Henley Business School
UNIVERSITY OF READING

Discussion Paper

British Working-class Household Composition, Labour Supply and Commercial Leisure Participation during the 1930s

November 2014

Peter Scott
Henley Business School, University of Reading

James T Walker
Henley Business School, University of Reading

Peter Miskell
Henley Business School, University of Reading

Discussion Paper Number:
IBH-2014-03

The aim of this discussion paper series is to disseminate new research of academic distinction. Papers are preliminary drafts, circulated to stimulate discussion and critical comment. Henley Business School is triple accredited and home to over 100 academic faculty who undertake research in a wide range of fields from ethics and finance to international business and marketing.

www.henley.ac.uk/research/research-centres/the-centre-for-international-business-history

British Working-class Household Composition, Labour Supply and Commercial Leisure Participation during the 1930s

Abstract

The early twentieth century constituted the heyday of the 'breadwinner-homemaker' household, characterised by a high degree of intra-household functional specialization between paid and domestic work according to age, gender, and marital status. This paper examines the links between formal workforce participation and access to resources for individualized discretionary spending in British working-class households during the late 1930s, via an analysis of household leisure expenditures. Leisure spending is particularly salient to intra-household resource allocation, as it constitutes one of the most highly prioritized areas of individualized expenditure, especially for young, single people. Using a database compiled from surviving returns to the Ministry of Labour's national 1937/38 working-class expenditure survey, we examine leisure participation rates for over 600 households, using a detailed set of commercial leisure activities together with other relevant variables. We find that the employment status of family members other than the male breadwinner was a key factor influencing their access to commercial leisure. Our analysis thus supports the view that the breadwinner-homemaker household was characterised by strong power imbalances, that concentrated resources - especially for individualized expenditures - in the hands of those family members who engaged in paid labour.

Keywords

household composition, labour supply, leisure, entertainment sector

JEL Classifications

J22, D13, N74, L82, L83

Acknowledgements

We thank Nat Ishino, Fatima Cardias Williams and Natalie Anderson for excellent research assistance. Thanks are also due to Ian Gazeley, Sara Horrell, John Sedgwick, Nicolas Ziebarth and participants at the 2012 Economic History Society Conference, for their comments. The Nuffield

Foundation provided financial support for this project (Project Number: H502620) and we also wish to thank the National Archives, Kew, and University of Bangor Library Archives for generous assistance. Any errors are our own.

Contacts

p.m.scott@henley.ac.uk

j.t.walker@henley.ac.uk

p.m.miskell@henley.ac.uk

Introduction

The 1930s can be seen as the heyday of the 'breadwinner-homemaker' household, with a high degree of functional specialization between paid and domestic work according to age, gender, and marital status. This has, in turn, been linked to long-term changes in household behaviour and labour supply. From the second half of the nineteenth century rising incomes were said to be associated with a shift in working-class consumption preferences from goods purchased in the market to those only achievable via heavy inputs of household labour, such as improved nutrition, health, and housing (a transition largely completed by 1911, when married womens' peacetime labour-force participation rates became relatively stable). Fathers thus specialized in paid work, mothers in unpaid work (contributing to the production of these goods) and, more gradually, children were kept in full-time education at progressively higher ages.[1] Yet after 1945 Britain, in common with other countries, witnessed a rapid decline of such households, with a 'new industrious revolution' characterized by rising labour force participation for other family members, particularly married women.[2]

One explanation for married women's willingness to return to the paid labour market, once greater job opportunities became available, concerns the power imbalances underpinning the breadwinner model. Access to individual discretionary spending appears to have been strongly linked to participation in the paid labour market. As discussed below, household resource allocation was typically based on a division of incomes between a pool of cash for collective expenditure, managed by the housewife, and personal spending money that mainly represented people's individual earnings, net of contributions to the pool. The amount an individual retained varied according to their earnings, age, gender, local custom, and the financial circumstances of the family. Wage-earning adolescents' 'outside options' (leaving home for work or marriage) also appear to have been important, given that retaining them in the household as long as possible was often a key determinant of household prosperity.[3]

In this paper we examine working-class household participation in a detailed set of leisure-related consumption activities during the late 1930s. Leisure spending is particularly salient to the above debates, as it constitutes one of the most highly prioritized areas of individualized,

[1] See, for example, De Vries, *Industrious revolution*, pp. 186–9; Horrell and Humphries, 'Origin and expansion of the male breadwinner family'; Mokyr, 'Why "more work for mother?"'; Bourke, 'Housewifery'.
[2] De Vries, *Industrious revolution*, pp. 238–73.
[3] Horrell and Oxley, 'Crust or crumb?' Differential effects of male and female labour supply on household consumption have also been identified for much more recent periods, e.g. Browning and Meghir, 'Effects of male and female labor supply'.

discretionary, consumer expenditure, especially for young, single people. While there is a substantial literature on working-class leisure, there has been very little research from the household perspective. Yet leisure formed a significant and growing part of household expenditure; it has been estimated that per capita spending on cinema and live entertainment rose by an average of 2.5 per cent per annum over 1881–1938, compared with an annual growth in real wages of 1.9 per cent. The growth rate accelerated over this period, particularly after 1908; entertainment and leisure services expenditure was equivalent to about 15 per cent of household disposable income by 1937/38.[4] This in turn stimulated the provision and diffusion of 'new' goods and services, facilitating leisure consumption both directly and via enabling technologies, such as public transport, laundry services, and labour-saving household technologies.

Using surviving returns from the Ministry of Labour's national 1937/38 working-class expenditure survey, we examine household commercial leisure consumption, together with leisure-related goods and services, for more than 600 families. The data provide the first comprehensive quantitative analysis of British working-class leisure spending, and participation rates, prior to the Second World War. Meanwhile time-budget surveys and other data are used to assess the amount of time working-class people typically devoted to each major leisure activity, including analyses of variations by age and gender. We identify a spectrum of working-class leisure pursuits, with participation varying positively with accessibility and addictive elements and negatively with costs per unit of time and the threshold level of skill or knowledge required for full participation. The diversity in participation by age and gender across leisure activities facilitates a cross-activity analysis of household leisure participation, to examine whether hypotheses derived from the qualitative data are corroborated by spending patterns for households with different age, gender, and formal labour market participation profiles.

The aims of this article are threefold. First, we examine the nature of working-class commercial leisure activity, categorized by the frequency, cost, and minimum threshold level of commitment demonstrated by the consumer. We show that expenditure on reading materials was larger than previously thought; on a par with spending on cinemas, the quintessential working class leisure pursuit of the time. Second, we use descriptive evidence to examine two elements central to the industrious revolution literature: participation in consumption activities and the characteristics of the household. Third, we hypothesize and test the extent to which participation in commercial leisure was impacted by women's labour market participation, or by the presence of working adolescents in the household. After controlling for regional factors,

[4] Bakker, Entertainment industrialised, p. 102.

urbanization, income, competing expenditures on food and housing, and other variables, our analysis shows that participating in commercialized leisure was strongly interrelated with income generation; a typical characteristic of economically successful working-class households being an ability to retain juvenile and young adult wage-earners and thus expand labour market participation beyond the 'breadwinner'. Wives' participation in paid work is also shown to have important impacts on their access to commercial leisure. We then analyse the diversity of household participation in leisure activities and show that household composition, particularly wives' formal labour force participation, influenced the number of leisure activities households engaged in. We discuss the implications of these findings.

Leisure in the 1937/38 household expenditure survey

From the late nineteenth century, Britain (in common with other Western societies) witnessed a long-term trend towards increasing commercialization of leisure and greater working-class leisure expenditure.[5] Rising real incomes, the introduction of the 48-hour week in 1919, and technological developments that lowered real costs (including motorized public transport) led to an interwar acceleration of expenditure growth. National employment in entertainment and sport rose from 101,700 in 1920 to 129,600 in 1929 and 247,900 by 1938.[6]

While historians of leisure initially neglected household budgeting, intra-household resource allocation is receiving growing attention. Feminist historians have emphasized the contested nature of processes by which the male breadwinner's income was divided between household and leisure spending, while research on adolescents in employment has shown that there were also tensions regarding the division of their incomes between personal and pooled expenditure.[7] However, despite some excellent oral history and other qualitative studies, and efforts by contemporaries to quantify working-class leisure participation, research on these processes has been severely impeded by the lack of detailed quantitative evidence.

The 1937/38 Ministry of Labour working-class household expenditure survey provides the first detailed national household data on British working-class leisure consumption. This was Britain's largest pre-1939 nationwide household expenditure survey, providing a representative collection of expenditure budgets for households headed by manual wage-earners (with the exception of the long-term unemployed) and non-manual workers with annual salaries under

[5] Ibid., pp. 11–152; on the commercialization of sport in Britain, see Holt, *Sport*, pp. 144–8.
[6] Jones, *Workers at play*, pp. 42–7.
[7] Davies, *Leisure*, p. 3.

£250. Some 10,762 sets of four, weekly, budgets were collected at four quarterly intervals, from October 1937.

