d. Wages in Domestic Services

Another depository of unskilled labor is domestic services. Almost all (99.6%) of those who were employed in this industry in May 1969 were wage and salary workers.[11] There was no wage legislation setting any floor to the wages of domestic helpers until after the imposition of martial law in 1972.[12] Their conditions of employment range from with or without (free) board and lodging, with or without clothing provisions, and with or without cash allowance. These terms of employment are determined between the employer and the employee on an individual basis and there are no rules of the game. As a result, any data on the cash earnings of domestic help without additional information on such other forms of remuneration as board and lodging are likely to be misleading. One is ndt able to interpret the level of cash earnings in this industry much less compare it with those of other industries or occupations. However, the data we have might give us some insights on the level of wages in this industry if qualified to the extent that we know the industry. It is the common set-up for domestic help to get free board and lodging. Hence, the data on cash earnings may be interpreted as the cash component of total remuneration in addition to board and lodging. Using the minimum wage law (as amended by R.A. 4180 in 1965) provision on board and lodging allowances as

---

[11] BCSSH, Labor Force May 1969, Table 17, p. 18.

[12] Presidential Decree No. 99 was issued on January 15, 1973 setting minimum compensation for household and domestic helpers by municipality.

standard, we can add their total amount as a mark-up to the cash earnings data to get an estimate of the wages of domestic helpers. According to this law, the valuation of board is not to exceed ₱.70 while that of lodging is not to exceed ₱.80 in the case of non-agricultural employees; we shall use the maximum limits which total ₱1.50 as our mark-up. Unfortunately, we shall use only this one mark-up regardless of region which would underestimate the wages of domestic helpers in regions with higher cost of living and vice-versa for the wages of those in regions with lower cost-of-living.

The range of cash earnings among domestic helpers was from ₱.67 to ₱2.85 (Table 7). When board and lodging are assumed to be components of total remuneration and, hence, added to the cash earnings in Table 7, the resulting wages ranged from ₱2.17 to ₱4.35. The sex wage differential is not statistically significant but the regional wage differential together with the "sex-region interaction" wage differential are: Males in Western Visayas got the highest wage followed by males in Greater Manila and females in Southern Luzon. The lowest wages, corresponding to cash earnings of less than a peso, were earned by males in Ilocos-Mountain Province, Northern Mindanao and Cagayan Valley, and females in the Visayan regions and Northern Mindanao. The wage differential based on the interaction between region and sex which came out to be statistically significant may be explained by a combination of factors such as the size of and sex distribution of the unskilled or the supply of domestic help by region, the cost of living, (household) income of employers and degree of urbanization. It is difficult to speculate on the causes of the wage differential for

TABLE 7

WAGES OF DOMESTIC HELPERS IN
DOMESTIC SERVICES BY REGION AND BY SEX, MAY 1969*

Region \ Sex	Cash Earnings			Wages[a]		
	Male (1)	Female (2)	(1)/(2)	Male (1)	Female (2)	(1)/(2)
	(₱)	(₱)		(₱)	(₱)	
1. Greater Manila	2.41	1.63	1.48	3.91	3.13	1.25
2. Ilocos-Mountain Province	.67	1.37	.49	2.17	2.87	.76
3. Cagayan Valley & Batanes	.79	1.13	.70	2.29	2.63	.87
4. Central Luzon	2.58	1.78	1.45	4.08	3.28	1.24
5. Southern Luzon & Islands	2.08	2.40	.87	3.58	3.90	.92
6. Bicol	1.16	1.32	.88	2.66	2.82	.94
7. Western Visayas	2.85	.97	2.94	4.35	2.47	1.76
8. Eastern Visayas	1.06	.82	1.29	2.56	2.32	1.10
9. Northern Mindanao	.78	.98	.80	2.28	2.48	.92
10. Southern Mindanao & Sulu	1.32	1.30	1.02	2.82	2.80	1.01

[a] Cash earnings plus board and lodging allowances (equal to ₱1.50).

*Regression 6

different sex-region combinations in the absence of correspondingly disaggregative data. Therefore, no such attempt will be undertaken in this paper. The ratio of male to female cash earnings per region ranged from 0.5 to 3.0 (Table 7). When board and lodging allowances are added to get an approximation of their wages, this ratio's range narrowed and became 0.8 to 1.8.

Another major occupational group in domestic services is composed of launderers. The qualifications mentioned in the case of domestic helpers also apply to this group. The estimation of their cash earnings is based on that of female launderers, the females being the dominant sex in this occupation. Their daily cash earnings by region which comes out statistically significant ranged from ₱1.83 to ₱4.47 while their wages (i.e., including board and lodging allowances equal to ₱1.50) ranged from ₱3.33 to ₱5.97 (Table 8). Of the seven regions included in the estimation, the highest cash earning was in Central Luzon, then Greater Manila and Southern Luzon while the lowest was in Ilocos-Mountain Province. This group's cash earnings were higher than that of domestic helpers per region by a differential which ranged from ₱.46 to ₱2.69. The cash earnings of launderers were from 30% to 200% higher than that of domestic helpers while their wages were 16% to 82% more than that of the latter.

Among the occupational groups engaged in domestic services which are included in this study, drivers earned the highest cash earnings which ranged from ₱4.75 to ₱7.94 in seven regions (Table 9). It should be noted in the case of this group which is dominated by males that the incidence of free lodging may not be as prevalent as in the case of

TABLE 8

REGIONAL WAGES OF FEMALE DOMESTIC HELPERS AND LAUNDERERS IN DOMESTIC SERVICES, MAY 1969*

Region \ Industry	Cash Earnings				Wages[a]			
	Launderers (1)	Domestic helpers (2)	(1) (2)	(1)-(2)	Launderers (1)	Domestic helpers (2)	(1) (2)	(1)-(2)
	(₱)	(₱)		(₱)	(₱)	(₱)		(₱)
1. Greater Manila	3.19	1.63	1.96	1.56	4.69	3.13	1.50	1.56
2. Ilocos-Mountatin Province	1.83	1.37	1.34	.46	3.33	2.87	1.16	.46
3. Central Luzon	4.47	1.78	2.51	2.69	5.97	3.28	1.82	2.69
4. Southern Luzon & Islands	3.11	2.40	1.30	.71	4.61	3.90	1.18	.71
5. Western Visayas	2.10	.97	2.17	1.13	3.60	2.47	1.46	1.13
6. Eastern Visayas	2.55	.82	3.11	1.73	4.05	2.32	1.75	1.73
7. Southern Mindanao & Sulu	2.56	1.30	1.97	1.26	4.06	2.80	1.45	1.26

[a] Cash earnings plus board and lodging allowances (equal to ₱1.50).

