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## Data sources and methods

While throughout this paper, we have talked about wage rates, it is good to note that the numbers used here are more accurately referred to as daily earnings. Both in the Japanese and in the Indian textile industries, most workers were paid piece rates, although this depended on the job type. Higher-paid workers, most of them male, more often received a fixed time rate, especially when they were in supervisory positions, but even for them employers usually had incentives to pay piece rates, in order to make sure overseers pushed their inferiors to work harder. In some cases, foremen or "jobbers" as they were often called in the Indian case, also performed manual labour themselves while supervising. Having said this, most of our source material itself either recorded daily (or monthly) earnings, or, for comparative purposes, calculated time wages from the piece rates and hours/days worked. This is why we also chose to convert all information into (average) daily earnings per occupational group, and sometimes, necessarily, per sector. Below, we will extensively justify how and why we did this with the source material we had at our disposal.

## a) Textile mill workers wages

## Japan

For Japan, especially in the earlier period, we were only able to locate highly aggregate data from Ohkawa e.a., Long Term Economic Statistics (LTES), Vol. 8 (1967). The series provides average daily earnings in yens separated by gender for the period 1899-1939, for the industrial sector as a whole and for the cotton textile sector. Unfortunately, these daily earnings per year were national averages, and while there were some data available for the cities of Tokyo and Osaka, we decided not to use these, as these only comprised a period of six years and we preferred to have a longitudinal consistent series. As Table A1 below shows, there were also data available for handloom weaving up until WWI, to which we refer in the text once. However, as our focus is on the mechanized textile mills, and not on the rural handloom industry, we have not used these earnings to make the comparison with agricultural day wages. What does appear from those years in which the textile mill earnings and those for handweaving overlap (1899-1914), is that adult women could earn about the same on a daily basis with their side-employment in handweaving as young girls earned fulltime in the textile mills, underlining our point that the opportunity cost of sending married women to the mills was simply too high, taking into account all of the other economic and household duties they performed on the family farms.

The Indian data was unfortunately more haphazard, in the sense that we had to combine different sources to come to a consistent series. As Mukerji has also argued, there is different source material available for the period before and after 1921. ${ }^{1}$ Like he and Morris, for the period 1882-1921 we use the consistent series of the Manockjee Petit Cotton Mills in Bombay, which lists average monthly earnings for 29 different occupations for a consecutive period of forty years. Of course, it is debatable to what extent one single mill serves as a representant of all Bombay mills, but it is the only source we have. These authors have used the same series have not always done so for the same stretch of time, and, to our knowledge, not to distinguish gender differences in the early Indian textile industry. ${ }^{2}$

Since the Manockjee data series does not provide differentiated figures for men and women, for each year we have taken the arithmetic mean of wages for reelers and winders as an indication for female wages, and compared this with the average wages of all other workers (ranging from doffers to jobbers) to establish the female-male wage ratio. We use the simple mean because we have no information on the number of workers in each category, which means we could not weight the series appropriately.

Another issue is that the data source provide monthly earnings. While Mukerji has stated that he derives at daily earnings by dividing the monthly pay by 26 days (all days except Sundays), we have chosen to use 25 instead, to account for some holidays. The 1925 report on Wages and Prices states that while millowners' granting of holidays other than Sundays varied widely within a range of 4 to 16 days per year, ${ }^{3}$ we have chosen to take some days into account. Obviously, as we applied these to both the monthly wages for men and women, this has no effect whatsoever on the calculated gender ratios.

As Mukerji, we also make use of the in-depth inquiries into the labour conditions of Indian mill workers that have been taken for the years 1923, 1926, 1933, and 1937. ${ }^{4}$ These reports actually do differentiate between male and female workers, as well as the number of workers per occupation, so we were able to take actual weighted averages of earnings for men and women in the textile industries for these four years. Unlike Mukerji, we do not impute earnings for intermediate years, because we cannot know whether wages in reeling and winding followed general wage trends (and from the varying gender ratios in the years up to 1921, we suspect this not to have been the case), so this would not add value to our analysis, as such an assumption would artificially stabilize gender ratios.