Survey design and execution was supervised by an influential committee comprising relevant government departments, business and other organizations, and statisticians, who achieved a major methodological advance on earlier official and other British household budget investigations. Great care was taken to establish a random sample, which was representative of the population both in terms of geographical composition and household characteristics, while subsequent comparison of the returns against other data showed that this had been successful.[8] Participating households were asked to keep a contemporary record of all expenditure during four separate weeks (spaced at quarterly intervals) and enter the particulars on printed forms, volunteers being employed to explain the procedure to each household and to check their entries. The Second World War delayed analysis of the returns and no comprehensive survey report was published, though several early studies utilised the original data.[9]

The budget returns were believed to have been destroyed, apart from 99 sets of household-level summaries preserved at the National Archives, Kew (TNA: LAB 17/8-106). A further 524 sets of summaries, donated to an academic research project when the other records were destroyed and eventually deposited in the University of Bangor Archives (Ms. 26441-7), have been used in conjunction with the TNA summaries to develop a joint dataset, which has been used in several recent household consumption studies.[10] Of these schedules, 21 are missing information on income or geographical location, providing a usable sample of 603 sets of household budget returns, covering four separate weeks, spaced at quarterly intervals. The Bangor and National Archives records are both from the same one in ten sample of budget summaries, which originally comprised 977 sets of summaries (it appears that some of the Bangor sample budgets were lost before transfer to Bangor).[11] The surviving sample has broadly similar characteristics to the full survey sample, in terms of regional coverage, family size, and household expenditure (though households with expenditures under 50s a week are over-represented in the surviving budgets).[12] A full set of descriptive statistics is contained in Appendix 1 for the interested reader.

[8] TNA, LAB 17/7, 'Weekly expenditure of working-class households', pp. 4–9.
[9] TNA, LAB17/7, 'Weekly expenditure of working-class households'; Prais and Houthakker, *Analysis of family budgets*.
[10] See, for example, Scott and Walker, 'Power to the people'; idem, 'Working class household consumption smoothing'; Gazeley and Newell, 'End of destitution'.
[11] TNA, LAB 17/231, Working Class Household Enquiry, 1937-1938 and Household Expenditure Enquiry, 1953-1954, retention and destruction of records, list of the one in ten sample boxes.
[12] See Gazeley and Newell, 'End of destitution', pp. 11–13. Families on under 50s a week account for 17.7 per cent of non-agricultural workers in the sample, compared with 8.7 for a random sample of 2,225 of

The survey provides detailed household-level data on leisure expenditure, including 'Entertainments' (item No. 86), classified under three sub-items: 'cinemas'; 'theatres, music halls, concerts, dances, etc.'; and 'sports, games, etc. – admission charges'. Other leisure-related items are No. 81 (tobacco and cigarettes);[13] non-work transport costs (a sub-category of No. 82); No. 83 (newspapers, magazines, and other periodicals); 84 (books, stationery, pens, pencils, etc.); 87 (education, music lessons, etc.); 98 (holiday expenditure); and 101 (drink, i.e. beer, mineral water, etc.).[14]

Table 1 examines commercial leisure in the context of overall working class expenditure. The set of leisure activities collectively represent some 18 per cent of disposable income, defined as total expenditure less food, accommodation, and journey to work costs. Meanwhile Table 2 examines the proportion of households that recorded some expenditure on each of the leisure categories in any one of the four survey weeks, together with the average weekly expenditures on each activity for all households. As comparisons of leisure participation are usually based on weekly data, average weekly participation rates are provided in Appendix 2. The returns do not include data on quantities consumed, though reasonable inferences can be made, given information on typical price points.

[Tables 1 and 2 near here]

There is also a small amount of near-contemporary time budget data, the most useful (separately analysing male and female leisure time for a broad range of activities) being Middleton's unpublished 1931 study of weekly time budgets for 180 working people in Liverpool (including some white-collar workers). The sample was dominated by relatively young adults; the average age of respondents was 32 for men, and only 24 for women (reflecting the fact that most left paid work on marriage). Despite this, his data tally reasonably well with available indicators of working-class leisure activities.[15]

these budgets analysed by the Ministry of Labour, TNA, LAB 17/7, 'Weekly expenditure of working-class households'.

[13] Jones, *Workers at play*, p. 45, includes tobacco in his definition of leisure goods, as it constituted a marketed item of 'entertainment, sporting, and spare time character'.

[14] TNA, LAB17/7, 'Weekly expenditure of working-class households'.

[15] For example, 19 per cent of male respondents reported attending spectator sports, while local football matches had average crowds of 40,000 per week, or 16 per cent of the adult male population; consistent with a reasonable margin for attendance at other types of sport, see Middleton, 'Enquiry', pp. 137–45.

The nature of working-class commercial leisure

Commercial leisure is generally classified by activities with functional similarities (such as home and venue-centred leisure). However, such distinctions are less relevant for working-class communities in the 1930s. Given the limited space, overcrowding, and poor quality, of much working class housing, leisure was much less 'domesticated' than during the post-war era, with venues in the immediate vicinity, such as the local pub or cinema, being effectively regarded as an extension of the home. In the following analysis we classify leisure into three broad categories, based on the frequency, cost, and minimum threshold level of commitment demonstrated by the consumer: low commitment activities (reading, cinema-going); high commitment activities (theatre, sport, holidays, educational classes); and addictive activities (smoking, drinking).

Low-commitment activities were typically low cost (relative to leisure time spent), and could be accessed with little or no forward planning. Consumption was typically undertaken in the immediate locality and participants needed little or no knowledge either of the activity itself, or social conventions associated with it, to benefit. These were characterized by relatively high participation rates. By contrast, high-commitment forms of leisure tended to have a very strong appeal to a relatively narrow section of the population. Price points were accordingly higher, and consumption tended to occur *en masse* at specified venues. Consumers would often invest time building up knowledge of (or technical proficiency in) their preferred activity, or in the case of holidays, would save throughout the year for their week of leisure at the seaside. The third class involves activities where commitment is progressive, owing to their addictive nature, and consumption is therefore high despite substantial weekly costs.

One of the most interesting findings from Tables 1 and 2 is the high expenditure devoted to, and household participation in, reading. This corroborates the findings of studies based on local survey, or qualitative, evidence that reading played a central role in the leisure time of many working-class people.[16] Expenditure on reading matter (books, newspapers, magazines, and comics) amounts to 3.1 per cent of average disposable expenditure, significantly higher than for cinema (which is generally regarded as the leading form of working-class commercial leisure at this time). Reading also had the highest participation rates of any commercial leisure activity. Middleton's time budgets indicated that 83 per cent of men, and 84 per cent of women, did some leisure reading each week, devoting an average of 4.44 and 4.36 hours respectively. He

[16] Rose, 'Intellectual life'; McKibbin, 'Ideologies of Class', pp. 242-3; Beaven, 'Leisure', p. 181.

found that newspapers and 'light literature' made up the bulk of reading matter, in about equal proportions.[17]

Newspaper and periodical consumption demonstrates average weekly participation rates of 96 per cent or more for all income groups other than the lowest; a result corroborated by contemporary survey data.[18] Expenditure on books is also found to be widespread (regarding participation in at least one of the four survey weeks), but reveals a much stronger positive relationship with income. Book sales witnessed a major interwar increase; annual volume sales rose from 7.2 million in 1928 to 26.8 million in 1939.[19] Most books were accessed through libraries, yet - given that many towns had very few branch public libraries - people often found it both more convenient and cheaper to use local commercial 'two penny libraries'.[20]

Cinema has significant commonalities with reading in constituting a geographically accessible entertainment, which required little specialist knowledge for its enjoyment and offered a long period of entertainment relative to its cost. Average weekly expenditures of 11.7d make it the third most popular form of leisure after reading and tobacco. Participation is shown to be substantial, but by no means universal, with 50 per cent of households having some attendance on an average week (of the four surveyed) and 71 per cent attending during at least one of the four weeks. Meanwhile, given that minimum admission costs to most cinemas were around 6d (or 3d in the cheapest venues), average weekly attendances were probably at least two or three per household (and twice this number for households recording some participation). Yet despite low unit costs, participation demonstrates a substantial rise from the lowest expenditure group to the second lowest and continues to grow thereafter.