Regression 6 and 7

TABLE 9

REGIONAL WAGES OF MALE DRIVERS IN
LAND TRANSPORT AND DOMESTIC SERVICES, MAY 1969*

Region \ Industry	Land transport (1)	Domestic Services		(1) (3)
		Cash earnings (2)	Wages[a] (3)	
	(₱)	(₱)	(₱)	
1. Greater Manila	6.10	7.24	7.94	.77
2. Central Luzon	4.64	5.78	6.48	.72
3. Southern Luzon and Islands	6.80	7.94	8.64	.79
4. Bicol	5.56	6.70	7.40	.75
5. Western Visayas	3.88	5.02	5.72	.68
6. Eastern Visayas	3.61	4.75	5.45	.66
7. Southern Mindanao and Sulu	3.78	4.92	5.62	.67

[a] Cash earnings plus board allowance of ₱.70.

*Regression 8

launderers and domestic helpers though free board is likely to be as prevalent in this group as in the others. We are assuming that the wages of drivers are equal to their cash earnings plus free board to be valued as ₱.70 per day.[13] With this adjustment, their wages in the seven regions included in the estimation (with region coming out as statistically significant) ranged from ₱5.45 to ₱8.64 (Table 9). Drivers' wages were 9% to 87% higher than that of launderers per region. When the wages of drivers in domestic services are compared with that of drivers in the land transport industry by region, those of the latter came to only about 65% to 80% of the former groups' wages. However, this industrial wage differential is not statistically significant.

It is of interest to compare the wages in domestic services with that of agricultural workers to see whether there is an improvement in the income of the relatively unskilled members of the rural labor force who go to more urban areas and find employment as domestic helpers. We shall compare the regional wages of agricultural workers in palay and corn farming with that of this lowest paid occupational group in domestic services. We are assuming that (1) the cash earnings of this group of agricultural workers are equal to their wages meaning that there is no free board that goes with it and (2) the wages of domestic helpers equal cash earnings plus free board and lodging. The comparison of these two groups by region and by sex shows that the wages of domestic helpers were higher in four out of seven regions for both males and

---

[13] This is the provision in the revised minimum wage law used for the other occupational groups in domestic services.

females (Tables 5 and 7). Agricultural wages were higher only in Central Luzon and Bicol for both sexes and in Southern Luzon for males; the case of females in Southern Luzon resembles that of the other four regions. There are other qualitative factors in these two employment situations such as hours of work, nature of work, and others which need to be assessed to qualify these monetary remunerations but would not be dealt with in this paper. Bearing this in mind, one can say from the available cash earnings data that in terms of comparative monetary remunerations, those who find employment as domestic helpers tend to be better-off than agricultural workers in palay and corn farming in regions not best suited for such crops. Those who acquire higher level skills in domestic services as the launderers and drivers get even higher wages than domestic helpers and higher wages than agricultural workers in all of the seven regions. One may therefore conclude that domestic services provide an improvement over what unskilled people would get as hired agricultural workers in most regions.

e. Wages of Manual Workers

Manual laborers are near the bottom of the skill ladder in the non-agricultural sector. Most of them are wage and salary workers and dominated by males. In May, 1969, 94% of manual workers and laborers were wage and salary workers and 98% of the total were males.[14] Unlike domestic helpers, hawkers, and peddlers, they are covered by the minimum wage law. They are usually classified as unskilled and are engaged

[14] BCSSH, Labor Force May 1969, Table 18, p. 19.

in heavy manual types of work as in road, bridge and building construction and also in transportations. In the growth literature, specifically on labor surplus economies, non-agricultural workers' productivity (as represented by that of manual laborers, among others) vis-a-vis that of agricultural workers define the development potential of the excess labor supply in such economies. The excess labor in agriculture, excess in the sense that agricultural output does not decline when they move out of the sector, can be shifted to the non-agricultural sector where their productivity is positive and tapped for capital accumulation by keeping their wages at subsistence level. This means that the wages of manual laborers and agricultural workers are only enough to support subsistence and their differential attributed mainly, if not solely, to the differential cost of living in their locations. But the situation in the Philippines is more complex than this. Several factors may influence the wages of these two groups. The minimum wage law sets the level and, thereby, the wage differential between manual laborers and agricultural workers. This law uses for its first criterion in setting the minimum wage level for different types of labor their subsistence needs or the cost of living (see pp. 199). Hence, the differential in the minimum wages of agricultural and non-agricultural workers is supposed to include the differential cost of subsistence between these two groups in their respective locations. Labor unions could also affect their relative wages though this is doubtful. Manual workers (who are likely to be employed as casuals) and agricultural workers are most probably paid lower wages than the minimum prescribed by law and, therefore, if ever these two groups

become sufficiently organized, their effectiveness might be manifested more in terms of making employers pay the minimum wage rather than effecting an increase in them.

The wages of male manual workers in construction and transport industries in six regions are shown in Table 10. They ranged from ₱4.16 to ₱8.68. The wages of manual workers in construction were above the minimum wage of ₱6.00 with the exception of those in Eastern Visayas; however, regional differentials in the wages in this industry are not statistically significant unlike the case for transportation.

TABLE 10

REGIONAL WAGES OF MALE MANUAL WORKERS AND LABORERS IN CONSTRUCTION AND TRANSPORT INDUSTRIES, MAY 1969*

Region \ Industry	Road and Bridge, and building construction (1)	Services incidental to transport (2)
	(₱)	(₱)
1. Greater Manila	6.17	6.74
2. Southern Luzon and Islands	6.03	6.66
3. Bicol	6.40	8.68
4. Western Visayas	6.32	4.20
5. Eastern Visayas	5.23	4.16
6. Southern Mindanao and Sulu	7.05	5.01

*Regressions 9 and 10

In the latter, three out of the six regions, i.e., Western and Eastern Visayas, and Southern Mindanao, showed wages lower than the minimum set by law. When we compare manual workers' wages with that of agricultural workers in palay and corn farming (Table 4) by region, the latter came to about 28% to 63% of the former. Among these wage ratios by region, only two (construction in Southern Luzon and transport in Western Visayas) out of the twelve industry-region combinations were greater than these wages' proportion of 58% (₱3.50/₱6.00) in the 1965 revised minimum wage law; the rest were below 58%. However, the absolute differential between the wages of the two groups ranged from ₱1.70 to ₱5.26 and only three out of the twelve groups were below the ₱2.50 differential defined by the legal minimum wages. What comes out from these comparisons is the relatively higher wages of manual laborers than expected. This may be a statistical artifact due to the small sample of about 50 that was used in estimating these wages and, therefore, worth reestimating with more observations.