[^0]Japan
For the agricultural wages, we use the same, nationally aggregated, data from the LTES as we have for textile earnings. These are the wages for unskilled farm labour, and the series is almost complete except for a few missing data points in the 1880s and early 1890s. As can be deducted from our rural-urban wage analysis, nominal earnings for adult men and women in unskilled agricultural labour were on par with earnings in the urban textile industry in the period of large demand in the industry, and after WWI rural wages were even higher. For men, nominal industrial wages became more attractive than rural wages in the late 1920s, while for adult women, they never reached parity again before the end of our period.

## India

The agricultural wages for India pertain to the Konkan region (Ratnigiri district), from which the majority of textile workers for the Bombay mills were recruited. As stated in the text, wage developments in Konkan diverged somewhat from those reconstructed by Roy, in the sense that a modest rise was visible here, potentially because the large-scale male migration to the city relieved some of the pressure on the overcrowded agricultural labour market. Yamin (1991) suggests that wages in Ratnagiri were likely to have been at artificially low levels due to the constraints imposed by the oppressive labour tenure system. ${ }^{5}$ This, in conjunction with low prevalence of wage labour in the region, suggests that the modestly increasing wages were likely to be representative of market wage rates for free labour alone.

For male agricultural wages we use the wage series constructed by Mazumdar which refer to the daily wages for the category of field labour and have made no further changes to his series. ${ }^{6}$ The data series is from 1900 to 1936 with a few missing data points in 1920s and 1930s. The data show that urban wages for men were consistently higher throughout period. Until WWI, rural wages were two to two and half times lower than the urban wages. Thereafter, urban wages increased steadily to nearly three and half times higher than the rural wages in 1930s.

[^1]Table A1 - Nominal day wages in Japanese textiles (in yens), men, women, gender wage ratios, 1885-1939

| Year | \% of female workers in the Japanese textile factories | Textiles, average Japan, entire industry |  |  | Weaving, Japan, handloom production |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | men | women | f/m wage ratio | men | women | $f / m$ wage ratio |
| 1885 |  |  |  |  | 0.13 | 0.08 | 0.60 |
| 1886 |  |  |  |  | 0.12 | 0.08 | 0.63 |
| 1887 |  |  |  |  | 0.13 | 0.07 | 0.58 |
| 1888 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1889 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1890 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1891 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1892 |  |  |  |  | 0.12 | 0.08 | 0.68 |
| 1893 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1894 |  |  |  |  | 0.17 | 0.11 | 0.66 |
| 1895 |  |  |  |  | 0.18 | 0.12 | 0.63 |
| 1896 |  |  |  |  | 0.19 | 0.13 | 0.68 |
| 1897 |  |  |  |  | 0.23 | 0.15 | 0.67 |
| 1898 |  |  |  |  | 0.30 | 0.19 | 0.62 |
| 1899 | 81 | 0.30 | 0.17 | 0.57 | 0.41 | 0.24 | 0.59 |
| 1900 | 87 | 0.29 | 0.18 | 0.62 | 0.33 | 0.20 | 0.60 |
| 1901 | 87 | 0.29 | 0.18 | 0.62 | 0.29 | 0.19 | 0.66 |
| 1902 | 86 | 0.29 | 0.18 | 0.62 | 0.33 | 0.20 | 0.60 |
| 1903 | 86 | 0.29 | 0.18 | 0.62 | 0.34 | 0.19 | 0.56 |
| 1904 | 88 | 0.30 | 0.18 | 0.60 | 0.35 | 0.17 | 0.49 |
| 1905 | 88 | 0.31 | 0.18 | 0.58 | 0.34 | 0.18 | 0.53 |
| 1906 | 88 | 0.33 | 0.19 | 0.58 | 0.42 | 0.21 | 0.50 |
| 1907 | 88 | 0.36 | 0.21 | 0.58 | 0.42 | 0.24 | 0.57 |
| 1908 | 88 | 0.41 | 0.24 | 0.59 | 0.44 | 0.24 | 0.55 |
| 1909 | 88 | 0.40 | 0.25 | 0.63 | 0.44 | 0.26 | 0.59 |
| 1910 | 88 | 0.40 | 0.25 | 0.63 | 0.49 | 0.27 | 0.55 |
| 1911 | 91 | 0.42 | 0.26 | 0.62 | 0.43 | 0.25 | 0.58 |
| 1912 | 91 | 0.44 | 0.26 | 0.59 | 0.43 | 0.27 | 0.63 |
| 1913 | 91 | 0.46 | 0.28 | 0.61 | 0.45 | 0.28 | 0.62 |
| 1914 | 89 | 0.46 | 0.27 | 0.59 | 0.46 | 0.29 | 0.63 |
| 1915 | 89 | 0.46 | 0.26 | 0.57 |  |  |  |
| 1916 | 89 | 0.48 | 0.28 | 0.58 |  |  |  |
| 1917 | 88 | 0.57 | 0.34 | 0.60 |  |  |  |
| 1918 | 84 | 0.78 | 0.49 | 0.63 |  |  |  |
| 1919 | 84 | 1.30 | 0.84 | 0.65 |  |  |  |
| 1920 | 85 | 1.34 | 0.85 | 0.63 |  |  |  |
| 1921 | 76 | 1.59 | 0.96 | 0.60 |  |  |  |
| 1922 | 82 | 1.48 | 0.92 | 0.62 |  |  |  |