Sedgwick estimated that the average Briton aged 15 or over spent one-and-a-half to two working weeks watching films each year, yet cinema accounted for little more than one per cent of total consumer expenditure.[21] Accessibility was enhanced both by the huge numbers of venues and a wide spread of price points both between and within cinemas. A hierarchy of venues had emerged by the 1930s with city centre 'dream palaces' at the top, modern suburban cinemas in the middle and local 'flea pits' at the bottom. Those attending the more expensive venues paid a premium partly for comfort and style, but also for access to the latest releases. Prices were also influenced by choice of seat; commonly ranging from 6d to 2s 6d within a

[17] Middleton, 'Enquiry into the uses of leisure', pp. 146, 179–80.
[18] Political and Economic Planning, *Report on the British press*, pp. 3, 229–33. See also Harrison and Mitchell, *Home market*, p. 104.
[19] Rowntree, *Poverty and progress*, pp. 371–6. Beaven, *Leisure*, p. 181.
[20] Beaven, *Leisure*, p. 181; Rowntree, *Poverty and progress*, pp. 381–3.
[21] Sedgwick, *Popular film-going*, p. 46.

modern suburban or town centre cinema, or 3d to around 1s 3d in local neighbourhood venues.[22]

Adolescents were the most frequent cinema-goers.[23] A 1937 study of working juvenile girls in Manchester found that cinema had a considerable influence on clothing choices, reading matter, and even speech and 'manners'.[24] There is some evidence of a female gender bias in attendance, though this appears to have largely represented married women having higher participation than their husbands, the gender imbalance for juveniles being much less obvious.[25] Cinema was certainly less gender specific in its appeal than 'high-commitment' commercial entertainments such as spectator sports or dancing, or 'addictive' pursuits such as drinking, smoking, and gambling, and was more family orientated.[26]

Activities such as dancing, spectator sports, and theatres/music halls typically involved a significantly greater minimum commitment than majority leisure pursuits such as reading and cinema, in terms of longer journeys to venues, higher admission costs, and the greater 'cultural capital' investments required to gain full appreciation. As a result weekly participation rates were only a fraction of those for cinema, yet for large numbers of working-class people a visit to a dance hall or football match could be the highlight of their week, assuming an importance out of all proportion to the time spent.

Dance halls represent an archetypal high-commitment leisure activity. Nott characterized the regular dance-goer as typically young, single, predominantly female, and largely working class.[27] Skill took time to accumulate, sometimes via formal tuition, and for the most serious adherents dancing was treated almost as a competitive sport.[28] Yet even among young women regular attendance was confined to a relatively small minority; Middleton's time budgets indicated that only 17 per cent of women, and 6 per cent of men, went to dances during a given week.[29] By 1938 weekly attendances were estimated at two million (around 750,000 visiting public dance halls and the balance being composed of private dances, restaurants, and clubs).[30] Like cinema, dance halls were accessible at a variety of price points. Studies indicate prices ranging from 2d

[22] For example, Richards and Sheridan, eds., *Mass observation*, pp. 32–3; Miskell, *Social history*, pp. 92–8; Beaven, *Leisure*, pp. 191–4.
[23] Davies, *Leisure,* p. 94; Moss and Box, 'Cinema audience', pp. 254–5.
[24] Harley, 'Report of an enquiry', p. 109; see also, Wall and Simson, 'Effects of cinema attendance', pp. 53–61.
[25] The predominance of females in cinema audiences is challenged in Durant, *Problem of leisure,* pp. 117–19; Moss and Box, 'Cinema audience', pp. 254–5; Box, *Cinema and the public*, p. 3.
[26] Davies, *Leisure*, p. 77; Langhamer, *Women's leisure*, p. 166.
[27] Nott, *Music*, pp. 177–85.
[28] James and Moore, 'Adolescent leisure patterns', pp. 132–45; Caradog Jones, *Social survey*, p. 278.
[29] Middleton, 'Enquiry', p. 149; Harley, 'Report ', p. 110.
[30] Nott, *Music*, pp. 154–8; Jones, *Workers at play*, p. 45.

for some open air summer evening dances to 2s 6d or more (6d being a popular price point).[31] However, the costs of costumes, cosmetics, drinks, and longer typical journeys significantly raised minimum financial commitments compared with cinema.

The Ministry of Labour survey groups dance halls with theatre. However, we find a significant pairwise correlation between this category and spending on women's clothing, of 0.32 (at the one per cent significance level), while the correlation with men's clothing expenditure is only 0.1. Mass Observation accounts of dancing in holiday resorts such as Blackpool suggest that drinking was integral to the evening's entertainment, but many dance halls (particularly the more prestigious) were unlicensed.[32] Nevertheless, household drink consumption was found to be strongly correlated with dance/theatre participation. Theatres and music halls have similar features to dance halls in terms of high attendance costs (when transport costs are added), an enthusiast audience, and low working-class participation rates. Music halls or variety theatres accounted for most working-class attendance, though by the late 1930s their numbers were in severe decline, implying significant journey times to venues for most families.

Spectator sports were similarly characterized by low average household participation rates (relative to low-commitment, low-cost leisure activities). Popular spectator sports were nevertheless highly visible, owing to the vast crowds drawn to large stadia and the role of local teams in reinforcing civic pride or fuelling fierce local or regional rivalries.[33] Sporting fixtures took up a good deal of space in local and national newspapers and often provided the main source of conversation in pubs or working mens' clubs, reflected in a positive correlation between expenditure on sport and drink (of 0.17, significant at the one per cent level).[34] Yet for all its social and cultural significance, spectator sport had a relatively narrow appeal.

Unlike the cinema or dance hall, access to football league games was generally limited to home matches played once a fortnight between September and April. Leading clubs were based in cities or large towns, and tended to draw on a very local, and overwhelmingly male, fan base, with skilled and higher paid working class men being over-represented.[35] Admissions typically started at one shilling[36], though would have been higher for important cup-tie fixtures.[37] High minimum price points for professional matches imply that sporting events attended by the

[31] Davies, *Leisure*, pp. 89–90; Nott, *Music*, p. 178; Crump, 'Recreation in Coventry', pp. 277–8; Caradog Jones, *Social survey*, p. 278.
[32] Cross, ed., *Worktowners at Blackpool*, p. 177; McKibbin, *Classes and cultures*, p. 394.
[33] Mason, 'Football', p. 152; Walvin, *People's game*, p. 123.
[34] Holt, *Sport*, pp. 168–9.
[35] Mason, *Association football*, pp. 159–60.
[36] Mason, 'Football', p. 152; Walvin, *People's game*, p. 123.
[37] London School of Economics, *New survey of London life and labour*, pp. 52–6.

lowest strata of the working class would typically be very local, as reflected in the lack of any positive correlation between attendance and non-work transport costs for this group. By contrast we find strong positive correlations (at the 5 per cent significance level of better) between participating in spectator sports and non-work travel expenditures for 50–70s (0.1935), 70–90s (0.1627) and 90–120s (0.1909) households, but not for incomes above 120s. That we are not able to identify a link for the highest income group may reflect their participation in a broad range of leisure pursuits.

Holidays also represented a high commitment activity, principally owing to high minimum costs, which often required systematic savings over several months. However, one major constraint on holiday-going, the absence of earnings during the holiday week, was being relaxed, owing to a dramatic increase in entitlements to holidays with pay in the run up to the 1938 Holidays with Pay Act.[38] Our finding that some 20 per cent of working-class households undertook holiday expenditure (including contributions to holiday savings clubs) at least once over our four survey weeks would appear consistent with a contemporary participation estimate, for all classes, of around one-third of families.[39]

Our data reveal that, in common with other high-commitment leisure activities, access to holidays is sharply differentiated by incomes. Indeed, holidays represent the single largest leisure item for the most affluent working-class households, comprising one-quarter of expenditures. For this group, high weekly incomes severely reduced the commitment necessary for regular holiday savings. Yet holidays displayed low participation rates even amongst the highest-income working-class households (despite some underestimation, given the less frequent nature of the activity and sampling only over four survey weeks, which would nevertheless capture 'holiday club' savings).[40]

Education expenditure is also included under 'high-commitment' leisure, though this category is problematic, as it would include both classes involving genuine leisure, those providing 'mainstream' education, classes related to specific trades or skills, and other activities designed to augment 'cultural capital' while including some leisure element, such as piano lessons.

The third class of leisure activities have low minimum costs of participation, but high typical weekly expenditures for participants, owing to their addictive nature. As such, they represented a substantial part of total leisure expenditure. Tobacco is shown to be the most widespread leisure activity after newspapers and displays a clear positive relationship with income,

[38] Walton, *British seaside*, p. 59.
[39] Brunner, *Holiday making and the holiday trades*, p. 3; Walton, *British seaside*, pp. 58–60.
[40] See Scott and Walker, 'Working class household consumption smoothing', pp. 800-812.

participation rising from 78 per cent for those with the lowest incomes to 93 per cent for households with weekly incomes over 120s. Smoking was traditionally an overwhelmingly male pursuit, associated with other male leisure activities; Mass Observation found greater propensities for male smokers to frequent pubs, spend more on drink, and gamble on horse and dog races.[41] However, women's estimated share of total consumption had risen from 1.0 per cent in 1922 to 9.4 per cent in 1938.[42]

Alcohol represents another addictive, progressive-commitment, activity. Participation is shown to be strongly related to income and again had traditionally been dominated by male wage-earners, a trend that had diminished, but was still clearly evident, during the 1930s. Meanwhile annual beer consumption per head of population aged 15 and over had fallen significantly over the interwar period, to 18.35 gallons in 1938 (equivalent to 2.8 pints per week).[43] This suggests that, in common with most near-contemporary social surveys, our data substantially under-estimate alcohol consumption. Alcohol was an area where the extent of household members' spending was often not known to the housewife. The survey's designers recognised this problem and asked for separate forms to be completed by individuals who undertook such spending. Thus, while under-reporting is still likely to be considerable, the enquiry can be expected to be at least as accurate as other near-contemporary British household budget surveys in capturing alcohol consumption.[44]

Davies identifies drink, gambling, and sport as the three cornerstones of traditional, male-orientated, working-class culture, during a period when a wife's leisure often constituted an independent sphere from that of her husband (which was much less generously resourced, in terms of both money and time).[45] We find some support for Davies's view, with pairwise correlations between drink and sport for household incomes below 50s (0.1840) and for 70–90s (0.1210), both significant at the one per cent level, but not for the two highest expenditure groups (where the proportion of paid work conducted by the 'breadwinner' is typically less than that provided by the rest of the family, thus reducing his share of overall leisure consumption).