Given the assessment of the extent to which the wages set by the 1965 Minimum Wage Law may be considered adequate for the minimum subsistence of an average-sized household, (~~see pp.~~), one can speculate a few things. The excess supply of labor, especially the unskilled labor pushes down the wages of manual workers below minimum subsistence as defined by the minimum wage law. On the other hand, the productivity of manual labor may be higher than the going wage. If so, it implies that the development potential of the economy's excess labor supply mentioned earlier is being fulfilled.

f. Wages in Manufacturing

Manufacturing has been given much attention in most less developed countries in the implementation of import substitution strategy as the spring board to development. The Philippine government hoped that the development of this sector would also provide sufficient employment to alleviate the unemployment problem. However, its average annual employment generation or growth rate from 1956 to 1968 was only 3% or second to the lowest when measured in number of persons employed in the industry, or lowest at 4% average annual growth rate in terms of full-time equivalent employment. Even when gauged in terms of the net absolute employment it generated from 1956 to 1968, it came only fourth from the highest.

A characteristic of the industry worth noting is the extent of paid employment. Only about half (52%) of those employed in the industry were wage and salary workers in May, 1969. A larger percentage (70%) among the males than (33%) among the females were in paid employment during the same year.[15]

Table 11 gives the industrial wage structure in manufacturing industries for male craftsmen and production process workers. Their wages in Greater Manila ranged from ₱7.48 to ₱11.45 and, in other regions, from ₱4.66 to ₱8.63. The broad regional wage differential of ₱2.82 is statistically significant while the industrial wage differential is not. However, the wage differential defined by the interaction

---

[15] Ibid., Table 17, p. 18.

TABLE 11

WAGES OF MALE CRAFTSMEN AND PRODUCTION PROCESS WORKERS BY REGION, MAY 1969*

Industry	Greater Manila	Non-Greater Manila
	(₱)	(₱)
(20) Food, manufactures	9.39	6.57
(23) Textiles	8.18	5.36
(24) Footwear, other wearing apparel	9.92	7.10
(25) Wood and cork products	9.02	6.20
(26) Furniture and fixtures	8.06	5.24
(33) Non-metallic mineral products, except products of petroleum and coal	9.00	6.18
(34) Basic metal industries	7.48	4.66
(35) Metal products	7.71	4.89
(37) Electrical machinery, appliances	11.45	8.63
(38) Transport equipment	9.81	6.99
(39) Miscellaneous manufactures	7.66	4.84

*Regression 11

between region and industry is statistically significant.[16] Workers in metal industries earned the lowest wages followed by those in furniture and fixtures, textiles, non-metallic mineral products, wood products, food manufactures, transport equipment, footwear and other wearing apparel, and, finally electrical machinery and appliances which paid the highest. A more disaggregative regional estimation of wages was possible for males and females separately in a number of manufacturing industries. The wages of males in three manufacturing industries were highest in Greater Manila then Southern Luzon, Northern Mindanao, Central Luzon, Western Visayas and Eastern Visayas (Table 12). In the case of females employed in textiles and footwear and other wearing apparel, the regional wages showed basically the same ranking with the exception of the inverse ordering between Northern Mindanao and Central Luzon (Table 13). In both estimates, these regional wage differentials are statistically significant. The industrial wage differential for males in the three industries is also statistically significant (Table 12) but is not the case for the females (Table 13).[17]

---

[16]The wage differentials due to the interaction between region and manufacturing industry show lower wages for textiles, furniture and fixtures, basic metal, and metal products than the other seven manufacturing industries in Greater Manila and the reverse situation in the case of non-Greater Manila. This differential may be interpreted to mean that relatively higher wage paying establishments in the other seven industries vis-a-vis the four enumerated ones existed in Greater Manila and vice-versa in non-Greater Manila area.

[17]What is interesting is the different ranking of the three industries in the case of males as compared to their ranking and the size of the wage differentials in Table 11. Table 12 shows the wages in transport equipment as highest followed by the wage in wood products and, lastly, footwear and other wearing apparel. In the estimates shown in Table 11, the wage in footwear and other wearing apparel was higher than that in transport which in turn was higher than the wage in wood products. The wage differentials are also much larger than those in Table 11. Hence, some care should be exercised in using these estimates.

TABLE 12

REGIONAL WAGES OF MALE CRAFTSMEN AND PRODUCTION PROCESS WORKERS IN SOME MANUFACTURING INDUSTRIES, MAY 1969*

Region \ Industry	Footwear, other wearing apparel	Wood & cork products	Transport equipment
	(₱)	(₱)	(₱)
1. Greater Manila	5.84	7.53	8.41
2. Central Luzon	4.71	6.40	7.28
3. Southern Luzon and Islands)	5.46	7.15	8.03
4. Western Visayas	4.69	6.38	7.26
5. Eastern Visayas	3.66	5.35	6.23
6. Northern Mindanao	4.80	6.49	7.37

*Regression 12

TABLE 13

REGIONAL WAGE STRUCTURE AMONG FEMALE SPINNERS, WEAVERS, TAILORS, EMBROIDERERS AND RELATED WORKERS, MAY 1969*

Region \ Industry	Textiles	Footwear, other wearing apparel
	(₱)	(₱)
1. Greater Manila	6.19	6.37
2. Central Luzon	4.96	5.14
3. Southern Luzon and Islands	6.27	6.45
4. Bicol	2.25	2.43
5. Western Visayas	1.75	1.93
6. Eastern Visayas	2.82	3.00

*Regression 13

The data allow the estimation of sex wage differential in the clothing industry (textiles and footwear and other wearing apparel) while controlling for region to a limited extent (Greater Manila and non-Greater Manila). The male-female wage differential of ₱1.96 comes out statistically significant.[18] One must be careful about these results because when an estimation was done for tailors and related workers in the footwear and other wearing apparel industry while controlling for region as in Regression 14, the male-female differential turned out negative, i.e., female wages were ₱.44 greater than males'.[19] However, this is not statistically significant, which may be interpreted to mean that on the average, there is no difference in the wages of male tailors as compared to that of female tailors.

Workers in manufacturing have always been covered by the minimum wage law. As of May 1969, their minimum wage was ₱6.00. For the purpose of assessing the extent to which this minimum wage was observed in 1969, we shall use the estimates in Table 12 and 13 for males and females, respectively, which control for regional location as well. Male workers in footwear and other wearing apparel received wages lower than the minimum even in the Greater Manila area, whereas, female workers in the same industry received slightly higher wages than the minimum in Greater Manila and Southern Luzon though not for the other four regions included. The regional wages of male workers

---

[18] Regression 14, See Appendix A.