| $\mathbf{1 9 2 3}$ | 84 | 1.44 | 0.86 | 0.60 |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\mathbf{1 9 2 4}$ | 82 | 1.47 | 0.86 | 0.59 |  |  |  |
| $\mathbf{1 9 2 5}$ | 83 | 1.47 | 0.87 | 0.59 |  |  |  |
| $\mathbf{1 9 2 6}$ | 82 | 1.49 | 0.88 | 0.59 |  |  |  |
| $\mathbf{1 9 2 7}$ | 82 | 1.48 | 0.84 | 0.57 |  |  |  |
| $\mathbf{1 9 2 8}$ | 82 | 1.48 | 0.82 | 0.55 |  |  |  |
| $\mathbf{1 9 2 9}$ | 79 | 1.43 | 0.76 | 0.53 |  |  |  |
| $\mathbf{1 9 3 0}$ | 81 | 1.35 | 0.66 | 0.49 |  |  |  |
| $\mathbf{1 9 3 1}$ | 81 | 1.29 | 0.59 | 0.46 |  |  |  |
| $\mathbf{1 9 3 2}$ | 81 | 1.27 | 0.55 | 0.43 |  |  |  |
| $\mathbf{1 9 3 3}$ | 81 | 1.25 | 0.55 | 0.44 |  |  |  |
| $\mathbf{1 9 3 4}$ | 82 | 1.22 | 0.56 | 0.46 |  |  |  |
| $\mathbf{1 9 3 5}$ | 82 | 1.22 | 0.57 | 0.47 |  |  |  |
| $\mathbf{1 9 3 6}$ | 79 | 1.19 | 0.58 | 0.49 |  |  |  |
| $\mathbf{1 9 3 7}$ | 79 | 1.23 | 0.62 | 0.50 |  |  |  |
| $\mathbf{1 9 3 8}$ | 79 | 1.28 | 0.65 | 0.51 |  |  |  |
| $\mathbf{1 9 3 9}$ | 79 | 1.43 | 0.70 | 0.49 |  |  |  |

Sources: LTES, 8 (1967) p. 247, Table 27. For weaving: GIPH Website UDavis, data file compiled by David Jacks 2006.