Another high-commitment, male-orientated, expenditure category, gambling was omitted from the 1937/38 survey, in common with other near-contemporary surveys (as it was not considered that respondents would provide meaningful data).Estimates suggest that although the majority

[41] Hilton, *Smoking*, p. 117.
[42] Alford, *W. D. & H. O. Wills*, pp. 340, 362.
[43] Gourvish and Wilson, *British brewing industry* p. 335–41, 618–19.
[44] TNA, LAB 17/7, 'Weekly expenditure of working-class households', p. 6.
[45] Ibid., pp. 28–30, 56. See also, Rowntree, *Poverty and progress*, pp. 358–9; London School of Economics, *New survey of London life and labour*, pp. 252–3.

of working-class men bet fairly regularly, average weekly gambling expenditure (net of winnings) was not particularly large and was dwarfed by expenditure on alcohol and tobacco.[46] The analysis also excludes a variety of other leisure activities – such as active sports, hiking, and radio listening (which was very widely diffused even among working-class households by the late 1930s).[47]

Determinants of household participation

Table 3, showing the relationship between household expenditure and composition, illustrates a number of stark differences in demographic characteristics at different income levels. Working-class household income is shown to be strongly determined by the number of wage-earners per household, which rises from 1.15 for households with a weekly expenditure under 50s to 2.87 for those on over 120s per week. While the number of employees per household is significant, the number of days worked by supplementary earners is of even greater importance. The 'breadwinner' provided over 80 per cent of days worked for households on under 50s per week, but less than 60 per cent for families earning 70–90s. For families with incomes over 90s, members other than the breadwinner contributed more than two and a half times the paid hours of those with lower incomes (though this would not be fully reflected in their contribution to total earnings, owing to large wage differentials for women and juveniles, relative to adult males).

[Table 3 near here]

Household leisure expenditure also appears to have been subject to strong lifecycle effects. Families with children below working age had the lowest margin for leisure spending (while child care duties might further restrict leisure opportunities). Conversely, households with children in employment had particularly high leisure spending, both on account of their greater collective financial resources and the high propensities to consume leisure for young, single workers. Since the 1980s historians have challenged previous assertions that 'teenage' lifestyles were an entirely post-war phenomenon and have traced a distinct 'youth culture' at least as far back as the interwar period.[48] Fowler argues that juveniles and single young adult wage-earners

[46] McKibbin, 'Working-class gambling', pp. 151–9; Stone and Rowe, *Measurement of consumers' expenditure*, pp. 91–2.

[47] By 1939 some 71.2 per cent of UK households had radio licenses, while a further 15.3 per cent were estimated to have unlicensed radios, see Scott, 'Intellectual property regimes', Table 1. Radio licenses were grouped with other licenses in the 1937/38 survey and expenditure was only reported if incurred during the week in question.

[48] Davies, *Leisure*, pp. 82, 171.

were both particularly affluent groups within the working class (in terms of disposable income) and constituted the principal beneficiaries of interwar developments in commercialised leisure.[49] Dauphin found that intra-household allocation decisions are conditioned by not only by adults but also by children, a result corroborated by our findings for typical age structures of families at different income levels.[50] Households in the highest expenditure group have almost four times as many working-age (14–17) adolescents than the lowest group, while households in the lowest three expenditure categories have around three times as many children aged under five than the highest two categories. These impacts are also influenced by gender; while the proportions of adolescent boys and girls are quite similar for families on less than 90s per week, there is a distinct jump for higher-income categories, where over 60 per cent of adolescents are male.

The share of wages young people would hand over to their mothers varied by age, with the whole wage packet typically being 'tipped up' on starting work at 14 and progressively larger proportions being retained as they became older. Workers would also take on more personal financial responsibilities by their late teens, such as buying clothes. There was a tendency for sons to retain more money than was the case for daughters.[51] Langhamer found that while boys often paid board to their mothers, girls might continue to hand over their wages right up to when they got married and receive spending money back.[52] However, Todd argues that the amount young women retained for their own spending also varied according to their earnings, local social norms, and the size and financial position of the family.[53] Data on sums retained by young women are relatively scarce, though a 1937 study of employed girls in Manchester, aged 14–19, found that their spending money averaged just over 2s per week.[54]

This period saw a particularly rapid expansion in young women's leisure spending, as the decline of domestic service and expansion of shop, office, and factory work gave them access to leisure structured around the industrialised working day, rather than the longer working day and lower wages of the domestic servant.[55] There was also some reduction in the amount of household labour necessary to maintain working-class homes, principally owing to the diffusion of utilities such as running water, bathrooms, water heating systems, electric lighting (which removed the dust caused by gas light), and modern gas cookers. Plugged-in labour-saving appliances had

[49] Fowler, *First teenagers*, p. 99.
[50] Dauphin et al., 'Are children decision-makers', pp. 871–903.
[51] Davies, *Leisure*, pp. 84–5.
[52] Langhamer, *Women's leisure*, p. 102.
[53] Todd, *Young women*, p. 203.
[54] Harley, 'Report ', p. 56.
[55] Todd, *Young women*, p. 197.

lesser impact, owing to their low diffusion rates.[56] Nevertheless, Middleton found that the housework constraints on single women's leisure time were substantially greater than those for men. Some 50 per cent of married male, and 84 per cent of single male, respondents recorded none of their time being spent on help within the home, while 72 per cent of women (who were almost all single) recorded devoting some 'leisure' time to housework, averaging 5.4 hours per week.[57]

Access to entertainment was limited both by income and location. It was estimated in 1933 that a cinema was not commercially viable in a community of less than 5,000 people, while no town of less than around 40,000 could support a league football team.[58] Table 3 indicates that about 54 per cent of families lived in towns of under 50,000 but that a higher proportion of low-income families were in larger urban areas. For people in villages or suburban estates, travelling to the nearest town could add substantially to the cost of a visit to a football match, cinema, or dance hall; evidence for individual cities indicates return bus or tram fares from outlying estates of 4–8d.[59] High transport costs might lead people to find alternatives to commercialised leisure; a 1938/9 survey of Ipswich found that migrants to new suburban estates tended to spend more of their spare time in their homes and gardens than those living more centrally.[60]

Our data allow us to examine the determinants of household leisure participation over the four survey weeks, for eight distinct leisure activities (we exclude newspapers and periodicals, as these demonstrate almost complete diffusion, with 100 per cent participation in some regions). The literature provides intriguing evidence of substantial differences in participation, influenced both by household income and composition. Yet, given that supply-side data sources relate to individuals' purchases, it is perhaps not surprising that, while there is a keen awareness that household composition and resource allocation mechanisms could potentially have substantial impacts on participation, the literature lacks any systematic quantitative framework for analysing these effects.

Our analysis focuses on the impacts of household composition on household participation for each leisure category. However, the preceding discussion emphasises the need to include household expenditure, which, as Table 2 shows, has a marked influence on participation. The literature also highlights regional differences, as well as urbanisation, as significant determinants of participation. We therefore include the (log) income, a set of dummy variables capturing UK

[56] Bowden and Offer, 'Technological revolution', pp. 244–74; Whitworth, 'Men, women, shops', p. 227.
[57] Middleton, 'Enquiry', pp. 155–6.
[58] Evans and Boyd, *Use of leisure in Hull*, p. 6.
[59] Thompson, *Development of facilities for recreation and leisure*, pp. 4–6.
[60] National Institute of Industrial Psychology, *Leisure pursuits*, p. 55.

Standard Economic Regions, and a further set of dummies for urban size. Non-work transportation and laundry expenditures are also included, as 'enabling' expenditures, in the sense that they widened access (by, respectively, increasing access to venues and freeing up women's leisure time).

The 'industrious revolution' literature highlights household composition as an important driver of labour market participation and consumption behaviour. Women's and children/juveniles' participation is particularly important, as it is for these groups that the balance of factors between allocating time to paid labour, household labour, or (especially for the young) human capital development, changes most over time in response to shifting labour supply and/or demand incentives. We capture each of these dimensions explicitly, specifically the number of children aged under 5, and between 5 and 13, the number of adolescent females and males (14–17), and men and women aged over 18. We further distinguish between 'dual income' families, which we define as families with two adults (one male and one female), both of whom engage in paid work; 'breadwinner' families, where there are two adults, but only the male adult works; and 'other' families. Both 'dual income' and 'breadwinner' families may include some working juveniles. Finally, to test whether household employment patterns influence leisure participation, after controlling for household size, income, and composition, we include a variable capturing the number of earners in the household.