[19] Regression 15, See Appendix A.

in wood products were all above the minimum except for those in Eastern Visayas while those in transport equipment received greater wages than the minimum in all the six regions. In the case of female workers in textiles, only those in Greater Manila and Southern Luzon as those employed in footwear and other wearing apparel received wages higher than the minimum while those in the other regions did not.

Large establishments of 20 or more employees account for a larger proportion of employment than small establishments of 5 to 19 employees in the different manufacturing industries. There are also smaller establishments of less than five employees which account for not an inconsequential size of employment [20] although likely to consist of unpaid family workers. An exception to the case of large establishments accounting for the larger share of employment in manufacturing industries is footwear and other wearing apparel.[21] The relative size of the establishment in terms of employment in this industry may indicate a relatively smaller capacity to pay high wages vis-a-vis larger firms. If this were true then it may form part of the explanation to the lower wages among males in footwear and other wearing

---

[20] The size of this employment was estimated to be about 700 to 800 thousand in the early 1960's. T.A. Mijares and R.L. Tidalgo, "Labor Absorption in the Philippines," paper presented at the Conference on Manpower Problems in East and Southeast Asia, Singapore, May, 1971 (mimeo)ow

[21] Of the 10.3% share of the footwear and other wearing apparel industry out of the total employment in manufacturing in 1968, 5.4% of this grand total were employed in small establishments and 4.9% were in large establishments. /Ibid., Table 56./

apparel industry as compared to the wages of male workers in wood products and transport equipment where large establishments predominate. The case for females' wages in the two industries needs a different explanation since their wages in footwear and other wearing apparel were higher than their wages in textile where large establishments account for a major part of the industry's total employment. Textile manufacturing needs many workers to perform in production processes which are relatively repetitive, monotonous and under relatively unpleasant conditions of noise and heat and, therefore, tends to attract females more than males and the unskilled rather than the skilled. Those who start unskilled are easily apprenticed to specific production duties. The higher incidence of unemployment among females (~~Table 5~~) and the lower average educational attainment among unemployed females (~~Table 9~~) attract them to these types of jobs in textile establishments at low pay. Food manufactures is also another industry where one is likely to find low wage earners. About a fourth of those employed in this industry in 1968 were in small establishments and the production processes in food preparation can easily be learned by unskilled workers. Unfortunately, there is not enough observations for this industry which are classified by region to enable us to verify this hypothesis in the wages of those who are employed in the industry.

The wages of craftsmen and production process workers were in general not as high as the wages of manual laborers. In effect, the low-wage earning workers inmanufacturing were even worse-off than manual workers in the standard of living their wage income could support.

A final point of interest is the comparison between the wages in manufacturing, especially the lowest-paying industries and the wages of agricultural workers. The argument on the development potential in economies with labor surplus may be expressed in terms of the movement of excess agricultural labor to low-skill jobs in manufacturing. We shall compare the wages of agricultural workers in palay and corn farming (Table 4) with the wages of craftsmen and production workers in the footwear and other wearing apparel industry (Table 12) and 13) in five regions. For males, the regional wages in palay and corn farming were from 40% to 92% of wages in manufacturing. This wage ratio in Central and Southern Luzon were above the 58% ratio of the corresponding legal minimum wages for these groups, whereas, those in the other regions were less than this. The spread of this wage ratio was larger for females and ranged from 38% to 127%. Only the ratios for Eastern Visayas (38%) and Southern Luzon (54%) were below 58%. The agricultural-manufacturing absolute wage differential for males ranged from ₱.40 to ₱2.67 while that for females was from -₱.65 to ₱2.98.

To summarize the comparison, there was a positive average differential between the wages in manufacturing and agricultural wages. What the magnitude of the average differential implies depends on how both wages compare with subsistence income in the corresponding sectors and whether the differential is explained completely by the difference in cost of living. If this difference may be interpreted as the difference in productivity between the two groups of workers, if both were at least of subsistence level in their corresponding sectors, and the difference in their wages was not explained completely by the cost

of living differential, then, there is something to be said for the argument on the development potential in moving the excess labor in agriculture into the non-agricultural sector as in manufacturing.

g. Wages in the Government Sector

Only estimates of wages among professionals in the government were possible from the BCSSH May 1969 data. Therefore, the effects on wages of variables such as region, sex, and employment in the private sector as opposed to government employment were estimated for this occupational group only. The wages of males in four professions in Greater Manila and outside Greater Manila are shown in Table 14. Lawyers earned the

TABLE 14

WAGES OF MALE PROFESSIONALS IN THE GOVERNMENT SECTOR BY REGION, MAY 1969*

Occupation \ Region	Greater Manila (1)	Non-Greater Manila (2)	(1)/(2)
	(₱)	(₱)	
1. Architects, engineers and surveyors	15.84	17.74	.89
2. Physicians, surgeons and dentists	16.46	18.36	.90
3. Lawyers, judges and related workers	16.77	18.67	.90
4. Accountants, social scientists and related workers	16.09	17.99	.89

*Regression 16

highest wage (₱16.77), followed by those in the medical professions (₱16.46), accountants and social scientists (₱16.09) and, lastly, engineers (₱15.84). The wages outside Greater Manila were higher than those in Greater Manila; the latter came to about 90% of the former. However, both the occupation and broad regional variables are not statistically significant. The corrected R^2 of the regression is negative which may be interpreted to mean that these two variables do not explain any portion of the variations in the wages of male professionals (i.e., the four professional groups considered in this estimation) who were employed by the government, or, that the observations are not random enough.

The sex wage differential among three professional groups outside Greater Manila is given in Table 15. This wage differential is statistically significant but not the occupational wage differentials. Males earned about 60% to 70% more than females in these professional occupations. In absolute terms, this wage differential came to about ₱7.08.