Figures A1a and A1b - Correlations between share of women in industry and gender wage ratio (1.0=total equality), all manufacturing (1a) and textile industry (1b), Japan, 1899-1939


Table A2 - Female-male wage ratios in some occupations in the Bombay textile mills, 1923, 1926, 1933 and 1937 ( 1.0 = wage parity)

| 1923 | Women |  | Men |  | wage ratio $\mathrm{f} / \mathrm{m}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | no. of workers | rupees/day | no. of workers | rupees/day |  |
| Coolie (mixing and waste room) | 67 | 0.74 | 167 | 1.05 | 0.70 |
| Gaiter (ring spinning) | 280 | 1.02 | 644 | 1.03 | 0.99 |
| Reeler, August 1923 | 9,665 | 0.78 | 1,273 | 0.77 | 1.01 |
| Side piecer, August 1923 | 1,058 | 0.95 | 14,267 | 1.02 | 0.93 |
| Sweeper | 1,953 | 0.54 | 216 | 0.73 | 0.74 |
| Tarwalla or follower (ring spinning) | 939 | 0.79 | 4,205 | 0.90 | 0.88 |
| Total | 14,276 |  | 20,892 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Women |  | Men |  |  |
| 1926 | no. of workers | rupees/day | no. of workers | rupees/day | wage ratio $\mathrm{f} / \mathrm{m}$ |
| Doffer | 2,452 | 0.71 | 1,931 | 0.76 | 0.93 |
| Colour winder | unknown | 0.78 | unknown | 1.06 | 0.74 |
| Grey winder | unknown | 0.72 | unknown | 0.75 | 0.96 |
| Pirn winder | unknown | 0.85 | unknown | 1.05 | 0.81 |
| Single side sider | 636 | 0.95 | 5,244 | 1.02 | 0.93 |
| Total | 3,088 |  | 7,175 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Women |  | Men |  |  |
| 1933 | no. of workers | rupees/day | no. of workers | rupees/day | wage ratio $\mathrm{f} / \mathrm{m}$ |
| reeler, average wage | 6,519 | 0.64 | 8 | 0.54 | 1.19 |
| reeler, December 1933 | 5,052 | 0.68 | 120 | 0.54 | 1.26 |
| single side sider | 737 | 0.82 | 8,889 | 0.85 | 0.96 |
| Winder, grey and colour | 7,143 | 0.73 | 22 | 0.68 | 1.07 |
| Winder, grey | 4,403 | 0.65 | 14 | 0.69 | 0.94 |
| Winder, colour | 2,429 | 0.84 | 8 | 0.67 | 1.25 |
| Total | 26,283 |  | 9,061 |  |  |


| 1937 | Women |  | Men |  | wage ratio $\mathrm{f} / \mathrm{m}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | no. of workers | rupees/day | no. of workers | rupees/day |  |
| Doffer | 1,090 | 0.64 | 6,950 | 0.66 | 0.97 |
| Double side sider | 195 | 1.16 | 4,468 | 1.11 | 1.05 |
| Drawing tenter | unknown | 0.99 | 1,035 | 0.99 | 1.00 |
| Single side sider | 296 | 0.83 | 4,701 | 0.86 | 0.97 |
| Winder | 14,725 | 0.68 | 281 | 0.96 | 0.71 |
| Total | 16,306 |  | 17,435 |  |  |

[^2]Table A3 - Number of Gainful Workers by Sex and Industry (Reclassification of Census Population), Japan, 1920-1940


Sources: LTES, 2(1988), Table 7, 202-203
Notes: $1920^{*}$ : Includes only Japanese population; $1920^{+}$refers to the Japanese, persons from colonial territories, and foreigners; $1930^{+}$same as $1920^{+} ; 1940$ includes Japanese and persons from colonial territories.