As discussed in the introduction, the bread-winner/home-maker model emphasises the importance of preferences for goods such as better food and a superior domestic environment, which raises the question of trade-offs between leisure participation and consumption of these goods. We incorporate these elements using food expenditures, normalized for household composition using age and gender adult male food expenditure equivalent scales, developed by Prais and Houthakker in their seminal work on the Ministry of Labour survey.[61] We focus on expenditure equivalents rather than nutritional content as, while purchasers knew the cost of food, they would not have had a precise idea of nutritional value. Moreover, recent work suggests that absolute poverty was largely eliminated by the time of the survey; thus expenditure might reasonably be expected to focus on 'luxury' as well as nutritional foods.[62] For housing we utilize a variable capturing the number of rooms occupied, excluding those that are let (the number of individuals in the household being already included in the model). We prefer this variable over accommodation costs, as housing expenditure data for this period are

[61] Prais and Houthakker, *Analysis of family budgets*, pp. 125-45 (based on their preferred, tab. 29, specification). For a recent application of these weightings, in the context of the survey, see Scott and Walker, 'Working class household consumption smoothing', p. 819.
[62] Gazeley and Newell, 'End of destitution'.

distorted by different tenure forms (private renting, local authority renting, purchasing on mortgage, outright ownership, or 'rent-free', i.e. a benefit in kind). In general we find quite strong evidence of substitution effects between housing and different leisure activities.

As we have noted, the data comprise "household-level summaries", rather than individual person data. This is a characteristic of almost all pre-1945 family expenditure surveys – indeed the practice of expenditure pooling would make the collection of individualized spending data problematic. As we do not have a means to directly observe individual spending patterns, we need to infer them indirectly - via information on household composition. To do so we follow an approach analogous to that taken by Horrell and Oxley.[63] Specifically, by linking together characteristics of households with different age, gender, and employment characteristics and household leisure participation we are able to make inferences regarding relationships between household composition and participation. Using data on the number of individuals in each household, their age and gender characteristics, the number of earners, and total household expenditure, we examine the relationships between these characteristics and participation in a wide range of leisure activities, which - as we have shown in reviewing the literature - had distinctive age and gender participation patterns.

Our analysis, in Table 4, uses binary probit models, with the probability of household participation in at least one of the four quarterly survey weeks as the dependent variable.[64] We report the findings as marginal effects, i.e. the change in probability of a family member(s) making a positive expenditure to an infinitesimal change in the continuous regressor (or a unit increase in the dichotomous regressor), holding all other variables at their sample means, so the coefficients can be interpreted as elasticities.[65] Given that we do not have data for individual household members, we need to be careful in interpreting the findings as reflecting the marginal impact of household composition on participation. To illustrate, we take the extreme hypothesis that a household head hoards all the surplus income for leisure spending - the 'total hoarding scenario'. This scenario is an extreme one. It is not consistent with the rational self-interest of the breadwinner to monopolise household expenditure – as this would accelerate the departure of wage-earning juveniles and thus reduce the total surplus income. Furthermore, the substantial qualitative literature shows that it was established practice for wage-earners to receive a share of

[63] Horrell and Oxley, 'Crust or crumb?'

[64] Probit models are commonly used for examining labour market participation and policy issues (e.g. Antecol, 'Gender gap in labour force participation'; Eissa and Hoynes, 'Taxes and the labor market participation of married couples'; Eissa, Kleven, and Kreiner, 'Labor supply and welfare effects for single mothers').

[65] An alternative estimation, looking at intensity of participation (i.e. the number of weeks where participation was recorded), yielded very similar results.

their income back for personal use. Indeed, if the total hoarding scenario were correct, whether the same household income was generated by one, or several, earners would be irrelevant.

However, the findings do not preclude some household heads from obtaining income from other family members' earnings. If a household head were to take a proportion of another household member's income, then we would expect to observe levels of participation that were the same or lower than in the case of each individual keeping all their surplus income. To take a concrete example, Table 4 corroborates the reviewed literature in showing that households with more adolescent girls have higher cinema participation rates. It may be that the tax rate of the household head is zero - in which case we are perfectly capturing the income effect and the coefficient reported, 12.5%, would be an accurate measure of participation rates for households with adolescent girls. Alternatively, it may be that cinema is a sufficiently popular low commitment, and cost, alternative that even if there were a tax on income by the household head, it would need to be large to discourage adolescent girls' participation. If such a tax were insufficiently large, then the coefficient would be an accurate measure of participation rates for households with adolescent girls. However, if the tax were sufficiently high that it reduced their participation, then the coefficient we observe would understate the degree of participation against a counterfactual where all individuals spent their own surplus income. In that sense, we record the observed impact for non-household heads at the lower bound of the unconstrained value (were they able to spend their surplus income as they wished).

[Table 4 near here]

We are able to reject the total hoarding scenario and reassuringly find that activities with a known gender and/or age bias show the predicted variations with household composition. Given our methodology, we need to be careful to highlight the links between the historical literature and the findings obtained. In particular, we find that children under five reduce participation for every category (though not all results are significant). Young children are both costly and reduce the time available for both commercial leisure and women's formal labour market participation, owing to their care needs. Of all leisure activities analysed, cinema, the class with the strongest evidence for a female leisure bias among adults, is most affected, households having one or more children under five being 11.6 per cent less likely to attend screenings in a given week. Older children, aged 5–13, also reduce cinema attendance, though the impact is lower (as would be expected, given the reduced child care burden of school-age children). Cinema attendance is also shown to be positively related to the number of adolescent girls, as suggested in the historiographical literature.

A key finding is that, compared with male 'breadwinner' families, dual income families generally have higher leisure participation (with the exception of 'education'), having controlled for the number of men and women, total household expenditure, and the number of employed individuals.[66] Participation increases are often both significant and large. For example, relative to breadwinner families, dual income households were 28.1 per cent more likely to spend on holidays, 6.5 per cent more likely to spend on reading matter, 6.2 per cent more likely on drink, 12.3 per cent more likely on attending theatres etc., and 4.9 per cent more likely on smoking.

Our findings illustrate critical differences on participation and household composition. In addition to the greater cinema participation of adolescents, we find that households with more adolescent girls were more likely to spend on reading matter than those with adolescent boys. And, despite the rise in smoking by adolescents and women, our results are consistent with male adults being smokers. The findings for drink are less clear. The results suggest that - other than being a dual income family, which raises participation, or having young children, that reduces drinking - there is no indication that having more men over 18 in the household raises participation levels. This is consistent with poor capture of drink expenditure in this and other near-contemporary surveys, discussed earlier.

Our results also shed light on the inter-relationships between participation in commercial leisure outside the home and non-location-specific leisure expenditure. Both drinking and smoking are found to be strongly associated with sports and cinema attendance (raising participation by 13.6 and 30.6 per cent respectively for sport and 9.9 and 18.4 per cent for cinema). A significant correlation is also found for theatres, dance halls, etc. Thus the nexus of smoking, drinking, and sport, together with the strong link between smoking and cinema attendance, is confirmed; indeed there appears to be a significant overlap between these addictive habits and all 'venue-based' leisure activities. Laundry expenditure is positively related to cinema attendance – perhaps providing an early indication of the positive impacts of substitutes for women's housework on their access to commercial leisure. No strong relationships are found between women's clothing and venue-based activities, or holidays, though this may reflect the infrequent nature of clothing purchases and the fact that clothes bought for particular events are not necessarily purchased in the same week as the event.

We are also able to show that there is a broadly negative relationship between the number of rooms a household occupies and its leisure participation. The finding is well determined for

[66] There are two households where income is derived from a single female wage earner. We have included these observations in the 'other' category. We note that excluding them makes no qualitative difference to the results.

three of the eight leisure activities analysed and suggests a trade-off between house size and cinema attendance, sports and holiday expenditure. Meanwhile, relationships between food consumption and leisure participation are less clear, after the other variables in the model have been taken into account.

The wide set of leisure variables at our disposal enables us to further expand the analysis, to test whether household composition influences the diversity of household leisure activities. Specifically, we derive a categorical variable that captures the number of leisure areas that households engaged in, valued between zero, where the household does not participate in any leisure activity over the four survey weeks, to eight, where all activities are engaged in during at least one week. Only in a minority of instances did a household not participate at all (10 weekly-household instances) or in all eight areas (one instances), although 13% engaged in six or more activities, with the mean family participating in 3.5 activities in a given week. To capture the ordinal nature of the variable, we analyse it using an ordered logit estimator. The results are provided in Table 5. The interpretation of the ordered logit coefficient is that, for a one-unit increase in the predictor, the response variable level is expected to change by its respective regression coefficient in the ordered log-odds scale while the other variables in the model are held constant.