Also of interest is the wage differential between male professionals in the government sector and those in private services. Those in the government showed higher wages (45% to 55% more) than those in private services (Table 16). This wage differenital is statistically significant, whereas, the occupational wage differentials were not as in the two previous estimations (Table 14 and 15). The estimated government-private services wage differential among male professionals is contrary to what is usually expected, i.e., wages in the government are generally lower than the wages of individuals doing comparable jobs

TABLE 15

MALE-FEMALE WAGE DIFFERENTIAL IN THE PROFESSIONAL OCCUPATIONS IN THE GOVERNMENT SERVICES OUTSIDE GREATER MANILA, MAY 1969*

Occupation \ Sex	Male (1) (₱)	Female (2) (₱)	(1)/(2)
1. Architects, engineers and surveyors	17.42	10.34	1.69
2. Physicians, surgeons and dentists	18.95	11.87	1.60
3. Accountants, social scientists and related workers	19.31	12.23	1.58

*Regression 17

TABLE 16

WAGES OF MALE PROFESSIONALS IN THE GOVERNMENT AND PRIVATE SERVICES IN GREATER MANILA, MAY 1969*

Industry / Occupation	Government services except schools (1) (₱)	Private Community, business and recreational services (2) (₱)	(1)/(2)
1. Architects, engineers and surveyors	15.57	10.13	1.54
2. Physicians, surgeons and dentists	17.79	12.35	1.44
3. Accountants, social scientists and related workers	16.53	11.09	1.49

*Regression 18

in the private sector. The WAPCO wage and salary surveys verify this relationship. The estimate in Table 16 was based on a very small number of observations (17 degrees of freedom; see Appendix A) and there were other job specifications which were not controlled for in the estimations such as length of service, competence, job responsibilities, etc. In other words, given the small sample of observations, there is a large probability that the individuals classified in the same profession but employed in either the government or the private sector were not exactly comparable in their job descriptions and qualifications. Therefore, the result of the estimation should not be considered conclusive.

h. Wages in the Clerical Occupations

Almost everyone in the clerical occupations are wage and salary workers. In May, 1969, about 98% of those belonging to this group were in paid employment and the same percentage was true among males and among females in this occupational group.[22] The wages of clerical workers (bookkeepers, accounting clerks, cashiers, stenographers, typists and office machine operators) were estimated in four industries for each sex and two broad regional classification (Table 17). The industrial wage differential is not statiscically significant but the sex wage differential and regional wage differential are. Outside Greater Manila, the wages of those in clerical occupations in the four

[22] BCSSH, Labor Force May 1969, Table 18, p. 19.

TABLE 17

WAGES IN THE CLERICAL OCCUPATIONS BY INDUSTRY, REGION AND SEX, MAY 1969*

Industry	Greater Manila			Non-Greater Manila		
	Male (1) (₱)	Female (2) (₱)	(1)/(2)	Male (1) (₱)	Female (2) (₱)	(1)/(2)
1. Retrail trade (other than sari-sari stores, peddling and hawking)	10.45	8.93	1.17	8.81	7.29	1.21
2. Banks and Other financial institution	11.73	10.21	1.15	10.09	8.57	1.18
3. Government services except schools	11.77	10.25	1.15	10.13	8.61	1.18
4. Private community, business & recreational services	11.41	9.89	1.15	9.77	8.25	1.18

*Regression 19

industries were ₱1.64 lower than the corresponding wages in Greater Manila. The wages in Greater Manila among the males per industry were 16% to 19% more than wages outside Greater Manila and, among females, were 19% to 23% more. Male wages were ₱1.52 higher than female wages. This differential was about 15% to 17% of female wages in Greater Manila and 18% to 21% in the non-Greater Manila area.

i. Some Comparisons of Wages

A comparison of the wages of professionals, clerical workers, manual workers among males in Greater Manila and agricultural workers is presented in Table 18. There was a greater dispersion of wages among these occupations in the government services than in private community services, especially, between the professional group and manual workers. Such a contrast is mainly due to the high estimates of the wages of professionals in the government relative to the wages of professionals in private services; these estimates were earlier mentioned to be likely biased.

When the data on those employed in government services were classified by sex which was possible for regions outside Greater Manila, the wages of males showed a greater dispersion (as measured by the range) than that of females (Table 19). Assuming way any bias in the data, one may explain this difference in wage dispersion by sex in terms of employment discrimination of women and their unemployment characteristics. The discrimination may take the form of limiting the highest-paying job a female may be employed in and/or promoted to; employers do not tend to hire women to fill high wage (which could imply

TABLE 18

COMPARISON OF MALE PROFESSIONAL, CLERICAL AND MANUAL WORKERS' WAGES IN GREATER MANILA AND MALE AGRICULTURAL WORKERS' WAGES, MAY 1969

Industry / Occupation	Government Services except Schools		Private Community, Business and Recreational Services	
	Wage (₱)	Index	Wage (₱)	Index
1. Professional[a/]	16.63	257	11.19	173
2. Clerical[b/]	11.77	182	11.20	173
3. Manual[c/]	6.46	100	6.46	100
4. Agricultural[d/]	3.32	51	3.32	51

a/ Table 16: average wage of male engineers, medical professionals, accountants and social scientists and related workers.

b/ Table 17: private community services wage is the average of the wages in retail trade, banks and financial institutions and private community services.

c/ Table 10: average of wages of manual workers in construction and transport industries in Greater Manila.

d/ Table 13: average wage of male farm worker in different agricultural crops.

TABLE 19

COMPARISON OF PROFESSIONAL, CLERICAL, AND MANUAL WORKERS' WAGES IN REGIONS OUTSIDE GREATER MANILA IN THE GOVERNMENT SECTOR AND AGRICULTURAL WORKERS' WAGES, MAY 1969

Industry / Occupation	Male		Female	
	Wage	Index	Wage	Index
	(₱)		(₱)	
1. Professional[a/]	18.56	311	11.48	192
2. Clerical[b/]	10.13	170	8.61	144
3. Manual[c/]	5.97	100	5.97	100
4. Agricultural[d/]	3.32	56	2.98	50

a/ Table 15: average wage of engineers, medical professionals, accountants, social scientists and related workers by sex.

b/ Table 17.

c/ Table 10: average wage of male manual workers in construction and transport industries in regions outside Greater Manila.

d/ Table 3: average wage of farm workers in different agricultural crops by sex.

high responsibility) positions as they do men. At the other end of the range, the explanation may take the form of the tendency among women to get lower paying employments relative to men which may be caused by the higher incidence of unemployment among them and the lower average level of education among the unemployed females.

Of interest is the ratio between manual workers' wage and that of agricultural workers. Farm wage was about 50% of manual workers' wage in Greater Manila and 50% to 56% of manual workers' wage in regions outside Greater Manila (Tables 18 and 19). In the latter comparison, the female agricultural wage was 50% of male manual workers' wage while that of males was 56%.

