	6	.85	\$.86	-1	..	.62	..	..	.62	..	..	.86	..
Company 45 North Carolina	.. .46	.. .45	.. 2	.. .63	.. .70	.. -10	.. .92	.75 1.18	23 -22	.. .40	.. .45	.. -11	.. .50	.. .70	.. -29	.. .82	.75 1.18	9 -30
Company 46 California	.. .65	.75 .94	-13 -31	.. .98	.83 1.04	18 -6	.. 1.26	1.04 1.30	21 -3	.. .65	.62 .69	4 -6	.. .98	.69 .76	42 29	.. 1.26	.84 .89	50 41

<sup>a</sup> See first page of table.<sup>b</sup> See first page of table.