[Table 5 near here]

We provide three specifications. The first includes only household composition variables, plus income; the second introduces 'enabling' expenditures, as well as food expenditure and the number of rooms occupied, while the third, preferred, specification also includes both the full set of regional and city size dummies. Dual income households are shown to have substantially more diverse leisure participation, with coefficients that are quite stable across specifications. Two other household compositional characteristics are also consistently significant; the presence of young children (less than 5 years) and adolescent boys. In contrast, having older children (5-13) is not found to significantly effect the diversity of household participation in the preferred estimation, nor does having a higher number of adolescent girls. It is also noteworthy that for some other variables that are well determined, the magnitude of the effect is influenced by the incorporation of a richer set of controls - highlighting the value of using this extremely rich data source. The findings also suggest that enabling expenditures are highly significant, with the exception of food, while total household expenditure shows the expected strong positive relationship. While food consumption does not impact on the diversity of leisure participation, housing does - households with more rooms participating in fewer leisure activities. This may reflect either a trade-off between accommodation and leisure expenditure and/or a locational

effect (larger working-class houses typically being located in suburban areas, some distance from most commercial leisure venues). We also find that families who spend more on enabling expenditures - non-work travel and laundry expenditure – participate in a broader range of leisure activities.

Conclusion

Our findings stress both the importance of mass commercial leisure in the lives of women and juveniles, and the strong link between paid employment and entitlements to leisure spending. Thus families with working wives are shown to have significantly greater propensities to participate in high unit-cost leisure activities such as theatre, music hall, dances etc., and holidays, than 'breadwinner' households. Meanwhile the number of adult women, and juveniles of both genders, are shown to increase attendance at the cheapest form of 'evening out', the cinema, while families where the husband and wife both work appear to switch some of their venue-based leisure from cinema to more expensive activities. The number of males aged 14–17 has a negative or insignificant impact on household leisure spending for activities other than cinema and (at the 10 per cent significance level) education. This is not surprising, given that some would have either continued in full-time education beyond minimum school leaving age or, more commonly, have been placed in apprenticeships, which offered greater long-term employment opportunities than 'dead end' jobs, but at the cost of markedly lower initial earnings.[67] Indeed families might plausibly have conceived this as a trade-off between juvenile boys maximizing current income and taking their reward in leisure, or sacrificing current leisure for longer-term gains.

Our results echo those of Horrell and Oxley for the 1890s, that the earning potential of family members had major impacts on entitlements to household resources.[68] This lends further credence to the view that the 'breadwinner-homemaker' household model was one that concentrated access to resources, especially involving individualized expenditure, in the hands of the breadwinner, rather than constituting an egalitarian pooling of income to meet the needs of those engaged in either paid or household labour. Commercial leisure was a particularly individualized consumption activity and the ability to generate earnings is shown to be key to participation in a range of leisure activities that played major roles in raising individuals' perceived welfare and cultural capital. This leads on to an interesting speculation - for subsequent research – regarding the rapid demise of the 'breadwinner' household after the

[67] Todd, *Young women*, pp. 208–9.
[68] Horrell and Oxley, 'Crust or crumb?'

Second World War, when labour shortages forced employers to relax institutional barriers to women's work (particularly an insistence on full-time working).[69] Given a choice between focusing their labour exclusively on the home or splitting it between home and market, many women chose the latter, plausibly motivated at least in part by the prospect of cash earnings that might give them greater entitlements to leisure and other individualized spending. This in turn, highlights the pitfalls of viewing the household as an entity optimising its collective welfare; in reality power inequalities played a major role in resource allocation and one of their key determinants was participation in the formal labour market.

[69] Matthews, Feinstein, and Odling-Smee, *British economic growth*, p. 60.

References

Alford, B. W. E., *W. D. & H. O. Wills and the development of the U.K. tobacco industry 1786–1965* (London, 1973).

Antecol, H., 'An examination of cross-country differences in the gender gap in labor force participation rates', *Labour Economics*, 7 (2000), pp. 409–26.

Bakker, G., *Entertainment industrialised: the emergence of the international film industry, 1890–1940* (Cambridge, 2008).

Beaven, B., *Leisure, citizenship, and working-class men in Britain 1850–1945* (Manchester, 2005).

Bourke, J., 'Housewifery in working-class England 1860–1914', *Past and Present*, 143 (1994), pp. 167–97.

Box, K., *The cinema and the public: an enquiry into cinema going habits and expenditure made in 1946* (1948).

Bowden, S. and Offer, A., 'The technological revolution that never was: gender, class and the diffusion of household appliances in interwar England', in V. de Grazia and E. Furlough, eds., *The sex of things: gender and consumption in historical perspective*, (Berkeley, 1996), pp. 244–74.

Browning, M. and Meghir, C., 'The effects of male and female labor supply on commodity demand, *Econometrica*, 66 (1991), pp. 1241–78.

Browning H. E. and Sorrell, A. A., 'Cinemas and cinema-going in Great Britain', *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society*, series II, 117, no. 2 (1954), pp. 133–70.

Brunner, E., *Holiday making and the holiday trades* (Oxford, 1945).

Caradog Jones, D., ed., *The social survey of Merseyside*, volume 3 (1934).

Clapson, M., *A bit of a flutter: popular gambling and English society, c.1823–1961* (Manchester, 1992).

Cross G., ed., *Worktowners at Blackpool: mass-observation and popular leisure in the 1930s* (London, 1990).

Crump, J., 'Recreation in Coventry between the wars', in B. Lancaster and T. Mason, eds., *Life and labour in a 20th century city: the experience of Coventry (Coventry, 1986)*, pp. 261-287.

Dauphin, A., El Lahga, A.-H., Fortin, B., and Lacroix, G., 'Are children decision-makers within the household?' *Economic Journal*, 121 (2011), pp. 871–903.

Davies, A., *Leisure, gender, and poverty: working-class culture in Salford and Manchester, 1900–1939* (Buckingham, 1992).

Durant, H., *The problem of leisure* (1938).

De Vries, J., *The industrious revolution: consumer behaviour and the household economy, 1650 to the present* (Cambridge, 2008).

Eissa, N. and Hoynes, H. W., 'Taxes and the labor market participation of married couples: the earned income tax credit', *Journal of Public Economics*, 88 (2004), pp. 1931–8.

Eissa, N., Kleven, H. J., and Kreiner, C. T., 'Evaluation of four tax reforms in the United States: labor supply and welfare effects for single mothers, *Journal of Public Economics*, 92, (2008), pp. 795–816.

Evans, R. and Boyd, A., *The use of leisure in Hull: a survey prepared for the "use of leisure" sub-committee* (Hull, 1933).

Fowler, D., *The first teenagers: the lifestyles of young wage-earners in interwar Britain* (1995).

Gazeley, I. and Newell, A., 'The end of destitution: evidence from urban British working households 1904–37', *Oxford Economic Papers*, 64 (2009), pp. 80–102.

Gourvish, T. and Wilson, R., *The British brewing industry 1830–1980* (Cambridge, 1994).

Harley, J. L., 'Report of an enquiry into the occupations, further education, and leisure interests of a number of girl wage-earners from elementary and central schools in the Manchester district' (unpub. M.Ed. thesis, Univ. of Manchester, 1937).

Harrison, G. and Mitchell, F. C., *The home market* (1939).

Holt, R., *Sport and the British: a modern history* (Oxford, 1989).

Horrell, S. and Humphries, J., 'The origin and expansion of the male breadwinner family: the case of nineteenth century Britain', *International Review of Social History*, supplement, 42 (1997), pp. 25–64.

Horrell, S. and Oxley, D., 'Crust or crumb? Intra-household resource allocation and male breadwinning in late Victorian Britain', *Economic History Review*, LII (1999), pp. 494–522.

James, H. E. O. and Moore, F. T., 'Adolescent leisure in a working-class district', *Occupational Psychology*, XIV (1940), pp. 132–45.

Jones, S. G., *Workers at play: a social and economic history of leisure* 1918–1939 (1986).

Langhamer, C., *Women's leisure in England 1920–60* (Manchester, 2000).

London School of Economics, *New survey of London life and labour, volume IX: life and leisure* (1935).

Mason, T., *Association football and English society, 1863-1915* (Brighton, 1980).

Mason, T., 'Football', in T. Mason, ed., *Sport in Britain: a social history* (Cambridge, 1989).

McKibbin, R., 'Working-class gambling in Britain 1880–1939', *Past & Present*, 82 (1979), pp. 147–78.

McKibbin, R., *The Ideology of Class. Social Relations in Britain 1880-1950* (Oxford, 1991).

McKibbin, R., *Classes and cultures: England, 1918–1951* (Oxford, 1998).

Matthews, R. C. O., Feinstein, C. H., and Odling-Smee, J. C., *British economic growth 1856–1973* (Oxford, 1982).

Middleton, T. M., 'An enquiry into the use of leisure amongst the working classes of Liverpool' (unpub. M.A. thesis, Univ. of Liverpool, 1931).

Miskell, P., *A social history of the cinema in Wales, 1918–1951* (Cardiff, 2006).

Miskell, P., 'Seduced by the silver screen: film addicts, critics and cinema regulation in Britain in the 1930s and 1940s', *Business History*, 47 (2005), pp. 433–48.

Mokyr, J., 'Why "more work for mother?" Knowledge and household behavior, 1870–1945', *Journal of Economic History*, 60 (2000), pp. 1–41.

