



# WILEY

---

Review

Author(s): A. L. Bowley

Review by: A. L. Bowley

Source: *The Economic Journal*, Vol. 30, No. 117 (Mar., 1920), pp. 106-107

Published by: Wiley on behalf of the Royal Economic Society

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2223204>

Accessed: 27-06-2016 02:56 UTC

---

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at

<http://about.jstor.org/terms>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).



*Royal Economic Society, Wiley* are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to  
*The Economic Journal*

only to provide the capital at less than the commercial rate, but also to ensure that houses shall be provided on comprehensive and well-devised schemes and be of a satisfactory character. The author expresses great admiration for the pre-war housing policy of England, but she would hardly be contented with similar numerical results in the ambitious programme she proposes.

A. L. BOWLEY

*The Equipment of the Workers.* (London : G. Allen and Unwin. Pp. 334. 6s. net.)

THE sub-title of this work is "An Enquiry into the Adequacy of the Adult Manual Workers for the Discharge of their Responsibilities as Heads of Households, Producers and Citizens," the inquiry being undertaken by the St. Philip's (Y.M.C.A.) Settlement Education and Economics Research Society of Sheffield, to which city as a whole it relates. The compilation was the work of a number of people and the editors prefer to remain undistinguished. The method of the inquiry was to select a number of workmen and workwomen and to find out by personal visits and conversation what was their degree of education and culture, what their outlook on or interest in social or political questions, what their tastes and how they occupied their leisure, what their attitude to religious organisations. Four-fifths of the book is devoted to a selection of more or less detailed accounts of the individuals examined, partly with the intention of giving a composite view of the classes whose relative numbers form the statistical basis of the report. These accounts are human, and in some cases amusing, but it is doubtful whether they add much to one's knowledge of working-class life or outlook; they are coloured by the enthusiastic personalities of the investigators, who report on rather ordinary people thus : "She strikes me as being awakened to the seriousness and splendour of life," "Green, spotty face and what seemed like a green, spotty soul." However, the details serve to explain the principles on which the classification was made.

408 men and 408 women were the subject of investigation; they were so grouped as to age (under 25, 25-55, over 55 years) and house-room (three, four, five or more rooms) and sex that in each group they were about 1 in 250 of the adult working class of Sheffield. These 816 persons were selected, not as acquaintances of the investigators or attendants at W.E.A. or other classes, but "by some neutral, accidental or random method of approach"; it appears that the process of selection followed

was likely to give a random sample, though the description on page 39 is not sufficiently detailed to make this certain.

When the questionnaires of these 816 persons were received they were classified as "well-equipped," "inadequately equipped," or "mal-equipped." In Class I. were placed "those who, without any question, were far above the average in equipment," the effective persons in labour, social or religious movements, and those who in obscurity were interested in books or music, or who had intelligent knowledge of affairs outside their immediate circle. In Class III. were placed all "who without question are far below the average in character or intelligence—or, as we usually found the case, in both." They are mainly unskilled or casuals; they have many vices and no virtues discoverable by the investigators. Classes I. and III. have positive characteristics, Class II. negative. They follow a leader, but initiate nothing; they are free from vice, respectable and self-supporting; they are just ordinary people, and the enthusiasts who undertook the inquiry despair of waking them from what they regard as their sleep.

The whole value of the inquiry from the statistical point of view depends on the adequacy of this classification. It comes to be this: certain numbers of persons were found to have the positive quantities defined as above, and more clearly delimited from the verbal descriptions already described. Is it possible, in the great majority of cases, to decide clearly whether a man or woman has the attributes of Class I. or Class III.? It appears that the number of marginal cases is relatively small, and if we can get a clear understanding of the attributes we can depend on the results (subject to the hazard of sampling) within a small but undefined proportion. The errors due to sampling are treated adequately, and sub-classification by age or house-room is not attempted because of the smallness of the numbers. The results are:—

	Men.	Women.
Well-equipped ... ..	$23\frac{1}{2} \pm 2$ per cent.	$22\frac{1}{2} \pm 2$ per cent.
Inadequately equipped	$68\frac{1}{2} \pm 2$ „	$71 \pm 2$ „
Mal-equipped ... ..	$8 \pm 1\frac{1}{2}$ „	$6 \pm 1\frac{1}{2}$ „

where  $\pm 2$ , etc., are the standard deviations from pure sampling. The authors use twice the standard deviation as the measure of roughness, and judiciously quote the results as "some two-thirds" inadequately equipped.

That nearly one-quarter of the population should be in the first class and less than one-twelfth in the third is perhaps a more favourable result than would have been anticipated.

A. L. BOWLEY