Also worth mentioning is the wider dispersion of wages between professionals and agricultural workers outside Greater Manila relative to the corresponding wage dispersion in Greater Manila among males. But since the estimates for professionals are subject to question, then if we exclude this group, the wage dispersion among males who were clerks, manual workers, and agricultural workers is narrower outside Greater Manila than the case for Greater Manila. At the lower half of the dispersion, the larger wage differential between manual workers and agricultural workers in Greater Manila vis-a-vis outside Greater Manila is due to the higher wages of manual workers in Greater Manila than outside which may be explained by the relatively higher cost of living in the former than in the latter location. At the upper half of the dispersion, the even larger spread between the wages of clerical workers and manual workers may be indicative of a tendency in urban areas for the wage differentials between skill levels to be larger

relative to the case for less urban areas. This tendency may be explained by the presence of non-market forces which may even work contrary to the workings of the labor market. For example, the presence of foreign and/or big companies in urban areas that tend to pay higher wages to their employees who are likely to be mostly non-manual labor and act as price leaders influencing the wages paid by other companies in the same area. Another factor is the greater extent of union organization or potential for such among clerks than among manual workers in a relatively more urban area as Greater Manila.

The sex wage differentials for different occupations and industries are presented in Table 20. In terms of absolute wage differential, the wages of males were greater than those of females in higher skilled occupations as the case among professionals. Wages of males in the professional occupations were on the average ₱7.08 higher than that of females, ₱1.52 more in clercial occupations and ₱.35 more in agriculture. In relative terms, the wages of males were 58% to 69% more than that of females among professionals, 15% to 21% more among clerical workers and 11% to 30% more among agricultural workers. The sex wage differential among professionals may be explained by discrimination in the hiring of women. The small differential in agriculture which is not even statistically significant may be explained by the closely similar skill levels of both sexes in the performance of work in agriculture, both sexes having been equally trained or exposed to equal opportunities to demonstrate their work capabilities unlike in the professional occupations. In the latter group, the entry of women was late relative to men's and the training was by formal education

TABLE 20

MALE-FEMALE WAGE DIFFERENTIALS IN DIFFERENT OCCUPATIONS AND INDUSTRIES, MAY 1969

Table No.	Industry / Occupation	Male-female absolute wage differential (₱)	Male-female wage ratio
	Over-all average:		
60	Regression I	1.80*	1.32
60	Regression II	.90	1.16
74	Professionals: in Government services; regions outside Manila	7.08*	1.58 to 1.69
76	Clerical	1.52*	1.15 to 1.21
62 & 63	Agriculture	.34	1.11 to 1.30
65	Retail Trade except Sari-sari store, hawking and peddling	3.11 & 3.65[a]	1.75 & 1.91
66	Domestic services: Domestic helpers	-.70 to 1.88	.49 to 2.94 i[b] .76 to 1.76 ii
[c]	Manufacturing: Clothing industries	1.96*	1.33 to 1.56
[d]	Footwear and wearing apparel	-.44	.91 to .92

*Statistically significant at 1%.

[a] The statistical significance of the differential cannot be determined since the males' and females' wages were each estimated in separate regressions.

[b] (i) refers to cash earnings and (ii) refers to wages defined as cash earnings plus ₱1.50 for board and lodging allowances.

[c] Regression 14, see Appendix A.

[d] Regression 15, see Appendix A.

Source:

which used to be no woman's world. Therefore, it is to be expected that there would be skepticism regarding women's abilities in these professions and women's lack of confidence in themselves. There is also women's natural potential for child-bearing which may cost their employers not only disrupted service but also maternity leave benefits due such working mothers. Another factor is the difference in the cultural roles of women in basically subsistence agricultural communities and in non-agricultural, middle-class oriented communities. Women's place in the latter setting was emphasized to be home and their training was correspondingly geared towards the needs of middle-class society. Among peasants, both sexes have always shared work in the fields. However, this lack of, if not absence of the emphasis on the home as a women's right place may also be observed among the non-agricultural lowest income working class whose material situation requires both sexes to seek work.

Females earned higher wages than males in domestic services and in footwear and other wearing apparel industry. But in domestic services, there were some regions where males earned higher wages than females. In both industries, the sex wage differentials are not statistically significant. However, these wage differentials seem reasonable and may be explained as follows. The existence of sex wage differential which goes in one direction in some regions and in the other direction in other regions may be interpreted to imply that both sexes are regarded as equally capable in this occupation and, also, that each has his or her separate areas of expertise in performing household chores. In the case of footwear and other wearing apparel industry,

the skills required are those which women are better trained for and seem to have the temperament suited for such works because of their usual culturally determined or defined role in the family. The male-female wage differential came out positive and statistically significant in the clothing industries which is composed of textiles and footwear and other wearing apparel. However, when the wages in the latter industry alone were estimated, the sex wage differential was negative but not statistically significant. Hence, the estimates of wages in these manufacturing industries are subject to some doubt and need a re-examination with more observations.

A summary of the broad regional wage differential between Greater Manila and regions outside Greater Manila for different occupations and industries is presented in Table 21. The differential did not go consistently in any one direction. It was negative for professionals, i.e., the wages in Greater Manila were lower than the wages outside Greater Manila, which may be explained by the relatively fewer supply of professionals outside the Greater Manila area. The negative and positive wage differentials between Greater Manila and the rest of the country among manual workers, drivers, domestic helpers, launderers and females in retail trade (other than "sari-sari" stores hawking and peddling) may mean that the regional breakdown is not a meaningful one in giving us a handle at estimating the urban-rural cost of living differential which might be reflected in wages.

TABLE 21

WAGE DIFFERENTIALS BETWEEN GREATER MANILA AND REGIONS OUTSIDE GREATER MANILA FOR DIFFERENT INDUSTRIES, OCCUPATIONS AND SEXES, MAY 1969

Table No.	Occupation; industry sex	Greater Manila-Regions outside Greater Manila absolute wage differential	Greater Manila-Regions outside Greater Manila wage ratio
		(₱)	
73	Professionals:		
	Males,		
	Government services	-1.90	.89 to .90
76	Clerical:		
	Males	1.64*	1.16 to 1.19
	Females		1.19 to 1.23
69	Manual:		
	Construction	-.88 to .94	.88 to 1.18
	Transport	-1.94 to 2.58*	.78 to 1.62
	Manufacturing:		
70	Craftsmen and production process workers: males	2.82*	1.33 to 1.61
a/	Clothing industries:		
	Males	2.06*	1.35 to 1.38
	Females		1.53 to 1.59

*Statistically significant at 1%.

a/ Regression 14, see Appendix A.

Table 21 - Wage Differentials Between Greater Manila and Regions Outside Greater Manila for Different Industries, Occupations and Sexes, May 1969

(Cont.)