Moss, L. and Box, K., 'The cinema audience: an enquiry made by the wartime social survey for the Ministry of Information', in J. P. Mayer, *British cinemas and their audiences (1948)*, pp. 250–75.

Munting, R., *An economic and social history of gambling in Britain and the USA* (Manchester, 1996).

National Institute of Industrial Psychology, *Leisure pursuits outside the family circle* (1939).

Nott, J. J., *Music for the people: popular music and dance in interwar Britain* (Oxford, 2002).

Political and Economic Planning, *Report on the British press* (1938).

Prais, S. J. and Houthakker, H. S., *The analysis of family budgets, with an application to two British surveys conducted in 1937–9 and their detailed results* (Cambridge, 1955).

Richards, J. and Sheridan, D., eds., *Mass observation at the movies* (1987).

Rose, J., *The Intellectual Life of the British Working Classes* (New Haven, 2001).

Rowntree, S., *Poverty and progress: a second social survey of York* (London, 1941).

Rowson, S., 'A statistical survey of the cinema industry in Great Britain in 1934', *Journal of*

the Royal Statistical Society , Vol. 99 (1936), pp. 67-129.

Scott, P., 'Intellectual property regimes, monopoly power, and the divergent development

paths of the British and American interwar radio equipment industries', *Business*

History Review (forthcoming, 2013).

Scott, P. and Walker, J. T., 'Power to the people: working-class demand for household power in 1930s Britain', *Oxford Economic Papers*, 63, (2011), pp. 598–624.

Scott, P. and Walker, J. T., 'Working class household consumption smoothing in interwar Britain', *Journal of Economic History*, 72, no. 3 (2012), pp. 797–825.

Sedgwick, J., *Popular Film-going in 1930s Britain: A Choice of Pleasures* (Exeter, 2000)

Stone, R. and Rowe, D., *The measurement of consumers' expenditure and behaviour in the United Kingdom, 1920–1938*, volume 2 (Cambridge, 1966).

Taylor, A. J. P., *English history 1914–1945* (Oxford, 1965).

Taylor, R., 'Walking alone together: football supporters and their relationship with the game', in J. Williams and S. Wagg, eds., *British football and social change* (Leicester, 1991), pp. 111–29.

Thompson, F., 'A study of the development of facilities for recreation and leisure occupation on new housing estates, with special reference to Manchester' (unpub. Diploma in Social Studies, Univ. of Manchester, 1937).

TNA, LAB17/7, 'Weekly expenditure of working-class households in the United Kingdom in 1937–38', unpub. report, Ministry of Labour, July 1949.

TNA, LAB 17/231, TNA, LAB 17/231, Working Class Household Enquiry, 1937-1938 and Household Expenditure Enquiry, 1953-1954, retention and destruction of records.

Todd, S., *Young women, work, and family in England 1918–1950* (Oxford, 2005).

Wall, W. D. and Simson, W. A., 'The effects of cinema attendance on the behaviour of adolescents as seen by their contemporaries', *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 19 (1949), pp. 53–61.

Walton, J. K., *The British seaside: holidays and resorts in the twentieth century* (Manchester, 2000).

Walvin, J., *The people's game* (Edinburgh, 2000).

Whitworth, L. K., 'Men, women, shops, and "little, shiny homes": the consuming of Coventry 1930–1939' (D. Phil., Univ. of Warwick, 1997).

Table 1. Household expenditure on leisure and other activities (%)

	All items	Leisure items	Disposable expenditure
Total expenditure	100.0		
Food	40.0		
Accommodation	12.3		
Transport to work	1.6		
Disposible expenditure	46.1		
Low-commitment leisure			
Cinema	1.1	12.8	2.3
Newspapers	1.2	14.5	2.6
Books	0.2	2.8	0.5
High-commitment leisure			
Theatre etc.	0.2	3.0	0.5
Sport	0.3	3.2	0.6
Holidays	0.9	10.9	2.0
Education	0.3	3.7	0.7
Addictive leisure			
Smoking	3.1	37.5	6.7
Drink	1.0	11.7	2.1
Total leisure	8.3	100.0	18.0

Notes: Definitions of variables are found in the main text.

Table 2. Participation rates for leisure activities (in any of the four weeks) and average weekly expenditures for all households

	Cinema		Newspapers		Books		Theatre		Sport		Holidays		Education		Smoking		Drink	
	%	d	%	d	%	d	%	d	%	d	%	d	%	d	%	d	%	d
Under 50s	36	3.1	94	7.3	43	0.7	11	0.3	15	0.4	6	1.1	1	0.0	78	13.6	24	2.2
50-70s	65	7.3	100	10.0	60	1.2	25	1.1	32	2.1	15	2.5	7	0.9	86	25.8	49	6.1
70-90s	77	10.4	98	12.4	63	1.5	37	2.0	39	3.0	20	5.3	12	2.4	83	30.0	54	7.4
90-120s	88	14.0	100	14.4	75	2.7	42	3.5	50	3.3	28	12.1	12	5.7	92	37.7	65	12.2
Over120s	88	23.6	100	17.9	79	7.0	46	6.7	58	5.3	39	35.2	22	8.5	93	57.6	73	23.7
AVERAGE	71	11.7	98	12.4	64	2.6	32	2.7	39	2.8	22	11.2	11	3.5	86	32.9	53	10.3

Table 3. Household composition and enabling expenditures

	No. in household	No. wage earners	No. days worked by headhold head	No. days worked excl. headhold head	No. females (18+)	No. males (18+)	No. children (under 5)	No. adolescent (14-17)	No. adolescent girls (14-17)	No. adolescent boys (14-17)	Prop. living in towns with popn less than £50K	Non-work transport prop (%)	Laundry prop (%)
Under 50s	3.41	1.15	4.25	1.00	0.99	1.00	0.59	0.12	0.07	0.05	67	21	18
50-70s	3.46	1.39	4.59	2.61	1.02	1.10	0.52	0.17	0.06	0.11	54	28	33
70-90s	3.85	1.61	4.90	3.30	1.11	1.19	0.57	0.33	0.16	0.17	54	34	55
90-120s	4.38	2.39	4.37	8.09	1.46	1.47	0.17	0.63	0.21	0.42	50	42	60
Over120s	4.55	2.87	4.00	10.55	1.89	1.64	0.18	0.47	0.18	0.29	48	52	65
AVERAGE	3.93	1.88	4.42	5.11	1.29	1.28	0.41	0.34	0.14	0.21	54	35	46

Table 4. Determinants of household participation in leisure activities in at least one of the four survey weeks (N=603)