Table A4 Main Female Occupations, Ratnagiri 1881-1921 (Total numbers of women employed in each occupation, and sex ratio of male/female workers in each occupation

|  | $\mathbf{1 8 8 1}$ |  | $\mathbf{1 9 9 1}$ |  | $\mathbf{1 9 1 1}$ |  | $\mathbf{1 9 2 1}$ |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Occupation | Workers | SR | Workers | SR | Workers | SR | Worker | SR |
| Cultivators | $1,34,587$ | 136 | 246724 | 94 | $2,04,629$ | 107 | 62,369 | 107 |
| Field labourers* | 32,805 | 70 | 19305 | 65 | 49515 | 46 | 3824 | 44 |
| General Labourers | 27,140 | 53 | 7272 | 61 | 2394 | 72 | 769 | ND |
| Fisherman/Sellers | 7,584 | 105 | 11417 | 97 | 8228 | 122 | 2010 | 428 |
| Domestic Servants | 733 | 410 | 1307 | 285 | 2619 | 188 | 3105 | 59 |
| Sheep/Cattle <br> herds** | 1,063 | 814 | 1002 | 751 | 1729 | 751 |  |  |
| Beggars*** | 5,076 | 135 | 3554 | 168 | 2777 | 241 | 1954 | 65 |
| Cotton spinner | 1,899 | 11 | 108 | 21 |  |  | 1004 | 40 |
| Cotton weaver | 123 | 342 | 166 | 620 | 2322 | 61 | 741 | 275 |
| Showmaker | 631 | 321 | 955 | 208 | 413 | 404 | 445 | 364 |
| Potter | 727 | 193 | 758 | 116 | 1136 | 91 | 769 | 111 |
| Oil maker/sellers | 704 | 300 | 827 | 222 | 580 | 250 | 345 | 260 |
| Basket weavers | 378 | 59 | 1002 | 70 | 925 | 49 | 405 | 75 |
| Porter | 156 | 69 | 506 | 105 | 268 | 210 | 579 | 33 |
| Total female <br> population | $5,24,037$ |  | 620402 |  | $6,50,256$ |  | 628013 |  |

Notes: * includes farm servants; ** includes breeders and sellers; *** includes paupers, prostitutes, and religious beggars
Source: Yamin (1991), Table 2.6, 305


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ Mukerji (1959)
    ${ }^{2}$ Morris (1965), Appendix III, 219-225. Morris also provides a useful discussion of the data advising a heavy note of caution on its use. The Mukerji series is for the period 1900 to 1951 and the Morris series extends from 1875 to 1947.
    ${ }^{3}$ BLO (1925), pp. 23-24.
    ${ }^{4}$ Findlay Shirras. G., Report on an Enquiry into the Wages and Hours of Labour in Cotton Mill Industry, Labour Office, Government of Bombay, 1923; Sedgwick L. J., Report on an Enquiry into the Wages and Hours of Labour in Cotton Mill Industry, Labour Office, Government of Bombay, Labour Office, Government of Bombay, 1925; Bombay Labour Office, Report on an Enquiry into the Wages and Hours of Labour in Cotton Mill Industry, Government of Bombay, 1926; BLO, Wage and Unemployment in the Bombay Textile Industry, Labour Office, Government of Bombay, 1934; 5. The Report of the Textile Labour Enquiry Committee, Government of Bombay, 1937)

[^1]:    ${ }^{5}$ Yamin (1991), 47. For more details on the khoti tenural system refer to the discussion on pages 8-9 of this paper.
    ${ }^{6}$ Mazumdar (1973), Appendix, pp. 495-496.

[^2]:    Sources: BLO, Report on an Enquiry into Wages and hours of labour in the cotton mill industry, 1925, 1926; General Wage Census Part 1 Perennial Factories 3rd Report - May 1934; BLO, Wages and Unemployment in the Bombay Cotton Textile Industry; BLO, Report of the Textile Labour Inquiry Committee 1937-1938 (1938).