Table No.	Occupation; industry sex	Greater Manila-Regions outside Greater Manila absolute wage differential (₱)	Greater Manila-Regions outside Greater Manila wage ratio
b/	Footwear and other wearing appreal; tailors	.34	1.07 to 1.08
65	Retail trade except "sari-sari" stores, hawking & peddling:		
	Males	1.96*	1.30 & 1.73
	Females	-.66 & 1.42	.71 & 1.41
68	Drivers: males		
	Land transport		.90 to 1.69
	Domestic services	-.70 to 2.49+	c/ i) .91 to 1.52 ii) .92 to 1.46
	Domestic services		
66	Domestic helpers		
	Males	-.44 to 1.74+	d/ i) .84 to 3.60 ii) .90 to 1.80
	Females	-.77 to .81+	d/ i) .68 to 1.99 ii) .80 to 1.35
67	Launderers:		
	Females	-1.28 to 1.36+	d/ i) .71 to 1.74 ii) .79 to 1.41

*Statistically significant at 1%.

b/ Regression 15, see Appendix A.

c/ i) refers to cash earnings while ii) refers to wages which are equal to cash earnings plus ₱.70 board allowance.

d/ i) refers to cash earnings while ii) refers to wages which are equal to cash earnings plus ₱1.50 board and lodging allowances.

+ The regional variable is statistically significant at 1% but the individual wage differentials between Greater Manila and each of the other regions are not tested for significance.

APPENDIX A

TECHNICAL NOTES ON THE ANALYSES BASED ON THE BCSSH, MAY 1969 DATA

Definition of Some Variables in the Regressions

1. Ten occupational groupings (See Appendix B for BCSSH occupational classification code scheme for May 1969):

Professional, technical and related workers (00-09); administrative, executive and managerial workers (10-11); clerical workers (20-29); sales workers (30-34); farmers, farm laborers, fishermen, hunters, loggers and related workers (40-48); miners, quarrymen and related workers (51-53); workers in transport and communication occupations (60-68); craftsmen and production process workers (70-85, 87); manual workers and laborers (86, 88, 89); and service, sport and related workers (90-99).

2. Three skill groupings defined by a 2-digit occupational classification (refer to Appendix B):

Skilled (00-09, 10-11, 30-32, 44, 60-62, 67, 73-76, 80 and 87); semi-skilled (20-22, 29, 33-34, 40-43, 45, 47-48, 51-53, 63-64, 66, 70-72, 77-79, 81-85, 90, 94 and 96-97); and unskilled (46,65, 68, 86, 88-89, 91-93, 95 and 98).

Method of Estimation

The BCSSH, May 1969 data may be thought of intuitively as violating the assumptions of constant variance of the error terms and one which also equals population variance. There is no reason to believe that the daily cash earnings of individuals in a group characterized by an occupation, industry, sex and region would vary in the same way as the daily cash earnings of individuals in another group characterized by a different set of occupation, industry, sex and region. The rational for this intuitive assessment is the belief that there are other explanatory variables in addition to these four independent variables which influence the daily cash earnings but are not controlled for in the regression model. Under this condition of heteroskedasticity, the least squares estimators of the regression coefficients would still be unbiased and consistent but not efficient. The last characteristic results from the biased estimates of the coefficients' variances. This bias would lead to incorrect inferences about the population coefficients which are based on hypotheses testing and confidence intervals.

An alternative method of estimation, called "weighted" least squares, which deflates the influence of less precise observations is used instead. In this method, one minimizes, for example is a 2-variable linear model, the $\Sigma {}^{1}\!/_{\sigma_j^2}(Y - \hat{\alpha} - \hat{\beta} X_{ij})^2$ rather than the usual $\Sigma(Y - \hat{\alpha} - \hat{\beta}X_{ij})^2$, i.e., each squared deviation or residual is weighted by a factor, ${}^{1}\!/_{\sigma_j^2}$, where σ_j^2 is the variance of cell j, before summing. Therefore, when the error, meaning σ_j^2, tends to be

large, the observation is given a smaller weight of $1/\sigma_j^2$. To pursue the same 2-variable linear model, initially

e_{ij} are independently $N(0,\sigma_j^2)$.

With weighting, the regression equation

$$Y_{ij} = \alpha + \beta X_{ij} + e_{ij}$$

becomes

$$\frac{Y_{ij}}{\sigma_j} \frac{\sigma}{\sigma_j} + \beta \frac{X_{ij}}{\sigma_j} = \frac{e_{ij}}{\sigma_j}$$

The new error term, $\frac{e_{ij}}{\sigma_j}$, has

$$E\left(\frac{e_{ij}}{\sigma_j}\right) = \frac{E(e_{ij})}{\sigma_j} = \frac{0}{\sigma_j} = 0 \; ;$$

$$\text{Var}\left(\frac{e_{ij}}{\sigma_j}\right) = \frac{1}{\sigma_j^2}(\text{var } e_{ij}) = \frac{\sigma_{ij}^2}{\sigma_j^2}$$

It is assumed that every observation in each cell has the same variance hence, $\sigma_{ij}^2 = \sigma_j^2$, and the Var $\left(\frac{e_{ij}}{\sigma_j}\right) = 1$. Therefore, the new error term

$$\tilde{e}_{ij} = \frac{e_{ij}}{\sigma_j} \sim N(0, 1),$$

i.e., the variance of the error terms are constant and equal to 1.

The application of simple least squares estimation on this transformed variables would result in unbiased, consistent and efficient estimates of the coefficients.

In the regression models, using the BCSSH, May 1969 data, σ_j^2 is estimated from the sample by calculating the variance of the daily cash earnings comprising each cell j characterized by a given category of each of the included explanatory variables. Then, every squared deviation is weighted by the reciprocal of the variance of the daily cash earnings in cell j, $1/\sigma_j^2$, where the observation belongs.

The two regressions ran using the whole data set were estimated assuming additivity or no interaction among the explanatory variables. None of the categories in each variable nor any of the variables could be left out of the regressions. This constraint and the size of the sample created some empty calls characterized by some combinations of the categories of the four independent variables. As a result, additivity had to be assumed.

In the case of the other regressions using sub-sets of the whole data, the requirement that each regression be run assuming non-additivity was imposed. This requirement constrained the choice among the categories of the explanatory variables included in each regression. With the assumption of non-additivity, only those categories of the included explanatory variables per regression which had more than one observation when the categories were cross-tabulated could be included. Whenever the interaction variables came out to be statistically insignificant, the regression was run again assuming additivity and the corresponding estimates were used instead. The interaction terms which came out statistically significant were also used to qualify the results of the two regressions run on the whole data set assuming additivity.