		Low commitment leisure		High commitment leisure				Addictive leisure	
		Cinema	Books	Theatre	Sport	Holidays	Education	Smoking	Drink
Household Composition	Children (under 5)	-0.116 ***	-0.056 *	-0.025	-0.036	-0.056 **	-0.029 **	-0.024	-0.003
		(3.28)	(1.89)	(0.92)	(0.60)	(2.20)	(1.96)	(1.41)	(0.14)
	Children (5 to 13)	-0.036 *	-0.015	0.037 **	-0.036	-0.005	0.022 ***	-0.009	-0.059 ***
		(1.87)	(0.79)	(2.24)	(0.28)	(0.33)	(2.90)	(1.30)	(4.51)
	No. of Adolescent Males (14 to 17)	0.148 **	-0.089 *	0.037 *	-0.044	-0.018	0.007	-0.023	-0.052
		(2.95)	(1.94)	(1.73)	(1.03)	(0.47)	(0.35)	(0.70)	(0.34)
	No. of Adolescent Females (14 to 17)	0.125 **	0.063	-0.043	-0.032	-0.013	0.033 *	-0.095 ***	-0.052
		(2.19)	(1.43)	(1.33)	(0.90)	(0.31)	(1.67)	(2.93)	(1.34)
	No. of Men (18+)	0.081 *	0.094 **	0.022	0.025 **	-0.030	0.003	0.044	-0.045
		(1.71)	(2.23)	(0.58)	(2.24)	(0.89)	(0.17)	(1.29)	(1.38)
	No. of Women (18+)	0.043 **	0.088 **	-0.006	-0.049	0.003	-0.059 **	-0.052 ***	-0.023
		(2.04)	(3.15)	(0.22)	(1.20)	(0.09)	(2.28)	(2.83)	(0.76)
	"Dual income"[1]	0.008	0.065 **	0.123 *	0.006	0.281 ***	-0.005	0.049 **	0.062 **
		(0.09)	(1.98)	(1.84)	(0.07)	(3.87)	(0.14)	(2.02)	(1.96)
	"Other"[2]	0.014	-0.010	0.038	-0.001	0.064 ***	0.045 ***	-0.049 **	0.054 **
		(0.28)	(0.45)	(0.88)	(0.95)	(2.18)	(2.86)	(1.99)	(1.52)
	No. of earners	0.017	0.004	0.013	0.010	-0.060 ***	0.006	0.013	0.011
		(1.14)	(1.20)	(0.58)	(0.40)	(3.12)	(0.45)	(0.78)	(0.37)
Expenditure	log(Expenditure)	0.312 ***	0.246 ***	0.143 ***	0.232 ***	0.302 ***	0.112 ***	0.172 ***	0.277 ***
		(4.50)	(3.65)	(2.52)	(3.70)	(5.97)	(4.70)	(3.83)	(6.14)
Enabling	log(Non-work travel)	0.002	0.004 ***	0.003 ***	0.002 *	0.002 **	0.001	0.0003	0.002 **
		(1.21)	(2.87)	(2.43)	(1.67)	(2.18)	(1.07)	(0.37)	(2.32)
Expenditures	log(Laundry)	0.004 **	0.004 ***	0.001	-0.001	0.001	-0.0011 *	0.001	-0.001
		(2.32)	(3.05)	(0.05)	(0.60)	(1.12)	(1.71)	(1.36)	(0.65)
Other	Drink	0.099 ***		0.067 **	0.136 ***				
		(2.77)		(2.19)	(4.11)				
	Smoke	0.184 ***		0.053 *	0.306 ***				
		(3.77)		(1.77)	(7.42)				
	log(Women's clothing)	-0.002		0.001		0.006			
		(0.23)		(1.35)		(0.88)			
	No rooms	-0.054 ***	-0.026	-0.016	-0.027 **	-0.031 **	-0.013 *	-0.004	0.018
		(3.28)	(1.46)	(1.09)	(2.04)	(2.35)	(1.86)	(0.39)	(1.55)
	log(Food)	0.121	0.121	0.067	0.002	-0.103 *	0.007	-0.084 *	0.059
		(1.45)	(0.55)	(2.35)	(0.02)	(1.73)	(0.22)	(1.86)	(1.16)
City size (Ref. Greater than 500,000)	less than 50,000	0.110	0.072	-0.066	-0.094	0.002	-0.011	0.130 ***	-0.162
		(1.49)	(1.05)	(0.98)	(1.32)	(0.03)	(0.36)	(3.10)	(3.11) ***
	between 50,000-100,000	0.069 **	0.115	0.012	-0.107 **	0.011	-0.043	0.062 **	-0.341
		(2.20)	(1.57)	(0.79)	(1.96)	(0.16)	(1.49)	(2.47)	(6.13) ***
	between 100,000-200,000	0.184 **	0.134 *	0.046	-0.146 **	-0.045	0.086	0.094 **	-0.206
		(2.04)	(1.68)	(0.23)	(2.65)	(0.68)	(1.62)	(2.45)	(3.24) ***
	between 200,001-500,000	-0.050	0.018	-0.040	-0.133 **	0.018	-0.054 **	0.012	-0.109
		(0.30)	(0.22)	(0.77)	(2.40)	(0.27)	(2.03)	(0.24)	(1.79) *
Region dummes		YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Log pseudolikelihood		-338	-330	-327	-339	-275	-160	-423	-750
Pseudo R^2		0.162	0.118	0.089	0.115	0.121	0.173	0.116	0.075

*** Significant at 1% level; ** Significant at 5% level; * Significant at 10% level.

Notes: All estimations include regional dummies based on UK 1980 Standard Economic Regions. The regional dummies were jointly significant in all estimations. The analysis uses regional weightings - weighted by regional populations using, Greater London - Royal Commission on the Distribution of the Industrial Population, Report (Cmd. 6153 of 1940); other regions, C.H. Lee, British Regional Employment Statistics 1841-1971 (Cambridge, 1980). For probit estimations, coefficients are estimated marginal effects ($\partial F / \partial x_k$), i.e. the marginal effect of Pr(y = 1) given a unit increase in the value of the relevant dichotomous regressor (x_k) holding all other regressors at their sample means. The discrete change in probability is reported for binary regressors. z-statistics are reported and are derived using robust standard errors.

[1.] The reference group is families where there is a single male breadwinner. 'Dual income' families are those where there are two adults, one male and one female, who are both in employment. [2.] 'Other' includes those households that are neither 'dual income' nor 'breadwinner' households.

Table 5: Determinants of the diversity of household participation in leisure activities during any survey week (N=603)

		1		2		3	
Household Composition	Children (under 5)	-0.266	***	-0.398	***	-0.391	***
		(7.32)		(5.94)		(5.76)	
	Children (5 to 13)	-0.103	**	-0.060		-0.063	
		(2.51)		(1.36)		(1.39)	
	No. of Adolescent Males (14 to 17)	-0.424	***	-0.215	*	-0.235	**
		(3.89)		(1.91)		(2.03)	
	No. of Adolescent Females (14 to 17)	-0.205		-0.080		0.010	
		(1.53)		(0.63)		(0.66)	
	No. of Men (18+)	-0.123		0.036		0.037	
		(1.25)		(0.33)		(0.09)	
	No. of Women (18+)	-0.223	**	-0.061		-0.062	
		(2.41)		(0.59)		(0.58)	
	"Dual income"[1]	0.822	***	0.841	***	0.881	***
		(4.24)		(4.15)		(4.20)	
	"Other"[2]	0.232	**	0.208	*	0.231	**
		(2.07)		(1.83)		(2.01)	
	No. of earners	-0.018		-0.114		-0.015	
		(0.20)		(1.24)		(0.61)	
Expenditure	log(Expenditure)	2.385	***	2.190	***	2.330	***
		(20.84)		(13.93)		(14.03)	
Enabling	log(Non-work travel)			0.004	***	0.019	***
				(5.70)		(5.81)	
Expenditures	log(Laundry)			0.004	***	0.011	***
				(2.75)		(3.18)	
	No. rooms			-0.026	***	-0.154	***
				(3.40)		(3.99)	
	log(Food)			0.121		0.144	
				(1.06)		(0.83)	
Region dummes		NO		NO		YES	
City size dummies		NO		NO		YES	
Log pseudolikelihood		-2083		-2022		-2008	
Pseudo R^2		0.086		0.093		0.101	

*** Significant at 1% level; ** Significant at 5% level; * Significant at 10% level.

Notes: All estimations use regional weightings - weighted by regional populations using, Greater London - Royal Commission on the Distribution of the Industrial Population, Report (Cmd. 6153 of 1940); other regions, C.H. Lee, British Regional Employment Statistics 1841-1971 (Cambridge, 1980).

[1, 2,] see Table 4 for definitions.

Appendix 1

Descriptive statistics (averages over the four weeks)

		mean	std	min	max
EXPENDITURE	Weekly expenditure	84.28	38.13	18.8	304.6
VARIABLES	Food	33.75	12.92	9.0	98.9
(in shillings)	House	10.34	5.92	0	35.2
	Transport to work	1.36	2.35	0	18.1
	Cinema	0.89	1.00	0	6.2
	Theatre	0.21	0.47	0	4.1
	Sport	0.22	0.44	0	4.1
	Holiday	0.76	3.34	0	50.0
	Tobacco	0.57	0.92	0	5.3
	Tobacco and cigarettes	0.33	0.88	0	9.6
	Cigarettes	1.72	2.22	0	23.6
	Drink	0.81	1.76	0	16.0
	Newspaper	1.01	0.50	0	3.1
	Books	0.19	0.50	0	9.8
	Postage	0.43	0.80	0	16.0
	Rail (non-work)	0.15	0.52	0	6.8
	Other trans (non-work)	0.49	0.78	0	8.8
	Education	0.26	1.61	0	24.6
	Laundry	0.50	0.81	0	6.5
DEMOGRAPHIC	No of days worked	9.36	7.82	0	245
Occupants	No. Children (less than 5)	0.43	0.73	0	4
	No. Children (btw 5 & 13)	0.61	0.89	0	6
	No. in household	0.39	1.63	1	11
Housing	No. of rooms*	4.24	1.18	0	8
Regions	Greater London	0.11	0.32	0	1
	South East	0.17	0.37	0	1
	South West	7.97	0.27	0	1
	East Anglia	0.06	0.24	0	1
	East Midlands	0.06	0.23	0	1
	West Midlands	0.63	0.24	0	1
	Yorkshire	0.12	0.33	0	1
	Northern	0.09	0.29	0	1
	North West	0.15	0.36	0	1
	Scotland	0.06	0.24	0	1
	Wales	0.04	0.19	0	1
City size	less than 50	0.54	0.50	0	1
(000s)	50 to 100	0.11	0.31	0	1
	100 to 200	0.08	0.27	0	1
	200 to 500	0.10	0.30	0	1
	more than 500	0.17	0.37	0	1
	more than 500	0.17	0.37	0	1
OTHER	Disperse	3.55	1.66	0	8

Notes: Definitions of variables are found in the main text.

Appendix 2

Average household participation rates over each of the four survey weeks (%)

	Cinema	Newspapers	Books	Theatre	Sport	Holidays	Education	Smoking	Drink
Under 50s	22	85	17	3	5	3	18	78	14
50-70s	43	96	30	7	14	6	30	86	27
70-90s	50	96	31	11	18	9	34	83	31
90-120s	63	98	41	16	23	12	44	92	44
Over120s	70	99	46	20	29	15	49	93	46
AVERAGE	50	95	33	12	18	9	35	86	33