REGRESSIONS RAN ON BCSSH, MAY 1969 DATA

No.	Specification	No. of Categories Per Variable				D.F.	Corrected R^2
		Industry	Occupation/Skill	Region	Sex		
I.	w/o interaction	9	10	10	2	6,002	.7617
II.	w/o interaction	9	3	10	2	6,002	.5829
1	w/o interaction	5	(1)	(10)	2	566	.0013
2	w/o interaction	(1)	(1)	7	2	199	.1791
3	w/o interaction	(1)	(1)	6	(1)	86	.2789
4	w/o interaction	2	(1)	2	(1)	112	.2097
5	w/o interaction	2	(1)	2	(1)	107	.2462
6	w/o interaction	(1)	(1)	10	2	817	.2031
7	w/o interaction	(1)	(1)	7	(1)	37	.2653
8	w/o interaction	2	(1)	7	(1)	250	.0560
9	w/o interaction	(1)	(1)	6	1 (1)	50	neg.
10	w/o interaction	(1)	(1)	6	(1)	52	.1904
11	w/o interaction	11	(1)	2	(1)	492	.1947
12	w/o interaction	3	(1)	6	(1)	210	.2092
13	w/o interaction	2	(1)	6	(1)	163	.4443
14	w/o interaction	2	(1)	2	2	320	.1678
15	w/o interaction	(1)	(1)	2	2	149	neg.
16	w/o interaction	(1)	4	2	(1)	41	neg.
17	w/o interaction	(1)	3	(1)	2	33	.3413
18	w/o interaction	2	3	(1)	(1)	17	.4926
19	w/o interaction	4	(1)	2	2	442	.0350

Note: The numbers in parenthesis refer to the number of categories per variables which are controlled for in addition to the variables explicitly specified in each regression.

APPENDIX B

BCSSH OCCUPATIONAL CLASSIFICATION CODE SCHEME FOR MAY 1969 SURVEY

Major Group 0: Professional, Technical and Related Workers

00 Architects, Engineers and Surveyors

01 Chemists, Pharmacists, Natural and Agricultural Scientists

02 Professors and Teachers

03 Physicians, Surgeons and Dentists

04 Nurses, Midwives, Professional Medical Workers N.E.C. and Medical Technicians

05 Lawyers, Judges and Related Workers

06 Clergy, Charitable and Social Welfare Workers

07 Accountants, Social Scientists and Related Workers

08 Artists, Writers, Entertainers and Related Workers

09 Draftsmen, Technicians and Semi-Professional Workers not Elsewhere Classified

Major Group 1: Administrative, Executive and Managerial Workers

10 Government Officials

11 Directors, Managers and Working Proprietors (Excluding Working Proprietors in Wholesale and Retail Trade)

Major Group 2: Clerical Workers

20 Bookkeepers, Accounting Clerks and Cashiers

21 Stenographers and Typists

22 Office Machine Operators

29 Clerical Workers N.E.C.

Major Group 3: Sales Workers

30 Working Proprietors, Wholesale and Retail Trade

31 Insurance and Real Estate Salesmen, Salesmen of Securities and Services and Auctioneers

32 Commercial Travellers and Manufacturers' Agents

33 Salesmen, and Related Workers

34 Shop Assistants and Related Workers

Major Group 4: Farmers, Farm Laborers, Fishermen, Hunters, Loggers and Related Workers

40 Farmer Owners

41 Farmer Part Owners

42 Farmer Tenants

43 Farmers Not Specified and Tuba Gathers

44 Farm Managers, Administrators and Overseers

45 Farm Laborers, Including Foremen, Copra Workers (in farm) Tuba Gathers, Farm Equipment Operators, etc.

46 Fishermen, Fishpond Laborers, and Related Workers

47 Hunters, Trappers, and Related Workers

48 Loggers, and Other Forestry Workers

Major Group 5: Miners, Quarrymen and Related Workers

51 Workers in Coal and Metal Mining

52 Workers in Quarrying and Non-metallic Mining

53 Well Drillers and Related Workers

Major Group 6: Workers in Transport and Communication Occupations

60 Deck Officers, Engineering Officers and Pilots, Ship

61 Deck and Engine-Room Rating, Barge Crews and Boatmen

62 Aircraft Pilots, Navigators and Flight Engineers

63 Drivers, Firemen and Brakemen, Railway

64 Drivers, Road Transport

65 Conductors, Railway and Road Transport

66 Inspectors, Supervisors, Traffic Controllers and Dispatchers, and Other Workers, N.E.C. Transport

67 Telephone, Telegraph and Related Telecommunication Workers

68 Mail Carriers and Messengers

Major Group 7-8: Craftsmen, Production Process Workers and Laborers N.E.C.

70 Spinners, Weavers, Knitters, Dyers and Related Workers

71 Tailors, Sewers, Embroiderers and Related Workers

72 Footwear and Other Leather Product Makers

73 Furnacemen, Rollers, Drawers, Moulders, and Related Metal Making and Treating Workers

74 Precision-Instrument Mechanics, Watchmakers and Watch Repairers, Jewelers and Related Workers

75 Toolmakers, Machinists, Plumbers, Welders, Platers and Related Workers

76 Electricians and Related Electrical and Electronics Workers

77 Carpenters, Joiners, Cabinetmakers, Coopers and Related Workers

78 Painters and Paperhangers

79 Bricklayers, Masons, Plasterers and Other Construction Workers N.E.C.

80 Compositors, Pressmen, Engravers, Bookbinders and Related Workers

81 Potters, Kilnmen, Glass and Clay Formers and Related Workers

82 Millers, Bakers, Brewers and Related Food and Beverage Worker

83 Chemical and Related Process Workers

84 Tobacco Preparers and Tobacco Product Makers

85 Craftsmen and Production Process Workers N.E.C.

86 Packers, Labellers and Related Workers

87 Stationary-Engine and Excavating and Lifting Equipment Operators and Related Workers

88 Manual Workers and Laborers in Construction N.E.C.

89 Manual Workers and Laborers in Transport and Others N.E.C.

Major Group 9: Service, Sport and Related Workers

90 Protective Service Workers

91 Housekeepers, Cooks, Maids and Related Workers

92 Waiters, Bartenders and Related Workers

93 Building Caretakers, Cleaners and Related Workers

94 Barbers, Beauticians, Hairdressers and Related Workers

95 Launderers, Dry Cleaners and Pressers

96 Athletes, Sportsmen and Related Workers

97 Photographers and Related Camera Operators

98 Service, Sport and Related Workers N.E.C.

99 OCCUPATION NOT REPORTED OR UNIDENTIFIABLE OR INADEQUATELY DESCRIBED